



**HAL**  
open science

## Chilblains during lockdown are associated with household exposure to SARS-CoV-2. A multicentre case-control study

Florence Poizeau, Emmanuel Oger, Sebastien Barbarot, Yannick Le Corre, Mahtab Samimi, Emilie Brenaut, H el ene Aubert, Estel Chambrelan, Catherine Droitcourt, Val erie Gissot, et al.

### ► To cite this version:

Florence Poizeau, Emmanuel Oger, Sebastien Barbarot, Yannick Le Corre, Mahtab Samimi, et al.. Chilblains during lockdown are associated with household exposure to SARS-CoV-2. A multicentre case-control study. *Clinical Microbiology and Infection*, 2022, 28 (2), pp.285-291. 10.1016/j.cmi.2021.09.032 . hal-03372974

**HAL Id: hal-03372974**

**<https://hal.science/hal-03372974>**

Submitted on 26 Oct 2021

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destin ee au d ep ot et  a la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publi es ou non,  emanant des  tablissements d'enseignement et de recherche fran ais ou  trangers, des laboratoires publics ou priv es.



Distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution - NonCommercial 4.0 International License

1 **Article type:** Original article

2 **Title:** Chilblains during lockdown are associated with household exposure to SARS-CoV-2.

3 **A multicentre case-control study.**

4

5 Florence Poizeau <sup>1,2</sup>; Emmanuel Oger <sup>1</sup>; Sébastien Barbarot <sup>3</sup>; Yannick Le Corre <sup>4</sup>; Mahtab  
6 Samimi <sup>5</sup>; Emilie Brenaut <sup>6</sup>; Hélène Aubert <sup>3</sup>; Estel Chambrelan <sup>2</sup>; Catherine Droitcourt <sup>1,2</sup>;  
7 Valérie Gissot <sup>7</sup>; Christopher Heslan <sup>8</sup>; Claire Laurent <sup>1,2</sup>; Ludovic Martin <sup>4</sup>; Laurent Misery <sup>6,9</sup>;  
8 Pierre Tattevin <sup>10</sup>; Alexis Toubel <sup>2</sup>; Vincent Thibault <sup>8</sup>; Alain Dupuy <sup>1,2</sup>.

9 <sup>1</sup> EA 7449 REPERES (Pharmacoepidemiology and Health Services Research), Rennes 1 University, Rennes,  
10 France

11 <sup>2</sup> Department of Dermatology, CHU Rennes, Rennes, France

12 <sup>3</sup> Department of Dermatology, CHU Nantes France

13 <sup>4</sup> Department of Dermatology, CHU Angers, France

14 <sup>5</sup> Department of Dermatology, CHU Tours, France

15 <sup>6</sup> Department of Dermatology, CHU Brest, France

16 <sup>7</sup> INSERM Clinical Investigation Center 1415, CHU Tours, Tours, France

17 <sup>8</sup> Department of Virology, CHU Rennes, Rennes, France

18 <sup>9</sup> Univ Brest, LIEN, Brest, France

19 <sup>10</sup> Infectious Diseases and Intensive Care Unit, CHU Rennes, Rennes, France

20

21 **Corresponding author:** Alain Dupuy, MD, PhD

22 Department of Dermatology, CHU Rennes, 2 rue Henri le Guilloux 35000 Rennes, France, Tel:

23 + 33 2 99 28 43 49, Fax: + 33 2 99 28 41 00

24 Mailto: [alain.dupuy@chu-rennes.fr](mailto:alain.dupuy@chu-rennes.fr).

25 **Manuscript word count:** 2480

26 **Keywords:** chilblains, pernio, perniosis, COVID-19, SARS-CoV-2, acral manifestations

27 **Trial Registration:** ClinicalTrials.gov Identifier NCT04455308

28 **Abstract**

29

30 **Objectives:** During the COVID-19 pandemic, numerous cases of chilblains have been  
31 reported. However, in most cases, RT-PCR or serology did not confirm SARS-CoV-2 infection.  
32 Hypotheses have been raised about an interferon-mediated immunological response to  
33 SARS-CoV-2, leading to effective clearance of the SARS-CoV-2 without the involvement of  
34 humoral immunity. Our objective was to explore the association between chilblains and  
35 exposure to SARS-CoV-2.

36 **Methods:** In this multicentre case-control study, cases were the 102 individuals referred to 5  
37 referral hospitals for chilblains occurring during the first lockdown (March to May 2020).  
38 Controls were recruited from healthy volunteers' files held by the same hospitals. All  
39 members of their households were included, resulting in 77 case households (262  
40 individuals) and 74 control households (230 individuals). Household exposure to SARS-CoV-2  
41 during the first lockdown was categorized as high, intermediate or low, using a pre-  
42 established algorithm based on individual data on symptoms, high-risk contacts, activities  
43 outside the home and RT-PCR testing. Participants were offered a SARS-CoV-2 serological  
44 test.

