Risk Stratification tool for Healthcare workers during the CoViD-19 Pandemic; *using published data on demographics, co-morbid disease and clinical domain in order to assign biological risk*

Prof Janusz Jankowski (1,2,3,4),
Dr Angharad Davies (5,6),
Prof Peter MB English (7)
Prof Ellis Friedman (4,8),
Dr Helena McKeown (9, 10),
Prof Mala Rao OBE (4,11),
Dr Su Sethi (4,12),
Dr W. David Strain (6,13).

1. Sherwood Forest Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust, Nottinghamshire
2. Comprehensive Clinical trials Unit, University College London
3. Department of Life Sciences, Roehampton University, London
4. Consultant Committee, British Medical Association, London
5. Swansea University Medical School, Swansea
6. Medical Academic Staff Committee, British Medical Association, London
7. Public Health Medicine Committee, British Medical Association, London
8. Faculty of Public Health, UK
9. Portfolio GP, Wiltshire.
10. Chair of Representative body, British Medical Association, London
11. Imperial College, London
12. North West Commissioning Team, Liverpool
13. College of Medicine and Health, University of Exeter

Corresponding Author:

Dr David Strain

Diabetes and Vascular Medicine Research,

University of Exeter, College of Medicine and Health,

Royal Devon & Exeter Hospital,

Barrack Road, Exeter, EX2 5AX

Tel 01392 403058

Fax 01392 403027

e-mail: d.strain@exeter.ac.uk

Orcid ID: 0000-0002-6826-418X

Declarations of Interest; None to declare by all authors

Funding; None

Key words;

CoViD-19,

Risk stratification

Health care worker

Abstract

Healthcare workers have a greater exposure to individuals with confirmed SARS-novel coronavirus 2, and thus a higher probability of contracting coronavirus disease (CoViD)-19, than the general population. Employers have a duty of care to minimise the risk for their employees. We wished to explore the predictive role of basic demographics in order to establish a simple tool that could help risk stratify healthcare workers.

Methods: We undertook a review of the published literature (including multiple search strategies in MEDLINE with PubMed interface) and critically assessed early reports on medRxiv, a pre-print server (https://www.medrxiv.org: date of last search: May 18, 2020). We explored the relative risk of mortality from readily available demographics in order to identify the population at highest risk and incorporated them into a biological risk assessment tool.

Results: There were a multitude of international studies exploring the predictors of adverse outcomes in the general population. Two UK based datasources were identified that predicted admission to ITU and mortality in the UK population. Mortality increased with increasing age from 50 years onwards. Male sex at birth and people of black and minority ethnicity groups had higher susceptibility to both hospitalisation and mortality. Similarly, vascular disease, diabetes and chronic pulmonary disease further increased risk.

A risk stratification tool was compiled using a Caucasian female <50years of age with no comorbidities as a reference. Each point allocated to risk factors was associated with an approximate doubling in risk. This tool provides objective support for employers when determining which healthcare workers should be allocated to high-risk vs. lower risk patient facing clinical duties or to remote supportive roles.

Conclusions. We have generated a tool which can provide a framework for objective risk stratification of doctors and health care professionals during the CoViD-19 pandemic.

Strengths and limitations of this study

- There is potentially an increased risk of mortality in the clinical workforce due to the effects of CoViD-19.
- This manuscript outlines a simple risk stratification tool that helps to quantify an individual's biological risk
- This will assist team leaders when allocating roles within clinical departments.
- This tool does not incorporate other external factors, such as high-risk household members or those at higher risk of mental health issues, that may require additional consideration when allocating clinical duties in an appropriate clinical domain.
- This population-based analysis did not explain for the very high risk observed in BAME healthcare workers suggesting there are other issues at play that require addressing.

Introduction and Background.

Coronaviruses are a common cause of upper respiratory tract infections, both in adults and children, causing ~20% of such infections[1 2]. Infections usually last for several days and have a mild course. SARS-CoV-2 is a novel virus and the disease it causes, CoViD-19, has been associated with vast differences in morbidity and mortality, ranging from <1% to 15% in different geographical locations[1-4]. The variations have been attributed to multiple determinants of pathogenesis: host fitness including immunocompetency, the viral inoculum dose, potential variations to the viral genome, patient comorbidity, and the capacity of local healthcare services to provide care[5].

