medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.09.20125237; this version posted June 9, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

COVID-19 related mortality and spread of disease in long-term care: first findings from a living systematic review of emerging evidence

Maximilian Salcher-Konrad [1*], Arnoupe Jhass,[2,3] Huseyin Naci,[4] Marselia Tan,[1] Yousef El-Tawil,[4] Adelina Comas-Herrera [1]

[1] Care Policy and Evaluation Centre (CPEC), London School of Economics and Political Science
[2] Research Department of Primary Care & Population Health, University College London
[3] Institute of Health Informatics, University College London
[4] Department of Health Policy, London School of Economics and Political Science

* Corresponding author: m.salcher@lse.ac.uk; London School of Economics and Political Science, Houghton Street, London WC2A 2AE, United Kingdom.

Abstract

Background: Policy responses to mitigate the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on long-term care (LTC) require robust and timely evidence on mortality and spread of the disease in these settings. The aim of this living systematic review is to synthesise early international evidence on mortality rates and incidence of COVID-19 among people who use and provide LTC.

Methods: We report the initial findings of a living systematic review (CRD42020183557), including studies identified through database searches up to 29 May 2020. We searched seven databases (MEDLINE; Embase; CINAHL Plus; Web of Science; Global Health; WHO COVID-19 Research Database; medRxiv) to identify all studies reporting primary data on COVID-19 related mortality and incidence of disease among LTC users and staff. We excluded studies not focusing on LTC. Included primary studies were critically appraised and results on number of deaths and COVID-19 related mortality rates, case fatality rates, and excess deaths (co-primary outcomes), as well as incidence of disease, hospitalisations, and ICU admissions were synthesised narratively. We further included official figures on number of deaths in LTC.

Findings: A total of 30 study reports for 27 unique primary studies or outbreak reports were included. Outbreak investigations in LTC facilities found COVID-19 incidence rates of between 0.0% and 71.7% among residents and between 1.5% and 64.0% among staff. Mortality rates varied from 0.0% to 9.9% of all residents at outbreak facilities, with case fatality rates between 0.0% and 33.7%. In included studies, no LTC staff members had died. LTC residents accounted for between 0% (Hong Kong) and 82% (Canada) of COVID-related deaths, according to official figures.

Interpretation: Long-term care users have been particularly vulnerable to the COVID-19 pandemic. However, we found wide variation in spread of disease and mortality rates between outbreaks at individual LTC facilities. Further research into the factors determining successful prevention and containment of COVID-19 outbreaks is needed to protect long-term care users and staff.

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

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.09.20125237; this version posted June 9, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Funding: This work was partially funded by the World Health Organization and was partially conducted as part of the "Strengthening responses to dementia in developing countries" (STRiDE) project, supported by the UK Research and Innovation's Global Challenges Research Fund (ES/P010938/1). The funders had no role in the design and execution of this study, interpretation of its results, and decision to submit this work to be published.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.09.20125237; this version posted June 9, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Introduction

As of 7 June 2020, the coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) pandemic has claimed over 400,000 lives globally, and almost 7 million cases have been recorded.[1] Over the course of the evolving pandemic, public attention in some countries has shifted towards long-term care facilities as "ground zero".[2] Indeed, early evidence on risk factors for severe outcomes suggests that residents of long-term care facilities, such as nursing homes and residential care facilities for people who need medical support or support in their activities of daily living, may be particularly vulnerable. Studies have shown that older people and those with underlying health conditions, including hypertension, diabetes, cardiovascular disease, chronic lung disease, obesity, and cancer, are more likely to experience severe outcomes after contracting the disease.[3] Importantly, case series from China, Italy, the United States (US), and the United Kingdom (UK), have shown higher mortality rates among older COVID-19 cases.[4,5,6,7] While older people and those with chronic conditions would already have higher mortality rates in the absence of a pandemic, a modelling study for the United Kingdom has shown that excess deaths due to COVID-19 are likely to be concentrated among older people.[8] It has also been suggested that older age and some chronic conditions were associated with an increased risk of infection with SARS-CoV-2, the virus causing COVID-19.[9]

While the combination of a population of older people with underlying health conditions living in close proximity to each other suggests the long-term care sector to be at particularly high risk, specific evidence on COVID-19 infections and associated deaths in this setting was initially slow to emerge. An early rapid review on deaths in care homes conducted in mid-April 2020 identified only 3 studies on infection rates and COVID-19 incidence and mortality in long-term care homes (all from the US).[10] These studies showed wide variation in the proportion of residents and staff being infected (with the majority of cases asymptomatic at the time of testing), in the spread of the disease between different care homes, and in case fatality rates among nursing home residents, which were reported to be as high as 33%.[11,12,13] As the pandemic continues to spread, more evidence about the spread and impact of COVID-19 in long-term care settings is expected to emerge, including information about infection rates and outcomes among those receiving long-term care services (long-term care users) and those providing them (long-term care staff), including both for institutional settings and community-based services. Indeed, the number of records in PubMed retrieved through a combination of search terms for COVID-19 and long-term care increased by more than 100 records per week from the end of April to the end of May. However, no data or studies appear to be available yet on the population relying on community-based long-term care services, even though this represents a group that is potentially highly vulnerable to infection (as they rely on care from others) and at risk of severe outcomes.[14]

Given the vulnerability of the population relying on long-term care services and the potentially large burden of COVID-19 in this sector, timely and evidence-based policy responses are required. We therefore aimed to systematically collate and synthesise available and newly emerging evidence on the number of long-term care users and staff who contract COVID-19 and experience severe outcomes, including death, and the spread of disease in long-term care settings.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.09.20125237; this version posted June 9, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Methods

We conducted a systematic review of available evidence on COVID-19 infection rates and mortality among users and providers of long-term care services (PROSPERO: CRD42020183557). Due to the rapidly evolving nature of the situation and an expected increase in research focusing on COVID-19 in long-term care, database searches will be updated continuously, and findings incorporated as a living systematic review. The reporting of this review is PRISMA-compliant (see supplemental file).[15]

Search Strategy & Selection Criteria

Potentially eligible studies were identified through systematic searches of 7 electronic databases (MEDLINE, Embase, CINAHL plus, Web of Science, Global Health, the World Health Organization's COVID-19 Research Database, medRxiv). Search terms were based on published search blocks for COVID-19 related studies and were adapted to each database (see supplemental file).[16,17] We included full study reports and research letters published in peer-reviewed journals or on pre-print servers since 1 January 2020 in order to capture newly emerging evidence pertinent to the COVID-19 pandemic. Initial database searches were conducted on 15 May 2020 and updated weekly up to 29 May 2020.

Inclusion criteria were defined following the CoCoPop (Condition, Context and Population) framework, as recommended by the Joanna Briggs Institute for systematic reviews of prevalence and incidence.[18] Studies were eligible for inclusion if they reported primary data on COVID-19 related mortality (including mortality rate among the population of interest, case fatality rate (CFR), and excess deaths compared to previous periods) or spread of COVID-19 among users and staff of long-term care services. Long-term care services included both institutional and community (i.e., care provided in the homes of patients) settings. We excluded studies that focused on COVID-19 mortality and infection rates in non-long-term care settings, studies of infectious disease outbreaks other than COVID-19, modelling studies, as well as opinion pieces and review articles that did not report original data.

In addition to primary studies, we included official figures of deaths and infections in long-term care settings at the country level, as collated by the LTCcovid.org network. As of 5 June 2020, this included data for 19 countries.

Title and abstract screening, as well as full text review was undertaken by three reviewers (AJ, MS-K, and MT). To ensure consistency, all studies deemed eligible for inclusion were again reviewed by one reviewer (MS-K). Records reporting on the same study or outbreak were combined.

Data Extraction & Synthesis

A standardised template was used to extract data at the study level, including information on study design; care setting (institutional vs. community); how COVID-19 was diagnosed and

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.09.20125237; this version posted June 9, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

confirmed; baseline characteristics of participants; absolute number of deaths and mortality rates from confirmed and suspected COVID-19 cases; CFRs; excess deaths; absolute numbers and rates of confirmed and suspected COVID-19; and rates of hospitalisation and intensive care unit (ICU) admissions among confirmed and suspected COVID-19 cases. All study participant characteristics and outcomes data were extracted separately for long-term care users and staff. For rates, we also recorded how numerator and denominator were defined, as well as the follow-up time over which outcomes were measured.

