Occupation and risk of COVID-19: prospective cohort study of 120,621 UK Biobank participants

Miriam Mutambudzi*[1], Claire L Niedzwiedz*[2], Ewan B Macdonald[2], Alastair H Leyland[1], Frances S Mair[2], Jana J Anderson[2], Carlos A Celis-Morales[2,3], John Cleland[4], John Forbes[5], Jason MR Gill[3], Claire Hastie[2,3], Frederick K Ho[2], Bhautesh D Jani[2], Daniel F Mackay[2], Barbara I Nicholl[2], Catherine A O'Donnell[2], Naveed Sattar[3], Paul Welsh[3], Jill P Pell[2], Srinivasa Vittal Katikireddi[+1], Evangelia Demou[+1]

*Equal contribution

+Equal contribution

1. MRC/CSO Social and Public Health Sciences Unit, Institute of Health and Wellbeing, University of Glasgow, UK
2. Institute of Health and Wellbeing, University of Glasgow, UK
3. Institute of Cardiovascular & Medical Sciences, University of Glasgow, UK
4. Robertson Centre for Biostatistics, Institute of Health and Wellbeing, University of Glasgow, UK
5. School of Medicine, University of Limerick, Limerick, Ireland

Corresponding Authors:
Evangelia Demou, Srinivasa Vittal Katikireddi
MRC/CSO Social and Public Health Sciences Unit
Institute of Health & Wellbeing
University of Glasgow
Glasgow, G2 3AX
Emails: Evangelia.demou@glasgow.ac.uk; Vittal.Katikireddi@glasgow.ac.uk

Author contributions: SVK and ED conceived the idea for the study. ED, SVK, CLN, JPP and MM designed the study. CLN and MM conducted the statistical analysis. MM and ED drafted the manuscript. All authors contributed to the interpretation of the results, critically revised the paper and agreed on the final version for submission.

Abstract

Objectives: To investigate COVID-19 risk by occupational group.

Design: Prospective study of linked population-based and administrative data.

Setting: UK Biobank data linked to SARS-CoV-2 test results from Public Health England from 16 March to 3 May 2020.

Participants: 120,621 UK Biobank participants who were employed or self-employed at baseline (2006-2010) and were 65 years or younger in March 2020. Overall, 29% (n=37,890) were employed in essential occupational groups, which included healthcare workers, social and education workers, and 'other' essential workers comprising of police and protective service, food, and transport workers. Poisson regression models, adjusted for baseline sociodemographic, work-related, health, and lifestyle-related risk factors were used to assess risk ratios (RRs) of testing positive in hospital by occupational group as reported at baseline relative to non-essential workers.

Main outcome measures: Positive SARS-CoV-2 test within a hospital setting (i.e. as an inpatient or in an Emergency Department).

Results: 817 participants were tested for SARS-CoV-2 and of these, 206 (0.2%) individuals had a positive test in a hospital setting. Relative to non-essential workers, healthcare workers (RR 7.59, 95% CI: 5.43 to 10.62) and social and education workers (RR 2.17, 95% CI: 1.37 to 3.46) had a higher risk of testing positive for SARS-CoV-2 in hospital. Using more detailed groupings, medical support staff (RR 8.57, 95% CI: 4.35 to 16.87) and social care workers (RR 2.99, 95% CI: 1.71 to 5.24) had highest risk within the healthcare worker and social and education worker categories, respectively. In general, adjustment for covariates did not substantially change the pattern of occupational differences in risk.

Conclusions: Essential workers in health and social care have a higher risk of severe SARS-CoV-2 infection. These findings underscore the need for national and organizational policies and practices that protect and support workers with elevated risk of SARS-CoV-2 infection.

Trial registration- N/A

What is already known on this topic

- Essential workers have a higher exposure to the SARS-CoV-2 virus due to the nature of their work.
- In comparison to non-essential workers, healthcare workers have a higher risk of SARS-CoV-2 infection.

What this study adds

- In addition to healthcare workers who have a more than seven-fold higher risk of SARS-CoV-2 infection, those in social care have a three-fold increased risk.
- Adjustment for potential confounding and mediating variables did not account for the differences in the observed risk between occupational groups.

INTRODUCTION

The Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome coronavirus-2 (SARS-CoV-2) and its resulting disease (COVID-19) has resulted in a fast-moving pandemic. According to surveillance data from Public Health England (PHE) there were over 99,000 confirmed infections in England between January 31st, 2020 and April 22nd 2020, with London reporting an incidence rate of 221/100,000 persons (1). Essential workers and older adults are particularly vulnerable to infection and adverse subsequent outcomes (2). At present however, few studies globally have assessed risk of COVID-19 in different essential worker groups and only one UK study has assessed COVID-19 related morbidity and mortality across different occupations, with limited consideration of potential confounding factors (3–6).