Health Care Professionals (HCPs) have a greater exposure to infected patients with advanced disease. As a result, the risk of infection has been reported to be higher in healthcare workers compared to the general population. Worldwide, there have been ~235,000 known CoViD-19 related deaths, of which ~ 1000 are health care professionals. As of 22nd April, there had been 21,000 deaths in the UK of whom 119 (~0.5%) were health care workers, approximately a 2-5-fold increased risk compared with an age matched population [6]. The exact reason for this is not fully understood, however it is believed to be in part due to their contact with patients who have advanced disease, or by involvement in aerosol generating procedures (AGP) such as endoscopy, intubation tracheostomy, suction and resuscitation [7-11]. As the occupational health risk is not fully understood it is not possible to completely neutralise the risk of increased exposure. Public Health England regularly issues guidance which includes both behavioural instruction and the level of personal protective equipment (PPE) to be worn in different clinical environments. This notwithstanding, there remain individuals who are regarded as high risk due to increased vulnerability: age >70years, certain underlying health conditions and pregnancy. The health conditions are further divided into those 'extremely vulnerable' to COVID-19 for whom 'shielding' is currently required and those at 'increased risk of severe illness from COVID-19', requiring stringent social distancing. These parameters are based on conditions previously identified as requiring an annual flu vaccination. The mortality and morbidity for COVID-19, however, has been substantially different from all previous coronaviruses, therefore existing risk scores are unlikely to encompass the peculiarities of this disease. Therefore, there is a need

for a tool to identify those individuals at highest risk of an adverse outcome from CoViD-19 in order to allocate roles with least exposure to those with viral load, through either working at "cold" sites with people who have tested negative for infection, or by working remotely providing advice and guidance to patients or other specialties.

On 12th May 2020, a risk reduction framework for NHS staff was launched suggesting the need for workplace and workforce assessments. This framework was borne of the observation that certain ethnic groups appeared to be at higher risk than others[12]. Whilst ethnicity remains a significant predictors of adverse outcomes, there are several other biological parameters that have also been reported to be associated with adverse outcomes

Here, we review the demographics of those who have been hospitalised, and ultimately died, due to CoViD-19 compared to the general population in order to develop a risk stratification tool. Better biological risk evaluation may then inform workplace evaluation allowing team leaders and managers to appropriately allocate clinical duties.

Methods.

We reviewed the published literature (including multiple search strategies in MEDLINE with PubMed interface) and critically assessed early reports on medRxiv, a pre-print server (https://www.medrxiv.org/) (date of last search: May 18, 2020). Given there are selection biases in testing for coronavirus, CoViD-19 care and reporting, we explored predominantly the 'hard outcomes' of mortality and admission to the intensive care unit. Further, the majority of the existing analyses are based on retrospective and often single-centre series. No published or completed prospective cohort studies or randomized controlled trials were present in this literature search. We reviewed the case reports and cohort studies and where possible the local demographics. Risk for age[13], ethnicity[14], socioeconomic status[14], and co-morbidities[15] was normalised to a female aged 40-49.

Once collated and compared to the risk within the general population predictive risk modelling was used to predict adverse future events for individuals. This risk tool was standardised to the risk of mortality of a female under the age of 50 years. A point was then allocated for each approximate doubling in risk. Given the likely co-linearity of multiple risk

factors where risk was a greater multiple than two it was rounded down. Once a simplified risk tool was compiled, 98 cases were evaluated into low, middle and high risk. These cases were assessed using the composite hazard ratios using data derived from the OpenSafely platform report that quantified a range of clinical risk factors for death from CoViD-19, in the largest cohort study conducted by any country to date [16]. Agreement between the simplified risk assessment tool and the calculated hazard ratio was evaluated using Cohen's kappa coefficient for inter-rater agreement.

Results.