Based on extracted data, we calculated the mortality rate directly attributable to COVID-19 (all deaths among COVID-19 cases/all long-term care users or staff), CFR (all deaths among COVID-19 cases/all cases among long-term care users or staff), incidence of COVID-19 (all COVID-19 cases/all long-term care users or staff), and incidence of hospital and ICU admissions (all hospital or ICU admissions/all cases among long-term care users or staff). Due to heterogeneity in the definitions of numerators, denominators, and follow-up times across included studies, data were not pooled. Instead, results are summarised narratively and presented in tables, including information on sample characteristics, follow-up time, and case definitions, as appropriate. Where studies reported on overlapping populations, we gave preference to those with larger sample sizes and longer follow-up times.

In addition to the pre-specified outcomes above, we extracted information on the proportion of asymptomatic cases at time of testing, and findings of studies comparing outcomes in long-term care users to others.

Critical Appraisal

The quality of included primary studies reporting figures relating to mortality rates, CFR, or disease incidence were assessed using the Joanna Briggs Institute critical appraisal tool for prevalence studies.[19] The tool includes 9 questions about the appropriateness of the sampling frame, sampling of participants, sample size, description of study setting and participants, data analysis, identification of cases, measure of disease, statistical analysis, and response rate. We summarised appraisals as the number of items that were deemed appropriate for each study.

We did not assess risk of bias across studies.

Results

A total of 30 study reports for 27 unique primary studies or outbreak reports were included (Figure 1).[7,11,12,13,20,21,22,23,24,25,26,27,28,29,30,31,32,33,34,35,36,37,38,39,40,41,42,43,44,45] An overview of study characteristics is provided in Table 1. Included primary studies were conducted in 10 countries (11 in the United States, 3 each in Canada, South Korea and the United Kingdom, 2 in Belgium, and 1 each in France, Germany, Hungary, Israel, and Spain). All included studies were conducted in institutional care settings and no study reported on home-based or community-based care.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.09.20125237; this version posted June 9, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

In addition to original studies, official government figures from 19 countries (providing estimates for 20 different entities) were included as reported in an international comparison of mortality rates.[10]

Evidence on disease incidence in long-term care settings

Evidence on the spread of disease within institutional long-term care settings was available from 12 studies,[21,22,23,25,28,31,32,33,36,38,41,44] including 11 studies reporting the number of cases among long-term care users and 8 studies reporting cases among staff (Table 2).

The incidence rate for cohorts of residents at long-term care institutions where an outbreak occurred varied widely. The lowest estimate was 0% over a 3-week period and was observed in a South Korean long-term care hospital, where an infected care worker had been working throughout the facility for 2 days while symptomatic.[36] Following the diagnosis of the index case, exposed care workers were quarantined at home, while remaining staff who continued to work were quarantined in a hotel. Considerably higher incidence rates of between 40.3% and 71.7% were reported from outbreaks in 4 US and 2 UK facilities. Tests to confirm cases were not described in detail in 3 of the 11 studies among residents.

The incidence rate for cohorts of long-term care staff at outbreak facilities was overall lower compared to residents. Among 5 studies testing all staff members, the rate of infections was between 1.5% and 5.9%. Two of these studies were point-prevalence surveys conducted over 2 days, while the other two studies reported incidence rates over periods of 2 to 9.5 weeks. Another point-prevalence study from the UK found that 4.1% of a sample of asymptomatic staff representing various roles across 3 nursing homes (including care workers as well as kitchen staff, administrators, and maintenance personnel) tested positive.[32] The rate of infection was higher for the remaining 2 studies, but this included 1 study where testing was only conducted for 51 of 138 staff members (incidence rate of confirmed COVID-19 for all 138 staff: 18.8%),[23] and one report of an outbreak that did not provide details on testing (16/25 staff members tested positive).[21]

Complementing studies of individual outbreaks, Abrams et al. conducted a survey of 9,395 nursing homes in the US and found that 31.4% had at least one documented COVID-19 case.[20]

Data on asymptomatic residents and staff who tested positive for COVID-19 was extracted from 8 studies (Table 3).[11,23,28,32,33,3338,41,42] Definitions of symptomatic cases differed (see lists of symptoms in the table), as did the number of identified cases, leading to a range of asymptomatic cases at the time of testing from 7-75% among long-term care residents, and between 50% and 100% asymptomatic cases for staff. There were only between 2 and 8 infected staff members in studies reporting symptoms.

Evidence on case fatality rates in long-term care settings

CFR is the proportion of confirmed COVID-19 cases who die. CFRs for 11 studies of entire long-term care home populations (including COVID-19 positive and negative residents and staff) are

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.09.20125237; this version posted June 9, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

summarised in Table 4,[11,23,25,28,31,32,34,36,38,41,44] while CFRs for 3 studies of COVID-19 positive populations are described further down.[24,27,40]

For most studies included in Table 4, the source population for the identification of cases were all or close to all (>90%) residents or staff at long-term care institutions where an outbreak occurred. The CFR among long-term care users for these studies ranged from 0% to 33.7%, with differences in follow-up time between 1 and 10 weeks. The CFR among long-term care staff was 0% in all included studies. The source population was unclear for Kemenesi et al., which reported the number of deaths among all confirmed COVID-19 cases in nursing homes in Hungary to be 4%.[34] It is unclear how cases in nursing homes were identified. Similarly, the CFR of 27.8% in Stall et al. was calculated across all nursing homes in the province of Ontario, Canada, but this was based on reporting of cases to the authorities, rather than on systematic testing of all residents.[44] The source population was also unclear for long-term care staff in McMichael et al., where no information was provided about the proportion of staff at an outbreak facility that was tested.[11]

Not included in Table 4 are CFRs reported by 3 studies for which the source population consisted exclusively of COVID-19 cases (Prieto-Alhambra et al.; Baker et al.; De Smet et al.).[24,27,40] Prieto-Alhambra et al. found the 30-day mortality rate among 10,795 nursing home residents who were registered with a clinical or lab-confirmed COVID-19 diagnosis in a regional primary care database in Catalonia, Spain, to be 25.3% (95% CI 24.2-26.4%).[40] This was considerably higher compared to the 30-day mortality rate for all other COVID-19 cases in the database (4.0%, 95% CI 3.9-4.2%), although these findings were not adjusted for age and underlying chronic conditions.

Baker et al. found that 40.7% of 60 lab-confirmed cases who were admitted to a teaching hospital in Newcastle, UK, from nursing or residential homes died within a 28-day period.[24] Compared to non-care home residents, the unadjusted odds ratio for death was 6.19 (95% CI 3.32-11.8).

De Smet et al. report that 52% of COVID-19 patients at a geriatric department were admitted from long-term care facilities, and the CFR for those was 28.6%.[27]

Evidence on mortality rates in long-term care settings

As of 5 June 2020, official estimates of the total number of COVID-19 related deaths among long-term care users were available from 20 different entities (in the UK, figures are reported for England and Wales, and separately for Scotland).[10] The total number of deaths ranged from none in Hong Kong to over 30,000 in the United States (Figure 2). Deaths among long-term care residents accounted for between 0% (Hong Kong, where there had been 4 COVID-19 related deaths overall) and 82% (Canada). The proportion of deaths among long-term care residents was more than 50% of all deaths in 5 countries.

Information on excess deaths among long-term care residents was only available for the United Kingdom.[10] In England and Wales, the number of excess deaths in care homes in the period of

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.09.20125237; this version posted June 9, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

10 April to 15 May 2020 was 21,753. In Scotland, there were a total of 2,006 excess deaths of care home residents in the period up to 17 May 2020, compared to the 5-year average. In addition to excess deaths based on official figures, one study of outbreaks in 4 nursing homes in London (UK) estimated an increase in all-cause mortality by 203% for a two-month period from 1 March to 1 May 2020 compared to the average of the preceding two years.[32]

Estimates of the proportion of care home populations who died due to COVID-19 based on official data were available for 8 countries, with high estimates of 3.4% and 3.7% of all care home residents in the UK and Belgium, respectively. The lowest estimates were for Hong Kong (no deaths in care homes), Austria (0.3%), Germany (0.4%), and Canada (0.9%), and intermediate estimates were reported for Sweden (2.0%) and France (2.4%).[10]

Table 5 presents mortality rates for confirmed COVID-19 cases for 8 primary studies of long-term care institutions.[25,28,31,32,36,38,41,44] The source populations for these studies are all or close to all (>90%) residents or staff at long-term care institutions where an outbreak occurred. For these studies, the mortality rate for all or nearly all residents over a 1-to-10-week follow-up period was between 0.0% and 9.9%. For Osterdahl et al.,[38] the mortality rate only includes 2 deaths among cases who died of the disease. Including 1 other case who died of an unrelated cause, the mortality rate increases to 14.3%. Similarly, there was one additional death among cases in the study by Cercy, which would increase the mortality rate to 10.6%.[25]

There were 2 studies reporting on mortality among all staff members who were screened, and in both of these outbreaks, no member of staff had died after follow-up periods of 3 and 9.5 weeks, respectively.[31,36]

Evidence on hospitalisations and ICU admissions

Eight studies provided information on the rate of hospitalisations among long-term care residents with COVID-19 diagnosis,[11,23,25,31,40,41,42,45] and 2 of these also provided numbers for hospitalisations among staff members (Table 6). Hospitalisation rates for long-term care residents varied between 0.0% and 54.4% for follow-up periods of between 3 and 10 weeks.