To protect public health, the UK instituted precautionary lockdown policies and urged businesses to transition to home working where possible during March 2020, to reduce risk of infection (7). However, the risks faced by different population groups during the shutdown have not been equal (8). Essential workers who provide crucial or fundamental public services including those in healthcare, social care, sanitary services, and transportation have continued attending work to carry out their daily duties. These essential worker groups have increased exposure to the SARS-CoV-2 virus through their work which may bring them into close proximity with members of the public or infected patients, particularly since carriers may be infectious without, or before, showing significant symptoms (6,9). In addition, their risk may be increased due to working closely with infected asymptomatic or even sick colleagues (presenteeism) who still report to work. Asymptomatic carriers and presenteeism in the workplace have both been associated with the spread of infectious diseases such as influenza and Ebola (10–12). Preliminary research indicates that occupational exposure to the SARS-CoV-2 virus is of great concern among essential worker groups, particularly healthcare workers, in whom the lack of personal protective equipment (PPE) caused “a real and justified fear about personal safety”(13). Inadequate PPE and challenges in implementing timely and effective practices in care homes has resulted in significant

outbreaks in these occupational settings (14). In education, the reluctance to reopen schools because of concern about risk of infection could exacerbate existing inequalities (15). Furthermore, there is evidence of high infection rates and subsequent morbidity and mortality among low skilled occupations, and social, transport, food, and sales and retail workers (2,3,16–18).

Despite large occupational differences being generally seen for health outcomes (19), there has been a lack of studies examining differences in risk of COVID-19 across occupational groups. Apart from healthcare workers (20), it is not clear which other occupational groups are most at risk. Increasing our knowledge of the risk of infection among different groups of essential and non-essential workers will contribute to providing a more comprehensive depiction of the impact of global pandemics on vulnerable workers. This information has important implications for ensuring the safety and protection of essential workers from the risks of COVID-19 (21).

We therefore aimed to assess the risk of COVID-19 in essential workers, relative to non-essential workers. Specifically, we used linked data from the UK Biobank study and SARS-CoV-2 test results from Public Health England (PHE) to examine the risk of infection by a) broad essential occupational groups, b) detailed essential occupational groups and c) Standard Occupational Classification (SOC) 2000 major groups (22), while accounting for baseline sociodemographic, socioeconomic, work-related, lifestyle, and health factors.

METHODS AND DATA

Study design

UK Biobank is a prospective cohort study, established to identify disease determinants in middle and older age adults and has been previously described in detail (23). In brief, adults aged 40-69 years were invited to participate in the study if they resided within 25 miles (40.23 km) of an assessment centre and were registered with the National Health Service in England, Wales, or Scotland (24).

Approximately 502,000 individuals (out of 9 million invited) consented to participate, representing a 5.5% response rate (23). At baseline participants were required to visit an assessment centre to complete a computer-assisted self-administered questionnaire and a face-to-face interview, and to provide physical measures and biological samples. All baseline data were collected between 2006 to 2010. The UK Biobank study received ethical approval from the NHS National Research Ethics Service North West (16/NW/0274) and all participants provided written informed consent.

UK Biobank participants who were 1) working at baseline 2) below retirement age (<65years) in March 2020 and had their baseline assessment in England were included in the study. The latter criterion was used because linked SARS-CoV-2 test results from PHE were available for England only. Participants were excluded if 1) they had previously requested to withdraw from the study (N=30), or 2) had died prior to 31 January 2018 according to linked mortality records from the NHS Information Centre (N=17,632). The analysis presented here includes only those participants tested for SARS-CoV-2, and therefore excludes asymptomatic cases as well as symptomatic cases who did not present to the health service.

Ascertainment of outcomes

The outcome of interest was a positive test result for SARS-CoV-2 in a hospital setting (i.e. participants whose tests were taken while an inpatient or attending an Emergency Department). By focusing on hospital cases we limit potential bias due to differential ascertainment, as hospital cases likely reflect more severe illness and potential COVID-19 (25). Participants testing negative or positive outside a hospital setting were included in the denominator.

Public Health England provided data for SARS-CoV-2 test results for the period 16 March 2020 to 3 May 2020 from its microbiology database, Second Generation Surveillance System Data. Data provided included specimen date, origin (evidence that the individual was an inpatient or not) and result (positive or negative) (25). These data were linked to the UK Biobank baseline data.

Ascertainment of exposure

Our exposure of interest was occupational group as reported at baseline. UK Biobank asked participants about their current or most recent job title and these were converted to 4 digit Standard Occupational Classification (SOC) 2000 codes (22). Employed participants were classified into five broad groups (non-essential workers, healthcare workers, social and education workers, police and protective service and 'other' essential workers) by members of our team with expertise in occupational and public health. To assess whether there were differences in risk among occupations within these broad groups, we further classified occupations into nine more precise categories of essential workers [healthcare professionals (e.g. doctors, pharmacists), health associate professionals (e.g. nurses, paramedics), medical support staff (nursing assistants, hospital porters), social care workers, education workers, food workers, transport workers, and police and protective services (including sanitary service workers)], whose risk was assessed relative to non-essential workers (see supplementary material Figure S1).

To allow for comparability with research that uses occupations as defined by broader SOC groups, we also examined the associations between risk of a positive SARS-CoV-2 test in hospital and the SOC 2000 major occupation groups (managers and senior officials, professional occupations, associate professional and technical occupations, administrative and secretarial occupations, skilled trades occupations, personal service occupations, sales and customer service occupations, process, plant and machine operatives, elementary occupations) (5,22). As occupation data were collected at baseline between 2006-2010, we assessed correlations between occupation at baseline and follow-up for the subsample of the cohort (n=12,306) who participated in further data collection when attending an imaging visit (26) between 30th April 2014 and 7th March 2019 (median August 2017). We found a high correlation ($r=0.71$, $p<0.001$) between job at baseline and follow-up indicating a high likelihood that participants had continued working in the same profession.