There were no studies specifically describing the risk factors of health care workers, beyond gender and ethnicity. Multiple global observational studies were identified describing the risk of hospitalisation and mortality due to CoViD-19, however there was significant heterogeneity in these studies, such that the robust nature of the data when applying to a Western population of health care providers was questionable (Supplementary table 1). One point of agreement, however, was that multiple co-morbidities appeared to confer cumulative risk. As a result, the development of a risk calculator was based exclusively on UK data, with multiple co-morbidities being given additive weighting.

Clinician Demographics.

Age and sex. In all age groups, mortality was at least twice as high in men as in women (Table 1). Compared to those under the age of 50, mortality was doubled in 50-59 year-olds, quadrupled in the 60-69 years age group, and 12 times higher after the age of 70 years in men. In addition, the time from symptoms being diagnosed to death was shorter for patients older than 70 years as compared to younger patients (the median times were 11.5 and 20 days, respectively).

Ethnicity.

People of non-white ethnic origin appear to be at a higher risk of hospitalisation and mortality than the general population. This is most accentuated in people of black African descent where the risk was two-fold elevated compared to those of white European descent. People of Indian Asian descent also had an approximately 50% increased risk of

hospitalisation compared to their European counterparts. This is both when compared to the local population, and for CoViD-19 compared to non-CoViD-19 viral pneumoniae over the previous 3 years[17] (Supplementary table 2).

Socioeconomic status. As with flu, 25% of ICU admissions are people from the most deprived quintile as evaluated compared with just 15% from the least deprived (Table 2). Once on ITU, however, there were only slight differences in mortality between people in the most deprived vs least deprived status.

Co-morbidities.

There were multiple co-morbid factors that were each incrementally associated with increased mortality. The most common recorded comorbidities are chronic cardiac disease (29%), uncomplicated diabetes (19%), chronic pulmonary disease excluding asthma (19%) and asthma (14%) (Table 2) [18]. These represented 16,749 patients: 7,924 (47%) patients had no documented reported comorbidity. Although numerically not a large percentage of patients, those with active malignant neoplasms and rheumatological diseases were at a 3 and 11-fold increased risk of hospitalisation respectively compared to the prevalence in the general population. Although data was sparse, there was a suggestion that other conditions requiring long term immunosuppressant therapy was similarly over-represented (data not shown). Similarly, dementia was associated with a significantly higher risk than the general population of both hospitalisation (~7.7 times increased) and mortality in hospital (39% increase). This has limited relevance for modifying clinical exposure, although may be pertinent if using this tool to assess risk within the community. Contrary to many popular media reports, there was only a marginal rise in the hospitalisation and mortality in people living with obesity, such that the composite increased risk was increased by approximately 2-fold when BMI>35kg/m^2, but less than this had little impact. Given the co-linearity between obesity and ischaemic heart disease, chronic pulmonary disease and type 2 diabetes, it was therefore decided not to include obesity *per se* as an independent predictor of adverse outcome below class 2 obesity.

Mental health. There is no data to indicate whether healthcare workers with pre-existing mental health conditions are more at risk. However, given that >50% of healthcare workers

with pre-existing mental health conditions experience depression and anxiety and >70% of them feel traumatised during CoViD-19 duties, it seems plausible this group will need special consideration[18]. Data from Korea and Italy indicate that suicide risks are >25% greater in healthcare workers who had been managing people with CoViD-19. There is likely to be an increase in post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD) in doctors on the front line. Quantification of this risk, however, was not possible from the information available.

Generating a risk stratification score

By considering each of the demonstrated associated factors for CoViD-19 hospitalisation and subsequent mortality, a risk stratification tool was generated that may be considered when allocating clinical individuals to standard or higher risk duties (Table 3). The risk model attributes a point for every approximate doubling of risk compared to the reference population (Hazard Ratio ≥1.75 and ≤2.25). By adding the risk score from each category, it gives every individual a personal risk score which provides an estimate of their biological hazard.

Ninety-eight cases were evaluated using the simplified risk tool compared to the OpenSafely platform. Good agreement was demonstrated (Cohen's kappa 0.68 SD 0.077; $p<0.0001$; Table 4). Whereas there was excellent agreement at lower risk, the simple risk assessment tool tended to over-estimate the risk in people of non-white European origin compared to the biological risk as assigned by the Open Safely platform report. When compared to the much smaller population of healthcare workers, however, it tended to underestimate the increased risk in health in people of African and Indian Asian origin (data not shown).