Hospitalisation rates for long-term care staff with COVID-19 diagnosis were 0.0% and 6.0% in 2 studies in US skilled nursing facilities.

Three studies reported the number of confirmed cases among long-term care users who were admitted to the ICU. Cercy reports that 12.3% of positive tested residents were admitted to the ICU over a 10-week period.[25] Arons et al. report that 5.3% of 48 nursing home residents with a positive PCR test were admitted to an ICU over a 3.5-week period.[23] Roxby et al. report that none of the 4 residents at an assisted living facility with positive PCR test were admitted to an ICU over a 3-week period.[41]

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.09.20125237; this version posted June 9, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Evidence on outcomes in long-term care residents compared to others

Seven of the included studies compared outcomes in COVID-19 cases between long-term care users and others. These studies generally found that long-term care users had worse outcomes, including higher 28-day-mortality (unadjusted odds ratio for death of nursing home or residential home residents admitted to hospital compared to non-residents: 6.19, 95% CI 3.32-11.8),[24] 30-day-mortality (25.3%, 95% CI 24.2-26.4%, among COVID-19 cases from nursing homes registered in a primary care database compared to 4.0%, 95% CI 3.9-4.2%, among all other cases in the database),[40] and overall mortality (incidence rate ratio for COVID-19 mortality comparing Ontario long-term care residents to community-living adults 70 years and older: 13.1, 95% CI 9.9-17.3),[29] as well as increased risk of complicated disease (odds ratio for deteriorating disease, admission to ICU, or death, comparing nursing home residents to non-residents over 65 years of age: 2.48, 95% CI 1.29-4.65).[45] Bhatraju et al. report that, among 24 patients admitted to the intensive care units of 9 hospitals in the Seattle area (US), 6 (25%) were residents of skilled nursing facilities.[7]

Two studies did not find a statistically significant association between long-term care users and worse COVID-19 outcomes. De Smet et al. found that short-term mortality was not associated with long-term care residence in a cohort of COVID-19 patients at a geriatric department.[27] Palaiodimos et al. did not find that nursing home residents fared worse than community-dwelling patients in a retrospective cohort study of the first 200 lab-confirmed COVID-19 cases in a teaching hospital in New York, US.[39] There was no statistically significant difference between community-based and skilled nursing facility based patients for in-hospital mortality (OR 0.90, 95% CI 0.42-1.91; p= 0.779), increasing oxygen requirements (OR 1.14, 95% CI 0.59-2.21; p= 0.701), and intubation (1.39, 95% CI 0.59-3.27; p= 0.446).

Evidence on burden of disease in the long-term care sector

Six primary studies provided evidence on the extent to which long-term care users are affected by the COVID-19 pandemic. These studies varied widely in their sampling frame (ranging from nationwide figures to single-centre case series of COVID-19 patients), and findings therefore need to be viewed in this context. Stall et al. found that 30.5% of all nursing homes in Ontario, Canada, experienced a COVID-19 outbreak from 29 March-20 May 2020.[44] Kemenesi et al. report that in Hungary, as of 18 April 2020, 11% of all laboratory-confirmed COVID-19 cases in the country came from social homes, all of which were adult nursing homes.[34] Prieto-Alhambra et al. found that 10,795/121,263 (8.9%) COVID-19 cases registered in primary care records in Catalonia, Spain, were nursing home residents.[40] Kim & Jiang found that 3 of the 12 largest clusters in South Korea were related to long-term care facilities, including 2 nursing homes and 1 psychiatric ward of a long-term care hospital.[35] Das and Gopalan found that 46 out of 3,299 (1.4%) patients with confirmed COVID-19 in South Korea from 20 January to 30 April 2020 had been exposed at nursing homes (no information about whether these were residents, staff, or visitors).[26] Gold reports that 20/305 (6.6%) of all hospitalised patients with laboratory confirmed COVID in Atlanta and Southern Georgia (US) were residents in a long-term care facility (study period: 1 to 30 March 2020).[30]

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.09.20125237; this version posted June 9, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

These findings are complemented by official figures on the share of the pandemic carried by care homes and their residents for some contries.[10] In Hong Kong, there had been no cases in care homes as of 20 May 2020. In Belgium, 19% of all new hospital admissions over a 24-hour period on 18 May 2020 were from care homes. In Ireland, 24% of confirmed cases were in residential community settings, including nursing homes. In France, 52% of confirmed COVID-19 cases were care home residents. At the institutional level, 18% of care homes in Sweden were reported to have experienced outbreaks and care home residents accounted for 14% of all confirmed cases as of 10 May 2020. In England, 35.7% of care homes were reported to have experienced outbreaks as of 10 May 2020, and in Scotland, 59% of care homes had suspected outbreaks.

Discussion

We report the first findings of a living systematic review of the spread of COVID-19 and outcomes in long-term care settings. Our findings based on review of official figures as well as 27 primary studies can be summarised as follows. First, official figures from 19 countries showed variation in the number of COVID-19 related deaths among long-term care users, but overall indicating that, in countries with large number of deaths, a high share of deaths (up to 80% in Canada) is concentrated in this group. Excess risk of severe outcomes for long-term care users after contracting COVID-19 was also found in several of the primary studies included in this systematic review, including increased risk of death, although not all studies accounted for case mix, and other studies did not find increased risk for long-term care users. Second, primary studies, which mostly focused on outbreaks in individual long-term care institutions, showed substantial variation in how widely the disease spread among both residents and staff (ranging from none up to around two thirds of the LTC facility population), and how many residents died as a result of COVID-19 entering a facility (up to one tenth of all residents may die within a short time span). While it is currently unclear what is driving the variation in spread of disease and outcomes, some outbreaks have been contained successfully, suggesting that future research should explore the source of this variation to provide urgently needed evidence to better manage COVID-19 in long-term care. No studies on people who use long-term care services while living in the community were found. Third, a substantial proportion of cases detected during systematic screening of residents (as many as 75%) and staff (up to 100%, although case numbers were very low) of long-term care facilities were asymptomatic at the time of testing, casting doubts over the appropriateness of symptoms-based strategies in this setting. Finally, reporting standards of included studies were variable and often poor, highlighting the need to harmonise research practices and reporting standards in this body of fast-evolving literature.

Impact of COVID-19 on the long-term care sector

The findings of this systematic review underline the urgent need for decisive policy action to tackle the COVID-19 pandemic in the long-term care sector. The combination of older, chronically multimorbid people, living in close proximity to each other has contributed to this population being particularly vulnerable to the COVID-19 pandemic. This vulnerability has been mirrored in official figures which show that deaths in long-term care users now make up more than 50% of all COVID-19 related deaths in at least 5 countries, and more than 30% in 16 of 19

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.09.20125237; this version posted June 9, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

countries reporting relevant data. Emerging evidence summarised in this review also shows potentially excessive risk of severe outcomes, including a higher risk of death, among long-term care residents compared to non-long-term care residents of similar age. While official deaths data for care homes in most country only includes people who either tested positive or had COVID-19 mentioned in the death certificate, data from England and Wales shows that the number of excess deaths of care home residents during the pandemic (compared to the number of deaths in the same period in previous year) was almost double the number of deaths that had been registered as being linked to COVID-19.[10] This suggests that current official estimates of the mortality impact of COVID-19 in care homes in most countries may underestimate the full impact of the pandemic, be it because of lack of attribution of deaths to COVID, or because of other indirect effects such as reduced access to usual health care for non-COVID conditions.