Ascertainment of covariates

Covariates of interest included sociodemographic factors [current age group (<55, 55-59, 60+ years), gender (male/female), country of birth (UK and Ireland or elsewhere), ethnicity (white British, white Irish, white other, mixed, south Asian, black, other)], socioeconomic factors [area-level socioeconomic deprivation index, education level (college or university degree, A levels/AS levels or equivalent, O levels/GCSEs/CSEs or equivalent, other, none of the above)], work-related factors [shift work (yes, no), manual work (manual, non-manual), work hours (<40, 40-45, >45), tenure in job-years (<=10, 11-20, >20)], health conditions [number of self-reported chronic conditions, limiting illness/disability (yes, no)], and lifestyle-related factors [(alcohol consumption (daily or almost daily, three or four times a week, once or twice a week, one to three times a month, special occasions only, former drinker, never), smoking status (never, former, current), body mass index (BMI) category]. The Townsend index was used to assess area-level socioeconomic deprivation, which includes measures of neighborhood unemployment, non-car ownership, non-home ownership and household overcrowding (27). The index was categorised into quartiles reflecting a gradient from most advantaged (lowest quarter) to least advantaged (highest quartile). Self-reported number of chronic health conditions was ascertained from a pre-defined list of 43 conditions and categorized into none, one, two, three, four or more (28). BMI was calculated from physical measurements and treated as an ordinal variable with four categories according to the WHO classification (29): underweight (<18.5 kg/m^2), normal (18.5-24.9 kg/m^2), overweight (25.0–29.9 kg/m^2), and obese (>30.0kg/m^2). Assessment centre was included as a covariate in all models to account for potential differences in recruitment and measurement processes. All covariates were measured at baseline.

Statistical analyses

Sample characteristics were summarised using frequencies and proportions. Poisson regression models for which risk ratios (RR) and 95% confidence intervals (95% CI) were reported, examined the strength of association between baseline occupational group and risk of testing positive for SARS-CoV-2

infection while an inpatient or attending an Emergency Department. Robust standard errors were used to ensure accurate estimation of 95% CIs and p values (30).

We estimated six nested models. Model 1 included sociodemographic factors, i.e. age, sex, assessment centre, country of birth, and ethnicity. Model 2 included all covariates in Model 1, plus socioeconomic factors, i.e. area-level socioeconomic deprivation quartile, and education level. Model 3 included all covariates in Model 2, plus work-related factors, i.e. shift work, manual work, job tenure, and work hours. Model 4 included all covariates in Model 2, plus number of chronic conditions, and long-standing illness/disability. Model 5 included the covariates from model 2 as well as lifestyle-related factors i.e. BMI, smoking, and alcohol. Model 6 was fully adjusted for all covariates. Participants with missing data (N=8,549 (6.6%)) for any variable were excluded from the statistical analyses. All analyses were performed using Stata MP/15.1 Software (Stata, College Station, TX).

Patient and public involvement

Participants were not involved in the design and implementation of the study or in setting research questions and the outcome measures. No participants were asked to advise on interpretation or writing up of results. Participants will be able to freely access this study from the UK Biobank website and our institutional websites.

RESULTS

There were 120, 621 working participants aged 49 to 64 years in 2020, after excluding 8,549 with missing data (figure 1). Of these, 29.3% (n=37,890) were classified as essential workers; healthcare (8.8%), social and education (11.2%), and other essential workers (9.3 %) (Table 1). Within our sample, 85.8% had non-manual jobs, 51.2% worked less than 40 hours a week, and 59.0% had less than 10 years of tenure in their job at baseline assessment. Almost 91.3% of the sample was white (British, Irish, and

other). South Asian and black participants accounted for 2.8%, and 2.9% of the study sample, respectively. More female (36.7% vs 20.6% male) and black (43.0% vs 28.8% white British) participants were employed in essential occupations at baseline (supplementary table S1).

[Insert Figure 1]

817 (0.68%) participants had been tested for SARS-CoV-2 between 16th March and 3rd May 2020 and of these, 206 (0.2%) had a positive test in a hospital setting. Healthcare professionals (0.7%), medical staff support (0.8%), health associate professionals (0.7%), social care (0.3%), transport (0.2%) and police and protective service (0.2%) workers had higher risks of a positive COVID-19 test compared to non-essential workers (0.1%) (table 2).

Risk of testing positive for SARS-CoV-2 in hospital by broad occupational groups

In comparison to non-essential workers, healthcare workers had an over seven-fold (RR 7.59 95% CI 5.43 to 10.62) increased risk of a positive SARS-CoV-2 test (table 3 and figure 2). This association remained after adjusting for all covariates (RR 7.75, 95% CI 5.39 to 11.16). Social and education workers also exhibited a higher risk (RR 2.17, 95% CI 1.37 to 3.46), after adjustment for demographic factors. Adjustment for socioeconomic (RR 2.36, 95% CI 1.47 to 3.78), work-related (RR 2.24, 95% CI 1.38 to 3.63), health (RR 2.36, 95% CI 1.47 to 3.77), and lifestyle-related factors (RR 2.31, 95% CI 1.44 to 3.77) marginally strengthened the associations. Full adjustment for all covariates did not attenuate the risk of SARS-CoV-2 in social and education workers (RR 2.21, 95% CI 1.37 to 3.58). Detailed model results for the association between broad occupational groups and testing positive for SARS-CoV-2 are presented in supplementary table 2S.

