Check for updates

OPEN ACCESS

EDITED BY César Fernández-de-las-Peñas, Rey Juan Carlos University, Spain

REVIEWED BY Dalila Scaturro, University of Palermo, Italy Mustafa Bayraktar, Atatürk University, Türkiye

*CORRESPONDENCE Maria Leopolda Moratalla-Cebrián ⊠ leopolda.moratalla@uclm.es Blanca Notario-Pacheco ⊠ blanca.notario@uclm.es

RECEIVED 14 December 2023 ACCEPTED 26 February 2024 PUBLISHED 21 March 2024

CITATION

Marcilla-Toribio I, Moratalla-Cebrián ML, Notario-Pacheco B, Escudero-Lopez MA, Morales-Cuenca N and Martinez-Andres M (2024) Gender differences in symptomatology, socio-demographic information and quality of life in Spanish population with long COVID condition: a cross-sectional study. *Front. Public Health* 12:1355973. doi: 10.3389/fpubh.2024.1355973

COPYRIGHT

© 2024 Marcilla-Toribio, Moratalla-Cebrián, Notario-Pacheco, Escudero-Lopez, Morales-Cuenca and Martinez-Andres. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY). The use, distribution or reproduction in other forums is permitted, provided the original author(s) and the copyright owner(s) are credited and that the original publication in this journal is cited, in accordance with accepted academic practice. No use, distribution or reproduction is permitted which does not comply with these terms.

Gender differences in symptomatology, socio-demographic information and quality of life in Spanish population with long COVID condition: a cross-sectional study

Irene Marcilla-Toribio^{®1,2,3}, Maria Leopolda Moratalla-Cebrián^{®2,3*}, Blanca Notario-Pacheco^{®1,2,4*}, Miguel Angel Escudero-Lopez^{®2}, Nagore Morales-Cuenca^{2,4} and Maria Martinez-Andres^{®1,2,3}

¹Universidad de Castilla-La Mancha, Centro de Estudios Sociosanitarios, Cuenca, Spain, ²Universidad de Castilla-La Mancha, Grupo de Investigación Health, Gender, Social Determinants, Cuenca, Spain, ³Universidad de Castilla- La Mancha, Facultad de Enfermería de Albacete, Albacete, Spain, ⁴Universidad de Castilla-La Mancha, Facultad de Enfermería de Cuenca, Cuenca, Spain

Introduction: Long COVID patients experience a decrease in their quality of life due to the symptomatology produced by the disease. It is also important to understand how long COVID affects both men and women. The objective of this study is to examine the impact of long COVID symptomatology on the quality of life of Spanish adults from a gender perspective.

Methods: An observational and cross-sectional study was carried out. Participants were able to complete an online questionnaire using an online platform. A sample of 206 people participated in the study.

Results: The 80.6% of the sample were women with a mean age of 46.51 (\pm 8.28) and the 19.4% were men with a mean age of 48.03 (\pm 9.50). The medium score in the PAC19-QoL test was 141.47 (\pm 24.96) and segmented by gender, 141.65 (\pm 23.95) for women and 140.82 (\pm 28.66) for men. The most common symptoms in women were muscle and joint pain (94.6%), fatigue (94.0%), discomfort (92.2%), difficulty concentrating (91.0%), and memory loss (88.6%). For men the symptoms included muscle and joint pain (97.5%) and fatigue (97.5%) both occupying first position, discomfort (92.0%), difficulty concentrating (90.0%), mood disturbances (90.0%), and memory loss (87.5%). The chi-square test showed statistical significance (p < 0.005) for socio-demographic information, quality of life scores, and long COVID symptoms by intensities.

Conclusion: This study shows that there are gender differences in the way that long COVID is experienced.

KEYWORDS

long COVID, post-acute COVID syndrome, gender perspective, quality of life, symptomatology, epidemiology, public health

Introduction

The COVID-19 pandemic has had a global impact on various spheres of life worldwide (1). In addition to being a public health crisis and causing global economic disruption, this disease has had a significant impact on individual health (1, 2). Cases of incomplete recovery and persistence of symptoms months after the acute phase of the disease have been documented. This is a condition commonly referred to as long COVID (3, 4).

The World Health Organisation (WHO) has defined the term "long COVID" as the persistence of signs, symptoms, or abnormal clinical parameters persisting 3 months following the onset of COVID-19 (with or without a confirmed diagnosis) and with a duration of at least 2 months which cannot be explained by an alternative diagnosis (5). It is estimated that this disease affects 1 in 8 adults, or 12.7%, infected with COVID-19 (6, 7).

Long COVID can affect multiple organ systems and can include very heterogeneous symptoms (3, 8, 9). Although the exact cause of this disease is still not yet fully understood (3, 9, 10), the symptomatology has been well-studied. These more than 200 possible symptoms can be organized into categories such as general, respiratory, cardiac, neurological, psychological, otorhinological, ophthalmological, dermatological and digestive symptoms (3, 9, 11). Fatigue or asthenia, classified as general symptoms, has been reported as the most common symptomatology (3, 9, 11, 12). Other of the most prevalent symptoms reported have been respiratory and neurological symptoms (6, 11, 12). Although long COVID symptomatology has been studied, there is still very little information as regards its impact in terms of intensity (11, 12). Furthermore, long COVID seems to follow a pattern which points to the female gender in their 40s as the group most affected by this disease, however, there is a deficiency in knowledge as regards the differences between symptoms based on gender (3, 13, 14).

Several guidelines have been published on the treatment of long COVID, including rehabilitation and the use of drugs used in similar conditions such as fibromyalgia (10, 15). Additionally, clinical characterization of patients with the illness is essential to provide appropriate therapeutic options (4, 10). However, there is still a significant practical gap that needs to be addressed. Furthermore, to alleviate the burden on individuals with long COVID and the healthcare systems that support them, it is imperative to gain a better understanding of the pathogenesis, risk factors, symptoms and treatment methods of this condition (16).

The effects of an illness usually go beyond its clinical outcome such as mortality and morbidity and encompass the subjective plane in terms of poorer health-related quality of life (17, 18). This disease is known to affect the quality of life of those suffering from long COVID due to the frequency and the burden of persistent symptoms over time (19, 20). In certain circumstances, that situation can be extremely disabling. Unquestionably it is a public health issued that needs to be addressed (3). The importance of assessing the quality of life in people who suffer from this disease is crucial to finding solutions to this disease (3, 19). Emerging evidence suggests that these long-term symptoms have a negative impact on the health-related quality of life of afflicted patients and affect patients' ability to function in everyday life, including their ability to work (21, 22). Whether persistent symptoms intensities impacts health-related quality of life and if it is differences per gender are still unclear (21, 23).

Currently, there are general validated instruments which assess the quality of life, including EQ-5D, SF-36, and SF-12, but there is likewise a specific tool, thus far, that specifically assesses the quality of life in people suffering from long COVID, the "PAC19-QoI"instrument (24). In addition to being validated in its original language, English, to the best of one's knowledge, it has likewise been validated in other languages including Spanish (25), Slovak (26), and German (27).

Finally, the prognosis of this disease varies significantly among patients (28). Individual prognosis depends on several factors, including the severity of the initial infection, the presence of comorbidities, and the age and general health of the patient. Although there are currently limited studies on the prognosis and outcome of long COVID, further follow-up studies are necessary to determine the extent of the harm (29, 30).

Based on current knowledge to date, there have been no studies published which examine the impact of long COVID symptoms as regards the quality of life of these patients from a gender perspective. Therefore, the objective of this study is to examine the impact of long COVID symptomatology on the quality of life of Spanish adults from a gender perspective. The secondary objectives were (a) to analyse the influence of socio-demographic variables on quality of life and whether gender-related differences exist and (b) to assess how the intensity of the long COVID symptomatology influences quality of life and the role of gender.

Methods

Design

An observational and cross-sectional study was carried out with data collected using an online questionnaire to answer the research questions.

Participants and data collection

The study used convenience sampling to recruit adults suffering from long COVID in Spain. The researchers invited to participate individuals aged 18 years and above through various Spanish long COVID associations and social media. After receiving information about the study's objectives and procedures of the study, all the interested participants completed the consent form and then, the online questionnaire via the provided link. Participants were also provided with the contact details (email and telephone number) of the research team to resolve any doubts or problems during the filling of the survey. Finally, 206 people participated in the study. The inclusion criteria were based on the following: to be age 18 and older, have had COVID-19 or suspicions due to compatible symptomatology, have or have had symptomatology over three or more months since the onset of COVID-19 infection, and be able to speak, read, and/or understand Spanish. Individuals with end-stage disease, institutionalization, intellectual disability, dementia, and language barriers were excluded. Participants completed the questionnaire in an online format in the SurveyMonkey online platform account of the University of Castilla-La Mancha between 20 June to 20 July 2022. Security protocols and protection of personal data were upheld.

Variables and measurement instruments

The variables obtained and the measurement instruments used in the questionnaire for each participant were as follows:

- Sociodemographic information: gender, age, weight, height, marital status, level of education, and dependency in the household.
- Clinical information: COVID-19 and long COVID symptomatology and habits such as drinking alcohol, smoking, sleep problems and comorbidities.
- PAC19-QoL Spanish tool. This questionnaire specifically assesses the quality of life in people with long COVID. This instrument has 5 domains (social, psychological, self-recognition, physical, and work) and 44 items. This enables estimating the impact of long-term COVID on the quality of life of affected patients. Scores range from 0 to 220, with higher scores indicating a lower quality of life.

Data analysis

The data analysis was performed using the version 28.0 of IBM SPSS statistical software. A descriptive analysis was carried out to provide a profile of participants in the study. For categorical variables, the sample characteristics and responses were presented as frequency and percentage. For continuous data, the variables were reported as mean and standard deviation and/or median/ interquartile range. The Kolmmogorov-Smirnov test was used to verify the normality of the variables and the Levene test to verify the homogeneity of variance (Supplementary material). The relationship between sociodemographic characteristics, quartiles of quality of life and symptomatology was stablished using the Chi-Square test. The analysis was considered statistically significant at a *p* value \leq 0.05.

Ethical considerations

The study protocol was registered and approved under number 2022/001 by the Clinical Research Ethics Committee from Hospital of Albacete. All research procedures used in this study were established as per the Declaration of Helsinki. All participants provided their consent to participate in the study after being duly information as regards the objectives and procedures.

Results

This study comprised 206 people with a mean age of 46.81 years (± 8.53). Of the total participants 166 were women (80.6%) with a mean age of 46.51 (± 8.28) and 40 were men (19.4%) with a mean age of 48.03 (± 9.50). The sociodemographic data obtained are shown in Table 1.

To obtain the PAC19-QoL score, 45 questionnaires with unanswered items were considered missing dates. Therefore, 161 questionnaires were scored, 126 (78.3%) were from women, and 35 (21.7%) were from men. The average score in the test was 141.47 (\pm 24.96) and segmented by gender, 141.65 (\pm 23.95) for women and 140.82 (\pm 28.66) for men. A ceiling or floor effect was absent, as any participants scored the minimum (0) or the maximum score (220). Quality of life was also calculated by percentiles. These were classified as 0 to 25th percentile high quality of life, 25th to 75th percentile moderate quality of life, and 75th to 100th percentile low quality of life (Figure 1).

Symptomatology did not follow a normal distribution. The five most common symptoms in female were muscle and joint pain (94.6%), fatigue (94.0%), discomfort (92.2%), difficulty concentrating (91.0%), and memory loss (88.6%). For men, the symptoms included muscle and joint pain (97.5%) and fatigue (97.5%) both occupying first position, discomfort (92.0%), difficulty concentrating (90.0%), mood disturbances (90.0%), and memory loss (87.5%). The frequency of long COVID symptomatology is shown in Table 2.

Insofar as symptomatology by intensities are concerned (Figure 2), the three strongest most prevalent symptoms in women were muscle and joint pain (62%), fatigue (61.4%), and concentration difficulties (54.8%). For male, there were fatigue (57.5%), muscle and joint pain (55.0%), and in the third same position were discomfort (47.5%), and mood disturbances (47.5%).