This evidence highlights the need to develop targeted policies to both prevent outbreaks in long-term care settings, and to manage them effectively once they occur. In many countries, long-term care was not a priority in the early stages of the pandemic. In the UK, whilst policymakers had been aware of this risk early on in the pandemic,[46] inadequacies in the testing strategy and a focus on ensuring bed capacity in the secondary care sector is likely to have undermined mitigation of the spread in care homes. Until 16 April 2020, seven days after the peak in daily deaths, it was still possible for UK hospitals to send residents back to their care homes without having to test them for COVID-19.[47]

However, policymakers are increasingly aware of the scale of the problem in long-term care and starting to develop responses. For example, the WHO European Region Office has developed a list of 10 policy objectives to tackle COVID-19 in long-term care, starting with the maintenance of long-term care services during the pandemic.[48] Individual countries have developed their own set of policy responses, including implementing national task forces to coordinate responses in long-term care, the use of disease surveillance tools to monitor outbreaks in care homes and deployment of rapid response teams to manage them, reducing occupancy in care homes, and policies to increase the number of available staff.[49] Other responses were aimed at preventing the disease entering care homes, including isolation of care home residents, restrictions or banning of visits, measures to reduce the risk of disease spreading through staff, and quarantining of residents discharged from hospital upon re-entering the care home. Importantly, as the pandemic continues over a prolonged period, attention will need to be paid to ensure continuing care and maintaining the health and wellbeing of both long-term care users and providers.

Variation in infection rates and outcomes across countries and individual facilities

This review has shown considerable variation in the number of long-term care users and staff who contract the disease after an outbreak in a facility. In some cases, more than half of the resident population was infected. In other cases, outbreaks were contained to low case numbers or even preventing a single case among residents. Included studies were not designed to test the effectiveness of different strategies to prevent or contain outbreaks, leaving open questions about the factors driving the observed variation. Possible explanations for comparatively low infection rates in individual outbreaks include decisive action to isolate potentially infected staff

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.09.20125237; this version posted June 9, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

members and removing confirmed cases from the facility,[36] cohorting of infected residents,[28,31] weekly serial facility-wide testing,[28] as well as hygiene measures and comparatively spacious and more spread-out residents in an assisted living facility (compared to a nursing home).[41] We aim to examine these factors in more detail in a living systematic review of COVID-19 interventions in long-term care parallel to this one. In addition to evaluating the effectiveness of different strategies in containing outbreaks, their impact on the wellbeing of long-term care users and staff should be assessed.

It will be important to design such studies with scientific rigour in order to provide meaningful and generalisable evidence to guide decision making. The case of experimental administration of post-exposure prophylaxis hydroxychloroquine for patients and staff at a long-term care facility in South Korea highlights the need for methodologically robust studies. In the South Korean example, lack of a control group made it impossible to attribute the success in containing the outbreak (no patient and only one staff member other than the index case were infected over a 2-week period) to post-exposure prophylaxis.[36] In the meantime, a randomised controlled trial was published and showed no efficacy of hydroxychloroquine prophylaxis after exposure to COVID-19,[50] making it appear more likely that strict isolation measures put in place at the South Korean facility contributed to containing the virus.

A strategy that has increasingly attracted attention is systematic screening of residents and staff at affected facilities. Our review underlines the importance of diagnostic testing as compared to symptoms-based screening. Several included studies reported the number of cases detected through RT-PCR testing who were asymptomatic at the time. Due to the range in the number of COVID-19 cases in these studies (4-154) it was difficult to infer a reliable proportion of those residents that were asymptomatic and yet were found to be COVID-19 positive on RT-PCR testing, but included studies suggest that this could be a substantial minority of cases, or even the majority of infected residents (range of asymptomatic cases among residents at time of testing, 7-75%). For care home staff, the small numbers and sampling methods of COVID-19 cases made it impossible to make robust inferences about the numbers of asymptomatic employees. Further information about this would warrant a more systematic testing strategy across all care home workers and residents. Indeed, such nationwide comprehensive testing of the care home population including staff is being conducted in Belgium, showing that 74% of cases among residents and 76% of cases among staff were asymptomatic at the time of testing.[51]

Some of the included studies also highlighted that asymptomatic cases may develop symptoms within a period of about one week.[11,23,28] Future studies should plan to follow up identified cases to better understand symptoms and apply a more robust definition of what constitutes symptomatic. Whilst there is seemingly broad agreement with regards to respiratory symptoms, 2 studies did not consider gastrointestinal symptoms (anorexia, diarrhoea, abdominal pain, vomiting) within their definition of symptomatic. Consensus may also be needed on a definition of fever; it was interesting to note that 2 of the included studies in this review defined fever at 37.3 and 37.8, respectively.[23,38]

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.09.20125237; this version posted June 9, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Improvements to reporting of outbreaks

Lack of common standards in the reporting of outcomes has long been recognised as a major challenge for synthesising research findings.[52] In this systematic review, substantial differences across the included set of studies precluded a quantitative synthesis of results. Studies differed in how testing was conducted (comprehensive testing vs. convenience samples; varying time periods over which outcomes data was collected, including infections). We were also unable to ascertain the homogeneity of different populations due to a lack of reporting of their characteristics. For example, some of the outbreak investigation reports failed to report characteristics of long-term care residents, such as mean age, sex distribution, and comorbidities. In other studies, it was sometimes unclear whether all long-term care users or staff in the sample frame had been tested, and how testing was conducted. These limitations highlight the need to establish minimum reporting standards for future studies evaluating Covid-19 related mortality and spread of disease in LTC settings.

Limitations

This living review had some limitations. First, we extracted the number of COVID cases as defined by study authors when there was no specific confirmatory diagnostic test mentioned in the study, which may have overestimated the number of confirmed COVID cases. Second, official mortality figures share the limitations of the underlying data sources. Although evaluating the accuracy and completeness of these sources was beyond the scope of this review, these figures currently represent the most comprehensive source of mortality data in LTCs. Third, we report the proportion of long-term care users who were hospitalised due to COVID-19 but this is not necessarily an indicator for severity of disease, as it is likely to partially reflect differences in policies for transferring patients to acute care hospitals. Fourth, we deviated from our protocol due to the unanticipated large volume of research identified in this area. Instead of completing all review steps in double, one reviewer was responsible for study inclusion and data extraction. However, we implemented broad eligibility criteria in order to ensure no relevant studies were missed, and all studies deemed eligible for inclusion were reviewed by the same reviewer to ensure consistency.

Conclusions

Long-term care users are particularly vulnerable during the COVID-19 pandemic, accounting for a large proportion of deaths. Outbreak reports from individual long-term care facilities have shown wide variation in the spread of disease and outcomes among residents and staff. Further research into the factors determining successful prevention and containment of COVID-19 outbreaks in long-term care is needed, including for institutional and community-based services.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.09.20125237; this version posted June 9, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

References

[1] COVID-19 Dashboard by the Center for Systems Science and Engineering (CSSE) at Johns Hopkins University. https://coronavirus.jhu.edu/map.html. Last accessed 7 June 2020.

[2] Barnett ML, Grabowski DC. Nursing Homes Are Ground Zero for COVID-19 Pandemic. *JAMA Heal Forum*. 2020;1(3):e200369-e200369. doi:10.1001/JAMAHEALTHFORUM.2020.0369

[3] Jordan RE, Adab P, Cheng KK. Covid-19: Risk factors for severe disease and death. *BMJ*. 2020;368. doi:10.1136/bmj.m1198

[4] Onder G, Rezza G, Brusaferro S. Case-Fatality Rate and Characteristics of Patients Dying in Relation to COVID-19 in Italy. *JAMA*. 2020;323(18):1775-1776. doi:10.1001/jama.2020.4683

[5] Wu Z, McGoogan JM. Characteristics of and Important Lessons from the Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) Outbreak in China: Summary of a Report of 72314 Cases from the Chinese Center for Disease Control and Prevention. *JAMA*. 2020;323(13):1239-1242. doi:10.1001/jama.2020.2648

[6] Cummings MJ, Baldwin MR, Abrams D, et al. Epidemiology, clinical course, and outcomes of critically ill adults with COVID-19 in New York City: a prospective cohort study. *Lancet*. 2020;395(10239):1763-1770. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(20)31189-2

[7] Bhatraju PK, Ghassemieh BJ, Nichols M, et al. Covid-19 in Critically Ill Patients in the Seattle Region — Case Series. *N Engl J Med*. 2020;382(21):2012-2022. doi:10.1056/nejmoa2004500

[8] Banerjee A, Pasea L, Harris S, et al. Estimating excess 1-year mortality associated with the COVID-19 pandemic according to underlying conditions and age: a population-based cohort study. *Lancet*. 2020;395(10238):1715-1725. doi:10.1016/s0140-6736(20)30854-0

[9] de Lusignan S, Dorward J, Correa A, et al. Risk factors for SARS-CoV-2 among patients in the Oxford Royal College of General Practitioners Research and Surveillance Centre primary care network: a cross-sectional study. *Lancet Infect Dis*. 2020;0(0). doi:10.1016/s1473-3099(20)30371-6

[10] Comas-Herrera A, Zalakain J. *Mortality Associated with COVID-19 Outbreaks in Care Homes : Early International Evidence*; 2020. LTCcovid.org.