Risk of testing positive for SARS-CoV-2 in hospital by detailed essential occupational groups

Examination of these associations using more detailed occupation profiles indicated that relative to non-essential workers, healthcare professionals had higher risk of testing positive for SARS-CoV-2 in

hospital (RR 6.14, 95% CI 3.32 to 11.36) which was further increased with adjustment for covariates (RR 8.94, 95% CI 4.66 to 17.15) (table 3 and figure 3). Health associate professionals exhibited a higher risk (RR 7.82, 95% CI 5.41 to 11.31) when compared to non-essential workers, and adjustment for socioeconomic, health, and lifestyle-related factors resulted in higher risk ratios, while adjustment for work-related factors in model 3 and all covariates in model 6 did not attenuate risk. Medical support staff had an over eight-fold higher risk of testing positive (RR 8.57, 95% CI 4.35 to 16.87) relative to non-essential workers. Adjustment for covariates reduced risk; however it remained high (RR 6.24, 95% CI 3.17 to 12.30). Among social care workers, risk was three-fold (RR 2.99, 95% CI 1.71 to 5.24) and was attenuated but remained with adjustment for socioeconomic, work-related, health and lifestyle-related factors. There were no strong associations observed between other essential workers and risk of testing positive for SARS-CoV-2 in hospital, although risks for transport (RR 1.97, 95% CI: 0.95 to 4.08) and police and protective service (RR 1.79, 95% CI 0.78 to 4.09) workers were slightly elevated. Detailed model results for the association between detailed essential occupational groups and testing positive for SARS-CoV-2 are presented in supplementary table 3S.

Risk of testing positive for SARS-CoV-2 in hospital by SOC 2000 major occupational groups

In analyses using the SOC 2000 major occupation groups (table 3 and figure 4), in comparison to managers and senior officials, associate professional and technical occupations (RR 2.79, 95% CI 1.77 to 4.40) had the highest risk, which reduced only slightly following adjustment for all covariates. Personal service occupations were associated with increased risk, but this was attenuated after adjustment for demographic, socioeconomic, health, work-related and lifestyle-related factors. Process, plant and machine operatives (RR 2.18, 95% CI 1.11 to 4.28) had a higher risk, however this was substantially attenuated with inclusion of socioeconomic, work-related, health, and lifestyle-related factors. Detailed model results for the association between SOC 2000 major occupational groups and testing positive for SARS-CoV-2 are available in supplementary table 4S.

DISCUSSION

Our study is the largest to date to assess SARS-CoV-2 infection risk among different occupational groups. We found an over seven-fold higher risk for healthcare workers, and a three-fold increased risk for social care workers. Adjustment for covariates did not alter the associations substantially, implying that the socioeconomic, lifestyle-related, and health variables we studied were not the main mechanistic factors underpinning occupational differences. The comparisons of COVID risk across occupational groups highlighted how these increased risks seem to be particularly linked to the jobs themselves, rather than reflecting broader socioeconomic circumstances.

This study has several important strengths. First, by using a well characterised cohort study, we were able to compare infection risk across a wide range of occupational groups and identify occupations at higher risk of SARS-CoV-2. Data linkage, the large sample size and detailed data, enabled us to expeditiously provide empirical evidence from the ongoing pandemic and to investigate the extent to which observed outcomes are potentially explained by a wide range of factors, including work-related factors, lifestyle risk factors, pre-existing health status and other social variables.

Our findings should be considered in light of several limitations. Baseline data were collected 10-14 years ago, and we are unable to fully account for potential changes in health and employment status. Further, the UK Biobank has low participation from ethnic minorities and low-income adults (31). As participation in research studies is non-random this may lead to collider bias and increase the risk of inaccurate associations not generalizable to the general population (32–34). Finally, our results reflect current exposure circumstances. Risks may differ over time, as the extent of physical distancing measures, work patterns and structures or availability of PPE changes.

Our findings are corroborated by preliminary research reporting increased risk of SARS-CoV-2 and COVID-19 in essential workers (2,16–18,20). Recent UK Office for National Statistics (ONS) data

examining mortality from COVID-19 however, suggests a different pattern of findings from those we present here (5). ONS reported high COVID-19 death rates in men in the lowest skilled occupations and those working in transportation, as chefs and sales and retail assistants, while healthcare workers did not have higher death rates relative to the general population (5). Several reasons may explain the observed differences in occupational risk of infection and mortality. First, risk of SARS-CoV-2 infection is likely due to higher potential exposure (3), while risk of mortality may be further shaped by demographic, health, and socioeconomic factors (35,36). A Wuhan study reported that COVID-19 patients who died were more likely to be older, male, and have underlying chronic comorbidities (35). Low-skilled workers are disproportionately of lower socioeconomic position (37), which is associated with poorer health outcomes (38). Second, healthcare workers are likely to have better and earlier access to testing (39), while low skilled occupational groups may not have comparable accessibility, resulting in under or later ascertainment of disease, which may lead to more deaths after infection.

Our findings suggest there is an urgent need for policies and workplace interventions, to reduce exposure and limit spread of infectious diseases in work settings, through ensuring availability of resources for protective equipment, training, and other potential unforeseen challenges. Interventions should be rapidly implemented and delivered, based on the best available evidence, especially as other occupational groups return to workplaces and social distancing measures are relaxed (40). Combining our findings with those of the ONS (5), it is clear that maintaining testing for essential workers is important; however, there is an urgent need for testing and protective measures to be extended to wider and more disadvantaged occupational groups.