The Chi-square test with the socio-demographic information and the long COVID symptoms as per intensities with the quality-of-life scores of the participants was carried out. In terms of socio-demographic information and quality of life, women showed a *p*-value ≤ 0.05 for the dependency in the household (p=0.045) and sleep problems (p=0.025) variables. Men showed a *p*-value ≤ 0.05 for the overweight (p=0.043), obesity (p=0.032), married (p=0.033), single (p=0.033), primary education (p=0.028), alcohol (p=0.018), and sleep problems (p=0.046) variables. In terms of intensity of symptomatology and quality of life, women showed a *p*-value ≤ 0.05 for all symptoms except for dyspnoea (p=0.078), cough (p=0.109), skin rashes (p=0.104), and conjunctivitis (p=0.090). For men, only taste loss showed a significant *p*-value (p=0.007). For both genders, severe symptom modality was related closely to poorer quality of life score.

Table 3 shows the chi-square test to relate the intensity of the long COVID symptoms and the socio-demographic data. Women showed *p*-value ≤ 0.05 in the BMI category and the fatigue (p=0.046) and diarrhea (p=0.021) symptoms; in the marital status category and the diarrhea (p = 0.036), olfactory loss (p = 0.026) and difficulty swallowing (p = 0.002) symptoms; in the dependency in the household category and the memory loss (p=0.001); in the education category and the diarrhea (p = 0.011) symptoms; in the alcohol category and the dyspnoea (p = 0.006) symptom; in the sleep problems category and the fatigue (p=0.001), difficulty concentrating (p = 0.028), memory loss (p = 0.003), palpitations (p = 0.028), cough (p = 0.005), and difficulty swallowing (p = 0.031)symptoms. Men showed *p*-value ≤ 0.05 in the category education and the skin rashes (p=0.036) and conjunctivitis (p=0.046)symptoms; the tobacco category and the cough (p=0.046)symptom; the alcohol category and the discomfort (p=0.023)symptom; the sleep problems category and the difficulty concentrating (p = 0.004), and memory loss (p = 0.012) symptoms. Distributions and chi-square test of socio-demographic variables and long COVID symptomatology data based on intensity per gender are shown in Tables 4, 5.

TABLE 1 Socio-demographic characteristics of the sample population.