[11] McMichael TM, Currie DW, Clark S, et al. Epidemiology of Covid-19 in a Long-Term Care Facility in King County, Washington. *N Engl J Med*. 2020;382(21):2005-2011. doi:10.1056/NEJMoa2005412

[12] Roxby AC, Greninger AL, Hatfield KM, et al. Detection of SARS-CoV-2 Among Residents and Staff Members of an Independent and Assisted Living Community for Older Adults — Seattle, Washington, 2020. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep*. 2020;69(14):416-418. doi:10.15585/mmwr.mm6914e2

[13] Kimball A, Hatfield KM, Arons M, et al. Asymptomatic and Presymptomatic SARS-CoV-2 Infections in Residents of a Long-Term Care Skilled Nursing Facility — King County, Washington, March 2020. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep*. 2020;69(13):377-381. doi:10.15585/mmwr.mm6913e1

[14] Comas-Herrera A, Fernandez J-L, Hancock R, et al. COVID-19: Implications for the Support of People with Social Care Needs in England. *J Aging Soc Policy*. June 2020:1-8. doi:10.1080/08959420.2020.1759759

[15] Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, Altman DG, The PRISMA Group. Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses: The PRISMA Statement. *PLoS Med*. 2009;6(6): e1000097. doi:10.1371/journal.pmed1000097

[16] Ket J, Otten R, Van Dusseldorp I. Coronavirus 2019 (COVID-19) (COVID-19 SARS MERS) - bmi-online search blocks. https://blocks.bmi-online.nl/catalog/397. Accessed April 17, 2020.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.09.20125237; this version posted June 9, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

[17] The Cochrane Collaboration. About COVID-19 Study Register: Preliminary Search Strategies for the initial phase. https://community.cochrane.org/about-covid-19-study-register. Published 2020. Accessed April 22, 2020.

[18] Munn Z, Moola S, Lisy K, Riitano D, Tufanaru C. *Chapter 5: Systematic Reviews of Prevalence and Incidence. Joanna Briggs Institute Reviewer's Manual.*; 2017. https://wiki.joannabriggs.org/display/MANUAL/Chapter+5%3A+Systematic+reviews+of+prevalence+and+incidence. Accessed April 16, 2020.

[19] Munn Z, MClinSc SM, Lisy K, Riitano D, Tufanaru C. Methodological guidance for systematic reviews of observational epidemiological studies reporting prevalence and cumulative incidence data. *Int J Evid Based Healthc*. 2015;13(3):147-153. doi:10.1097/XEB.0000000000000054

[20] Abrams HR, Loomer L, Gandhi A, Grabowski DC. Characteristics of U.S. Nursing Homes with COVID-19 Cases. *J Am Geriatr Soc*. 2020. doi:10.1111/jgs.16661

[21] American Geriatrics Society. American Geriatrics Society (AGS) Policy Brief: COVID-19 and Nursing Homes. *J Am Geriatr Soc*. April 2020. doi:10.1111/jgs.16477

[22] American Geriatrics Society. American Geriatrics Society (AGS) Policy Brief: COVID-19 and Assisted Living Facilities. *J Am Geriatr Soc*. May 2020:jgs.16510. doi:10.1111/jgs.16510

[23] Arons MM, Hatfield KM, Reddy SC, et al. Presymptomatic SARS-CoV-2 Infections and Transmission in a Skilled Nursing Facility. *N Engl J Med*. April 2020:NEJMoa2008457. doi:10.1056/NEJMoa2008457

[24] Baker KF, Hanrath AT, Loeff IS van der, et al. COVID-19 management in a UK NHS Foundation Trust with a High Consequence Infectious Diseases centre a detailed descriptive analysis. *Medrxiv*. 2020. doi:10.1101/2020.05.14.20100834

[25] Cercy SP. Psychiatric Predictors of COVID-19 Outcomes in a Skilled Nursing Facility Cohort. *Medrxiv*. 2020. doi:10.1101/2020.05.23.20099671

[26] Das A, Gopalan SS. Epidemiology of CoVID-19 and predictors of recovery in the Republic of Korea. *medRxiv*. 2020:2020.05.07.20094094. doi:10.1101/2020.05.07.20094094

[27] De Smet R, Mellaerts B, Vandewinckele H, et al. Frailty and mortality in hospitalized older adults with COVID-19: retrospective observational study. *Medrxiv*. 2020. doi:10.1101/2020.05.26.20113480

[28] Dora A V, Winnett A, Jatt LP, et al. Universal and Serial Laboratory Testing for SARS-CoV-2 at a Long-Term Care Skilled Nursing Facility for Veterans - Los Angeles, California, 2020. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep*. 2020;69(21):651-655. doi:10.15585/mmwr.mm6921e1

[29] Fisman D, Lapointe-Shaw L, Bogoch I, McCready J, Tuite A. Failing our Most Vulnerable: COVID-19 and Long-Term Care Facilities in Ontario. *medRxiv*. 2020:2020.04.14.20065557. doi:10.1101/2020.04.14.20065557

[30] Gold JAW, Wong KK, Szablewski CM, et al. Characteristics and Clinical Outcomes of Adult Patients Hospitalized with COVID-19 - Georgia, March 2020. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep*. 2020;69(18):545-550. doi:10.15585/mmwr.mm6918e1

[31] Grabenhorst U, Stiels-Prechtel R, Niemann M, Weckbecker K. COVID-19 in the nursing home: a case report. *MMW-Fortschritte der Medizin*. 2020;162(9):60-62. doi:10.1007/s15006-020-0481-0

[32] Graham NSN, Junghans C, Downes R, et al. SARS-CoV-2 infection, clinical features and outcome of COVID-19 in United Kingdom nursing homes. *medRxiv*. May 2020. doi:10.1101/2020.05.19.20105460

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.09.20125237; this version posted June 9, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

[33] Guery R, Delaye C, Brule N, et al. Limited effectiveness of systematic screening by nasopharyngeal RT-PCR of medicalized nursing home staff after a first case of COVID-19 in a resident. *Médecine Mal Infect*. May 2020. doi:10.1016/j.medmal.2020.04.020

[34] Kemenesi GG, Kornya LL, Toth GE, et al. Nursing homes and the elderly regarding the COVID-19 pandemic: situation report from Hungary. *GeroScience*. May 2020:1-7. doi:10.1007/s11357-020-00195-z

[35] Kim Y, Jiang X. Evolving Transmission Network Dynamics of COVID-19 Cluster Infections in South Korea: a descriptive study. *medRxiv*. 2020. http://medrxiv.org/lookup/doi/10.1101/2020.05.07.20091769.