Discussion.

There are currently no reliable data for CoViD-19 related deaths in health care professionals including doctors; and surprisingly few data on the differences in risk in different healthcare settings. There is an urgent need for high quality research. We have applied general population risk factors to health care workers in order to generate a simplified biological risk stratification tool. This may serve to inform employers when allocating specific duties within the health care provision system, in order to fulfil their duty of care to their employees.

It is important to acknowledge that any patient contact in the current climate comes with some risk given the unknown true prevalence of the coronavirus, and uncertain infectivity at different stages in disease. As such, this biological risk assessment tool should only be used to inform the need for enhanced PPE, or to be allocated roles in which there is little or no direct contact with patients; roles such as "advice and guidance" services, or virtual clinic provision. This risk stratification, however, does not in any way replace the need for universal precautions with appropriate personal protective equipment.

There are three types of risk for medical staff. The first relates to their demographics (age, sex and ethnicity); the second relates to co-morbidities that have accrued through life; and the third relates their knowledge of, access to, and use of PPE. Physiological factors increase immunosenescence; but there is also the potential of workplace related influences too, especially around environmental risk; access to appropriate PPE, training effectiveness, and the confidence to raise concerns. The latter of these considerations form part of the workplace assessment as recommended by the Faculty of Occupational Medicine's Risk Assessment Framework [19], however there is a need to inform this, based on biological risk.

The observation that increasing age is associated with a poorer outcome in this viral illness is not surprising, although the inflection point of increased risk at the age of 50 is somewhat lower than might have been anticipated. The doubling in risk for those born as males compared to females, however, is novel to this particular virus. Although this may be a result of increased prevalence of "at risk" comorbidities, there is work to suggest that ACE2 enzyme levels are twice as high in men compared to women[20]. Given that the ACE2 enzyme is the cellular entrance route for this virus[21], that may contribute to this biological phenomenon.

The importance of pre-existing cardiovascular disease and cerebrovascular disease is a novel observation for a respiratory disease. Whereas inflammatory and atherogenic complications of viral illnesses such as influenza have been described, they have not previously featured as risk factors for more adverse outcomes in infections such as H1N1 influenza. This may be due to the method of cellular invasion of SARS-CoV-2 using the ACE2 enzyme; an enzyme

which is responsible for physiological vascular health responses to hypertension and obesity. It does not explain the risk associated with diabetes, however, given that in fact diabetes and the associated chronic hyperglycaemia and dyslipidaemia reduce the ACE2 enzyme expression [22].

Some ethnic groups of the clinical workforce are potentially at risk more than others. In particular a recent finding showed that Black, Asian and minority ethnic (BAME) individuals account for 63 per cent, 64 per cent and 95 per cent of deaths in the Nurse, Health Care Assistant and Doctor staff groups, respectively[6]. BAME patients also account for a higher proportion of patients admitted to UK intensive care units (deaths 18%) with CoViD-19 when compared with a 14 per cent of the UK population[17]. Interestingly, our tool distinguished between people of Black African descent and people with a heritage in the Indian subcontinent. When validated against the Open Safely report, however, the tool demonstrated similar predictive role in people of Black African descent as South Asian heritage. This is likely due to different disease profile in these populations, with measured counfounders in people of Indian subcontinent heritage, as opposed to unmeasured risk factors in people of black African descent.

In the UK health service, the increased risk in people of Black African, Asian and other minority ethnic (BAME) groups is further exaggerated beyond the biological risk alone. Up to the 21st April, 38% of health care workers who had died as a result of CoViD-19 were of white European descent despite representing 79% of the total workforce. 36% and 27% of the fatalities came from people of Indian Asian and Black African descent respectively, despite those populations only representing 10% and 6% of the work force, suggesting in excess of 3-fold risk for those of Indian origin and a 4-fold risk for those of Black African origin. This discrepancy between the risk seen in BAME individuals in the general population and that in healthcare workers is an important consideration that cannot yet be explained by the published data. We propose, therefore, that the increased risk may be due to previous risk stratification methods not considering ethnicity as an independent factor. Some hospitals are collegiate while others are coercive. As a consequence, certain groups of doctors are more vulnerable in uncertain and ambivalent circumstances. Indeed, this culture has been proposed as a contributor to the increased risk in BAME populations.