Future research will need to assess risk differences among other working groups, such as low skilled and younger workers and monitor how development and progression of chronic conditions may impact essential workers. Ethnic (41,42) and occupational (3,5) disparities in SARS-CoV-2 exposure,

infection, and mortality are evident and these should be studied in combination. Our study findings confirm the justification for concerns about the adequacy of health and safety arrangements and provision of PPE in the health and social care sectors, which should be urgently addressed. The wellbeing of essential workers is critical to limiting the spread, and managing the burden of global pandemics (43).

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We thank UK Biobank participants. This research has been conducted using the UK Biobank Resource (application No 41686 & 17333). We also acknowledge financial support from the Medical Research Council and Chief Scientist Office (MC_UU_12017/13; SPHSU13). CLN is supported by a Medical Research Council Fellowship (MR/R024774/1) and SVK by a NRS Senior Clinical Fellowship (SCAF/15). The views and opinions expressed are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect those of the above funding bodies.

Figure 1. Flow chart of cohort



Figure 2: Risk ratios for the association between broad occupational groups and testing positive for SARS-CoV-2 in hospital



Figure 3: Risk ratios for the association between detailed occupational groups and testing positive for SARS-CoV-2 in hospital



Figure 4: Risk ratios for the association between SOC2000 major occupational groups and testing positive for SARS-CoV-2 in hospital



Table 1. Cohort characteristics

	N	%
Broad occupational groups of essential workers		
Non-essential workers	91,016	70.5
Healthcare workers	11,353	8.8
Social and education workers	14,477	11.2
Other essential workers	12,060	9.3
Missing	264	0.2
Detailed occupational groups of essential workers		
Non-essential workers	91,016	70.5
Healthcare professionals	1,866	1.4
Medical support staff	1,390	1.1
Health associate professionals	8,097	6.3
Social care workers	5,811	4.5
Education workers	8,666	6.7
Food workers	4,964	3.8
Transport workers	3,675	2.8
Police and protective service workers	3,421	2.6
Missing	264	0.2
SOC 2000 major occupational groups		
Managers and Senior Officials	25,043	19.4
Professional Occupations	27,393	21.2
Associate Professional and Technical Occupations	24,682	19.1
Administrative and Secretarial Occupations	18,650	14.4
Skilled Trades Occupations	9,100	7.0
Personal Service Occupations	8,470	6.6
Sales and Customer Service Occupations	4,057	3.1
Process, Plant and Machine Operatives	5,354	4.1

Elementary Occupations	6,157	4.8
Missing	264	0.2
Age group (current)		
Under 55	27,068	21.0
55-59	48,219	37.3
60+	53,883	41.7
Sex		
Female	69,963	54.2
Male	59,207	45.8
Ethnicity		
White British	108,983	84.4
White Irish	3,468	2.7
White Other	5,441	4.2
Mixed	1,333	1.0
South Asian	3,662	2.8
Black	3,702	2.9
Other	2,194	1.7
Missing	387	0.3
Country of birth		
UK & Ireland	115,519	89.4
Elsewhere	13,449	10.4
Missing	202	0.2
Education level		
College or University degree	50,835	39.4
A levels/AS levels or equivalent	17,527	13.6
O levels/GCSEs/CSEs or equivalent	42,221	32.7
Other	10,880	8.4
None of the above	5,972	4.6
Missing	1,735	1.3

Deprivation quartile		
Quartile 1 (most advantaged)	30,066	23.3
Quartile 2	30,383	23.5
Quartile 3	34,092	26.4
Quartile 4 (least advantaged)	34,424	26.7
Missing	205	0.2
Shiftwork		
No	114,545	88.7
Yes	14,309	11.1
Missing	316	0.2
Manual occupation		
Non-manual	110,868	85.8
Manual	18,152	14.1
Missing	150	0.1
Job tenure		
<=10	76,158	59.0
11-20	29,514	22.8
>20	23,040	17.8
Missing	458	0.4
Working hours		
<40	66,104	51.2
40-45	40,599	31.4
>45	20,998	16.3
Missing	1,469	1.1
Number of chronic conditions		
0	64,948	50.3
1	41,281	32.0
2	15,551	12.0
3	4,693	3.6

4+	1,740	1.3
Missing	957	0.7
Long-standing illness, disability or infirmity		
No	99,217	76.8
Yes	27,215	21.1
Missing	2,738	2.1
BMI Category		
Underweight (<18.5)	673	0.5
Normal weight (18.5-24.9)	47,457	36.7
Overweight (25.0-29.9)	52,203	40.4
Obese (>=30.0)	28,313	21.9
Missing	524	0.4
Smoking status		
Never	79,583	61.6
Previous	33,887	26.2
Current	15,389	11.9
Missing	311	0.2
Alcohol consumption		
Daily or almost daily	21,508	16.7
Three or four times a week	31,770	24.6
Once or twice a week	37,637	29.1
One to three times a month	16,926	13.1
Special occasions only	13,212	10.2
Never (former drinker)	3,290	2.5
Never	4,726	3.7
Missing	101	0.1

Table 2: Descriptive statistics for testing positive for SARS-CoV-2 in hospital by occupational groups

	Tested positive for SARS-CoV-2 in hospital					
	No	**No**	**Yes**	**Yes**	**Total**	**Total**
	N	**%**	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**
Broad occupational groups of essential workers						
Non-essential workers	85,257	99.9	84	0.1	85,341	100
Healthcare workers	10,718	99.3	76	0.7	10,794	100
Social and education workers	13,499	99.8	27	0.2	13,526	100
Other essential workers	10,941	99.8	19	0.2	10,960	100
Detailed occupational groups of essential workers						
Non-essential workers	85,257	99.9	84	0.1	85,341	100
Healthcare professionals	1,779	99.3	12	0.7	1,791	100
Medical support staff	1,286	99.2	10	0.8	1,296	100
Health associate professionals	7,653	99.3	54	0.7	7,707	100
Social care workers	5,305	99.7	16	0.3	5,321	100
Education workers	8,194	99.9	11	0.1	8,205	100
Food workers	4,517	99.9	5	0.1	4,522	100
Transport workers	3,295	99.8	8	0.2	3,303	100
Police and protective service workers	3,129	99.8	6	0.2	3,135	100
SOC 2000 major occupational groups						
Managers and Senior Officials	23,779	99.9	25	0.1	23,804	100
Professional Occupations	26,005	99.9	32	0.1	26,037	100
Associate Professional and Technical Occupations	23,079	99.7	70	0.3	23,149	100
Administrative and Secretarial Occupations	17,531	99.9	22	0.1	17,553	100
Skilled Trades Occupations	8,407	99.9	8	0.1	8,415	100
Personal Service Occupations	7,669	99.7	22	0.3	7,691	100
Sales and Customer Service Occupations	3,699	99.9	4	0.1	3,703	100
Process, Plant and Machine Operatives	4,809	99.7	13	0.3	4,822	100
Elementary Occupations	5,437	99.8	10	0.2	5,447	100

Table 3 Risk ratios for testing positive for SARS-CoV-2 in hospital by occupational groups

	Model 1	**Model 2**	**Model 3**	**Model 4**	**Model 5**	**Model 6**
Tested positive for SARS-CoV-2 in hospital	**RR [95% CI]**	**RR [95% CI]**	**RR [95% CI]**	**RR [95% CI]**	**RR [95% CI]**	**RR [95% CI]**
Broad occupational groups of essential workers						
Non-essential workers (reference)	1.000 -	1.000 -	1.000 -	1.000 -	1.000 -	1.000 -
Healthcare workers	7.594*** [5.428,10.624]	8.655*** [6.143,12.193]	7.594*** [5.295,10.891]	8.659*** [6.142,12.207]	8.749*** [6.202,12.342]	7.754*** [5.387,11.161]
Social and education workers	2.174** [1.366,3.460]	2.357*** [1.471,3.778]	2.239** [1.382,3.626]	2.355*** [1.469,3.774]	2.313*** [1.444,3.706]	2.214** [1.368,3.583]
Other essential workers	1.584 [0.965,2.601]	1.276 [0.774,2.105]	1.104 [0.663,1.838]	1.276 [0.774,2.104]	1.239 [0.750,2.045]	1.080 [0.648,1.800]
Detailed occupational groups of						

essential workers						
Non-essential workers (reference)	1.000 -	1.000 -	1.000 -	1.000 -	1.000 -	1.000 -
Healthcare professionals	6.140*** [3.318,11.364]	8.646*** [4.519,16.545]	8.070*** [4.209,15.472]	8.681*** [4.537,16.610]	9.538*** [4.991,18.227]	8.943*** [4.663,17.152]
Medical support staff	8.566*** [4.350,16.865]	7.294*** [3.707,14.350]	6.284*** [3.180,12.422]	7.292*** [3.701,14.368]	7.162*** [3.660,14.015]	6.241*** [3.168,12.295]
Health associate professionals	7.822*** [5.412,11.305]	8.903*** [6.126,12.939]	7.813*** [5.220,11.694]	8.903*** [6.123,12.944]	8.899*** [6.099,12.985]	7.866*** [5.226,11.840]
Social care workers	2.992*** [1.710,5.236]	2.879*** [1.648,5.026]	2.632*** [1.480,4.680]	2.878*** [1.648,5.028]	2.780*** [1.591,4.855]	2.579** [1.451,4.584]
Education workers	1.555 [0.801,3.018]	1.849 [0.945,3.621]	1.833 [0.930,3.610]	1.846 [0.943,3.613]	1.845 [0.944,3.604]	1.824 [0.929,3.581]
Food workers	1.098 [0.445,2.710]	0.903 [0.367,2.221]	0.805 [0.325,1.994]	0.904 [0.367,2.223]	0.894 [0.364,2.196]	0.797 [0.322,1.973]
Transport workers	1.970 [0.951,4.081]	1.469 [0.707,3.054]	1.237 [0.592,2.586]	1.469 [0.707,3.055]	1.389 [0.663,2.909]	1.187 [0.565,2.495]
Police and protective service workers	1.787 [0.781,4.091]	1.554 [0.672,3.594]	1.335 [0.570,3.127]	1.550 [0.670,3.586]	1.503 [0.649,3.477]	1.305 [0.557,3.056]