[36] Lee SH, Son H, Peck KR. Can post-exposure prophylaxis for COVID-19 be considered as an outbreak response strategy in long-term care hospitals? *Int J Antimicrob Agents*. April 2020:105988. doi:10.1016/j.ijantimicag.2020.105988

[37] McMichael TM, Clark S, Pogosjans S, et al. COVID-19 in a long-term care facility - King county, Washington, February 27-March 9, 2020. *Morb Mortal Wkly Rep*. 2020;69(12):339-342. doi:10.15585/MMWR.MM6912E1

[38] Osterdahl M, Lee K, Ni Lochlainn M, et al. Detecting SARS-CoV-2 at Point of Care: Preliminary Data Comparing Loop-Mediated Isothermal Amplification (LAMP) to PCR. *SSRN Electron J*. 2020. doi:10.2139/ssrn.3564906

[39] Palaiodimos L, Kokkinidis DG, Li W, et al. Severe obesity is associated with higher in-hospital mortality in a cohort of patients with COVID-19 in the Bronx, New York. *Metabolism*. 2020:154262. doi:10.1016/j.metabol.2020.154262

[40] Prieto-Alhambra D, Ballo E, Coma-Redon E, et al. Hospitalization and 30-day fatality in 121,263 COVID-19 outpatient cases. *medRxiv*. 2020:2020.05.04.20090050. doi:10.1101/2020.05.04.20090050

[41] Roxby AC, Greninger AL, Hatfield KM, et al. Outbreak Investigation of COVID-19 Among Residents and Staff of an Independent and Assisted Living Community for Older Adults in Seattle, Washington. *JAMA Intern Med*. May 2020. doi:10.1001/jamainternmed.2020.2233

[42] Spiegeleer A De, Bronselaer A, Teo JT, et al. *The Effects of ARBs, ACEIs and Statins on Clinical Outcomes of COVID-19 Infection among Nursing Home Residents*.; 2020. doi:10.1101/2020.05.11.20096347

[43] Stall NM, Farquharson C, Fan-Lun C, et al. A Hospital Partnership with a Nursing Home Experiencing a COVID-19 Outbreak: Description of a Multi-Phase Emergency Response in Toronto, Canada. *J Am Geriatr Soc*. May 2020. doi:10.1111/jgs.16625

[44] Stall NM, Jones A, Brown KA, Rochon PA, Costa AP. For-profit nursing homes and the risk of COVID-19 outbreaks and resident deaths in Ontario, Canada. *Medrxiv*. 2020. doi:10.1101/2020.05.25.20112664

[45] Yanover C, Mizrahi B, Kalkstein N, et al. What factors increase the risk of complications in SARS-CoV-2 positive patients? A cohort study in a nationwide Israeli health organization. *medRxiv*. 2020. http://medrxiv.org/lookup/doi/10.1101/2020.05.07.20091652.

[46] Booth R. Why did so many people die of Covid-19 in the UK's care homes? *The Guardian*. https://www.theguardian.com/society/2020/may/28/why-did-so-many-people-die-of-covid-19-in-the-uks-care-homes. Published May 28, 2020. Accessed June 8, 2020.

[47] Booth R. Why did so many people die of Covid-19 in the UK's care homes? *The Guardian*. https://www.theguardian.com/society/2020/may/28/why-did-so-many-people-die-of-covid-19-in-the-uks-care-homes. Published May 28, 2020. Accessed June 8, 2020.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.09.20125237; this version posted June 9, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

[48] World Health Organization. *Strengthening the Health System Response to COVID-19: Preventing and Managing the COVID-19 Pandemic across Long-Term Care Services in the WHO European Region (May 29, 2020)*. Copenhagen; 2020. http://www.euro.who.int/__data/assets/pdf_file/0004/443605/Tech-guidance-6-COVID19-eng.pdf?ua=1. Accessed June 8, 2020.

[49] Comas-Herrera A, Ashcroft EC, Lorenz-Dant K, Ashcroft EC. *International Examples of Measures to Prevent and Manage COVID-19 Outbreaks in Residential Care and Nursing Home Settings*. 2020.

[50] Boulware DR, Pullen MF, Bangdiwala AS, et al. A Randomized Trial of Hydroxychloroquine as Postexposure Prophylaxis for Covid-19. *N Engl J Med*. June 2020:NEJMoa2016638. doi:10.1056/NEJMoa2016638

[51] Sciensano. *COVID-19-BULLETIN EPIDEMIOLOGIQUE DU 25 MAI 2020.*; 2020. https://epistat.wiv-isp.be/covid. Accessed June 8, 2020.

[52] Williamson P, Altman D, Blazeby J, Clarke M, Gargon E. Driving up the Quality and Relevance of Research Through the Use of Agreed Core Outcomes. *J Health Serv Res Policy*. 2012;17(1):1-2. doi:10.1258/jhsrp.2011.011131

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.09.20125237; this version posted June 9, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Figures and Tables

Figure 1: Flow chart for selection of included primary studies



medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.09.20125237; this version posted June 9, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Figure 2: Total number of COVID-19 related deaths among long-term care residents and proportion of all COVID-19 related deaths in 19 countries



Source: Official figures of COVID-19 related deaths, as summarised in Comas-Herrera & Zalakain (2020). Reproduced with permission from authors.

Table 1: Overview of included primary studies

Study	Location	Number of study participants	Care home type	Study overview	Critical appraisal *
Abrams 2020[20]	United States (nationwide)	N/A	Nursing homes	Survey of US nursing homes to identify those with at least one documented COVID-19 case and association study of nursing home characteristics with outbreaks.	Not applicable
AGS ALF 2020[21]	United States (Colorado)	46 LTC users 25 LTC staff	Assisted living facility	Recommendations by American Geriatrics Society, containing a brief report on number of cases in an assisted living facility in Colorado, US.	☐☐☐☐☐ ☐☐☐■
AGS NH 2020[22]	United States (Massachusetts)	98 LTC users	Nursing home (no further details)	Recommendations by American Geriatrics Society, containing a brief report on number of cases in a nursing home in Massachusetts, US.	☐☐☐☐☐ ☐☐☐■
Arons 2020[23] & Kimball 2020[13]	United States (King County, Washington)	76 LTC users 138 LTC staff	Skilled nursing facility	Report by the US CDC and local public health body on an outbreak investigation in a skilled nursing facility in King County, Washington, US. Systematic testing and symptom assessment, including two point-prevalence studies and post-mortem assessment, were conducted.	☑☑☑☑☑ ☑☑■■ †
Baker 2020[24]	United Kingdom (Newcastle)	60 LTC users	Nursing and residential homes	Pre-print of a cohort study of 316 consecutive adult patients with SARS-CoV-2 PCR-confirmed COVID-19 admitted to a hospital in Newcastle, England, from 8 January to 16 April 2020, including 60 from nursing and residential homes.	☑☑☑☑☑ ☑☐☐■
Bhatraju 2020[7]	United States (Seattle, Washington)	6 LTC users	Skilled nursing facilities	Case series of all confirmed COVID-19 patients admitted to the ICU of nine hospitals in the Seattle area, from 24 February to 9 March, including 6/24 patients who were admitted from skilled nursing facilities. Patients were followed up for at least 14 days.	☑☑☑☑☑ ☑☑■■
Cercy 2020[25]	United States (New York)	141 LTC users	Skilled nursing facility	Pre-print of a cohort study of residents in a Veteran Affairs skilled nursing facility.	☑☑☑☑☑ ☐☐☐☐
Das 2020[26]	South Korea (nationwide)	N/A	Nursing homes (no further details)	Pre-print of a cohort study of all confirmed COVID-19 cases in South Korea from 20 January to 30 April 2020, including 46 cases who were exposed at nursing homes.	Not applicable

				No information was available about whether these cases were residents or staff.	
De Smet 2020[27]	Belgium (Bornheiden)	42 LTC users	Long-term care residents (no further details)	Pre-print of a cohort study of hospitalised COVID-19 patients at the geriatrics department of a Belgian hospital.	☑ ☑ ☑ ☑ ☑ ☑ ☐ ☐ ☐
De Spiegeleer 2020[42]	Belgium (not specified)	154 LTC users	Nursing homes (no further details)	Pre-print of a retrospective cohort study of the association of the use of different drugs and COVID-19 outcomes among residents of 2 Belgian nursing homes.	☑ ☑ ☑ ☑ ☑ ☑ ☑ ☐ ☐
Dora 2020[28]	United States (Los Angeles)	99 LTC users 136 LTC staff	Skilled nursing facility	Outbreak investigation at a skilled nursing facility in Los Angeles, US, with serial (approximately weekly) testing of all residents, and testing of all staff.	☑ ☑ ☑ ☑ ☑ ☑ ☐ ■ ■
Fisman 2020[29] (overlapping data with Stall 2020a, which has longer follow-up)	Canada (Ontario)	79,498 LTC users	Long-term care facilities (no further details)	Pre-print of a cross-sectional study analysing an outbreak database created by Ontario Ministry of Health and LTC. Number of long-term care beds was assumed to represent all LTC users in Ontario.	☑ ☑ ☑ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
Gold 2020[30]	United States (Georgia)	20 LTC users	Not specified	Cohort study of all COVID-19 positive patients admitted to hospitals in Atlanta and southern Georgia, including 20 from long-term care settings.	☑ ☑ ☑ ☑ ☑ ☑ ☑ ☐ ☐
Grabenhorst 2020[31] (including follow-up data obtained from author)	Germany (North Rhine-Westphalia)	122 LTC users 122 LTC staff	Nursing home	Case report of an outbreak and response at a nursing home in Germany. All residents and staff were tested.	☑ ☑ ☑ ☑ ☑ ☑ ☑ ■ ■
Graham 2020[32]	United Kingdom (London)	313 LTC users 73 LTC staff	Nursing homes	Outbreak investigation at 4 care homes in London, UK. Two point-prevalence surveys (7 days apart), documentation of symptoms, and review of death certificates were conducted. All residents were tested, and a representative sample of asymptomatic staff.	☑ ☑ ☑ ☑ ☑ ☑ ☑ ☐ ☐ †
Guery 2020[33]	France (Nantes)	136 LTC staff	Nursing home	Research letter describing a cross-sectional study of an outbreak in a French nursing home, including systematic testing of all staff members.	☑ ☑ ☑ ☑ ☑ ☑ ☑ ☐ ☐