Clinical Domain and Medical Roles during CoViD-19 Pandemic.

The primary role of this tool is to provide a standardised approach to individual risk assessment to identify those at highest risk of experiencing severe illness or dying. From existing data, it is impossible to identify the risk of contracting the infection, however, we would argue that the risk of incident infection with no or mild symptoms does not require additional modification of the workplace beyond that which is recommended for all healthcare workers. Once risk is calculated, the nature of exposure needs to be considered. The impact of recurrent exposure compared to high-risk exposures with high viral load, or the environment of the clinical domain is uncertain. Likewise, the relative impact of different environments has not adequately been assessed. Regardless, employees in front line emergency and acute medical settings such as A&E medicine, anaesthesia, respiratory medicine or gastroenterology may be considered at increased risk, as may be those who may need very close proximity with the patient such as ENT and ophthalmology. This tool will enable employers to decide when to exclude workers from working in higher risk environments such as front-line work - even if they wish to do so – or modify the nature of their duties, in order to fulfil the employers' legal duty of care obligations to their work force.

There is a lack of robust data on the impact of repeated low-level exposure to virus, however, there is a suggestion that it could result in accumulation of viral inoculation over a short time frame such as occurs in General Practice and Outpatient settings (16). Indeed, one recent paper found that the rate of infection with CoViD-19 in staff in patient-facing occupations was no different from that in clerical/administrative staff without patient contact (16). This may suggest that demographic factors and underlying health status have greatest influence on risk. Alternatively, it may be that those with severe illness (particularly at the time of cytokine storm requiring high dependency care) have reduced viral load and shedding therefore paradoxically are a lower infection risk compared to those at an early stage of the disease with no or relatively mild symptoms.

It must also be acknowledged that this tool is based purely on biological risk of an individual. The prevalence of the disease in the community is another determinant which should be

considered; when prevalence is low, the increased relative risk may not reflect a significant absolute risk, allowing health care practitioners to return to their usual role.

Study limitations.

Selection bias in testing, care and reporting can lead to differences in prevalence estimates of pre-existing risk factors and presentation across the reports from various countries. The majority of the existing analyses are based on retrospective and often single-centre series. No published or completed prospective cohort studies or randomised controlled trials were present in this literature search. There is an urgent need for high quality research, using patient level data that will allow full mediation analyses in order to determine whether (for example) it is the age, the diabetes, or the cardiovascular disease that actually carries the greatest prognostic risk, given that these conditions commonly co-exist. There are currently only limited observational data for CoViD-19 related deaths in health care workers or doctors, again without full access to all potentially pertinent information.

Patient and public involvement

The primary target of this research was healthcare professionals, occupational health teams and medical managers. There was significant engagement with members of the British Medical Association – the trade union representing UK doctors - CoViD group, and the staff members. Several members of this group are listed as co-authors, including the chair of the representative body. It is important to distinguish that these individuals are reporting personal views based on their branch of practice and these are not necessarily the views of the Association.

Concluding Remarks and Key Messages.

There is an urgent and immediate need that every single healthcare worker has a formal risk assessment. There also needs to be appropriate, detailed consent for all doctors who are being asked to work in patient facing areas, so they also understand their risks. All doctors should wear appropriate PPE for any clinical examination or investigation on the basis that 20-40% of infected patients, especially if less than 40 years of age may be asymptomatic[1].

Within a team, an assessment of risk score may help guide allocation of duties, with the patient facing roles being taken by the appropriately trained member at lowest risk. Clearly this should also factor in other considerations such as the local prevalence of SARS-CoV-2 cases, many of whom will be asymptomatic. Within a specialty team, the highest risk individuals should be excluded from patient facing clinical areas; those at intermediate risk should have careful consideration to exclude them from front line areas or given limited duties avoiding close contact such as in ENT, ophthalmology and dentistry. Those at the lowest risk may be assigned duties with more patient contact, however the risk score does not negate the need for good personal protective equipment and training.

Contributor statement

JJ and WDS came up with the design and authored the first draft. WDS is responsible for the integrity of the analysis. All authors contributed to the format of the analysis and have contributed to the final manuscript.

Data sharing statement

This manuscript is based on a secondary analysis of published data. The analysis plan and Stata output are available on contact with WDS

Acknowledgements

The doctors from many branches of practice that gave comments and suggestions. We would also like to thank Professor Dame Parveen Kumar of Queen Mary University of London for helpful comments.

WDS is supported by the NIHR Exeter Clinical Research Facility and the NIHR Collaboration for Leadership in Applied Health Research and Care (CLAHRC) for the South West Peninsula.

The views expressed in this publication are those of the author(s) and not necessarily those of the NIHR Exeter Clinical Research Facility, the NHS, the British Medical Association, the NIHR or the Department of Health and Social Care in England.

References

1. Zhou P, Yang XL, Wang XG, et al. A pneumonia outbreak associated with a new coronavirus of probable bat origin. *Nature* 2020;579(7798):270-73. doi: 10.1038/s41586-020-2012-7 [published Online First: 2020/02/06]
2. Huang C, Wang Y, Li X, et al. Clinical features of patients infected with 2019 novel coronavirus in Wuhan, China. *Lancet* 2020;395(10223):497-506. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(20)30183-5 [published Online First: 2020/01/28]
3. Li B, Yang J, Zhao F, et al. Prevalence and impact of cardiovascular metabolic diseases on COVID-19 in China. *Clin Res Cardiol* 2020;109(5):531-38. doi: 10.1007/s00392-020-01626-9 [published Online First: 2020/03/13]
4. Zhou F, Yu T, Du R, et al. Clinical course and risk factors for mortality of adult inpatients with COVID-19 in Wuhan, China: a retrospective cohort study. *Lancet* 2020;395(10229):1054-62. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(20)30566-3 [published Online First: 2020/03/15]
5. Driggin E, Madhavan MV, Bikdeli B, et al. Cardiovascular Considerations for Patients, Health Care Workers, and Health Systems During the COVID-19 Pandemic. *Journal of the American College of Cardiology* 2020;75(18):2352-71. doi: 10.1016/j.jacc.2020.03.031
6. Cook T, Kursumovic E, Lennane S. Exclusive: deaths of NHS staff from covid-19 analysed: Wilmington Healthcare; 2020 [cited 2020 22 April]. Available from: Exclusive: deaths of NHS staff from covid-19 analysed | Comment | Health Service Journal accessed 1/5/20 2020.
7. Givi B, Schiff BA, Chinn SB, et al. Safety Recommendations for Evaluation and Surgery of the Head and Neck During the COVID-19 Pandemic. *JAMA Otolaryngol Head Neck Surg* 2020 doi: 10.1001/jamaoto.2020.0780 [published Online First: 2020/04/02]
8. Greenland JR, Michelow MD, Wang L, et al. COVID-19 Infection: Implications for Perioperative and Critical Care Physicians. *Anesthesiology* 2020;132(6):1346-61. doi: 10.1097/ALN.0000000000003303 [published Online First: 2020/03/21]
9. Lai J, Ma S, Wang Y, et al. Factors Associated With Mental Health Outcomes Among Health Care Workers Exposed to Coronavirus Disease 2019. *JAMA Netw Open* 2020;3(3):e203976. doi: 10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2020.3976 [published Online First: 2020/03/24]
10. Lai THT, Tang EWH, Chau SKY, et al. Stepping up infection control measures in ophthalmology during the novel coronavirus outbreak: an experience from Hong Kong. *Graefes Arch Clin Exp Ophthalmol* 2020;258(5):1049-55. doi: 10.1007/s00417-020-04641-8 [published Online First: 2020/03/04]
11. NHS England. Patient Deaths report 2020 [Available from: https://www.england.nhs.uk/statistics/statistical-work-areas/covid-19-daily-deaths/ accessed 1st May 2020.
12. Khunti K, Singh AK, Pareek M, et al. Is ethnicity linked to incidence or outcomes of covid-19? *BMJ* 2020;369:m1548. doi: 10.1136/bmj.m1548 [published Online First: 2020/04/22]
13. Verity R, Okell LC, Dorigatti I, et al. Estimates of the severity of coronavirus disease 2019: a model-based analysis. *Lancet Infect Dis* 2020 doi: 10.1016/S1473-3099(20)30243-7 [published Online First: 2020/04/03]