Age/years Mem 1.8 DP 46.8 ± 8.5 46.5 ± 8.3 48.5 ± 9.5 No answer 5 (2.4%) 4(3.2%) 1(3.2%) BMI (Kg/m) 25.5 ± 5.8 27.7 ± 5.5 Underweight 5 (2.4%) 5 (3.0%) 0 (0%) Normal weight 95 (4.5%) 7 (2.5 ± 5.8 27.7 ± 5.5 Underweight 95 (4.5%) 7 (2.5 ± 5.8 27.7 ± 5.5 Overweight 48 (2.3%) 7 (2.2 %) 15 (3.7 %) Overweight 48 (2.3%) 37 (2.3%) 11 (2.5%) Obesity 47 (2.2 %) 35 (21.1%) 12 (30.0%) No answer 13 (6.3%) 11 (6.6%) 2 (6.5%) Married 128 (62.1%) 10 (26.1.4%) 26 (65.0%) Single 46 (2.3%) 36 (1.7 %) 10 (2.6 %) Divorced 7 (3.4%) 7 (4.2%) 40 (0.0%) Divorced 7 (3.4%) 7 (1.2 %) 4 (0.0%) Other 7 (3.4%) 21 (12.7%) 8 (20.0%) No 10 (5 (7.9 %) 13 (6.0%) 3 (7 5%)	Socio-demographic data	Total group (<i>n</i> = 206)	Women (<i>n</i> = 166)	Men (<i>n</i> = 40)
No answer5 (2.4%)4 (2.4%)1 (2.5%)BM (Kg/m)Ment a SD263 a 5.72.5 9 a 5.82.7 z 5.5Underweight5 (2.4%)5 (3.0%)0.0(%)Normal weight93 (45.1%)78 (47%)15 (3.75%)Overweight48 (2.3%)3.7 (2.3%)11 (2.5%)Overweight44 (2.3%)3.5 (2.11%)12 (3.00%)Na answer13 (6.3%)11 (6.6%)2.6 (5.0%)Narital status128 (62.1%)102 (61.4%)2.6 (5.0%)Single2.6 (2.1%)3.6 (21.7%)4.0 (0.5%)Obvorced2.5 (12.1%)2.1 (12.7%)4.0 (0.5%)Obvorced2.5 (12.1%)2.1 (12.7%)4.0 (0.5%)Obvorced2.5 (12.1%)2.1 (12.7%)4.0 (0.5%)Obvorced1.5 (5.7.6%)1.1 (6.6%)3.0 (75%)Obvorced1.5 (5.7.6%)1.1 (6.6%)3.0 (75%)Na answer1.0 (5.9.6%)1.1 (6.6%)3.0 (75%)No answer1.0 (4.9%)7 (4.2%)3.0 (75%)Secondary8.7 (4.2%)3.0 (55%)3.0 (55%)Obvorced1.0 (4.9%)7 (4.2%)3.0 (75%)Secondary1.0 (4.9%)3.0 (55%)3.0 (55%)Obvorced1.0 (4.9%)3.0 (55%)3.0 (55%)Obvorced1.0 (2.4%)3.0 (55%)3.0 (55%)Obvorced1.0 (4.9%)3.0 (55%)3.0 (55%)No answer1.0 (4.9%)3.0 (55%)3.0 (55%)No answer1.0 (2.4%)3.0 (55%)3.0 (55%)Obvorced <t< td=""><td>Age/years</td><td></td><td></td><td></td></t<>	Age/years			
BHT (Kgm*)Mean ±SD26.3 ± 5.725.9 ± 5.827.7 ± 5.5Underweight5.6 2.4%)5.6 3.0%)0.0 (0%)Normal weight9.9 ± 6.1 (0.9 %)7.8 (47%)1.6 ± 5.0 %)Overweight4.8 (2.3%)3.7 (2.3 %)1.0 (2.6 %)Obesity4.8 (2.3 %)3.7 (2.3 %)1.0 (2.6 %)Obesity4.8 (2.3 %)3.7 (2.3 %)1.0 (2.6 %)Obesity4.7 (2.8 %)3.6 (2.1 %)1.0 (2.6 %)Normace1.0 (2.6 %)1.0 (2.6 %)1.0 (2.6 %)Narried1.0 (2.6 %)1.0 (2.6 %)2.6 (5.6 %)Single1.0 (2.6 (2.1 %)3.6 (2.1 %)1.0 (2.6 %)Other2.7 (2.1 %)3.6 (2.1 %)1.0 (2.6 %)Other2.7 (2.1 %)3.6 (2.1 %)3.0 (2.6 %)Other2.7 (2.1 %)3.0 (2.6 %)3.0 (2.6 %)Other2.7 (2.1 %)3.0 (2.6 %)3.0 (2.6 %)Namer1.0 (2.6 %)1.0 (2.6 %)3.0 (2.6 %)Namer1.0 (2.6 %)1.0 (2.6 %)3.0 (2.6 %)Namer1.0 (2.6 %)3.0 (2.6 %)3.0 (2.6 %)Namer1.0 (2.6 %)3.6 (2.6 %)3.0 (2.	Mean±SD	46.8±8.5	46.5 ± 8.3	48 ± 9.5
Name263±57259±58277±55Underweight5(3.4%)5(3.0%)0(0%)Normal weight93 (45.1%)78 (47%)15 (3.5%)Overweight448 (2.3%)73 (2.3%)11 (2.5%)Obesity47 (2.2.8%)35 (2.1.%)12 (3.0%)No anawer13 (6.3%)11 (6.5%)2.5(3.0%)Normal weight128 (62.1%)10 (2.6.4%)2.6(5.0%)Single128 (62.1%)10 (2.6.4%)2.6(5.0%)Single128 (62.1%)10 (2.6.4%)2.6(5.0%)Obvered25 (2.1%)3.5 (2.1.%)4.0(0.0%)Obvered25 (2.1%)3.6 (2.1%)4.0(0.0%)Obvered25 (2.1%)2.1 (1.2.%)4.0(0.0%)Obvered29 (14.1%)2.1 (1.2.%)8.0(0.0%)No13 (5.6,0%)11 (6.6%)3.0 (3.0%)No13 (5.7,6%)11 (6.6%)3.0 (3.0%)No13 (5.6,0%)11 (6.6%)3.0 (3.0%)No13 (5.6,0%)11 (6.6%)3.0 (3.0%)No13 (5.6,0%)11 (6.6%)3.0 (3.0%)No13 (6.3%)11 (6.6%)3.0 (3.0%)Scondary6.0 (1.6,1%)9.0 (3.0%)3.0 (3.0%)Scondary10 (1.6,1%)10 (4.0%)3.0 (3.0%)Scondary10 (2.6%)13 (6.3%)11 (6.3%)Scondary10 (2.6%)13 (3.0%)10 (4.0%)Scondary10 (2.6%)13 (3.0%)13 (3.0%)Scondary10 (2.6%)13 (3.0%)13 (3.0%)Scondary10 (2.6%)<	No answer	5 (2.4%)	4 (2.4%)	1 (2.5%)
Underweight5 (2.4%)5 (3.0%)0 (0%)Normal weight93 (45.1%)78 (47%)15 (3.5%)Overweight44 (23.3%)37 (22.3%)11 (2.5%)Obesity47 (22.8%)35 (21.1%)12 (3.0%)Nanswer13 (6.5%)11 (6.6%)2.5 (5.5%)Martiel status10 (26.1%)26 (65.0%)Orgel46 (22.3%)10 (26.1%)10 (26.0%)Orgel64 (22.3%)36 (21.7%)40 (0%)Obroced25 (21.1%)21 (12.7%)40 (0%)Obroced25 (21.1%)21 (12.7%)40 (0%)Obroced25 (21.1%)21 (12.7%)36 (20.5%)Obroced29 (44.1%)21 (12.7%)36 (20.5%)Obroced29 (44.1%)21 (12.7%)36 (20.5%)No16 (57.6%)134 (40.7%)30 (75%)No16 (57.6%)134 (40.7%)36 (25.5%)No16 (14.9%)74 (29.0%)36 (25.5%)No16 (61.5%)90 (54.2%)16 (40.5%)No answer10 (4.6%)37 (25.8%)No answer10 (24.5%)36 (25.9%)No answer10 (24.5%)38 (50.0%)19 (45.5%)No answer10 (24.5%)38 (50.0%)13 (32.5%)No answer10 (24.5%)34 (20.5%)31 (32.5%) <td>BMI (Kg/m²)</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>	BMI (Kg/m ²)			
Normal weight99 (45.1%)78 (47%)15 (37.5%)Overweight44 (23.3%)37 (22.3%)11 (27.5%)Obesity47 (22.8%)35 (21.1%)12 (30.0%)Na newer13 (6.3%)11 (6.6%)2 (5.0%)Marial status2 (5.0%)Maried128 (21.9%)102 (61.4%)26 (65.0%)Single64 (22.3%)36 (21.7%)10 (25.0%)Obvorced27 (3.4%)21 (12.7%)4 (10.0%)Other7 (3.4%)7 (4.2%)0 (00%)Obvorced29 (14.1%)21 (12.7%)8 (20.0%)No15 (57.6%)114 (80.7%)30 (75%)No answer13 (6.5%)114 (80.7%)30 (75%)No answer13 (6.5%)11 (6.6%)2 (15.5%)Version104 (49.5%)31 (32.5%)31 (5.5%)University or higher10 (4.9%)7 (4.2%)31 (5.5%)No answer10 (4.9%)7 (4.2%)31 (5.5%)No answer10 (4.5%)31 (5.0%)16 (40.0%)No answer10 (4.5%)31 (5.0%)10 (4.5%)No answer110 (4.9%)31 (3.2%)13 (3.2%)New smoker10 (24.5%)48 (28.9%)31 (3.2%)E-smoker for more than 5 years61 (29.6%)48 (28.9%)31 (3.2%)Sponda: for more than 5 years61 (29.6%)48 (28.9%)31 (3.2%)E-smoker for more than 5 years61 (29.6%)48 (28.9%)31 (3.2%)E-smoker for nore than 5 years61 (29.6%)48 (28.9%)31 (3.2%)	Mean±SD	26.3±5.7	25.9 ± 5.8	27.7±5.5
Overweight48 (23.3%)37 (22.3%)11 (27.5%)Obesity47 (22.8%)35 (21.1%)12 (3.0%)Nanswer13 (6.3%)11 (6.6%)2 (5.0%)Married128 (62.1%)102 (61.4%)66 (65.0%)Single46 (22.3%)36 (21.7%)010 (25.0%)Divorced27 (21.9%)21 (12.7%)40 (00%)Oberedouting27 (21.9%)21 (12.7%)8 (20.0%)Divorced29 (14.1%)21 (12.7%)8 (20.0%)Oberedouting29 (14.1%)21 (12.7%)8 (20.0%)No13 (63.0%)11 (6.6%)30 (75.0%)No13 (5.7%)11 (6.6%)30 (75.0%)No13 (63.0%)11 (6.6%)32 (55.0%)No10 (61.5%)90 (54.2%)31 (5.3%)Secondary30 (15.5%)30 (18.4%)10 (40.0%)No10 (24.5%)33 (15.0%)10 (40.0%)No11 (6.5%)30 (55.0%)11 (6.5%)No11 (6.5%)30 (15.5%)30 (15.0%)No10 (24.5%)33 (15.0%)10 (40.0%)No11 (6.5%)31 (6.3%)11 (6.5%)No11 (6.5%)31 (6.3%)11 (6.5%)No11 (6.5%)31 (6.3%)11 (2.5%)No11 (6.5%)31 (6.3%)11 (2.5%)No11 (6.5%)31 (6.3%)11 (5.5%)No11 (6.5%)31 (6.3%)11 (5.5%)No11 (6.5%)31 (6.3%)11 (5.5%)No11 (6.5%)31 (6.3%)11 (5.5%)N	Underweight	5 (2.4%)	5 (3.0%)	0 (0%)
Oesity $47(22\%)$ $35(21.\%)$ $12(30\%)$ No answer $13(6.3\%)$ $11(6.6\%)$ $2(5.0\%)$ Arritel status $128(62.1\%)$ $102(61.4\%)$ $26(65.0\%)$ Single $46(22.3\%)$ $35(21.7\%)$ $10(25.0\%)$ Divored $25(12.1\%)$ $36(21.7\%)$ $10(25.0\%)$ Divored $25(22.1\%)$ $21(12.7\%)$ $61(0.0\%)$ Other $29(14.1\%)$ $21(12.7\%)$ $82(20.0\%)$ No $29(14.1\%)$ $21(12.7\%)$ $82(20.0\%)$ No answer $13(65.0\%)$ $30(75\%)$ $30(75\%)$ No answer $13(65.0\%)$ $31(60.0\%)$ $2(55.0\%)$ Prinary $10(4.0\%)$ $7(4.2\%)$ $3(7.5\%)$ Secondary $87(42.2\%)$ $66(39.8\%)$ $21(52.5\%)$ No answer $31(6.5\%)$ $30(65.0\%)$ $31(6.0\%)$ No answer $31(5.0\%)$ $31(6.0\%)$ $31(2.0\%)$ No answer $31(2.0\%)$ $31(3.0\%)$ $31(3.0\%)$ No answer $31(2.0\%)$ $31(2.0\%)$ $31(2.0\%)$ No answer $31(2.0\%)$ $31(2.0\%)$ $31(2.0\%)$ Nonswer from than 5 years $61(2.9\%)$ $32(1.0\%)$ $31(2.0\%)$ Synader from than 5 years $61(2.0\%)$ $31(2.0\%)$ $31(3.0\%)$ $31(3.0\%)$ Synader from than 5 years $61(2.0\%)$ $31(2.0\%)$ $31(2.0\%)$ Synader from than 5 years $61(2.0\%)$ $31(3.0\%)$ $31(3.0\%)$ $31(3.0\%)$ Synader from than 5 years $61(2.0\%)$ $31(3.0\%)$ $31(3.0\%)$ $31(3.0\%)$ Synader from than 5 years $61(2.0\%)$	Normal weight	93 (45.1%)	78 (47%)	15 (37.5%)
No answer13 (6.3%)11 (6.6%)2 (5.0%)Marital statusMaried128 (62.1%)100(61.4%)26 (65.0%)Single46 (22.3%)36 (21.7%)10 (25.0%)Divorced25 (12.1%)21 (12.7%)4 (10.0%)Other7 (3.4%)7 (4.2%)0 (0%)Dependency in the household20 (14.1%)10 (10.7%)8 (20.0%)No165 (75.6%)114 (80.7%)8 (20.0%)No answer10 (5.0%)11 (6.6%)20 (5%)No answer13 (6.3%)11 (6.6%)20 (5%)Primary10 (4.9%)7 (4.2%)3 (7.5%)Secondary10 (4.9%)9 (64 (38.8%)21 (52.5%)University of higher10 (24.5%)9 (3 (4.3%)16 (40.0%)No answer10 (24.5%)9 (3 (4.3%)10 (4.0%)Examoder funder funder spars61 (29.6%)48 (28.9%)13 (3 (25.0%)Examoder funder spars61 (29.6%)48 (28.9%)13 (3 (25.0%)Examoder funder spars61 (29.6%)48 (28.9%)13 (3 (25.0%)Examoder funder spars61 (29.6%)48 (28.9%)13 (25.0%)Examoder funder spars61 (0.4%)7 (4.2%)3 (7.5%)Sparader funder spars61 (0.4%)10 (2.7%)3 (2.6%)Sparader funder spars61 (0.4%)10 (2.6%)10 (2.5%)Examoder funder spars61 (0.4%)7 (4.2%)3 (7.5%)Sparader funder spars61 (0.4%)10 (2.6%)10 (2.6%)Sparader funder spars61 (0.4%)3 (3 (1.9%) </td <td>Overweight</td> <td>48 (23.3%)</td> <td>37 (22.3%)</td> <td>11 (27.5%)</td>	Overweight	48 (23.3%)	37 (22.3%)	11 (27.5%)
Marital status Marital status Married 128 (6219) 102 (6149) 26 (65.98) Single 46 (22.3%) 36 (21.7%) 10 (25.98) Divorced 225 (12.1%) 21 (12.7%) 4 (10.0%) Other 7 (3.4%) 7 (4.2%) 0 (0%) Divorced 7 (3.4%) 7 (4.2%) 0 (0%) Dependency in the household 29 (14.1%) 21 (12.7%) 8 (20.0%) No 165 (75.6%) 134 (80.7%) 30 (75%) No answer 13 (6.3%) 11 (6.6%) 2 (5%) Finary 10 (4.9%) 7 (4.2%) 30 (75%) Scondary 10 (4.9%) 7 (4.2%) 31 (6.3%) University or higher 10 (6.15.9%) 30 (54.2%) 30 (54.2%) No answer 3 (15.9%) 30 (16.40.0%) 31 (64.0%) No answer 3 (15.9%) 30 (16.40.0%) 31 (64.0%) Neer smoker for more than 5 years 61 (12.9%) 48 (80.9%) 10 (24.5%) Ex-smoker for more than 5 years 11 (6.3%) 11 (2.5%) 31 (62.5%) </td <td>Obesity</td> <td>47 (22.8%)</td> <td>35 (21.1%)</td> <td>12 (30.0%)</td>	Obesity	47 (22.8%)	35 (21.1%)	12 (30.0%)
Maried128 (62.1%)102(61.4%)26 (65.0%)Single44 (62.3%)36 (21.7%)10 (25.0%)Divored22 (12.1%)21 (12.7%)4 (10.0%)Other7 (3.4%)7 (4.2%)0 (00)Dendency in the household29 (14.1%)21 (12.7%)8 (20.0%)No29 (14.1%)21 (12.7%)8 (20.0%)No16 5 (79.6%)134 (80.7%)30 (75%)No answer13 (6.3%)11 (6.6%)2 (50%)Prinary10 (4.9%)7 (4.2%)3 (7.5%)Scondary8 (74.2%)6 (6 (39.8%)2 (15.2%)University or higher10 (6 (51.5%)90 (54.2%)16 (40.0%)Na maver3 (1.5%)3 (1.8%)0 (0%)Neares11 (24.9%)3 (1.8%)10 (40.0%)Ex-smoker form ore than 5 years61 (29.6%)44 (28.9%)13 (32.5%)Spradic10 (4.9%)7 (4.2%)3 (7.5%)Spradic10 (4.9%)7 (4.2%)3 (7.5%)Regular10 (4.9%)7 (4.2%)3 (7.5%)Spradic10 (4.9%)7 (4.2%)3 (7.5%)Kathol10 (4.9%)3 (1.0%)1 (2.5%)Kathol10 (4.9%)3 (1.9%)3 (1.5%)Spradic10 (4.9%)3 (1.9%)3 (1.5%)Spradic10 (4.9%)3 (1.2%)3 (1.5%)Spradic10 (4.9%)3 (1.9%)3 (1.5%)Spradic10 (4.9%)3 (1.9%)3 (1.5%)Spradic10 (4.9%)3 (1.9%)3 (1.5%)Spradic10	No answer	13 (6.3%)	11 (6.6%)	2 (5.0%)