Kemenesi 2020[34]	Hungary (nationwide)	198 LTC users	Nursing homes (no further details)	Viral genomic analysis of COVID-19 cases that were centrally recorded. No specific analysis was done for LTC residents, except for reporting the proportion of cases from social homes (all from nursing homes). Network analysis of each case was performed.	☑ ☑ ☑ ☑ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
Kim & Jiang 2020[35]	South Korea (nationwide)	N/A	2 nursing homes, 1 psychiatric hospital	Pre-print of a network study using contact tracing data from the South Korean Center for Disease Controls and Prevention to identify and describe clusters, including 3 clusters in LTC settings.	Not applicable
Lee 2020[36]	South Korea (Busan)	193 LTC users 123 LTC staff	Long-term care hospital	Cohort study of residents and staff of a long-term care hospital. After a care worker was diagnosed, residents and staff were tested and received post-exposure hydroxychloroquine prophylaxis.	☑ ☑ ☑ ☑ ☑ ☑ ☑ ■ ■
McMichael 2020 (two reports for the same outbreak)[11,37]	United States (King County, Washington)	101 LTC users 50 LTC staff	Skilled nursing facility	Report by the CDC and local public health body on an outbreak investigation in a skilled nursing facility. After a resident of the facility (at that point already hospitalised) was diagnosed with COVID-19, a response was launched to identify additional cases linked to the outbreak at this facility.	☑ ☑ ☑ ☑ ☑ ☑ ☐ ■ ■
Osterdahl 2020[38]	United Kingdom (no further details)	21 LTC users	High dependency care home (Category 1 Continuing Care)	Pre-print of a report on an outbreak investigation at a care home, including systematic testing of residents. The study authors conducted testing using RT-PCR as well as RT-LAMP to test whether the latter was a reliable and faster alternative to RT-PCR.	☑ ☑ ☑ ☑ ☑ ☑ ☑ ■ ■
Palaiodimos 2020[39]	United States (Bronx, New York)	47 LTC users	Skilled nursing facilities	Retrospective cohort study of the first 200 laboratory confirmed COVID-19 cases admitted to a teaching hospital, including 47 patients from skilled nursing facilities. Patients were followed up for 3 weeks after hospital admission.	☑ ☑ ☑ ☑ ☑ ☐ ☐ ■ ■
Prieto-Alhambra 2020[40]	Spain (Catalonia)	10,795 LTC users	Nursing homes (no further details)	Pre-print of a cohort study of individuals with a positive PCR test and/or a clinical diagnosis for COVID-19 in primary care records in Catalonia, Spain. Data came from a primary care database covering over 80% of the region's	☑ ☑ ☑ ☑ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

				population (representative, according to authors), which was linked to regional hospital and outpatient emergency registries, central database for PCR COVID-19 tests, and the regional mortality registry.	
Roxby 2020[12,41] (two reports for the same outbreak)	United States (King County, Washington)	80 LTC users 62 LTC staff	Independent and assisted living facility	Report by the US CDC and local public health body on an outbreak investigation in an independent and assisted living facility. Systematic testing of all residents and staff.	☑ ☑ ☑ ☑ ☑ ☑ ☐ ■ ■ †
Stall 2020a[44] (three reports with overlapping data, including a case report[43] and a province wide study with shorter follow-up[29])	Canada (Ontario)	N/A	Nursing homes	Pre-print of a cohort study of all 623 nursing homes in Ontario. Study was conducted at the institutional level.	☑ ☑ ☑ ☑ ☑ ☑ ☐ ☐ ☐
Stall 2020b[43] (overlapping data with Stall 2020a, which has data on more nursing homes)	Canada (Ontario)	126 LTC users	Nursing home	Brief description of an outbreak in a nursing home in Toronto, Canada, prior to response initiation to through partnership with an acute care hospital.	☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ■
Yanover 2020[45]	Israel (nationwide)	67 LTC users	Nursing homes (no further details)	Pre-print of a cohort study of all SARS-CoV-2 positive cases in an Israeli health plan representing one quarter of the Israeli population, including 67 nursing home residents.	☑ ☑ ☑ ☑ ☑ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

* Tick marks indicate number of "Yes, appropriate" responses, empty boxes indicate "No, not appropriate" or "Unclear" responses, and black boxes indicate "Not applicable" responses to Joanna Briggs Institute critical appraisal tool for prevalence studies.
† Critical appraisal for LTC users.

Table 2: Incidence of confirmed COVID-19 among long-term care users and staff

Study	Incidence rate	Number of COVID-19 cases	Number of users / staff	Time period	Source population	Diagnosis
Incidence of confirmed COVID-19 among long-term care users						
AGS ALF 2020 (US)	71.7%	33	46	Not reported	No details reported	Positive test (no details)
Cercy 2020 (US)	57.4%	81	141	71 days	All 141 residents at the facility (unclear whether all residents were tested)	PCR
Arons 2020 (US)	63.2%	48	76	7 days	76 out of all 89 residents at the investigated skilled nursing facility	PCR
AGS NH 2020 (US)	51.0%	50	98	Not reported	All residents at the investigated nursing home who were asymptomatic	Positive test (no details)
Osterdahl 2020 (UK)	47.6%	10	21	4 days	21 out of all 24 residents at the investigated nursing home	PCR
Graham 2020 (UK)	40.3%	126	313	7 days	Appr. 94% of all residents at the time of systematic testing (available and consented to testing)	PCR
Stall 2020 (Canada)	19.4%	5218	Not reported	53 days	All residents in nursing homes with outbreaks in Ontario	Confirmed (no details)
Dora 2020 (US)	19.2%	19	99	26 days	All 99 residents at the facility at the time of outbreak	PCR
Grabenhorst 2020 (Germany)	13.1%	16	122	69 days	All 122 residents at the time of systematic testing	PCR
Roxby 2020 (US)	5.0%	4	80	7 days	All residents at the investigated assisted living facility except for 2 index cases	PCR
Lee 2020 (Korea)	0.0%	0	193	20 days	All 193 inpatients at the investigated long-term care hospital who were exposed to an infected care worker	PCR
Incidence of confirmed COVID-19 among long-term care staff						
AGS ALF 2020 (US)	64.0%	16	25	Not reported	No details reported	Positive test (no details)

Arons 2020 (US)	18.8%	26	138	24 days	All 138 full-time staff members at the investigated skilled nursing facility (51 of which were tested)	PCR
Dora 2020 (US)	5.9%	26	138	13 days	All 138 full-time staff members at the investigated skilled nursing facility (51 of which were tested)	PCR
Graham 2020 (UK)	4.1%	3	73	1-2 days	Sample of 11.8% of staff members asymptomatic at the time of testing (representing all staff roles including health care assistants, registered nurses, kitchen staff, administrators, domestic and maintenance staff)	PCR
Grabenhorst 2020 (Germany)	3.3%	4	122	69 days	All 122 staff members at the time of systematic testing (including maintenance personnel)	PCR
Roxby 2020 (US)	3.2%	2	62	2 days	All staff members working at the investigated facility	PCR
Guery 2020 (France)	2.2%	3	136	2 days	All 136 staff members, health workers, and administrative personnel at the investigated nursing home	PCR
Lee 2020 (Korea)	1.5%	2	132	20 days	All 123 staff at the investigated long-term care hospital	PCR