SOC 2000 major occupational groups						
Non-essential workers (reference)	1.000 -	1.000 -	1.000 -	1.000 -	1.000 -	1.000 -
Professional Occupations	1.139 [0.673,1.929]	1.211 [0.711,2.063]	1.262 [0.737,2.162]	1.212 [0.712,2.064]	1.253 [0.737,2.130]	1.304 [0.763,2.229]
Associate Professional and Technical Occupations	2.787*** [1.766,4.399]	2.711*** [1.723,4.266]	2.392*** [1.484,3.857]	2.709*** [1.721,4.262]	2.750*** [1.744,4.337]	2.432*** [1.507,3.924]
Administrative and Secretarial Occupations	1.149 [0.639,2.066]	1.060 [0.589,1.906]	1.216 [0.667,2.215]	1.059 [0.589,1.906]	1.082 [0.600,1.951]	1.237 [0.678,2.259]
Skilled Trades Occupations	0.854 [0.383,1.904]	0.710 [0.313,1.609]	0.479 [0.207,1.108]	0.711 [0.314,1.611]	0.733 [0.324,1.660]	0.494 [0.214,1.141]
Personal Service Occupations	2.537** [1.376,4.679]	2.156* [1.168,3.978]	1.594 [0.846,3.002]	2.154* [1.169,3.970]	2.163* [1.174,3.987]	1.613 [0.858,3.031]
Sales and Customer Service Occupations	0.941 [0.324,2.731]	0.754 [0.251,2.265]	0.637 [0.208,1.945]	0.754 [0.251,2.264]	0.748 [0.250,2.240]	0.628 [0.206,1.917]

Process, Plant and Machine Operatives	2.180* [1.109,4.283]	1.663 [0.836,3.307]	1.057 [0.515,2.172]	1.659 [0.834,3.301]	1.645 [0.824,3.281]	1.058 [0.514,2.179]
Elementary Occupations	1.492 [0.714,3.121]	1.092 [0.501,2.381]	0.690 [0.308,1.545]	1.091 [0.501,2.377]	1.113 [0.509,2.436]	0.710 [0.317,1.588]
Observations	120621	120621	120621	120621	120621	120621

CI=confidence interval; RR=risk ratio
* $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$
Coefficients for the covariates not shown.

Model 1: Adjusted for age group, sex, ethnicity, country of birth
Model 2: Model 1 + socioeconomic deprivation quartile, education level
Model 3: Model 2 + shift work, manual work, job tenure, working hours
Model 4: Model 2 + number of chronic conditions, long-standing illness/disability
Model 5: Model 2 + BMI category, smoking status, alcohol consumption
Model 6: All covariates

REFERENCES

1. Public Health England. National COVID-19 surveillance reports . 2020.
2. Wang D, Hu B, Hu C, Zhu F, Liu X, Zhang J, et al. Clinical Characteristics of 138 Hospitalized Patients with 2019 Novel Coronavirus-Infected Pneumonia in Wuhan, China. JAMA - J Am Med Assoc. 2020 Mar;323(11):1061–9.
3. Office of National Statistics. Which occupations have the highest potential exposure to the coronavirus (COVID-19)? - Office for National Statistics. 2020.
4. Lan F-Y, Wei C-F, Hsu Y-T, Christiani DC, Kales SN. Work-related Covid-19 transmission. medRxiv. 2020 Apr;2020.04.08.20058297.
5. Office for National Statistics. Coronavirus (COVID-19) related deaths by occupation, England and Wales: deaths registered up to and including 20 April 2020. 2020 May.
6. Baker MG, Peckham TK, Seixas NS. Estimating the burden of United States workers exposed to infection or disease: A key factor in containing risk of COVID-19 infection. Nelson CC, editor. PLoS One. 2020 Apr;15(4):e0232452.
7. Public Health England. Guidance for employers and businesses on coronavirus (COVID-19) - GOV.UK.
8. Douglas M, Katikireddi SV, Taulbut M, McKee M, McCartney G. Mitigating the wider health effects of covid-19 pandemic response. BMJ. 2020;369:m1557.
9. Rothe C, Schunk M, Sothmann P, Bretzel G, Froeschl G, Wallrauch C, et al. Transmission of 2019-NCOV infection from an asymptomatic contact in Germany. Vol. 382, New England Journal of Medicine. Massachussetts Medical Society; 2020. p. 970–1.
10. Dean NE, Halloran ME, Yang Y, Longini IM. Transmissibility and pathogenicity of Ebola virus: A systematic review and meta-analysis of household secondary attack rate and asymptomatic infection. Clin Infect Dis. 2016 May;62(10):1277–86.

11. Webster RK, Liu R, Karimullina K, Hall I, Amlôt R, Rubin GJ. A systematic review of infectious illness Presenteeism: prevalence, reasons and risk factors.

12. Furuya-Kanamori L, Cox M, Milinovich GJ, Soares Magalhaes RJ, Mackay IM, Yakob L. Heterogeneous and dynamic prevalence of asymptomatic influenza virus infections. Emerg Infect Dis. 2016 Jun;22(6):1052–6.

13. OSullivan ED. PPE guidance for covid-19: be honest about resource shortages.

14. Comas-Herrera, Adelina (CPEC L, Zalakian J (SIIS). Mortality associated with COVID-19 outbreaks in care homes: early international evidence [Internet]. 2020. Available from: https://alzheimeriberoamerica.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/04/Mortality-associated-with-COVID-12-April-3.pdf

15. Van Lancker W, Parolin Z. COVID-19, school closures, and child poverty: a social crisis in the making. The Lancet Public Health. Elsevier Ltd; 2020.

16. Koh D. Occupational risks for COVID-19 infection. Occup Med (Lond). 2020;70(1):3–5.

17. Chirico F, Nucera G, Magnavita N. COVID-19: Protecting Healthcare Workers is a priority. Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol. 2020 Apr;1–4.