Single44 (22.3%)36 (21.7%)10 (25.0%)Divorced25 (12.1%)21 (12.7%)4 (10.0%)Other7 (3.4%)7 (4.2%)0 (0%)Deendency in the household21 (12.7%)8 (20.0%)No25 (14.1%)21 (12.7%)8 (20.0%)No165 (79.6%)114 (80.7%)30 (75%)No answer13 (6.3%)11 (6.6%)2 (5%)Finary10 (4.9%)7 (4.2%)3 (7.5%)Secondary87 (42.2%)66 (39.8%)21 (52.5%)University or higher10 (6 (51.5%)90 (54.2%)16 (40.0%)No answer3 (1.5%)3 (1.8%)0 (0%)Ex-smoker for more than 5 years61 (29.6%)48 (28.9%)13 (32.5%)Ex-smoker form 1 to 5 years13 (6.3%)12 (7.2%)3 (7.5%)Sporadic10 (4.9%)7 (4.2%)3 (7.5%)Regular10 (4.9%)7 (4.2%)3 (7.5%)Abelo10 (4.9%)7 (4.2%)3 (7.5%)Kas45 (21.8%)3 (19.0%)12 (20.0%)Abelo10 (4.9%)7 (4.2%)3 (7.5%)Kas45 (21.8%)3 (19.9%)12 (30.0%)Abelo10 (4.9%)3 (19.9%)12 (30.0%)No16 (60.7%)13 (27.5%)28 (70.0%)No16 (0.77%)13 (27.5%)28 (70.0%)No16 (0.7%)13 (27.5%)28 (70.0%)No16 (0.7%)13 (2.5%)28 (70.0%)No16 (0.7%)13 (2.5%)28 (70.0%)No16 (0.5%) <td< td=""><td>Marital status</td><td>· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·</td><td></td><td>·</td></td<>	Marital status	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		·
Divorced25 (12.1%)11 (12.7%)4 (10.0%)Other7 (3.4%)7 (4.2%)0 (0%)Dependency in the household29 (14.1%)21 (12.7%)8 (20.0%)No165 (79.6%)134 (80.7%)30 (75%)No answer13 (6.3%)11 (6.6%)2 (5%)Education10 (4.9%)7 (4.2%)3 (7.5%)Secondary87 (42.2%)66 (39.8%)21 (52.5%)University or higher106 (51.5%)90 (54.2%)16 (40.0%)No answer3 (1.5%)3 (1.8%)0 (0%)Tobaco102 (49.5%)83 (50.0%)19 (47.5%)Ex-smoker for more than 5 years61 (29.6%)48 (28.9%)3 (13.25%)Ex-smoker form 1 to 5 years10 (4.9%)7 (4.2%)3 (1.5%)Sporadic10 (4.9%)7 (4.2%)3 (1.2.5%)Ex-smoker form than 5 years61 (29.6%)84 (8.0%)10 (4.5%)Sporadic10 (4.9%)7 (4.2%)3 (7.5%)Sporadic10 (4.9%)7 (4.2%)3 (1.2.5%)Sporadic10 (4.9%)7 (4.2%)3 (1.2.5%)Sporadic10 (4.9%)7 (4.2%)3 (1.2.5%)Sporadic10 (4.9%)7 (4.2%)3 (7.5%)Sporadic10 (4.9%)7 (4.2%)3 (7.5%)Sporadic10 (4.9%)7 (4.2%)3 (7.5%)Sporadic10 (4.9%)7 (4.2%)3 (7.5%)Sporadic10 (4.9%)3 (1.0.4%)3 (1.0.6%)No10 (4.9%)3 (1.0.4%)3 (1.0.6%)No10 (4.9%)10	Married	128 (62.1%)	102(61.4%)	26 (65.0%)
Other $1 \ (2.4\%)$ $1 \ (2.4\%)$ $1 \ (2.4\%)$ Other $7 \ (3.4\%)$ $7 \ (2.2\%)$ $0 \ (0\%)$ Dependency in the household $29 \ (14.1\%)$ $21 \ (12.7\%)$ $8 \ (20.0\%)$ No $165 \ (79.6\%)$ $114 \ (80.7\%)$ $30 \ (75.6\%)$ No answer $113 \ (6.3\%)$ $111 \ (6.6\%)$ $22 \ (5.5\%)$ Education $7 \ (4.2\%)$ $3 \ (7.5\%)$ Secondary $87 \ (42.2\%)$ $66 \ (39.8\%)$ $21 \ (52.5\%)$ University or higher $100 \ (51.5\%)$ $90 \ (54.2\%)$ $16 \ (40.0\%)$ No answer $31 \ (1.5\%)$ $30 \ (1.6\%)$ $00 \ (9.5\%)$ Diversity or higher $100 \ (49.5\%)$ $31 \ (1.8\%)$ $01 \ (4.5\%)$ Near sonker $102 \ (49.5\%)$ $83 \ (50.0\%)$ $11 \ (4.5\%)$ Ex-sonker for more than 5 years $61 \ (29.6\%)$ $48 \ (28.9\%)$ $11 \ (2.5\%)$ Spradic $10 \ (4.9\%)$ $7(\ 4.2\%)$ $37 \ (5.5\%)$ Ex-sonker form 1 to 5 years $61 \ (29.6\%)$ $84 \ (8.8\%)$ $21 \ (5.5\%)$ Spradic $10 \ (4.9\%)$ $7(\ 4.2\%)$ $37 \ (5.5\%)$ Regular $10 \ (4.9\%)$ $7(\ 4.2\%)$ $37 \ (5.5\%)$ Spradic $10 \ (4.9\%)$ $7(\ 4.2\%)$ $31 \ (5.5\%)$ No $10 \ (4.9\%)$ $7(\ 4.2\%)$ $31 \ (5.5\%)$ Spradic $10 \ (4.9\%)$ $7(\ 4.2\%)$ $31 \ (5.5\%)$ Spradic $10 \ (4.9\%)$ $7(\ 4.2\%)$ $31 \ (5.5\%)$ No $10 \ (4.9\%)$ $31 \ (4.5\%)$ $31 \ (4.5\%)$ No $10 \ (4.5\%)$ $31 \ (4.5\%)$ <td< td=""><td>Single</td><td>46 (22.3%)</td><td>36 (21.7%)</td><td>10 (25.0%)</td></td<>	Single	46 (22.3%)	36 (21.7%)	10 (25.0%)
Dependency in the household 29 (14.1%) 21 (12.7%) 8 (20.0%) No 165 (79.6%) 134 (80.7%) 30 (75%) No answer 131 (6.3%) 11 (6.6%) 30 (75%) Kextain 131 (6.3%) 11 (6.6%) 30 (75%) Education 101 (4.9%) 7 (4.2%) 3 (7.5%) Scondary 87 (4.2%) 66 (39.8%) 21 (52.5%) University or higher 1016 (51.5%) 90 (54.2%) 16 (40.0%) Na answer 3 (1.5%) 30 (1.6%) 0 (0.0%) No answer 3 (1.5%) 30 (1.6%) 0 (10.6%) No answer 3 (1.5%) 30 (1.6%) 0 (10.6%) No answer 3 (1.5%) 3 (1.8%) 0 (10.6%) No answer 102 (49.5%) 83 (50.0%) 19 (47.5%) Kever smoker 102 (49.5%) 83 (50.0%) 19 (47.5%) Ex-smoker form tor baysars 61 (29.6%) 48 (28.9%) 13 (3.25.5%) Sporadic 10 (4.9%) 12 (7.2%) 3 (1.5.5%) Regular 10 (4.9%) 3 (1.6.3%	Divorced	25 (12.1%)	21 (12.7%)	4 (10.0%)
Yes29 (14.1%)11 (12.7%)8 (20.0%)No165 (79.6%)134 (80.7%)30 (75%)No answer13 (6.3%)11 (6.6%)2 (5%) Education Primary10 (4.9%)7 (4.2%)3 (7.5%)Scondary87 (42.2%)66 (39.8%)21 (52.5%)University or higher106 (51.5%)90 (54.2%)16 (40.0%)No answer3 (1.5%)90 (54.2%)16 (40.0%)No answer3 (1.5%)3 (1.8%)0 (0%)Tobaco50 (24.9%)13 (3.2%)19 (47.5%)Ex-smoker for more than 5 years61 (29.6%)48 (28.9%)13 (3.25%)Ex-smoker form 1 to 5 years13 (6.3%)12 (7.2%)3 (7.5%)Sporadic10 (4.9%)7 (4.2%)3 (7.5%)Regular10 (4.9%)7 (4.2%)3 (7.5%)Ker smoker form 1 to 5 years11 (6.4%)2 (5.0%)Foradic10 (4.9%)3 (10.4%)3 (10.5%)Kohon10 (4.9%)3 (10.9%)3 (10.5%)Kohon45 (21.8%)33 (19.9%)2 (20.0%)No answer10 (0.5%)1 (0.6%)0 (0.9%)	Other	7 (3.4%)	7 (4.2%)	0 (0%)
No165 (79.6%)134 (80.7%)30 (75%)No answer13 (6.3%)11 (6.6%)2 (5%)EducationPrimary10 (4.9%)7 (4.2%)3 (7.5%)Secondary87 (42.2%)66 (39.8%)21 (52.5%)University or higher10 6 (51.5%)90 (54.2%)61 (40.0%)No answer3 (1.5%)3 (1.8%)0 (0%)No answer3 (1.5%)3 (1.8%)0 (0%)Never smoker102 (49.5%)83 (50.0%)19 (47.5%)Ex-smoker for more than 5 years61 (29.6%)48 (28.9%)13 (32.5%)Sporadic10 (4.9%)12 (7.2%)1 (2.5%)Regular10 (4.9%)7 (4.2%)3 (7.5%)Key10 (4.9%)3 (10.9%)2 (5.0%)Key10 (4.9%)3 (1.9%)2 (5.0%)No45 (21.8%)33 (19.9%)12 (30.0%)No10 (0.7%)10 (0.6%)0 (0%)	Dependency in the household		I	
No answer13 (6.3%)11 (6.6%)2 (5%)EducationPrimary10 (4.9%)7 (4.2%)3 (7.5%)Secondary87 (42.2%)66 (39.8%)21 (52.5%)University or higher10 (6 (51.5%)90 (54.2%)16 (40.0%)No answer3 (1.5%)3 (1.8%)0 (0%)Tobaco50 (50.0%)10 (249.5%)83 (50.0%)19 (47.5%)Ex-smoker for more than 5 years61 (29.6%)48 (28.9%)13 (32.5%)Sporadic10 (4.9%)7 (4.2%)3 (7.5%)Sporadic10 (4.9%)7 (4.2%)3 (7.5%)Regular10 (4.9%)7 (4.2%)3 (7.5%)Yes45 (21.8%)33 (19.9%)12 (30.0%)No160 (77.7%)13 (27.5%)28 (70.0%)No answer11 (0.5%)1 (0.6%)0 (0%)	Yes	29 (14.1%)	21 (12.7%)	8 (20.0%)
Education Education Primary 10 (4.9%) 7 (4.2%) 3 (7.5%) Secondary 87 (42.2%) 66 (39.8%) 21 (52.5%) University or higher 10 (6 (51.5%) 90 (54.2%) 16 (40.0%) No answer 3 (1.5%) 3 (1.8%) 0 (0%) Tobaco 50 (20.5%) 19 (47.5%) 19 (47.5%) Ex-smoker for more than 5 years 61 (29.6%) 48 (28.9%) 13 (32.5%) Ex-smoker for more than 5 years 61 (29.6%) 48 (28.9%) 13 (32.5%) Sporadic 10 (4.9%) 7 (4.2%) 3 (7.5%) Regular 10 (4.9%) 7 (4.2%) 3 (7.5%) No 10 (4.9%) 8 (4.8%) 2 (5.0%) Heysian 10 (4.9%) 7 (4.2%) 3 (7.5%) Regular 10 (4.9%) 8 (4.8%) 2 (5.0%) Moho 160 (77.7%) 33 (19.9%) 12 (30.0%) No 160 (77.7%) 132 (79.5%) 28 (70.0%)	No	165 (79.6%)	134 (80.7%)	30 (75%)
Primary10 (4.9%)7 (4.2%)3 (7.5%)Secondary87 (42.2%)66 (39.8%)21 (52.5%)University or higher106 (51.5%)90 (54.2%)16 (40.0%)No answer3 (1.5%)3 (1.8%)0 (0%) Tobaco 102 (49.5%)83 (50.0%)19 (47.5%)Ex-smoker for more than 5 years61 (29.6%)48 (28.9%)13 (32.5%)Ex-smoker from 1 to 5 years13 (6.3%)12 (7.2%)1 (2.5%)Sporadic10 (4.9%)7 (4.2%)3 (7.5%)Regular10 (4.9%)8 (4.8%)2 (5.0%)Hershold10 (4.9%)8 (4.8%)2 (5.0%)Yes45 (21.8%)33 (19.9%)12 (30.0%)No answer10 (0.5%)10 (6.9%)0 (0%)	No answer	13 (6.3%)	11 (6.6%)	2 (5%)
Secondary 87 (42.2%) 66 (39.8%) 21 (52.5%) University or higher 106 (51.5%) 90 (54.2%) 16 (40.0%) No answer 3 (1.5%) 3 (1.8%) 0 (0%) Tobaco 102 (49.5%) 83 (50.0%) 19 (47.5%) Kever smoker for more than 5 years 61 (29.6%) 48 (28.9%) 13 (32.5%) Ex-smoker from 1 to 5 years 13 (6.3%) 12 (7.2%) 12 (5.0%) Sporadic 10 (4.9%) 7 (4.2%) 3 (7.5%) Regular 10 (4.9%) 8 (4.8%) 2 (5.0%) Hore smoker 45 (21.8%) 33 (19.9%) 12 (30.0%) No 160 (77.7%) 132 (79.5%) 28 (70.0%)	Education			
University or higher 106 (51.5%) 90 (54.2%) 16 (40.0%) No answer 3 (1.5%) 3 (1.8%) 0 (0%) Tobacco 102 (49.5%) 83 (50.0%) 19 (47.5%) Ex-smoker for more than 5 years 61 (29.6%) 48 (28.9%) 13 (32.5%) Ex-smoker form 1 to 5 years 61 (29.6%) 48 (28.9%) 13 (32.5%) Sporadic 110 (4.9%) 7 (4.2%) 3 (7.5%) Regular 10 (4.9%) 8 (4.8%) 2 (5.0%) Alcohol 110 (4.9%) 3 (19.9%) 12 (30.0%) No 160 (77.7%) 13 (279.5%) 28 (70.0%)	Primary	10 (4.9%)	7 (4.2%)	3 (7.5%)
No answer 3 (1.5%) 3 (1.8%) 0 (0%) Tobacco 5 <	Secondary	87 (42.2%)	66 (39.8%)	21 (52.5%)
Tobacco Interface Interface Never smoker 102 (49.5%) 83 (50.0%) 19 (47.5%) Ex-smoker for more than 5 years 61 (29.6%) 48 (28.9%) 13 (32.5%) Ex-smoker form 1 to 5 years 13 (6.3%) 12 (7.2%) 1 (2.5%) Sporadic 10 (4.9%) 7 (4.2%) 3 (7.5%) Regular 10 (4.9%) 8 (4.8%) 2 (5.0%) Alcohol 12 (30.0%) 12 (30.0%) No 160 (77.7%) 132 (79.5%) 28 (70.0%) No answer 1 (0.5%) 1 (0.6%) 0 (0%)	University or higher	106 (51.5%)	90 (54.2%)	16 (40.0%)
Never smoker 102 (49.5%) 83 (50.0%) 19 (47.5%) Ex-smoker for more than 5 years 61 (29.6%) 48 (28.9%) 13 (32.5%) Ex-smoker from 1 to 5 years 13 (6.3%) 12 (7.2%) 1 (2.5%) Sporadic 10 (4.9%) 7 (4.2%) 3 (7.5%) Regular 10 (4.9%) 8 (4.8%) 2 (5.0%) Alcohol 12 12 (30.0%) 12 (30.0%) No 160 (77.7%) 132 (79.5%) 28 (70.0%) No answer 1 (0.5%) 1 (0.6%) 0 (0%)	No answer	3 (1.5%)	3 (1.8%)	0 (0%)
Interference Interference Interference Ex-smoker for more than 5 years 61 (29.6%) 48 (28.9%) 13 (32.5%) Ex-smoker forn 1 to 5 years 13 (6.3%) 12 (7.2%) 1 (2.5%) Sporadic 10 (4.9%) 7 (4.2%) 3 (7.5%) Regular 10 (4.9%) 8 (4.8%) 2 (5.0%) Alcohol Yes 45 (21.8%) 33 (19.9%) 12 (30.0%) No 160 (77.7%) 132(79.5%) 28 (70.0%)	Tobacco			
Ex-smoker from 1 to 5 years 13 (6.3%) 12 (7.2%) 1 (2.5%) Sporadic 10 (4.9%) 7 (4.2%) 3 (7.5%) Regular 10 (4.9%) 8 (4.8%) 2 (5.0%) Alcohol 12 (7.2%) 3 (7.5%) 3 (7.5%) Yes 45 (21.8%) 33 (19.9%) 12 (30.0%) No 160 (77.7%) 132 (79.5%) 28 (70.0%) No answer 1 (0.5%) 1 (0.6%) 0 (0%)	Never smoker	102 (49.5%)	83 (50.0%)	19 (47.5%)
Sporadic 10 (4.9%) 7 (4.2%) 3 (7.5%) Regular 10 (4.9%) 8 (4.8%) 2 (5.0%) Alcohol 33 (19.9%) 12 (30.0%) No 160 (77.7%) 132 (79.5%) 28 (70.0%) No answer 1 (0.5%) 1 (0.6%) 0 (0%)	Ex-smoker for more than 5 years	61 (29.6%)	48 (28.9%)	13 (32.5%)
Regular 10 (4.9%) 8 (4.8%) 2 (5.0%) Alcohol 10 (4.9%) 8 (4.8%) 2 (5.0%) Yes 45 (21.8%) 33 (19.9%) 12 (30.0%) No 160 (77.7%) 132(79.5%) 28 (70.0%) No answer 1 (0.5%) 1 (0.6%) 0 (0%)	Ex-smoker from 1 to 5 years	13 (6.3%)	12 (7.2%)	1 (2.5%)
Alcohol 410000 Yes 45 (21.8%) 33 (19.9%) 12 (30.0%) No 160 (77.7%) 132 (79.5%) 28 (70.0%) No answer 1 (0.5%) 1 (0.6%) 0 (0%)	Sporadic	10 (4.9%)	7 (4.2%)	3 (7.5%)
Yes 45 (21.8%) 33 (19.9%) 12 (30.0%) No 160 (77.7%) 132(79.5%) 28 (70.0%) No answer 1 (0.5%) 1 (0.6%) 0 (0%)	Regular	10 (4.9%)	8 (4.8%)	2 (5.0%)
No 160 (77.7%) 132(79.5%) 28 (70.0%) No answer 1 (0.5%) 1 (0.6%) 0 (0%)	Alcohol			
No answer 1 (0.5%) 1 (0.6%) 0 (0%)	Yes	45 (21.8%)	33 (19.9%)	12 (30.0%)
	No	160 (77.7%)	132(79.5%)	28 (70.0%)
	No answer	1 (0.5%)	1 (0.6%)	0 (0%)
Sleep problems	Sleep problems			
Yes 160 (77.7%) 129(77.7%) 31 (77.5%)	Yes	160 (77.7%)	129(77.7%)	31 (77.5%)
No 43 (20.9%) 36 (21.7%) 7 (17.5%)	No	43 (20.9%)	36 (21.7%)	7 (17.5%)
No answer 3 (1.5%) 1 (0.6%) 2 (5.0%)	No answer	3 (1.5%)	1 (0.6%)	2 (5.0%)

Discussion

The main objective of this study was to examine the impact of long COVID symptomatology on the quality of life of Spanish adults from a gender perspective. Socio-demographic variables and intensity of the long COVID symptoms were significantly related with the quality-of-life scores obtained. Likewise, significant differences per gender were identified.

The findings suggest that long COVID is more prevalent in females. Several studies on individuals with long COVID condition have found that over half of the sample population is female, which is consistent with the results of our cross-sectional study (13, 31, 32). In



Symptoms	ΤΟΤ	AL GROUP (/	n = 206)	W	/OMEN (n =	166)		MEN (n = 4	10)
	n	n (%)	Rank	n	n (%)	Rank	n	n (%)	Rank
Muscle and joint pain	196	95.1%	1	157	94.6%	1	39	97.5%	1
Fatigue	195	94.7%	2	156	94.0%	2	39	97.5%	1
Discomfort	190	92.2%	3	153	92.2%	3	37	92.%	2
Difficulty concentrating	187	90.8%	4	151	91.0%	4	36	90.0%	3
Memory loss	182	88.3%	5	147	88.6%	5	35	87.5%	5
Dyspnoea	175	85.0%	6	141	84.9%	6	34	85.0%	6
Mood disturbances	175	85.0%	6	139	83.7%	8	36	90.0%	4
Headache	173	84.0%	7	142	85.5%	7	31	77.5%	7
Palpitations	160	77.7%	8	131	78.9%	9	29	72.5%	8
Cough	126	61.2%	9	100	60.2%	11	26	65.0%	9
Hair loss	123	59.7%	10	111	66.9%	10	12	30.0%	14
Diarrhea	102	49.5%	11	79	47.6%	12	23	57.5%	10
Olfactory loss	90	43.7%	12	74	44.6%	14	16	40.0%	12
Gustatory loss	88	42.7%	13	75	45.2%	13	13	32.5%	13
Swallowing difficulties	86	41.7%	14	70	42.2%	15	16	40.0%	12
Skin rashes	84	40.8%	15	68	41.0%	16	16	40.0%	12
Conjunctivitis	73	35.4%	16	55	33.1%	17	18	45.0%	11

addition, this trend is also consistent with the average age of those affected, which is around 40 years old. These findings align with the results previously reported in other studies on the subject (13, 33, 34).

Other similarities related with the more prevalent symptoms were compared with the findings obtained by Anaya et al. (35) and Aiyegbusi et al. (36) in which are fatigue and muscle and joint pain are the most common symptoms. In terms of quality of life, this element was reported to be affected by the disease in other studies (20, 37). Quality of life of long COVID patients was measured from different perspectives in two studies. The quantitative study (20), using generic quality of life scales as EQ-5D-5L, and the qualitative study (37). Although different methodologies were used, both concluded that long COVID influences the quality of life of those with the disease hindering same. It is important to note that, although they are distinct entities, long COVID shares some similarities in terms of symptoms and challenges in diagnosis and treatment with other conditions, such



INTENSITY OF LONG COVID SYMPTOMS BY GENDER

as fibromyalgia (15, 38, 39). Furthermore, studies have also shown that long COVID, fibromyalgia and chronic fatigue syndrome are more prevalent among females (40, 41).

Analyzing gender in health has proven to be crucial due to the differences between men and women (42). These gender differences occur not only in acute but similarly in chronic diseases (42, 43). In this regard, the study has likewise demonstrated differences between both genders in relation to long COVID symptomatology. Male participants in the study were not only more likely to have mood disturbances the female participants but similarly experienced that symptom more acutely than the latter. This can be explained by the fact that age plays a role on resilience, with middle-aged women being more resilient than men (44, 45). As a matter of fact low resilience has been shown to be related to the development of mood disorders (46). Nevertheless, more studies are required to analyse resilience in chronic diseases from a gender perspective.

In terms of quality of life, this study showed statistically significant relationship between the presence of a dependent person in the household and the female gender. Women in nurturing roles often experience a decrease in their quality of life as compared to men. These disparities are due to a number of socio-cultural and economic factors that have been comprehensively discussed in academic literature (47, 48). These factors have a substantial impact on women's quality of life, as women assume an unequal burden of care responsibilities in the domestic sphere as compared to their male counterparts (48–50).

Another key point of the findings is that women had a higher number of symptoms which were closely related to a lower quality of life. Although it is important to take into account that pain perception is a complex and multifactorial phenomenon, certain studies suggest that women may have a greater sensitivity to pain as compared to men (51, 52). Furthermore, women are known to have a higher prevalence of chronic pain conditions, such as fibromyalgia (51, 53). Coupled with pain, whether chronic, acute or disease-related, can have a significant negative impact on a person's quality of life (54).

It is likewise remarkable how sleep problems affect not only the symptoms but also the intensity with which these are experienced in both genders. Sleep plays a crucial role in a person's health and wellbeing, and sleep deprivation can weaken the body and worsen the symptoms of a disease. In regard to this, being in pain likewise hinders the possibility of having good quality sleep (55). Sleep deprivation can increase stress levels and reduce pain tolerance (56). This fact can exacerbate the symptoms of an illness, especially if this entails chronic pain (55). Continuing with that series of factors which produces a more intense symptomatology, smoking was identified to be a condition that exacerbated long COVID symptomatology. These findings are consistent with those of a study carried out on patients with fibromyalgia which concluded that tobacco was closely related to more severe symptomatology (57).

Elsewhere, this study identified that both men and women who had a dependent in the household were more likely to have a household dependency experienced less severe symptoms of their

Long COVID symptoms by intensities	Bî	٩I	Mar stat		in	idency the ehold	Educ	ation	Tobi	ассо	Alco	ohol	Sle prob	
	Ť	ŕ	Å	ń	Å	ŕ	Ť	ŕ	Å	ŕ	Ť	ŕ	Å	Ť
Muscle and joint pain	0.214	0.240	0.052	0.173	0.269	0.499	0.879	0.455	0.192	0.142	0.192	0.186	0.013*	0.569
Fatigue	0.046*	0.803	0.157	0.749	0.116	0.251	0.235	0.492	0.587	0.478	0.060	0.372	0.001*	0.741
Discomfort	0.515	0.525	0.232	0.353	0.217	0.320	0.357	0.373	0.475	0.764	0.213	0.023*	0.264	0.162
Difficulty concentrating	0.560	0.080	0.275	0.935	0.134	0.641	0.518	0.373	0.457	0.517	0.466	0.280	0.028*	0.004*
Memory loss	0.060	0.265	0.118	0.470	0.001*	0.118	0.685	0.395	0.212	0.537	0.474	0.943	0.003*	0.012*
Dyspnoea	0.287	0.097	0.618	0.158	0.595	0.615	0.647	0.692	0.230	0.174	0.006*	0.516	0.101	0.643
Mood disturbances	0.525	0.253	0.242	0.297	0.359	0.899	0.404	0.951	0.915	0.454	0.982	0.465	<0.001*	0.797
Headache	0.903	0.260	0.779	0.889	0.478	0.588	0.151	0.349	0.408	0.764	0.293	0.066	0.070	0.938
Palpitations	0.483	0.284	0.302	0.899	0.500	0.282	0.660	0.321	0.656	0.301	0.157	0.796	0.028*	0.603
Cough	0.076	0.091	0.299	0.214	0.190	0.659	0.613	0.429	0.678	0.046*	0.668	0.139	0.005*	0.116
Hair loss	0.236	0.707	0.587	0.188	0.763	0.425	0.499	0.561	0.167	0.121	0.089	0.166	0.140	0.533
Diarrhea	0.021*	0.659	0.036*	0.333	0.577	0.874	0.363	0.051	0.011*	0.948	0.321	0.179	0.056	0.258
Olfactory loss	0.064	0.837	0.026*	0.277	0.168	0.706	0.792	0.387	0.605	0.409	0.105	0.186	0.133	0.610
Gustatory loss	0.807	0.794	0.446	0.896	0.017*	0.579	0.554	0.311	0.348	0.317	0.055	0.126	0.282	0.266
Swallowing difficulties	0.165	0.764	0.002*	0.801	0.051	0.604	0.972	0.398	0.353	0.373	0.200	0.936	0.031*	0.355
Skin rashes	0.257	0.303	0.150	0.257	0.838	0.433	0.169	0.036*	0.202	0.624	0.063	0.220	0.132	0.210
Conjunctivitis	0.201	0.875	0.447	0.717	0.124	0.965	0.143	0.046*	0.831	0.376	0.212	0.653	0.268	0.370

TABLE 3 Intensity of long COVID symptoms association with sociodemographic variables per gender.

Chi-square test. *p < 0.05. = women,

= men, BMI, Body mass.

illnesses than those who did not have this condition at home. The Hamptom & Newcomb study (58) has demonstrated that informal caregivers may have reduced perception of pain due to psychological factors such as an increased ability to handle stress. Furthermore, another important finding of the study as regards the intensity of symptomatology was that for both genders non-drinkers experienced the most intense symptoms. Although the reasons for this are unclear, the findings are consistent with the Kim et al. (59) study which concluded that low and moderate alcohol consumption is associated with a decrease in fibromyalgia symptoms.

Strengths and limitations

Insofar as the limitation of the present study are concerned, the following were identified. Firstly, the inherent factors of the disease hindered data collection. The cognitive problems associated with long COVID disease including difficulty concentrating and mental fogginess, was prejudicial to the sample numbers as many participants started the questionnaire but dropped out halfway through. Even so, participation was facilitated to the extent practicable by sending notifications as regards the status of the questionnaires and reminders to complete same. Secondly, research has been undertaken from a cross-sectional perspective. A follow-up study yield further information as regards the people participating in that study and the behavior of the disease over time. Likewise, causal relationships could be obtained. Moreover, studies with a higher sample and homogeneous number of men and women should be carried out. Nevertheless, difficulties may be experienced in this homogeneity as this disease seems to affect more women (3, 33, 34). Furthermore, other studies have likewise had more women in the sample (33, 34, 60). It is also important to note that factors as specifying the wave of the pandemic and the variant of the COVID-19 virus, may impact the symptoms of the disease and should therefore, be included in future studies. Finally, it should be noted as a strong point of this study is that it is the first of its kind to take into account the intensities of symptomatology and gender differences, which is of fundamental importance in health science research.

Conclusion

The findings of this research show that there are gender differences in the way that long COVID is experienced. The most acute symptoms TABLE 4 Distribution of women data of socio-demographic and long COVID symptomatology variables based on intensity.

*		High B	MI		Marrie	ed		endenc 10useh	y in the old	E	ducatio	n		Tobac	со		Alcoh	ol	Sle	ep pro	blems
	No	Yes	р	No	Yes	р	No	Yes	p	Basic	High	р	No	Yes	р	No	Yes	р	No	Yes	р
Muscle and joint pain			0.214			0.052			0.269			0.879			0.192			0.192			0.013*
No symptom	3	5		3	6		9	0		4	5		2	7		5	4		5	4	
Mild	9	4		9	4		11	1		6	7		1	12		11	2		5	8	
Moderate	23	13		11	30		34	3		21	20		10	31		31	10		10	30	
Severe	48	50		41	62		80	17		45	58		35	68		85	17		16	87	
Fatigue			0.046*			0.157			0.116			0.235			0.587			0.060			0.001
No symptom	7	1		6	4		9	0		3	7		1	9		5	5		6	4	
Mild	6	7		4	9		11	2		5	8		4	9		9	4		6	7	
Moderate	25	13		11	30		28	9		24	17		13	28		34	7		9	32	
Severe	45	51		43	59		86	10		44	58		30	72		84	17		15	86	
Discomfort			0.515			0.232			0.217			0.357			0.475			0.213			0.264
No symptom	8	4		3	10		12	0		3	10		2	11		8	5		5	8	
Mild	7	6		8	5		11	0		7	6		3	10		9	4		4	9	
Moderate	31	22		21	36		48	8		26	31		15	42		48	9		13	43	
Severe	37	40		32	51		63	13		40	43		28	55		67	15		14	69	
Difficulty concentrating			0.560			0.275			0.134			0.518			0.457			0.466			0.028
No symptom	7	8		5	10		14	1		8	7		3	12		10	5		7	8	
Mild	7	4		4	7		11	0		3	8		4	7		8	2		3	8	
Moderate	22	25		14	35		42	4		21	28		11	38		38	11		13	36	
Severe	47	35		41	50		67	16		44	47		30	61		76	15		13	77	
Memory loss			0.060			.118			0.001*			0.685			0.212			0.474			0.003*
No symptom	12	6		7	12		16	3		7	12		3	16		13	6		10	9	
Mild	11	7		7	14		20	0		8	13		5	16		15	5		3	18	
Moderate	22	34		17	42		52	2		29	30		15	44		48	11		14	45	
Severe	38	25		33	34		46	16		32	35		25	42		56	11		9	57	
Dyspnoea			0.287			0.618			0.595			0.647			0.230			0.006*			0.101
No symptom	13	9		10	15		21	2		13	12		4	21		15	10		10	15	
Mild	19	10		10	20		23	5		16	14		10	20		21	9		7	23	

(Continued)

TABLE 4 (Continued)

*		High B	MI		Marrie	ed		endenc nouseh	y in the old	E	ducatio	n		Tobac	со		Alcoh	ol	Sle	ep pro	blems
	No	Yes	р	No	Yes	р	No	Yes	p	Basic	High	р	No	Yes	р	No	Yes	р	No	Yes	р
Moderate	29	25		20	38		45	9		24	34		21	37		48	9		10	47	
Severe	24	28		24	39		45	5		23	30		13	40		48	5		9	44	
Mood disturbances			0.525			0.242			0.359			0.404			0.915			0.982			<0.001*
No symptom	16	10		15	12		22	2		10	17		7	20		21	6		13	14	
Mild	11	13		11	17		23	4		13	15		8	20		23	5		6	21	
Moderate	34	25		21	41		46	11		26	36		17	45		49	12		14	48	
Severe	22	24		17	32		43	4		27	22		16	33		39	10		3	46	
Headache			0.903			0.779			0.478			0.151			0.408			0.293			0.070
No symptom	13	9		9	15		21	1		12	12		4	20		16	8		8	16	
Mild	10	11		9	12		18	2		5	16		6	15		16	5		7	14	
Moderate	17	15		11	24		27	6		19	16		9	26		28	6		9	25	
Severe	43	37		35	51		68	12		40	46		29	57		72	14		12	74	
Palpitations			0.483			0.302			0.500			0.660			0.656			0.157			0.028*
No symptom	20	11		15	20		27	4		18	17		8	27		25	10		13	22	
Mild	16	19		11	25		28	6		14	22		9	27		26	10		9	27	
Moderate	21	20		14	30		39	3		22	22		15	29		37	6		4	39	
Severe	26	22		24	27		40	8		22	29		16	35		44	7		10	41	
Cough			0.076			0.299			0.190			0.613			0.678			0.668			0.005*
No symptom	39	22		20	46		56	5		33	33		21	45		50	16		23	43	
Mild	19	25		19	25		32	9		19	25		10	34		36	8		6	37	
Moderate	17	12		16	17		28	3		16	17		9	24		26	6		2	31	
Severe	8	13		9	14		18	4		8	15		8	15		20	3		5	18	
Hair loss			0.236			0.587			0.763			0.499			0.167			0.089			0.140
No symptom	24	28		20	35		46	5		29	26		11	44		44	10		17	37	
Mild	13	16		9	21		24	4		12	18		12	18		20	10		6	24	
Moderate	22	13		16	23		31	5		15	24		10	29		30	9		8	31	
Severe	24	15		19	23		33	7		20	22		15	27		38	4		5	37	
Diarrhea			0.021*			0.036*			0.577			0.363			0.011*			0.321			0.056
No symptom	52	30		25	62		73	9		41	46		20	67		64	22		26	61	

†		High B	MI		Marrie	ed		ndenc Iouseh	y in the	E	ducatio	n		Tobacc	0		Alcoh	ol	Sle	ep pro	blems
	No	Yes	р	No	Yes	р	No	Yes	р	Basic	High	р	No	Yes	р	No	Yes	р	No	Yes	р
Mild	15	12		14	14		21	3		9	19		5	23		24	4		3	24	
Moderate	7	13		9	13		18	3		10	12		8	14		19	3		4	18	
Severe	9	17		16	13		22	6		16	13		15	14		25	4		3	26	
Olfactory loss			0.064			0.026*			0.168			0.792			0.605			0.105			0.133
No symptom	45	40		31	61		73	12		43	49		26	66		68	24		23	68	
Mild	4	12		5	12		12	4		8	9		7	10		16	1		0	17	
Moderate	9	6		11	4		11	3		5	10		3	12		14	1		4	11	
Severe	25	14		17	25		38	2		20	22		12	30		34	7		9	33	
Gustatory loss			0.807			0.446			0.017*			0.554			0.348			0.055			0.282
No symptom	45	40		30	61		77	12		41	50		28	63		68	23		22	68	
Mild	9	9		9	11		11	6		8	12		7	13		20	0		1	19	
Moderate	8	9		8	10		13	2		11	7		2	16		16	2		4	14	
Severe	21	14		17	20		33	1		16	21		11	26		18	8		9	28	
Swallowing difficulties			0.165			0.002*			0.051			0.972			0.353			0.200			0.031*
No symptom	54	35		29	67		82	8		45	51		26	70		71	24		28	68	
Mild	14	18		12	23		28	4		15	20		8	27		32	3		2	32	
Moderate	11	13		16	8		17	6		11	13		10	14		20	4		5	19	
Severe	3	6		7	3		6	3		5	5		4	6		8	2		1	9	
Skin rashes			0.257			0.150			0.838			0.169			0.202			0.063			0.132
No symptom	56	37		34	64		82	11		48	50		25	73		72	25		27	71	
Mild	15	18		14	22		28	5		11	25		10	26		33	3		4	31	
Moderate	8	12		10	13		17	4		12	11		11	12		19	4		3	20	
Severe	4	4		6	2		6	1		5	3		2	6		8	0		1	7	
Conjunctivitis			0.201			0.447			0.124			0.143			0.831			0.212			0.268
No symptom	62	44		43	68		93	11		52	59		30	81		83	27		28	82	
Mild	7	14		9	14		18	3		6	17		8	15		21	2		3	20	
Moderate	10	10		10	11		16	3		11	10		6	15		18	3		2	19	
Severe	4	4		2	9		7	4		7	4		4	7		10	1		3	8	

10.3389/fpubh.2024.1355973

Frontiers in Public Health

 $\hat{\mathbf{m}}$ Chi-square test. *p < 0.05. $\hat{\mathbf{m}}$ = men, BMI, Body mass. Bold values = Chi-square test. *p < 0.05 (this is written in the legend). As there are so many numbers, it was decided to put the symbol * for p < 0.05 and to mark them in bold to make them more visual.

TABLE 5 Distribution of men data of socio-demographic and long COVID symptomatology variables based on intensity.

ń	ŀ	ligh B l	41		Marrie	d		benden house		E	ducatior	ו		Tobaco	:0		Alcoho	ol	Sle	ep prob	lems
	No	Yes	р	No	Yes	р	No	Yes	р	Basic	High	р	No	Yes	р	No	Yes	р	No	Yes	р
Muscle and joint pain			0.240			0.173			0.499			0.455			0.142			0.186			0.569
No symptom	0	1		0	1		1	0		0	1		0	1		1	0		0	1	
Mild	3	2		1	4		5	0		3	2		1	4		2	3		2	3	
Moderate	2	9		2	10		9	2		6	6		7	5		7	5		2	9	
Severe	10	11		11	11		15	6		15	7		5	17		18	4		3	18	
Fatigue			0.803			0.749			0.251			0.492			0.478			0.372			0.741
No symptom	0	1		0	1		1	0		0	1		0	1		1	0		0	1	
Mild	2	2		1	3		4	0		2	2		2	2		2	2		1	3	
Moderate	5	6		5	6		10	1		8	3		2	9		6	5		3	8	
Severe	8	13		8	15		14	7		14	9		9	14		18	5		3	19	
Discomfort			0.525			0.353			0.320			0.373			0.764			0.023*			0.162
No symptom	0	3		0	3		3	0		1	2		1	2		2	1		0	3	
Mild	1	1		0	2		2	0		1	1		0	2		2	0		1	0	
Moderate	6	9		7	9		13	2		8	8		6	10		7	9		3	13	
Severe	8	10		7	12		12	6		14	5		6	13		17	2		3	15	
Difficulty concentrating			0.080			0.935			0.641			0.373			0.517			0.280			0.004
No symptom	3	1		1	3		3	1		3	1		0	4		3	1		0	4	
Mild	1	7		3	5		6	1		4	4		3	5		6	2		5	3	
Moderate	6	4		3	7		9	1		8	2		4	6		9	1		1	7	
Severe	5	11		7	11		12	5		9	9		6	12		10	8		1	17	
Memory loss			0.265			0.470			0.118			0.395			0.537			0.943			0.012
No symptom	3	23		1	4		4	1		4	1		1	4		3	2		0	5	
Mild	3	7		5	5		8	1		4	6		2	8		7	3		5	4	
Moderate	7	6		3	10		12	1		9	4		6	7		9	4		1	11	
Severe	2	8		5	7		6	5		7	5		4	8		9	3		1	11	
Dyspnoea			0.097			0.158			0.615			0.692			0.174			0.516			0.643
No symptom	3	3		3	3		5	1		3	3		1	5		5	1		0	6	

(Continued)

TABLE 5 (Continued)

ŕ	H	ligh BN	41		Marrie	d	Dep the	enden house	cy in hold	E	ducation	۱ 		Tobacc	:0		Alcoho	ι	Slee	ep prot	olems
	No	Yes	р	No	Yes	p	No	Yes	p	Basic	High	p	No	Yes	р	No	Yes	p	No	Yes	р
Mild	1	5		0	6		4	2		4	2		4	2		4	2		1	4	
Moderate	9	6		8	9		14	2		9	8		6	11		10	7		4	13	
Severe	2	9		3	8		7	3		8	3		2	9		9	2		2	8	
Mood disturbances			0.253			0.297			0.899			0.951			0.454			0.465	1	3	0.797
No symptom	3	1		0	4		3	1		2	2		0	4		3	1		0	3	
Mild	0	3		1	2		2	0		2	1		1	2		3	0		3	10	
Moderate	5	8		4	10		11	3		8	6		6	8		8	6		3	15	
Severe	7	11		9	10		14	4		12	7		6	13		14	5				
Headache			0.260			0.889			0.588			0.349			0.764			0.066			0.938
No symptom	4	5		4	5		8	1		7	2		3	6		6	3		1	7	
Mild	0	4		1	3		3	0		1	3		2	2		1	3		1	3	
Moderate	7	6		5	9		10	4		8	6		5	9		9	5		3	11	
Severe	4	8		4	9		9	3		8	5		3	10		12	1		2	10	
Palpitations			0.284			0.899			0.282			0.321			0.301			0.796			0.603
No symptom	4	7		3	8		8	3		9	2		3	8		9	2		3	8	
Mild	0	3		1	2		1	1		1	2		1	2		2	1		0	3	
Moderate	6	10		7	10		12	4		9	8		8	9		11	6		2	14	
Severe	5	3		3	6		9	0		5	4		1	8		6	3		2	6	
Cough			0.091			0.214			0.659			0.429			0.046*			0.139			0.116
No symptom	8	6		7	7		11	2		9	5		1	13		10	4		1	12	
Mild	6	7		3	11		11	3		7	7		8	6		7	7		3	11	
Moderate	1	7		2	7		6	3		7	2		3	6		8	1		1	7	
Severe	0	3		2	1		2	0		1	2		1	2		3	0		2	1	
Hair loss			0.707			0.188			0.425			0.561			0.121			0.166			0.533
No symptom	10	17		10	18		20	7		16	12		7	21		21	7		6	22	
Mild	3	2		1	5		6	0		3	3		3	3		2	4		0	5	
Moderate	1	3		1	3		2	1		3	1		3	1		3	1		1	2	
Severe	1	1		2	0		2	0		2	0		0	2		2	0		0	2	

(Continued)

TABLE 5 (Continued)

ŕ	ŀ	ligh BN	41		Marrie	d	Dep the	enden housel	cy in hold	E	ducatior	١		Tobacc	0		Alcoho	ol	Sle	ep prob	olems
	No	Yes	р	No	Yes	р	No	Yes	р	Basic	High	р	No	Yes	р	No	Yes	р	No	Yes	p
Diarrhea			0.659			0.333			0.874			0.051			0.948			0.179			0.25
No symptom	5	12		4	13		12	4		14	3		5	12		14	3		3	13	
Mild	4	4		3	7		8	2		3	7		4	6		5	5		0	10	
Moderate	5	5		5	5		8	2		5	5		3	7		6	4		3	6	
Severe	1	2		2	1		2	0		2	1		1	2		3	0		1	2	
Olfactory loss			0.837			0.277			0.706			0.387			0.409			0.186			0.6
No symptom	9	15		7	17		18	6		13	11		8	16		16	8		5	18	
Mild	1	3		1	4		3	1		3	2		3	2		2	3		0	5	
Moderate	3	3		3	4		5	1		4	3		1	6		6	1		1	6	
Severe	2	2		3	1		4	0		4	0		1	3		4	0		1	2	
Gustatory loss	2	2	0.794	5	1	0.896	т	0	0.579		0	0.311	1	5	0.317	Т	0	0.126	1	2	0.20
	10	15	0.794	10	17	0.890	21		0.379	14	12	0.311		10	0.317	10	9	0.120	6	20	0.20
No symptom	12	15		10	17		21	5		14	13		9	18		18			6	20	
Mild	1	3		1	4		3	1		3	2		3	2		2	3		0	5	
Moderate	1	3		2	3		3	2		4	1		1	4		5	0		0	5	_
Severe	1	2		1	2		3	0		3	0		0	3		3	0		1	1	
Swallowing			0.764			0.801			0.604			0.398			0.373			0.936			0.35
difficulties No symptom	11	13		7	17		18	5		14	10		9	15		16	8		4	18	
Mild	1	2		2	2		2	1		2	2		1	3		3	0		4	3	
Moderate	2	5		3	4		5	2		6	1		3	4		5	2		0	7	-
Severe	1	3		2	3		5	0		2	3		0	5		4	1		2	3	
Skin rashes			0.303			0.257			0.433			0.036*			0.624			0.220			0.21
No symptom	8	16		9	15		19	4		16	8		6	18		18	6		6	16	
Mild	5	3		1	8		7	2		4	5		4	5		4	5		0	9	
Moderate	2	2		2	2		2	2		4	0		2	2		3	1		0	4	
Severe	0	2		2	1		2	0		0	3		1	2		3	0		1	2	
Conjunctivitis			0.875			0.717			0.965			0.046*			0.376			0.653			0.3
No symptom	9	13		6	16		17	5		11	11		7	15		15	7		5	16	
Mild	3	3		3	4		4	1		5	2		4	3		5	2		0	6	
Moderate	1	2		2	2		3	1		1	3		1	3		2	2		0	4	
Severe	2	5		3	4		6	1		7	0		1	6		6	1		2	5	

experienced by females are muscle and joint pain, fatigue, and concentration difficulties. In males, the most acute symptoms are fatigue, muscle and joint pain, discomfort, and mood disturbances. Undertaking a gender-sensitive study is important because it helps to understand and address gender inequalities and promote gender equality. The findings suggest future lines of research to design more effective, specific, and personalized care for this emerging disease. Furthermore, longitudinal studies should be carried out to explore the risk factors closely related to long COVID and its relationship to quality of life. Finally, exploring differences in the experience of this disease between different groups of people, such as different ethnic groups or people with pre-existing conditions, should likewise be carried out.

Data availability statement

The datasets presented in this article are not readily available because the database is part of a cohort study. Requests to access the datasets should be directed to MM-A, maria.martinezandres@ uclm.es.

Ethics statement

The studies involving humans were approved by the Clinical Research Ethics Committee from Hospital of Albacete (number 2022/001). The studies were conducted in accordance with the local legislation and institutional requirements. The participants provided their written informed consent to participate in this study.

Author contributions

IM-T: Writing – original draft, Writing – review & editing, Conceptualization, Formal analysis, Methodology. MM-C: Writing – original draft, Writing – review & editing, Conceptualization,

References

1. The Lancet Respiratory Medicine. Long COVID: confronting a growing public health crisis. *Lancet Respir Med.* (2023) 11:663. doi: 10.1016/S2213-2600(23)00268-0

2. Jassat W, Reyes LF, Munblit D, Caoili J, Bozza F, Hashmi M, et al. Long COVID in low-income and middle-income countries: the hidden public health crisis. *Lancet* 30 de septiembre de. (2023) 402:1115–7. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(23)01685-9

3. Rodriguez Ledo P. *Guía clínica para la atención al paciente long covid/covid persistente*. (2021); Available at: https://policycommons.net/artifacts/1692997/guia-clinica-para-la-atencion-al-paciente-long-covidcovid-persistente/2424645/ (Accessed October 4, 2023).

4. Crook H, Raza S, Nowell J, Young M, Edison P. Long covid—mechanisms, risk factors, and management. *BMJ.* (2021) 374:n1648. doi: 10.1136/bmj.n1648

5. World Health Organisation. A clinical case definition of post COVID-19 condition by a Delphi consensus (2021). Available at: https://www.who.int/publications-detailredirect/WHO-2019-nCoV-Post_COVID-19_condition-Clinical_case_ definition-2021.1 (Accessed October 4, 2023).

6. Ballering AV, van Zon S, Olde Hartman TC, Rosmalen JGMLifelines Corona Research Initiative. Persistence of somatic symptoms after COVID-19 in the Netherlands: an observational cohort study. *Lancet.* (2022) 400:452–61. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(22)01214-4

7. SPF. L'affection post-COVID-19 (appelée aussi COVID long) en France. (2022). Available at:https://www.santepubliquefrance.fr/maladies-et-traumatismes/ maladies-et-infections-respiratoires/infection-a-coronavirus/documents/ Methodology. BN-P: Writing – original draft, Writing – review & editing, Formal analysis, Methodology, Resources. ME-L: Writing – original draft, Writing – review & editing. NM-C: Writing – original draft, Writing – review & editing. MM-A: Writing – original draft, Writing – review & editing, Conceptualization, Funding acquisition, Methodology, Resources, Supervision.

Funding

The author(s) declare financial support was received for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article. This research was funded by the Provincial Council of Albacete (file number 33492).

Conflict of interest

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

Publisher's note

All claims expressed in this article are solely those of the authors and do not necessarily represent those of their affiliated organizations, or those of the publisher, the editors and the reviewers. Any product that may be evaluated in this article, or claim that may be made by its manufacturer, is not guaranteed or endorsed by the publisher.

Supplementary material

The Supplementary material for this article can be found online at: https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fpubh.2024.1355973/ full#supplementary-material

enquetes-etudes/l-affection-post-covid-19-appelee-aussi-covid-long-en-france.point-au-21-juillet-2022 (Accessed October 4, 2023).

8. Lai CC, Hsu CK, Yen MY, Lee PI, Ko WC, Hsueh PR. Long COVID: an inevitable sequela of SARS-CoV-2 infection. *J Microbiol Immunol Infect*. (2023) 56:1–9. doi: 10.1016/j.jmii.2022.10.003

9. Akbarialiabad H, Taghrir MH, Abdollahi A, Ghahramani N, Kumar M, Paydar S, et al. Long COVID, a comprehensive systematic scoping review. *Infection*. (2021) 49:1163–86. doi: 10.1007/s15010-021-01666-x

10. Yong SJ. Long COVID or post-COVID-19 syndrome: putative pathophysiology, risk factors, and treatments. *Scand J Infect Dis.* (2021) 53:737–54. doi: 10.1080/23744235.2021.1924397

11. López-Sampalo A, Bernal-López MR, Gómez-Huelgas R. Síndrome de COVID-19 persistente. Una revisión narrativa. *Rev Clin Esp.* (2022) 222:241–50. doi: 10.1016/j. rce.2021.10.003

12. Lopez-Leon S, Wegman-Ostrosky T, Perelman C, Sepulveda R, Rebolledo PA, Cuapio A, et al. More than 50 long-term effects of COVID-19: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *MedRxiv.* (2021) 30:2021.01.27.21250617. doi: 10.1101/2021.01.27.21250617

13. Bai F, Tomasoni D, Falcinella C, Barbanotti D, Castoldi R, Mulè G, et al. Female gender is associated with long COVID syndrome: a prospective cohort study. *Clin Microbiol Infect.* (2022) 28:611.e9–611.e16. doi: 10.1016/j.cmi.2021.11.002

14. Pelà G, Goldoni M, Solinas E, Cavalli C, Tagliaferri S, Ranzieri S, et al. Sex-related differences in long-COVID-19 syndrome. *J Women's Health*. (2002) 31:620–30. doi: 10.1089/jwh.2021.0411

15. Scaturro D, Vitagliani F, Di Bella VE, Falco V, Tomasello S, Lauricella L, et al. The role of acetyl-carnitine and rehabilitation in the Management of Patients with post-COVID syndrome: case-control study. *Appl Sci.* (2022) 12:4084. doi: 10.3390/app12084084

16. Koc HC, Xiao J, Liu W, Li Y, Chen G. Long COVID and its management. Int J Biol Sci. (2022) 18:4768-80. doi: 10.7150/ijbs.75056

17. Poudel AN, Zhu S, Cooper N, Roderick P, Alwan N, Tarrant C, et al. Impact of Covid-19 on health-related quality of life of patients: A structured review. *PLoS One.* (2021) 16:e0259164. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0259164

18. Guo L, Lin J, Ying W, Zheng C, Tao L, Ying B, et al. Correlation study of short-term mental health in patients discharged after coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) infection without comorbidities: a prospective study. *Neuropsychiatr Dis Treat.* (2020) 16:2661–7. doi: 10.2147/NDT.S278245

19. Fischer A, Zhang L, Elbéji A, Wilmes P, Oustric P, Staub T, et al. Long COVID symptomatology after 12 months and its impact on quality of life according to initial coronavirus disease 2019 disease severity. *Open Forum Infect Dis.* (2022) 9:ofac397. doi: 10.1093/ofid/ofac397

20. Malik P, Patel K, Pinto C, Jaiswal R, Tirupathi R, Pillai S, et al. Post-acute COVID-19 syndrome (PCS) and health-related quality of life (HRQoL)-a systematic review and meta-analysis. *J Med Virol.* (2022) 94:253–62. doi: 10.1002/jmv.27309

21. Brus IM, Spronk I, Haagsma JA, de Groot A, Tieleman P, Biere-Rafi S, et al. The prolonged impact of COVID-19 on symptoms, health-related quality of life, fatigue and mental well-being: a cross-sectional study. *Front Epidemiol.* (2023) 3:1144707. doi: 10.3389/fepid.2023.1144707

22. Davis HE, Assaf GS, McCorkell L, Wei H, Low RJ, Re'em Y, et al. Characterizing long COVID in an international cohort: 7 months of symptoms and their impact. *EClinicalMedicine*. (2021) 38:101019. doi: 10.1016/j.eclinm.2021.101019

23. Munblit D, Nicholson TR, Needham DM, Seylanova N, Parr C, Chen J, et al. Studying the post-COVID-19 condition: research challenges, strategies, and importance of Core outcome set development. *BMC Med.* (2022) 20:50. doi: 10.1186/s12916-021-02222-y

24. Jandhyala R. Design, validation and implementation of the post-acute (long) COVID-19 quality of life (PAC-19QoL) instrument. *Health Qual Life Outcomes*. (2021) 19:229. doi: 10.1186/s12955-021-01862-1

25. Marcilla-Toribio I, Martinez-Andres M, Moratalla-Cebrian ML, Jandhyala R, Femi-Ajao O, Galan-Moya EM. Adaptation and validation of the PAC-19QoL-specific quality of life questionnaire for the Spanish population with long COVID. *Curr Med Res Opin.* (2023) 39:1685–93. doi: 10.1080/03007995.2023.2256222

26. Ulbrichtova R, Vysehradsky P, Bencova A, Tatarkova M, Osina O, Svihrova V, et al. Validation of the Slovakian version of the "post-acute (long) COVID-19 quality of life instrument" and pilot study. *Patient Prefer Adherence*. (2023) 17:1137–42. doi: 10.2147/PPA.S404377

27. Umakanthan S, Monice M, Mehboob S, Jones CL, Lawrence S. Post-acute (long) COVID-19 quality of life: validation of the German version of (PAC19QoL) instrument. *Front Public Health.* (2023) 11, 11:1163360. doi: 10.3389/fpubh.2023.1163360

28. Fernández-de-las-Peñas C, Palacios-Ceña D, Gómez-Mayordomo V, Cuadrado ML, Florencio LL. Defining post-COVID symptoms (post-acute COVID, long COVID, persistent post-COVID): an integrative classification. *Int J Environ Res Public Health.* (2021) 18:2621. doi: 10.3390/ijerph18052621

29. Du Y, Zhang J, Wu LJ, Zhang Q, Wang YX. The epidemiology, diagnosis and prognosis of long-COVID. *Biomed Environ Sci.* (2022) 35:1133–9. doi: 10.3967/bes2022.143

30. Baroni C, Potito J, Perticone ME, Orausclio P, Luna CM. How does long-COVID impact prognosis and the long-term sequelae? *Viruses*. (2023) 15:1173. doi: 10.3390/ v15051173

31. Mateu L, Tebe C, Loste C, Santos JR, Lladós G, López C, et al. Determinants of the onset and prognosis of the post-COVID-19 condition: A 2-year prospective observational cohort study. *Lancet Reg Health Eur.* 33:100724. doi: 10.1016/j.lanepe.2023.100724

32. Rodríguez-Pérez MP, Sánchez-Herrera-Baeza P, Rodríguez-Ledo P, Huertas-Hoyas E, Fernández-Gómez G, Montes-Montes R, et al. Influence of clinical and sociodemographic variables on health-related quality of life in the adult population with long COVID. *J Clin Med.* (2023) 12:4222. doi: 10.3390/jcm12134222

33. Taquet M, Dercon Q, Luciano S, Geddes JR, Husain M, Harrison PJ. Incidence, co-occurrence, and evolution of long-COVID features: a 6-month retrospective cohort study of 273,618 survivors of COVID-19. *PLoS Med.* (2021) 18:e1003773. doi: 10.1371/journal.pmed.1003773

34. Perlis RH, Santillana M, Ognyanova K, Safarpour A, Lunz Trujillo K, Simonson MD, et al. Prevalence and correlates of long COVID symptoms among US adults. *JAMA Netw Open*. (2022) 5:e2238804. doi: 10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2022.38804

35. Anaya JM, Rojas M, Salinas ML, Rodríguez Y, Roa G, Lozano M, et al. Post-COVID syndrome. A case series and comprehensive review. *Autoimmun Rev.* (2021) 20:102947. doi: 10.1016/j.autrev.2021.102947

36. Aiyegbusi OL, Hughes SE, Turner G, Rivera SC, McMullan C, Chandan JS, et al. Symptoms, complications and management of long COVID: a review. *J R Soc Med.* (2021) 114:428–42. doi: 10.1177/01410768211032850

37. Tíscar-González V, Sánchez-Gómez S, Lafuente Martínez A, Peña Serrano A, Twose López M, Díaz Alonso S, et al. Vivencias e impacto en la calidad de vida de personas con COVID persistente. *Gac Sanit.* (2023) 37:102247. doi: 10.1016/j. gaceta.2022.102247

38. Mariette X. Long COVID: a new word for naming fibromyalgia? *Ann Rheum Dis.* (2024) 83:12–4. doi: 10.1136/ard-2023-224848

39. Colas C, Le Berre Y, Fanget M, Savall A, Killian M, Goujon I, et al. Physical activity in long COVID: a comparative study of exercise rehabilitation benefits in patients with long COVID, coronary artery disease and fibromyalgia. *Int J Environ Res Public Health.* (2023) 20:6513. doi: 10.3390/ijerph20156513

40. Faro M, Sàez-Francás N, Castro-Marrero J, Aliste L, Fernández de Sevilla T, Alegre J. Gender differences in chronic fatigue syndrome. *Reumatol Clín.* (2016) 12:72–7. doi: 10.1016/j.reuma.2015.05.007

41. Segura-Jiménez V, Estévez-López F, Soriano-Maldonado A, Álvarez-Gallardo IC, Delgado-Fernández M, Ruiz JR, et al. Gender differences in symptoms, health-related quality of life, sleep quality, mental health, cognitive performance, pain-cognition, and positive health in Spanish fibromyalgia individuals: the Al-Ándalus project. *Pain Res Manag.* (2016) 2016:5135176–14. doi: 10.1155/2016/5135176

42. IRIS PAHO. Incorporar la perspectiva de género en la equidad en la salud: un análisis de la investigación y las políticas. Washington: Pan American Health Organization (2005). 53 p.

43. Rohlfs I, Borrell C, Anitua C, Artazcoz L, Colomer C, Escribá V, et al. La importancia de la perspectiva de género en las encuestas de salud. *Gac Sanit.* (2000) 14:146–55. doi: 10.1016/S0213-9111(00)71448-8

44. Gínez-Silva MJ, Astorga CM, Urchaga-Litago JD. Resiliencia psicológica a través de la edad y el sexo. *Rev INFAD Psicol Int J Dev Educ Psychol.* (2019) 4:85–94. doi: 10.17060/ijodaep.2019.n1.v4.1513

45. González-Arratia López Fuentes NI, Valdez Medina JL. Resiliencia: Diferencias por Edad en Hombres y Mujeres Mexicanos. *Acta Investig Psicol - Psychol Res Rec.* (2013) 3:941–55. doi: 10.1016/S2007-4719(13)70944-X

46. Imran A, Tariq S, Kapczinski F, Cardoso TA. Psychological resilience and mood disorders: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Trends Psychiatry Psychother*. (2022) 1–37. doi: 10.47626/2237-6089-2022-0524

47. Informe CS. *Salud y Género 2022. [Internet]* Fundadeps (2023) Available at: https://fundadeps.org/recursos/informe-salud-y-genero-2022/.

48. Del Río LM, García-Calvente MDM, Calle-Romero J, Machón-Sobrado M, Larrañaga-Padilla I. Health-related quality of life in Spanish informal caregivers: gender differences and support received. *Qual Life Res.* (2017) 26:3227–38. doi: 10.1007/s11136-017-1678-2

49. Cascella Carbó GF, García-Orellán R, Cascella Carbó GF, García-Orellán R. Sobrecarga y desigualdades de género en el cuidado informal. Investig Educ En Enferm [Internet]. (2020) 38. Available at: http://www.scielo.org.co/scielo.php?script=sci_abstract&pid=S012 0-53072020000100010&lng=en&nrm=iso&tlng=es (Accessed November 7, 2023).

50. Sanjuán-Quiles Á, Alcañiz-Garrán M del MMontejano-Lozoya R, Ramos-Pichardo JD, García-Sanjuán S. La perspectiva de las personas cuidadoras desde un análisis de género. *Rev Esp Salud Pública*. (2023) 97:e202307062.

51. Osborne NR, Davis KD. Sex and gender differences in pain. Int Rev Neurobiol. (2022) 164:277-307. doi: 10.1016/bs.irn.2022.06.013

52. Fillingim RB, King CD, Ribeiro-Dasilva MC, Rahim-Williams B, Riley JL. Sex, gender, and pain: a review of recent clinical and experimental findings. *J Pain.* (2009) 10:447–85. doi: 10.1016/j.jpain.2008.12.001

53. Ruschak I, Montesó-Curto P, Rosselló L, Martín CA, Sánchez-Montesó L, Toussaint L. Fibromyalgia syndrome pain in men and women: a scoping review. *Healthcare Basel.* 11:223. doi: 10.3390/healthcare11020223

54. Gatchel RJ, Peng YB, Peters ML, Fuchs PN, Turk DC. The biopsychosocial approach to chronic pain: scientific advances and future directions. *Psychol Bull*. (2007) 133:581–624. doi: 10.1037/0033-2909.133.4.581

55. Keskindag B, Karaaziz M. The association between pain and sleep in fibromyalgia. Saudi Med J. (2017) 38:465–75. doi: 10.15537/smj.2017.5.17864

56. Goldstein AN, Walker MP. The role of sleep in emotional brain function. Annu Rev Clin Psychol. (2014) 10:679–708. doi: 10.1146/annurev-clinpsy-032813-153716

57. Weingarten TN, Podduturu VR, Hooten WM, Thompson JM, Luedtke CA, Oh TH. Impact of tobacco use in patients presenting to a multidisciplinary outpatient treatment program for fibromyalgia. *Clin J Pain*. (2009) 25:39–43. doi: 10.1097/AJP.0b013e31817d105e

58. Hampton MM, Newcomb P. Self-efficacy and stress among informal caregivers of individuals at end of life. *J Hosp Palliat Nurs*. (2018) 20:471–7. doi: 10.1097/NJH.000000000000464

59. Kim CH, Vincent A, Clauw DJ, Luedtke CA, Thompson JM, Schneekloth TD, et al. Association between alcohol consumption and symptom severity and quality of life in patients with fibromyalgia. *Arthritis Res Ther.* (2013) 15:R42. doi: 10.1186/ar4200

60. Mandal S, Barnett J, Brill SE, Brown JS, Denneny EK, Hare SS, et al. "long-COVID": a cross-sectional study of persisting symptoms, biomarker and imaging abnormalities following hospitalisation for COVID-19. *Thorax.* (2021) 76:396–8. doi: 10.1136/thoraxjnl-2020-215818