14. Office of National Statistics. UK population by ethnicity 2020 [Available from: https://www.ethnicity-facts-figures.service.gov.uk/uk-population-by-ethnicity accessed 1st May 2020.
15. Wang B, Li R, Lu Z, et al. Does comorbidity increase the risk of patients with COVID-19: evidence from meta-analysis. *Aging (Albany NY)* 2020;12(7):6049-57. doi: 10.18632/aging.103000 [published Online First: 2020/04/09]
16. Williamson E, Walker AJ, Bhaskaran KJ, et al. OpenSAFELY: factors associated with COVID-19-related hospital death in the linked electronic health records of 17 million adult NHS patients. *medRxiv* 2020:2020.05.06.20092999. doi: 10.1101/2020.05.06.20092999
17. Docherty AB, Harrison EM, Green CA, et al. Features of 16,749 hospitalised UK patients with COVID-19 using the ISARIC WHO Clinical Characterisation Protocol. *medRxiv* 2020:2020.04.23.20076042. doi: 10.1101/2020.04.23.20076042
18. Wynants L, Van Calster B, Bonten MMJ, et al. Prediction models for diagnosis and prognosis of covid-19 infection: systematic review and critical appraisal. *BMJ* 2020;369:m1328. doi: 10.1136/bmj.m1328 [published Online First: 2020/04/09]
19. Khunti K, de Bono A, Browne I, et al. Risk Reduction Framework for NHS Staff at risk of COVID-19 infection: Faculty of Occupational Medicine,; 2020 [Available from: https://www.fom.ac.uk/wp-content/uploads/Risk-Reduction-Framework-for-NHS-staff-at-risk-of-COVID-19-infection-12-05-20.pdf accessed 25th May 2020.
20. Sama IE, Ravera A, Santema BT, et al. Circulating plasma concentrations of angiotensin-converting enzyme 2 in men and women with heart failure and effects of renin-angiotensin-aldosterone inhibitors. *Eur Heart J* 2020;41(19):1810-17. doi: 10.1093/eurheartj/ehaa373 [published Online First: 2020/05/11]
21. Letko M, Marzi A, Munster V. Functional assessment of cell entry and receptor usage for SARS-CoV-2 and other lineage B betacoronaviruses. *Nat Microbiol* 2020;5(4):562-69. doi: 10.1038/s41564-020-0688-y [published Online First: 2020/02/26]
22. Tikellis C, Johnston CI, Forbes JM, et al. Characterization of renal angiotensin-converting enzyme 2 in diabetic nephropathy. *Hypertension* 2003;41(3):392-7. doi: 10.1161/01.HYP.0000060689.38912.CB [published Online First: 2003/03/08]
23. NHS Digital. Health Survey for England 2017 2018 [Available from: Health Survey for England 2017 [NS] - NHS Digital accessed 1st May 2020.
24. Diabetes UK. Facts and figures 2019 [Available from: https://www.diabetes.org.uk/professionals/position-statements-reports/statistics accessed 28th April 2020.
25. British Lung Foundation. The UK big picture 2019 [Available from: https://statistics.blf.org.uk/lung-disease-uk-big-picture accessed 28th April 2020.
26. Asthma UK. Facts and Figures 2019 [Available from: https://www.asthma.org.uk/about/media/facts-and-statistics/ accessed 28th April 2020.
27. Alzheimers UK. Dementia Statistics Hub 2018 [Available from: https://www.dementiastatistics.org/statistics-about-dementia/prevalence/ accessed 28th April 2020.
28. Cancer Research UK. Cancer Statistics for the UK 2019 [Available from: https://www.cancerresearchuk.org/health-professional/cancer-statistics-for-the-uk accessed 28th April 2020.

29. Arthritis UK. The state of musculoskeletal health 2019 2019 [Available from: https://www.versusarthritis.org/media/14594/state-of-musculoskeletal-health-2019.pdf accessed 28th April 2020.

Table 1. Clinician Demographics. Mortality by age group and risk of admission and subsequent mortality stratified by sex at birth (Features of 16,749 hospitalised UK patients with CoViD-19 using the ISARIC WHO Clinical Characterisation Protocol) (18).

Age group	**Mortality**
<50years	1 (reference)
50-69	4.02 (2.88-5.63)
70-79	9.59 (CI 6.89, 13.3)
≥80years	13.59 (CI 9.79, 18.85)
Sex at Birth	
Proportion of admissions	
Male	60.2%
Female	39.8%
Mortality once admitted	
Male	1 (reference)
Female	0.80 (CI 0.72, 0.89)
Composite risk	
Male	1 (reference)
Female	0.528

Table 2 - Composite risk of contracting CoViD-19 and mortality by pre-existing co-morbidity

	Prevalence in CoViD-19[17]	Prevalence in population	Relative risk of contracting disease	Additional Risk of mortality (18)	Composite increased risk
Chronic Cardiac Disease	29%	14%[23]	2.07	1.31	2.71
Uncomplicated diabetes	19%	4.8%[24]	3.95	N/A	3.95
Chronic pulmonary disease excluding asthma	16%	4.5%[25]	3.56	1.19	4.2
Asthma	14%	8.3%[26]	2.15	1.19	2.55
Dementia	10%	1.3% [27]	7.69	1.39	6
Malignant neoplasm	9%	1.5%[28]	6.00	1.19	8.45
Rheumatological disorder	9%	0.8% [29]	11.25	N/A	11.25
Obesity (BMI>35kg/m^2)	38.5%	27.8% [24]	1.38	1.37	1.90
Diabetes (with complications)	6%	1.2% [24]	5.00	N/A	5

Table 3 Suggested risk stratification tool for individuals not already identified as "vulnerable" (e.g. due to organ transplant) through the national identification system

Risk factor	Indicator	Adjustment
Age	>50	1
	>60	2
	>70	3
	>80	4
Sex at Birth	Female	0
	Male	1
Ethnicity	Caucasian	0
	Black African descent	2
	Indian Asian descent	1
	Other (including Mixed race)	1
Diabetes and Obesity	(Type 1 or Type 2) uncomplicated	1
	(Type 1 or Type 2) complicated	2
	BMI≥35kg/m^2	1
Cardiovascular disease	Angina or previous MI and stroke intervention	1
	Heart failure	2
Pulmonary disease	Asthma	1
	Non-Asthma chronic pulmonary disease	2
Malignant neoplasm	Active malignancy	3
	Malignancy in remission	1
Rheumatological conditions	Active treated conditions	2
Immunosuppressant therapy	Any indication	2

Interpretation	Score
Low Risk	<3
Medium Risk	3-5
High Risk	≥6

Table 4: Validation of Simple risk assessment tool compared to the Open Safely Platform report. PPV-positive predictive value in 98 individuals working in the health care system. (Cohen's kappa for agreement 0.68; p<0.0001)

	Open Safely platform report			
Simple risk tool	**≤3 fold increased risk**	**3-6 fold increased risk**	**≥6 fold increased risk**	**Total**
Score <3	42	2	0	44
PPV	95.5%			
Score 3-5	6	29	2	37
PPV		78.4%		
Score ≥6	0	9	8	17
PPV			47.1%	
Total	48	40	10	98

Table 5. Mitigation Factors for Doctors

Factor	***Detail of procedure***
Hand Hygiene	Appropriate gloves use 20 seconds hand washing with soap
Respiratory Hygiene	Fluid resistant mask FFP3 mask for AGP Eye protection to reduce droplet transmission through lacrimal ducts
Mental health	Reduced duration of acute activity and Buddy system.
Social Distancing	A minimum of 2m (6.5 feet) or full PPE and remote working
Health Pre-habilitation	Risk Factors should be screened and mitigated in an Occupational Risk Assessment