18. Rimmer A. Covid-19: Two thirds of healthcare workers who have died were from ethnic minorities. BMJ. 2020 Apr;m1621.

19. Katikireddi SV, Leyland AH, McKee M, Ralston K, Stuckler D. Patterns of mortality by occupation in the UK, 1991–2011: a comparative analysis of linked census and mortality records. Lancet Public Heal. 2017;2(11):e501–12.

20. Nguyen LH, Drew DA, Joshi AD, Guo C-G, Ma W, Mehta RS, et al. Risk of symptomatic Covid-19 among frontline healthcare workers. medRxiv. 2020 May;2020.04.29.20084111.

21. International Social Security Association (ISSA). Can COVID-19 be considered an occupational disease? | International Social Security Association (ISSA). 2020.

22. Office for National Statistics. Standard occupational classification (SOC 2000) and NS-SEC on the labour force survey . 2016.

23. Sudlow C, Gallacher J, Allen N, Beral V, Burton P, Danesh J, et al. UK Biobank: An Open Access Resource for Identifying the Causes of a Wide Range of Complex Diseases of Middle and Old Age. PLOS Med [Internet]. 2015 Mar;12(3):e1001779. Available from: https://dx.plos.org/10.1371/journal.pmed.1001779

24. Manolio TA, Weis BK, Cowie CC, Hoover RN, Hudson K, Kramer BS, et al. New Models for Large Prospective Studies: Is There a Better Way? Am J Epidemiol. 2012;175(9):859–66.

25. Armstrong J, Rudkin J, Allen N, Crook D, Wilson D, Wyllie D, et al. Dynamic linkage of COVID-19 test results between Public Health England's Second Generation Surveillance System and UK Biobank. 2020 Apr;

26. UK Biobank. Improving the health of future generations. UK Biobank Imaging Study.

27. Townsend P. Deprivation. J Soc Policy. 1987;15(2):125–46.

28. Jani BD, Hanlon P, Nicholl BI, McQueenie R, Gallacher KI, Lee D, et al. Relationship between multimorbidity, demographic factors and mortality: Findings from the UK Biobank cohort. BMC Med. 2019 Apr;17(1):74.

29. WHO. WHO | Obesity and overweight. World Health Organisation Media Centre Fact Sheet No. 311. World Health Organization; 2012. p. 1–2.

30. Zou G. Modified Poisson Regression Approach to Prospective Studies with Binary Data | American Journal of Epidemiology | Oxford Academic. Am J Epidemiol. 2004;159(7):702–6.

31. Fry A, Littlejohns T, Sudlow C, Doherty N, Allen N. OP41 The representativeness of the UK Biobank cohort on a range of sociodemographic, physical, lifestyle and health-related characteristics. J Epidemiol Community Health. 2016 Sep;70(Suppl 1):A26.1-A26.

32. Blom AG, Herzing JME, Cornesse C, Sakshaug JW, Krieger U, Bossert D. Does the Recruitment of

Offline Households Increase the Sample Representativeness of Probability-Based Online Panels? Evidence From the German Internet Panel. Soc Sci Comput Rev. 2017 Aug;35(4):498–520.

33. Griffith G, Morris TT, Tudball M, Herbert A, Mancano G, Pike L, et al. Collider bias undermines our understanding of COVID-19 disease risk and severity. medRxiv Prepr. 2020 May;1–32.

34. Van Loon A. Survey Non-response in the Netherlands Effects on Prevalence Estimates and Associations. Ann Epidemiol. 2003 Feb;13(2):105–10.

35. Chen T, Wu D, Chen H, Yan W, Yang D, Chen G, et al. Clinical characteristics of 113 deceased patients with coronavirus disease 2019: Retrospective study. BMJ. 2020 Mar;368.

36. Jordan RE, Adab P, Cheng KK. Covid-19: Risk factors for severe disease and death. Vol. 368, The BMJ. BMJ Publishing Group; 2020.

37. Davey Smith G, Hart C, Hole D, MacKinnon P, Gillis C, Watt G, et al. Education and occupational social class: Which is the more important indicator of mortality risk? J Epidemiol Community Health. 1998;52(3):153–60.

38. Ravesteijn B, Van Kippersluis H, Van Doorslaer E. The contribution of occupation to health inequality. Res Econ Inequal. 2013;21:311–32.

39. Iacobucci G. Covid-19: healthcare staff in hotspot areas are prioritised as testing expands. BMJ. 2020 Mar;368:m1318.

40. Xu S, Li Y. Beware of the second wave of COVID-19. Vol. 395, The Lancet. Lancet Publishing Group; 2020. p. 1321–2.

41. Niedzwiedz CL, O'Donnell CA, Jani BD, Demou E, Ho FK, Celis-Morales C, et al. Ethnic and socioeconomic differences in SARS-CoV2 infection in the UK Biobank cohort study. medRxiv. 2020 Apr;2020.04.22.20075663.

42. Aldridge RW, Lewer D, Vittal Katikireddi S, Mathur R, Pathak N, Burns R, et al. Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic groups in England are at increased risk of death from COVID-19: indirect

standardisation of NHS mortality data [version 1; peer review: awaiting peer review]. Wellcome Open Res. 2020;5(88):1–8.

43. Brooks SK, Dunn R, Amlôt R, Rubin GJ, Greenberg N. A Systematic, Thematic Review of Social and Occupational Factors Associated with Psychological Outcomes in Healthcare Employees during an Infectious Disease Outbreak. J Occup Environ Med. 2018 Mar;60(3):248–57.