45 **Results:** After adjustment for age, the association between chilblains and viral exposure was  
46 estimated at OR=3.3, 95%CI (1.4-7.3) for an intermediate household exposure, and 6.9 (2.5-  
47 19.5) for a high household exposure to SARS-CoV-2. Out of 57 case households tested, 6  
48 (11%) had positive serology for SARS-CoV-2, whereas all control households tested (n=50)  
49 were seronegative ( $p=0.03$ ). The effect of potential misclassification on exposure has been  
50 assessed in a bias analysis.

- 51 **Conclusions:** This case-control study demonstrates the association between chilblains  
52 occurring during the lockdown and household exposure to SARS-CoV-2.

Journal Pre-proof

**53 Introduction**

54 In the early months of the COVID-19 pandemic, the emergence of acral lesions, similar to  
55 classic chilblains, have been reported worldwide [1–9]. As an outbreak of chilblains is  
56 extremely unusual, especially during the spring season and in areas with a mild climate, they  
57 were rapidly attributed to COVID-19 under the term “COVID toes” [1,2,4,10]. However, the  
58 association between SARS-CoV-2 and chilblains could not be ascertained, due to negative  
59 tests for SARS-CoV-2 infection, whether direct (RT-PCR) or indirect (serology), in the large  
60 majority of patients with chilblains. Instead, non-viral hypotheses arose: lifestyle changes  
61 associated with community lockdown (changes in physical activity, unsuitable footwear, etc.)  
62 [3,9,11–15], or a surveillance bias during this anxiogenic pandemic [3].

63 Several hypotheses have been raised regarding an immunological rationale for SARS-CoV-2  
64 as a trigger for chilblains. Some researchers have suggested that chilblains could result from  
65 a strong interferon response, as seen in genetic interferonopathies. The interferon response  
66 could lead to rapid clearance of SARS-CoV-2, without the involvement of humoral immunity,  
67 explaining the negative SARS-CoV-2 serology in most patients [8,16–18].

68 To address the controversy, we conducted a multicentre case-control study in Western  
69 France to estimate the association between chilblains occurring during the first lockdown  
70 (March 17, to May 11, 2020) and household exposure to SARS-CoV-2 within confined homes.  
71 We used an algorithm based on self-reported features related to SARS-CoV-2 exposure  
72 rather than serological tests, because the underlying pathophysiological hypothesis implies  
73 low sensibility of serology to document SARS-CoV-2 exposure.

74

75

76

## 77 **Methods**

### 78 *Overview of the study*

79 This multicentre case-control study took place in Western France. Individuals who developed  
80 chilblains during lockdown and individuals who had been confined with them (case  
81 households) were questioned in June and July 2020 about their exposure to SARS-CoV-2  
82 during the first lockdown (March 17 to May 11, 2020). For the control group, individuals  
83 from households where no one developed chilblains (control households) were questioned  
84 using the same questionnaire covering the same period. Household exposure to SARS-CoV-2,  
85 assessed by self-reported information on the questionnaire, was compared between case  
86 households and control households. All individuals from these households were offered a  
87 COVID-19 serological test.

88

### 89 *Participants*

90 Individuals with suspicion of chilblains were referred by dermatologists and general  
91 practitioners from Western France to the Dermatology departments of 5 referral hospitals  
92 (Rennes, Brest, Nantes, Angers and Tours) covering 3 French regions (Bretagne, Pays de la  
93 Loire and Centre Val de Loire). The diagnosis of chilblains was established by a dermatologist  
94 in presence of localized erythema and swelling involving acral sites, persistent for more than  
95 24 hours [19]. All individuals who had chilblains during the first COVID-19 wave in France  
96 (March to May 2020) were eligible to participate as cases, whether or not they had had  
97 similar lesions in the past. French referral hospitals hold healthy volunteers' files to recruit  
98 individuals for clinical research. The abovementioned hospitals used these files to recruit the  
99 controls, so that the individuals would have consulted in the same settings as the cases if

100 they had had similar skin lesions. All controls were asked to check a series of images of  
101 chilblains, in order to exclude them if any reported they might have had such lesions during  
102 the lockdown. Each individual enrolled (whether case or control) was to get in touch with  
103 each person he/she was confined with to complete the questionnaire. Individuals confined  
104 together during the lockdown defined the households. Individuals living alone were included  
105 in a sensitivity analysis.

106

### 107 *Exposure to SARS-CoV-2*

108 Household exposure to SARS-CoV-2 was assessed by processing information from each  
109 household member, using an algorithm established before data acquisition by consensus  
110 between investigators (including dermatologists, a virologist (VT), an infectious disease  
111 specialist (PT), and an epidemiologist (EO)). As a first step, the algorithm determined the  
112 individual level of risk for each household member of promoting SARS-CoV-2 circulation at  
113 home. Individual risk was classified as high if the household member had RT-PCR-proven  
114 COVID-19, specific symptoms (i.e. anosmia or ageusia), or had had unprotected and  
115 prolonged contact with a person diagnosed with COVID-19. Individual risk was classified as  
116 intermediate in case of other symptoms (fever, asthenia, rhinitis, sore throat, cough,  
117 dyspnea), other types of contact (protected or short-lived) with a person diagnosed with  
118 COVID-19, or regular out-of-home activity during lockdown. Individual risk was classified as  
119 low otherwise (asymptomatic household member who had no contact with a COVID-19-  
120 infected individual and no regular out-of-home activity). As a second step, the algorithm  
121 classified household exposure to SARS-CoV-2 into 3 ordered categories, according to the  
122 individual risk obtained for each household member: a household with at least one high-risk

123 household member was considered as having a high level of household exposure to SARS-  
124 CoV-2; a household composed exclusively of low-risk members was considered as having a  
125 low level of household exposure to SARS-CoV-2. Household exposure to SARS-CoV-2 was  
126 considered as intermediate otherwise (i.e., at least one intermediate-risk member, and no  
127 one at high risk). The algorithm is presented in Supplementary Table 1.

128

#### 129 *SARS-CoV-2 serological testing*

130 A SARS-CoV-2 serological test was offered to all the members of each household, and  
131 performed between July 21, 2020 and October 19, 2020. Laboratory methods are detailed in  
132 the Supplementary Data 1.

133

#### 134 *Statistical analyses*

135 The association between chilblains occurring during lockdown and household exposure to  
136 SARS-CoV-2 was based on odds-ratio and 95% confidence interval (OR, 95%CI) estimation.  
137 The analysis was first stratified on age, then adjusted for age. Age was divided into quartiles  
138 in the main analysis, and modeled using a spline function in a sensitivity analysis. The  
139 analysis was also stratified and adjusted for the number of individuals confined together.  
140 Two additional sensitivity analyses were conducted, one including single-individual  
141 households, the other excluding households with a past history of chilblains. The statistical  
142 methods are detailed in Supplementary Data 2.

143

144



145 *Research Ethics*

146 The study was approved on June 25<sup>th</sup> 2020 by the Comité de Protection des Personnes Ile de  
147 France III for the authorization to perform the serological tests (Ref. CNRIPH  
148 20.06.17.34600), and by the CHU Rennes's Ethics Committee on June 24th for the  
149 questionnaire (Ref 20.79).

150

151

152 **Results**153 *Participants*

154 All individuals referred for chilblains answered the questionnaire. Out of 677 individuals  
155 included in the healthy volunteer files of the abovementioned hospitals, 109 (16.1%)  
156 answered the questionnaire. Three case and 4 control households were excluded because of  
157 incomplete questionnaires. Four additional control households were excluded because they  
158 reported having had lesions resembling chilblains during the lockdown. A total of 94 case  
159 households and 101 validated control households were thus included. Single-person  
160 households (17 cases and 27 controls) were excluded for the main analysis, leaving 77 case  
161 households (262 individuals) and 74 control households (230 individuals) (Figure 1).

162

163 *Characteristics of individuals with chilblains*

164 Eighty-five individuals had chilblains, 8 case households including several affected  
165 individuals. Fifty-three (62.4%) were women, the median age was 24 (range, 12-70).  
166 Chilblains were located on the feet (75.3%), hands (11.8%) or both (12.9%). The median  
167 duration of lesions was 33 days (range, 4-143). Eighteen patients (21.2%) reported a past

168 history of chilblains, with less severe episodes in all these patients. Ten (11.8%) reported a  
169 previous Raynaud phenomenon. Only 3 patients reported exposure to cold before the  
170 occurrence of the lesions.

171

### 172 *Characteristics of households*

173 The composition of the households and the conditions of lockdown are described in Table 1.

174 Case and control households did not differ for their main characteristics, except that they  
175 were not evenly distributed across the 3 regions (all in Western France).

176

### 177 *SARS-CoV-2 household exposure*

178 Across the case households, 23 (29.9%), 39 (50.6%) and 15 (19.5%) respectively were  
179 classified as having high, intermediate and low level of household exposure to SARS-CoV-2.

180 Across the control households, 9 (12.2%), 33 (44.6%) and 32 (43.2%) respectively were  
181 classified as having high, intermediate and low level of household exposure to SARS-CoV-2.

182 Symptoms (fever, asthenia, rhinitis, sore throat, cough, dyspnea), and a prolonged  
183 unprotected contact with an individual diagnosed with COVID-19 were significantly more  
184 often reported in case households than in control households (Table 2).

185

### 186 *Association between chilblains and level of household exposure to SARS-CoV-2*

187 The univariate analysis showed a significant association between chilblains and the level of  
188 household exposure to SARS-CoV-2, with a crude OR (95%CI) of 2.5 (1.2-5.4) for an  
189 intermediate level of exposure, and 5.5 (2.0-14.6) for a high level of exposure. After  
190 adjustment for age, the association was estimated at 3.3 (1.4-7.3) for an intermediate level  
191 of household exposure and 6.9 (2.5-19.5) for a high level of household exposure (Figure 2).

192 The homogeneity of the effect of viral exposure across the 4 age subgroups was not rejected  
193 ( $p$ -value for interaction, 0.54). The results of the stratified analysis on the 4 age subgroups  
194 and the sensitivity analysis selecting the minimum age within households are presented on  
195 the forest plot (Figure 2). When individuals living alone were included, the results were  
196 similar, with an adjusted OR of 2.4 (1.2-4.6) for an intermediate level of exposure, and 5.8  
197 (2.4-14.5) for a high level of exposure. When households with a past history of chilblains  
198 were excluded, the adjusted OR was 3.4 (1.3-8.8) for an intermediate level of exposure, and  
199 7.7 (2.3-25.7) for a high level of exposure.

200 The stratified, crude and adjusted analyses taking into account the number of individuals  
201 confined together did not show substantially different results (Supplementary Figure 1).

202

### 203 *SARS-CoV-2 serological tests*

204 Out of 57 tested case households, 6 (10.5%) had at least one SARS-CoV-2 seropositive  
205 household member, whereas out of 50 tested control households, none (0%) had a  
206 seropositive member ( $p=0.03$ ) (Table 3). Among the 6 seropositive case households (17  
207 seropositive individuals), 3 individuals with chilblains had SARS-CoV-2 antibodies, while in  
208 the other 3 households, all members were seropositive except the individual with chilblains.  
209 All seropositive households were categorized at a high level of exposure to SARS-CoV-2  
210 following our algorithm. Among the individuals with serology but excluded because they  
211 were living alone (10 individuals with chilblains and 18 without), only one individual, without  
212 chilblains, was positive (Table 3).

213

214

**215 Discussion**

216 In this case-control study comparing 77 case households to 74 control households, we  
217 observed a strong, significant, and proportional association between chilblains occurring  
218 during the lockdown and household exposure to SARS-CoV-2. This result is consistent with  
219 another case-control study based on serological tests [20].

220

221 The association between chilblains during the lockdown and exposure to SARS-CoV-2 within  
222 households is an important finding. While numerous reports of chilblains-like cases emerged  
223 throughout Europe and the United States during the first lockdown, the proportion of  
224 virologically confirmed SARS-CoV-2 infections was generally low, and discordant across  
225 studies [2–4,6–9], while the absence of a reference group without chilblains hampered the  
226 interpretation.

227

228 The main strength of our study is the comparison with a control group. Although we  
229 identified high exposure to SARS-CoV-2 in only 30% of the case households, the case-control  
230 design highlighted the fact that high exposure was about 7 times more frequent among case  
231 than among control households. In addition, the consistency of the results across age  
232 subgroups, with both statistical methods taking age into account, the evidence for a dose  
233 effect for chilblains according to the level of viral exposure, and the more frequent  
234 seropositivity among case households than control households (10.5 vs 0%) are additional  
235 arguments to support the validity and robustness of our results.

236

237 All individuals with chilblains had a diagnostic validation by a dermatologist. The multicentre  
238 recruitment ensured the diversity and representativeness of the cases. These cases were  
239 similar to those reported in several case series [2–9].

240

241 The controls were unevenly recruited across Western France, but the area was overall  
242 moderately affected by the COVID-19 pandemic, the highest incidence of COVID-19 in  
243 France during spring 2020 being located in Ile-de-France (Paris area) and Grand-Est  
244 (northeast of France) [21]. While we were initially concerned about a selection bias in the  
245 inclusion of controls towards individuals who might have been more exposed and seeking a  
246 confirmation of their infection by serological testing, our results rule out the possibility of an  
247 overestimation of seropositivity among the controls, as none was positive. We used healthy  
248 volunteers' files from the same referral hospitals where cases were recruited to limit  
249 selection bias. Regarding a possible underestimation of the seropositivity rate, the  
250 prevalence of SARS-CoV-2 infection in this area of France was estimated at 1.7% (weighting  
251 the prevalence from the 3 regions of interest by the number of cases originating from these  
252 regions) [21]. Among the 68 control households tested (including individuals living alone),  
253 1.18 positive serology was expected, and a value of 1 was observed. Although seropositivity  
254 was not the main outcome in this study, these findings suggest that we selected a fairly  
255 unbiased control group.

256

257 Our study has limitations. First, our main outcome was based on self-reported items. Hence,  
258 exposure misclassification may have occurred. Non-differential misclassification, affecting  
259 both cases and controls, may have occurred for viral symptoms that are not specific to SARS-  
260 CoV-2. However, these were only used to determine the intermediate level of SARS-CoV-2

261 exposure (Supplementary Table 1). In addition, protective measures during the lockdown  
262 resulted in a low incidence of other respiratory viruses. Also, past exposures may be more  
263 readily recalled by cases, possibly because of repeated questioning by physicians, leading to  
264 a differential misclassification. However, the odds-ratio would remain significant, even with  
265 a 20% misclassification rate. False positive and false negative rates among case households,  
266 control households or both were simulated in the bias analysis in Supplementary Table 2  
267 [22]. Furthermore, a significant association was also observed for objective criteria not  
268 subject to misclassification, such as serology results. Second, asymptomatic cases make  
269 analyses of intra-household transmission unreliable, and this is the reason why we  
270 considered the household as a whole for the entire duration of the lockdown. Third, residual  
271 confounding is possible. For example, urban and rural living area was not specified in the  
272 questionnaire and could thus not be taken into account in the analysis. Last, seropositivity  
273 could have been underestimated in our study, because serologies were performed 2 to 5  
274 months after the study period, and anti-nucleoprotein antibodies may wane within months  
275 [23]. However, antibody waning would have affected case and control households similarly,  
276 which would have led to an underestimation of the association [24,25].

277

278 Several issues remain regarding the relationship between chilblains and SARS-CoV-2. Among  
279 them, one can wonder; whether SARS-CoV-2 exposure acts as a stimulus for a flare (a first or  
280 a subsequent one) among subjects with an immuno-genetic background predisposing to  
281 chilblains, or whether SARS-CoV-2 is an independent cause of chilblains; whether any other  
282 clusters of chilblains have occurred following anti-SARS-CoV-2 vaccination, since 8 cases  
283 have been reported in a registry-based study [26]; and on practical grounds, what is the  
284 medium-to-long term evolution of patients with chilblains occurring during the first

285 lockdown, given that persistent symptoms following COVID-19 are increasingly being  
286 described [27–33]. Persistent systemic and acral manifestations among the individuals with  
287 chilblains included in this study have been described in another article [34].

288

289

## 290 **Conclusion**

291 This comparative multicentre case-control study demonstrates an association between  
292 chilblains during lockdown and exposure to SARS-CoV-2 within confined households.

293 **Acknowledgements:** Institut Dermatologique du Grand Ouest (IDGO), as the institutional  
294 framework for developing and conducting the study.

295

296 **Additional Contributions:** Loïc Fin and Valérie Visseiche (CHU Rennes) supervised the  
297 administrative part of the study. Sabrina Nekomouche-Messis helped in elaborating the  
298 online questionnaire. Marion Jacob (CHU Rennes), Antoine Boulay, Anne Lefebvre (CHU  
299 Nantes), H el ene Humeau, Chlo e Blondin (CHU Angers), Helene Blansard (CHU Tours), Sonia  
300 Haddad (CHU Brest) helped to collect the data. Angela Verdier, MA, and Sarah Leyshon, MA,  
301 SARL L'Auracoise, revised the article for the English language. They received compensation  
302 for their contribution.

303

304 **Funding:** This work was supported by a grant from the Programme Hospitalier de Recherche  
305 Clinique Interr egional (Ministry of Health) GRICI Grand-Ouest.

306

307 **Conflict of Interest Disclosures:** Mahtab Samimi has received reimbursement for travel  
308 and/or accommodation expenses for attending medical meetings from Bristol Myers Squibb,  
309 Lilly, Galderma International, Janssen, Abbvie, MSD, outside the submitted work. Alain  
310 Dupuy reports reimbursement for travel and/or accommodation expenses for attending  
311 medical meetings from Sanofi, and personal fees from Sanofi and Leo Pharma, outside the  
312 submitted work.



313 **Author contributions**

314 Substantial contribution to study concept and design: FP, EO, SB, YLC, MS, EB, CL, LMa, LMi,  
315 AD.

316 Substantial contribution to the acquisition of data: FP, SB, YLC, MS, EB, HA, VG, CH, AT, VT,  
317 AD.

318 Substantial contribution to the statistical analysis or interpretation of data: FP, EO, SB, YLC,  
319 MS, EB, EC, CD, CH, CL, PT, VT, AD

320 Drafting the manuscript: FP, AD.

321 Critical review of the manuscript for important intellectual content and final approval for  
322 publication: all authors

Journal Pre-proof

323 **References**

- 324 [1] Recalcati S, Barbagallo T, Frasin LA, Prestinari F, Cogliardi A, Provero MC, et al. Acral  
325 cutaneous lesions in the time of COVID-19. *J Eur Acad Dermatol Venereol*  
326 2020;34:e346–7.
- 327 [2] Freeman E, McMahon D, Lipoff J, Rosenbach M, Kovarik C, Takeshita J, et al. Pernio-  
328 like skin lesions associated with COVID-19: A case series of 318 patients from 8  
329 countries. *J Am Acad Dermatol* 2020;83.
- 330 [3] Le Cleach L, Dousset L, Assier H, Fourati S, Barbarot S, Boulard C, et al. Most chilblains  
331 observed during the COVID-19 outbreak occur in patients who are negative for  
332 COVID-19 on polymerase chain reaction and serology testing. *Br J Dermatol*  
333 2020;183:866–74.
- 334 [4] Fernandez-Nieto D, Jimenez-Cauhe J, Suarez-Valle A, Moreno-Arrones OM, Saceda-  
335 Corralo D, Arana-Raja A, et al. Characterization of acute acral skin lesions in  
336 nonhospitalized patients: A case series of 132 patients during the COVID-19 outbreak.  
337 *J Am Acad Dermatol* 2020;83:e61–3.
- 338 [5] de Masson A, Bouaziz J, Sulimovic L, Cassius C, Jactiez M, Ionescu M, et al. Chilblains is  
339 a common cutaneous finding during the COVID-19 pandemic: A retrospective  
340 nationwide study from France. *J Am Acad Dermatol* 2020;83.
- 341 [6] Galván Casas C, Català A, Carretero Hernández G, Rodríguez-Jiménez P, Fernández-  
342 Nieto D, Rodríguez-Villa Lario A, et al. Classification of the cutaneous manifestations  
343 of COVID-19: a rapid prospective nationwide consensus study in Spain with 375 cases.  
344 *Br J Dermatol* 2020;183:71–7.
- 345 [7] Piccolo V, Neri I, Filippeschi C, Oranges T, Argenziano G, Battarra VC, et al. Chilblain-  
346 like lesions during COVID-19 epidemic: a preliminary study on 63 patients. *J Eur Acad*

- 347 Dermatol Venereol 2020;34:e291–3.
- 348 [8] Hubiche T, Cardot-Leccia N, Le Duff F, Seitz-Polski B, Giordana P, Chiaverini C, et al.  
349 Clinical, Laboratory, and Interferon-Alpha Response Characteristics of Patients With  
350 Chilblain-like Lesions During the COVID-19 Pandemic. JAMA Dermatology  
351 2021;157:202–6.
- 352 [9] Herman A, Peeters C, Verroken A, Tromme I, Tennstedt D, Marot L, et al. Evaluation of  
353 Chilblains as a Manifestation of the COVID-19 Pandemic. JAMA Dermatology  
354 2020;156:998–1003.
- 355 [10] El Hachem M, Diociaiuti A, Concato C, Carsetti R, Carnevale C, Ciofi Degli Atti M, et al.  
356 A clinical, histopathological and laboratory study of 19 consecutive Italian paediatric  
357 patients with chilblain-like lesions: lights and shadows on the relationship with COVID-  
358 19 infection. J Eur Acad Dermatology Venereol 2020;34:2620–9.
- 359 [11] Baeck M, Herman A. Emerging Evidence of the Direct Association Between COVID-19  
360 And Chilblains-Reply. JAMA Dermatology 2021;157:239–40.
- 361 [12] Caselli D, Chironna M, Loconsole D, Aricò M. Response to “No evidence of SARS-CoV-2  
362 infection by polymerase chain reaction or serology in children with pseudo-chilblain”.  
363 Reply from the authors. Br J Dermatol 2020;183:1156–7.
- 364 [13] Roca-Ginés J, Torres-Navarro I, Sánchez-Arráez J, Abril-Pérez C, Sabalza-Baztán O,  
365 Pardo-Granell S, et al. Assessment of Acute Acral Lesions in a Case Series of Children  
366 and Adolescents During the COVID-19 Pandemic. JAMA Dermatology 2020;156:992.
- 367 [14] Baeck M, Peeters C, Herman A. Chilblains and COVID-19: further evidence against a  
368 causal association. J Eur Acad Dermatology Venereol 2021;35:e2–3.
- 369 [15] McCleskey PE, Zimmerman B, Lieberman A, Liu L, Chen C, Gorouhi F, et al.  
370 Epidemiologic Analysis of Chilblains Cohorts Before and During the COVID-19

- 371 Pandemic. *JAMA Dermatology* 2021;157:947–53.
- 372 [16] Magro CM, Mulvey JJ, Laurence J, Sanders S, Crowson AN, Grossman M, et al. The  
373 differing pathophysiologies that underlie COVID-19-associated perniosis and  
374 thrombotic retiform purpura: a case series. *Br J Dermatol* 2021;184:141–50.
- 375 [17] Lipsker D. Paraviral eruptions in the era of COVID-19: Do some skin manifestations  
376 point to a natural resistance to SARS-CoV-2? *Clin Dermatol* 2020;38:757–61.
- 377 [18] Damsky W, Peterson D, King B. When interferon tiptoes through COVID-19: Pernio-  
378 like lesions and their prognostic implications during SARS-CoV-2 infection. *J Am Acad*  
379 *Dermatol* 2020;83:e269–70.
- 380 [19] Cappel JA, Wetter DA. Clinical characteristics, etiologic associations, laboratory  
381 findings, treatment, and proposal of diagnostic criteria of pernio (chilblains) in a series  
382 of 104 patients at Mayo Clinic, 2000 to 2011. *Mayo Clin Proc* 2014;89:207–15.
- 383 [20] Ortega-Quijano D, Fernandez-Nieto D, Jimenez-Cauhe J, Cortes-Cuevas JL, Marcos-  
384 Mencia D, Rodriguez-Dominguez M, et al. Association between COVID-19 and  
385 chilblains: a case-control study. *J Eur Acad Dermatol Venereol* 2021;35:e359–61.
- 386 [21] Salje H, Tran Kiem C, Lefrancq N, Courtejoie N, Bosetti P, Paireau J, et al. Estimating  
387 the burden of SARS-CoV-2 in France. *Science* 2020;369:208–11.
- 388 [22] Johnson CY, Flanders WD, Strickland MJ, Honein MA, Howards PP. Potential sensitivity  
389 of bias analysis results to incorrect assumptions of nondifferential or differential  
390 binary exposure misclassification. *Epidemiology* 2014;25:902–9.
- 391 [23] Lumley SF, Wei J, O’Donnell D, Stoesser NE, Matthews PC, Howarth A, et al. The  
392 Duration, Dynamics, and Determinants of Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome  
393 Coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) Antibody Responses in Individual Healthcare Workers.  
394 *Clin Infect Dis* 2021;73:e699–709.

- 395 [24] Newcomer SR, Kulldorff M, Xu S, Daley MF, Fireman B, Lewis E, et al. Bias from  
396 outcome misclassification in immunization schedule safety research.  
397 *Pharmacoepidemiol Drug Saf* 2018;27:221–8.
- 398 [25] Weinberg CR, Umbach DM, Greenland S. When will nondifferential misclassification of  
399 an exposure preserve the direction of a trend? *Am J Epidemiol* 1994;140:565–71.
- 400 [26] McMahon DE, Amerson E, Rosenbach M, Lipoff JB, Moustafa D, Tyagi A, et al.  
401 Cutaneous reactions reported after Moderna and Pfizer COVID-19 vaccination: A  
402 registry-based study of 414 cases. *J Am Acad Dermatol* 2021;85:46–55.
- 403 [27] Carfi A, Bernabei R, Landi F, Gemelli Against COVID-19 Post-Acute Care Study Group.  
404 Persistent Symptoms in Patients After Acute COVID-19. *JAMA* 2020;324:603–5.
- 405 [28] McMahon DE, Gallman AE, Hruza GJ, Rosenbach M, Lipoff JB, Desai SR, et al. Long  
406 COVID in the skin: a registry analysis of COVID-19 dermatological duration. *Lancet*  
407 *Infect Dis* 2021;21:313–4.
- 408 [29] Petersen MS, Kristiansen MF, Hanusson KD, Danielsen ME, á Steig B, Gaini S, et al.  
409 Long COVID in the Faroe Islands: A Longitudinal Study Among Nonhospitalized  
410 Patients. *Clin Infect Dis* 2020. <https://doi.org/10.1093/cid/ciaa1792>.
- 411 [30] Salmon-Ceron D, Slama D, De Broucker T, Karmochkine M, Pavie J, Sorbets E, et al.  
412 Clinical, virological and imaging profile in patients with prolonged forms of COVID-19:  
413 A cross-sectional study. *J Infect* 2021;82:e1–4.
- 414 [31] Logue JK, Franko NM, McCulloch DJ, McDonald D, Magedson A, Wolf CR, et al.  
415 Sequelae in Adults at 6 Months After COVID-19 Infection. *JAMA Netw Open*  
416 2021;4:e210830.
- 417 [32] Nasserie T, Hittle M, Goodman SN. Assessment of the Frequency and Variety of  
418 Persistent Symptoms Among Patients With COVID-19. *JAMA Netw Open*

419 2021;4:e2111417.

420 [33] Moghadam P, Frumholtz L, Jaume L, De Masson A, Jachiet M, Begon E, et al.

421 Frequency of relapse and persistent cutaneous symptoms after a first episode of

422 chilblain-like lesion during the COVID-19 pandemic. *J Eur Acad Dermatol Venereol*

423 2021;35:e566–8.

424 [34] Poizeau F, Barbarot S, Le Corre Y, Brenaut E, Samimi M, Aubert H, et al. The long-term

425 outcome of patients with chilblains associated with SARS-CoV-2. *Acta Derm Venereol*

426 2021;[in press].

427

Journal Pre-proof

428 **Table 1. Characteristics of case and control households**

	<b>Case households N = 77</b>	<b>Control households N = 74</b>	<b>P-value</b>
Age of the youngest individual in the household in years, median (range)	17 (1-69)	25 (2-72)	0.10
Age of the oldest individual in the household in years, median (range)	49 (23-70)	47 (25-94)	0.33
Proportion of men, median (range)	50 (0-100)	50 (0-100)	0.38
Geographical area			<10 <sup>-5</sup>
Bretagne	50 (64.9)	18 (24.3)	
Centre Val de Loire	7 (9.1)	26 (35.1)	
Pays de la Loire	18 (23.4)	23 (31.1)	
Not specified	2 (2.6)	7 (9.5)	
House (vs apartment), n (%)	57 (74.0)	47 (63.5)	0.16
Home surface area in m <sup>2</sup> , n (%)			0.21
< 50	5 (6.5)	7 (9.5)	
50-100	26 (33.8)	30 (40.5)	
100-150	26 (33.8)	22 (29.7)	
> 150	20 (26.0)	15 (20.3)	
Number of individuals confined, n (%)			0.16
2	25 (32.5)	34 (45.9)	
3-4	41 (53.2)	30 (40.5)	
> 4	11 (14.3)	10 (13.5)	

429

430 **Table 2. Features used to define exposure to SARS-CoV-2 in cases and controls, at both**  
 431 **household and individual levels**

	Cases		Controls		Comparison of households P-value
	Households <sup>a</sup> N = 77	Individuals N=262	Households <sup>a</sup> N = 74	Individuals N=230	
Symptoms					
Anosmia, ageusia	10 (13.0)	16 (6.1)	4 (5.4)	4 (1.7)	0.16
Other symptoms <sup>b</sup>	41 (53.2)	59 (22.5)	15 (20.3)	22 (9.6)	<10 <sup>-3</sup>
Contact with a person diagnosed with COVID-19					
Any contact	30 (39.0)	40 (15.3)	22 (29.7)	29 (12.6)	0.30
Prolonged contact without protection	18 (23.4)	21 (8.0)	8 (10.8)	13 (5.7)	0.05
Activities outside the home					
Health care workers	19 (24.7)	25 (9.5)	12 (16.2)	14 (6.1)	0.23
Other regular activities outside the home	31 (40.3)	43 (16.4)	25 (33.8)	36 (15.7)	0.50
RT-PCR test <sup>c</sup>					
Positive	2 (2.6)	2 (0.8)	0	0	-
Tested	6 (7.8)	6 (2.3)	2 (2.7)	2 (0.9)	-

432 <sup>a</sup> features of at least one individual in the household

433 <sup>b</sup> among fever, asthenia, rhinitis, sore throat, cough, dyspnea

434 <sup>c</sup> period when RT-PCR testing was restricted to hospitalized patients or health care workers.



435 **Table 3. Anti-SARS-CoV-2 serology in case and control households**

	Case households		Control households		<i>P</i> -value <sup>a</sup>
	N=57	N=67 <sup>b</sup>	N=50	N=68 <sup>b</sup>	
<b>Positive serology</b>	6 (10.5%)	6 (9.0%)	0 (0%)	1 (1.5%)	0.03

436 <sup>a</sup> Comparison of households included in the main analysis and who were tested for serology (57 case  
 437 and 50 control households), using Fisher's exact test

438 <sup>b</sup> Including individuals living alone

Journal Pre-proof

439 **Figure Legends**

440

441 **Figure 1. Study flowchart**

442

443 **Figure 2. Forest plot of the analyses estimating the association between chilblains and**

444 **exposure to SARS-CoV-2 within households**

Journal Pre-proof