Abbreviations: PCR, polymerase chain reaction

Table 3: Proportion of asymptomatic cases at time of testing

Study	Proportion of asymptomatic cases at time of testing	Asymptomatic cases	COVID-19 cases	Symptoms reported	Source population
Asymptomatic cases among long-term care users					
Roxby 2020 (US)	75%	3	4	Cough in past 14 days; loose bowel movement.	All residents at the investigated assisted living facility except for 2 index cases.
Dora 2020 (US)	74%	14	19	Fever; myalgia; headache; cough; dyspnoea; nausea; emesis; diarrhoea; anorexia.	Source population are all 99 residents at the facility. Asymptomatic cases include presymptomatic ones.
Arons 2020 (US)	56%	27	48	Typical symptoms: fever (37.8); cough' shortness of breath Symptomatic atypical: chills; malaise; increased confusion; rhinorrhoea; nasal congestion; sore throat; myalgia; dizziness; headache; nausea; diarrhoea. Time frame prev. 14 days.	76 out of all 89 residents at the investigated skilled nursing facility.
Graham 2020 (UK)	43%	54	126	Cough or fever in the previous 14 days; confusion; altered behaviour; anorexia; diarrhoea/vomiting; shortness of breath.	Appr. 94% of all residents at the time of systematic testing (available and consented to testing).
De Spiegeleer 2020 (Belgium)	27%	41	154	Cough; dyspnoea; runny nose; sore throat; general weakness; headache; confusion; muscle pain; arthralgia; diarrhoea; abdominal pain; vomiting; fever > 37.6; increased O2 requirement or O2 saturations <= 92%.	All residents at the nursing home with clinical COVID-19 diagnosis or positive PCR test.
Osterdahl 2020 (UK)	20%	2	10	Fevers (>37.3); reduced oxygen saturations.	21 out of all 24 residents at the investigated nursing home. 10 COVID-19 cases identified using PCR, not RT-

					LAMP method where a further 3 were identified.
McMichael (US)	7%	7	101	Cough; fever; dyspnoea.	118 out of all approximately 130 residents at the investigated skilled nursing facility.
Asymptomatic cases among long-term care staff					
Roxby 2020 (US)	100%	2	2	Body aches; cough; headache	All staff working at the investigated assisted living facility.
Graham 2020 (UK)	100%	3	3	Cough or fever in the previous 14 days.	Only asymptomatic staff members were tested. Sample of 11.8% of staff members (representing all staff roles including health care assistants, registered nurses, kitchen staff, administrators, domestic and maintenance staff).
Guery 2020 (France)	67%	2	3	Asthenia; headache; myalgias; rhinitis; dysosmia; altered sense of taste.	All 136 staff members, health workers, and administrative personnel at the investigated nursing home.
Dora 2020 (US)	50%	4	8	Fever, myalgia, headache, cough, dyspnoea, nausea, emesis, diarrhoea, anorexia	All 136 staff members were tested, 8 tested positive.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.09.20125237; this version posted June 9, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Table 4: Case fatality rates among long-term care users and staff

Study	CFR	Number of cases	Time period	Source population	Diagnosis
CFR among long-term care users					
McMichael 2020 (US)	33.7%	101	3 weeks	118 out of all approximately 130 residents at the investigated skilled nursing facility	Confirmed cases (not further specified; PCR testing according to CDC guidelines mentioned)
Stall 2020 (Canada)	27.8%	5218	7.5 weeks	All COVID-19 resident deaths in nursing homes in Ontario	Confirmed cases (not further specified)
Arons 2020 (US)	26.3%	57	3.5 weeks	76 out of all 89 residents at the investigated skilled nursing facility	PCR
Osterdahl 2020 (UK)	20.0%	10	1 week	21 out of all 21 residents at the investigated nursing home	PCR
Cercy 2020 (US)	17.3%	81	10 weeks	All 141 residents at the facility (unclear whether all were tested)	PCR
Graham 2020 (UK)	16.7%	126	2 weeks	Appr. 94% of all residents at the time of systematic testing (available and consented to testing)	PCR
Grabenhorst 2020 (Germany)	12.5%	16	9.5 weeks	All residents at the investigated nursing home	PCR
Dora 2020 (US)	5.3%	19	3.5 weeks	All 99 residents at the facility at the time of outbreak	PCR
Kemenesi 2020 (Hungary)	4.0%	198	6.5 weeks	Unclear	PCR
Roxby 2020 (US)	0.0%	4	3 weeks	All residents at the investigated assisted living facility except for 2 index cases	PCR
CFR among long-term care staff					
McMichael 2020 (US)	0.0%	50	3 weeks	Not reported how many of approximately 170 staff at the investigated skilled nursing facility were tested	Confirmed cases (not further specified; PCR testing according to CDC guidelines mentioned)
Lee 2020 (Korea)	0.0%	2	3 weeks	All 123 staff at the investigated long-term care hospital	PCR

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.09.20125237; this version posted June 9, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Grabenhorst 2020 (Germany)	0.0%	4	9.5 weeks	All staff members at the investigated nursing home (no numbers provided)	PCR

Abbreviations: CDC, United States Centers for Disease Control and Prevention; CFR, case fatality rate; PCR, polymerase chain reaction

Table 5: COVID-19 mortality rates among long-term care users and staff

Study	Mortality rate of all users / staff	Number of users / staff	Number of COVID-19 cases	Number of deaths among COVID-19 cases	Time period	Source population
Mortality rate among long-term care users						
Cercy 2020 (US)	9.9%	141	81	14*	10 weeks	All 141 residents at the facility (unclear whether all were tested)
Osterdahl 2020 (UK)	9.5%	21	10	2*	1 week	21 out of all 24 residents at the investigated nursing home
Graham 2020 (UK)	6.7%	313	126	21	2 weeks	Appr. 94% of all residents at the time of systematic testing (available and consented to testing)
Stall 2020 (Canada)	5.5%	Not reported	5218	1452	7.5 weeks	Residents in nursing homes with outbreaks in Ontario
Grabenhorst 2020 (Germany)	1.6%	122	16	2	9.5 weeks	All 122 residents at the nursing home at the time of systematic testing
Dora 2020 (US)	1.0%	99	19	1	3.5 weeks	All 99 residents at the facility at the time of outbreak
Lee 2020 (Korea)	0.0%	193	0	0	3 weeks	All 193 inpatients at the investigated long-term care hospital who were exposed to an infected care worker
Roxby 2020 (US)	0.0%	80	4	0	3 weeks	All residents at the investigated assisted living facility except for 2 index cases
Mortality rate among care home staff						
Lee 2020 (Korea)	0.0%	123	2	0	3 weeks	All 123 staff at the investigated long-term care hospital
Grabenhorst 2020 (Germany)	0.0%	122	4	0	9.5 weeks	All 122 staff at the nursing home at the time of systematic testing

* Deaths caused by COVID-19 only. In both studies, there was one further death among COVID-19 cases, but this was ascribed to a different cause.

Table 6: Incidence of hospitalisations among long-term care users and staff with COVID-19 diagnosis

Study	Incidence rate of hospitalisations	Number of COVID-19 cases	Time period	Source population
Hospitalisations among long-term care users				
McMichael 2020 (US)	54.5%	101	3 weeks	All residents at the investigated skilled nursing facility who were confirmed cases (not further specified; PCR testing according to CDC guidelines mentioned)
Yanover 2020 (Israel)	34.4%	67	Not reported	Patients covered by Israeli health plan who had a SARS-CoV-2 positive PCR test and who were nursing home residents
Cercy 2020 (US)	26.6%	81	10 weeks	All residents at the facility with a positive PCR test
De Spiegeleer 2020 (Belgium)	24.0%	154	6.5 weeks	All residents at the nursing home with clinical COVID-19 diagnosis or positive PCR test
Arons 2020 (US)	19.3%	48	3.5 weeks	All residents at the investigated skilled nursing facility with a positive PCR test
Prieto-Alhambra 2020 (Spain)	16.1%	10795	4 weeks	All patients included in a Catalan primary care database who are nursing home residents and have a clinical COVID-19 diagnosis or positive PCR test
Grabenhorst 2020 (Germany)	12.5%	16	9.5 weeks	All residents with a positive PCR test, identified through systematic testing of all residents
Roxby 2020 (US)	0.0%	4	3 weeks	All residents at the investigated assisted living facility with a positive PCR test except for 2 index cases
Hospitalisations among long-term care staff				
McMichael 2020 (US)	6.0%	50	3 weeks	All health care personnel at the investigated skilled nursing facility who were confirmed cases (not further specified; PCR testing according to CDC guidelines mentioned)
Arons 2020 (US)	0.0%	26	3.5 weeks	All full-time staff members at the investigated skilled nursing facility with a positive PCR test

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.09.20125237; this version posted June 9, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .