Covid-19 infection and attributable mortality in UK Long Term Care Facilities: Cohort study using active surveillance and electronic records (March-June 2020)

Peter Dutey Magni,[1,2] Haydn Williams,[3] Arnoupe Jhass,[4] Greta Rait,[4] Fabiana Lorencatto,[5] Harry Hemingway,[1,2,6] Andrew Hayward,[7] Laura Shallcross[1,2*]

[1] Institute of Health Informatics, University College London, London, UK

[2] Health Data Research UK, University College London, London, UK

[3] Four Seasons Health Care Group, Norcliffe House, Station Road, Wilmslow, Cheshire, UK

[4] Primary Care & Population Health, University College London, London, UK

[5] Centre for Behaviour Change, University College London, London, UK

[6] University College London Hospitals NIHR Biomedical Research Centre, London, UK

[7] Institute of Epidemiology & Health Care, University College London, London, UK

* Corresponding author

Abstract

Background Rates of Covid-19 infection have declined in many countries, but outbreaks persist in residents of long-term care facilities (LTCFs) who are at high risk of severe outcomes. Epidemiological data from LTCFs are scarce. We used population-level active surveillance to estimate incidence of, and risk factors for Covid-19, and attributable mortality in elderly residents of LTCFs.

Methods: Cohort study using individual-level electronic health records from 8,713 residents and daily counts of infection for 9,339 residents and 11,604 staff across 179 UK LTCFs. We modelled risk factors for infection and mortality using Cox proportional hazards and estimated attributable fractions.

Findings: 2,075/9,339 residents developed Covid-19 symptoms (22·2% [95% confidence interval: 21·4%; 23·1%]), while 951 residents (10·2% [9·6%; 10·8%]) and 585 staff (5·0% [4·7%; 5·5%]) had laboratory confirmed infections. Confirmed infection incidence in residents and staff respectively was 152·6 [143·1; 162·6] and 62·3 [57·3; 67·5] per 100,000 person-days. 121/179 (67·6%) LTCFs had at least one Covid-19 infection or death. Lower staffing ratios and higher occupancy rates were independent risk factors for infection.

1,694 all-cause deaths occurred in 8,713 (19·4% [18·6%; 20·3%]) residents. 217 deaths occurred in 607 residents with confirmed infection (case-fatality rate: 35·7% [31·9%; 39·7%]). 567/1694 (33·5%) of all-cause deaths were attributable to Covid-19, 28·0% of which occurred in residents with laboratory-confirmed infection. The remainder of excess deaths occurred in asymptomatic or symptomatic residents in the context of limited testing for infection, suggesting substantial under-ascertainment.

Interpretation: 1 in 5 residents had symptoms of infection during the pandemic, but many cases were not tested. Higher occupancy and lower staffing levels increase infection risk. Disease control measures should integrate active surveillance and testing with fundamental changes in staffing and care home occupancy to protect staff and residents from infection.

Funding: Economic and Social Research Council [ES/V003887/1].

Background

Globally the number of Covid-19 cases continues to increase, but cases in Europe have declined since April 2020,[1] following the introduction of lockdown measures.[2] Although the incidence of infection in the general population in England is low (0.04%),[3] new infections persist, with substantially higher rates of infection reported in both long-term care facilities (LTCFs) and hospitals.[4] This raises the possibility that these settings represent a reservoir for transmission of infection back to the community.

In the UK, there are an estimated 400,000 residents living in approximately 11,000 LTCFs for the elderly.[5] Residents of LTCFs are particularly vulnerable to Covid-19 due to their advanced age and high prevalence of comorbidity,[6] and their frequent exposure to infection through close contact with staff members, other residents and contaminated surfaces in the care facility. At the peak of the pandemic, the number of deaths in residents of LTCFs was three-fold higher than the equivalent period in in 2019.[7] Staff in LTCFs also have higher aged-standardised rates of Covid-19 related mortality compared to other occupations.[8] National statistics suggests two-thirds of excess deaths recorded in residents of LTCFs in the last 6 months involved Covid-19,[7] but this is likely to be an underestimate because many residents were not tested. Understanding the proportion of excess deaths that can be directly and indirectly attributed to Covid-19 infection is important, to fully assess the impact of the pandemic on LTCFs.

The development of public health strategies to protect the public, residents and staff from Covid-19 requires knowledge of the burden of and risk factors for infection in residents and staff in LTCFs, linked to outcomes. However, there is no syndromic surveillance for infection in LTCFs in England, and widespread one-off testing for SARS-CoV-2 using reverse transcriptase polymerase chain reaction (RT-PCR) was not established for staff and residents in LTCFs until 11 May 2020.[9] Prior to this, testing was only available for residents or staff who were admitted to hospital, or as part of Public Health England's (PHE) outbreak investigations which permitted a maximum of five tests per LTCF. Consequently national estimates of incidence and prevalence will substantially underestimate the burden of infection in residents and staff in LTCFs.

74 In the absence of cohort studies or active surveillance, outbreak investigations provide the
75 most reliable estimates of the burden of infection and case-fatality.[10,11] An estimated 44% of
76 English LTCFs have had at least one outbreak, with a living systematic review[12] reporting
77 substantial variation in cumulative incidence of infection (0%-72%) and case fatality (0-34%)
78 in residents of LTCFs. A major limitation of outbreak investigations is that follow-up is usually
79 less than 30 days,[12] and investigations are only conducted in settings in which outbreaks have
80 been detected. Understanding the proportion of LTCFs with undetected cases is crucial for
81 policy decisions around the frequency of and justification for regular testing in this setting.

82 To our knowledge, there are no studies which have employed population-level active
83 surveillance in LTCFs throughout this pandemic to measure outcomes of both suspected and
84 confirmed infection in residents and staff. We analysed electronic health records from the Four
85 Seasons Health Care Group, one of the UK's largest independent provider of residential and
86 nursing care, with the aim of identifying strategies to protect staff and residents in LTCFs from
87 future waves of infection. Our objectives were to estimate incidence of and risk factors for
88 infection, and incidence of mortality in the following groups: (A) residents with no evidence of
89 infection; (B) symptomatic residents; (C) asymptomatic residents with confirmed infection; and
90 (D) symptomatic residents with confirmed infection. We also estimated mortality attributable
91 to Covid-19.

92 Methods

93 Study population and setting

94 Staff or residents living and working in LTCFs for the elderly between 2 March and 14 June
95 2020, which were run by the Four Seasons Healthcare Group (FSHCG) were eligible for study
96 inclusion. The FSHCG provides a combination of residential and nursing care (for residents
97 with medical conditions), which is primarily state funded. Most residents are permanent, but a
98 small proportion receive temporary (respite) care.

99 In 2020, there were 9,568 beds, representing 9% of all beds in England, Scotland and Northern
100 Ireland (supplementary material 1). 90% of FSHCG LTCFs participated in the whole care home
101 testing programme, implying that all staff and residents were tested for Covid-19 at least once
102 between 11 May and 22 June 2020.

103 **Data sources**

104 Electronic record datasets collected by the FSHCG are primarily used for billing and monitoring
105 care quality, but have also been used in research.[13]

106 *Individual-level data*

107 FSHCG collects electronic health record data on all their residents except those occupying beds
108 that are 'block contracted' to the local authority (855 beds). The dataset includes: dates of
109 entry and exit to the LTCF, sex, date of birth, type of stay (residential/nursing) and care (general,
110 dementia, elderly). Individual-level data on incidents including infections are also reported via
111 'Datix' which records the residents name, LTCF identifier, incident date/time, date of birth, sex,
112 Covid-19 symptoms, tests and test results, resident current location (LTCF/hospital), and death.
113 Information in Datix was used categorise residents' infection status into four groups: (A)
114 residents with no evidence of infection (not tested and/or no symptoms); (B) symptomatic
115 residents (symptoms and not tested or tested negative); (C) asymptomatic residents with
116 confirmed infection (no symptoms but tested positive); and (D) symptomatic residents with
117 confirmed infection (symptoms and tested positive) (supplementary material 1). The term
118 'confirmed' denoted a positive PCR test. Datix was also used to differentiate deaths in-hospital
119 from those in the LTCF, and to identify Covid-19 related deaths. Individual level data on
120 residents was linked to Datix reports (supplementary material 2). 1492/1880 (79%) of Datix
121 reports were successfully linked. Individual-level records were available between 2 March and
122 14 June 2020.

123 *Aggregate data*

124 On 24 March a new system was introduced to report Covid-19 cases and deaths. This required
125 managers of each LTCF to report daily tallies in residents (new symptomatic cases, new
126 confirmed infection in facility, new confirmed infection in hospital, deaths related to Covid-19)
127 and staff (symptomatic cases, new confirmed cases). Data on staff deaths were not extracted
128 due to the small number of cases. Covid-19 related deaths were defined as death in a resident
129 with confirmed infection or a death attributed to Covid-19 by the coroner. The number of
130 occupied beds in each LTCF was reported weekly.

Characteristics of each LTCF (number of beds, region, nursing versus residential care) were collected from organisational data. We therefore extracted organisational data, individual-level data for 8713 residents and aggregate data for all staff and residents (Figure 1).



Note: NI: Northern Ireland; S: Scotland; W: Wales; NE: North East; NW: North West; YTH: Yorkshire and The Humber; EM: East Midlands; WM: West Midlands; EE: East of England; L: London; SE: South East; SW: South West.

Figure 1: Study overview: location of FSHCG LTCF's and diagram of data sources

Risk factors for infection

Risk factors for infection included individual-level variables (age, sex, general or dementia care, residential versus nursing care) and LTCF characteristics (number of beds, occupancy and bed to staff ratio). Baseline LTCF occupancy was computed by averaging weekly occupancy in January-March 2020, before the first Covid-19 case, in order to calculate a ratio of baseline occupancy to the number of bedrooms. We also estimated the ratio of bed to staff as a continuous variable. An outbreak in a LTCF was defined as at least one confirmed infection or Covid-19 related death.

Statistical analysis

Infection in staff and residents in LTCF's

149 Prevalence, incidence and cumulative incidence were calculated for residents and staff using
150 the aggregate daily tallies. These were the trusted source of information used for national
151 reporting of cases, and encompassed all residents and staff.[14] Infection incidence was also
152 estimated from Datix, but was subject to under-reporting (supplementary material 2). In order
153 to calculate infection and death incidence, we estimated the total number of residents in each
154 LTCF by extrapolating estimates of LTCF occupancy from the individual-level dataset (because
155 dates of entry and exit to/from the LTCF were not available for 855 beds, supplementary
156 material 1). Daily occupancy was inferred from the weekly report of bed occupancy using linear
157 interpolation. The total number of residents at risk of infection was unknown, so it was
158 approximated in a multiple decrements life table (supplementary material 1). The life table
159 allowed us to compute Kaplan-Meier product limit estimators of the cumulative incidence of
160 symptoms, confirmed infections, and Covid-19 related deaths by day. The rate ratio for LTCF
161 versus community infections was estimated by contrasting the cumulative incidence for
162 confirmed cases in England with estimates from a national household survey for the period 11
163 May- 7 June 2020.[3,15]

164 *Mortality, attributable mortality and risk factors*

165 Individual-level data were used to estimate rates of infection, all-cause mortality and case-
166 fatality by age and gender in residents. Aggregate data were also used to estimate the crude
167 rate of Covid-19 related mortality. Cox proportional hazards models were used to test the
168 association between individual and organisational-level risk factors and confirmed infection.
169 In order to investigate the relationship between Covid-19 infection and excess mortality, we
170 assumed that residents in non-outbreak LTCFs had not been exposed to infection, and would
171 therefore not experience excess Covid-19 related mortality. We therefore compared all-cause
172 mortality in residents with no evidence of infection (group A) in LTCFs with and without
173 outbreaks.

174 A Cox proportional hazards regression model tested the effect of individual and LTCF-level
175 risk factors on all-cause mortality, alongside the effect of the time-variant infection status
176 (groups A-D) and LTCF outbreak status. We estimated the attributable fraction of deaths for
177 each infection category in LTCF's with and without outbreaks, taking the reference category as
178 individuals with no direct evidence of infection (group A) in non-outbreak LTCFs. This fraction
179 was obtained by using the model to predict the counterfactual mortality, then computing the

180 attributable fraction within study.[16] Ninety-five percent confidence intervals for proportions
181 and rates were computed from the exact Poisson and binomial limits.

182 Data were analysed in R3·5·0 using the epitool[17] and survival[18] libraries. All computer syntax is
183 available on an online repository.[19]

184 **Research ethics**

185 This study was approved by the University College London Research Ethics Committee (project
186 reference 13355/002).

187 **Role of the funding source**

188 The funders of the study had no role in study design, data collection, data analysis, data
189 interpretation or writing of the report. LS and PDM had full access to all the data in the study
190 and LS had final responsibility for the decision to submit for publication.

191 ## Findings

192 **Cases of infection in residents and staff**

193 The study included 9,339 residents across England, Scotland and Northern Ireland and 11,604
194 staff. 121/179 (67·6%) LTCFs, totalling 7,102 residents, recorded at least one Covid-19 outbreak
195 (including unconfirmed outbreaks) in either the individual-level or aggregate datasets. The
196 mean duration of follow-up for residents and staff was 71 days and 82 days respectively in the
197 aggregate dataset. Mean and median duration of resident follow-up was 86 and 105 days
198 respectively in the individual-level dataset.

199 Symptoms of infection were recorded in 2,075 residents based on the aggregate dataset,
200 contributing to an overall cumulative incidence of 22·2% [21·4%; 23·1%] or an incidence rate
201 of 368·0 per 100,000 resident-days [352·3; 384·2] (Table 1). An additional 951 residents had a
202 confirmed infection, of whom 199 were diagnosed in hospital. The cumulative incidence of
203 confirmed infection was 10·2% [9·6%; 10·8%], with an incidence rate of 152·6 per 100,000
204 [143·1; 162·6].

205 Kaplan-Meier estimates of the temporal trend in symptomatic and confirmed cases are shown
206 in Figure 2.

In England, 179 infections were confirmed of a total 194,023 residents-days between 11 May 2020 and 7 June 2020. In comparison, the survey of English community households[3] found a total of 35 confirmed cases out of 483,259 person-days during the same period. This implies a confirmed infection rate ratio comparing LTCFs to the community of 12·7 [8·9; 18·3].

Table 1: Cumulative incidence and rate of SARS-CoV-2 infections in residents according to FSHCG aggregate dataset (2 Mar 2020-14 Jun 2020)

Residents	All LTCFs			Outbreak LTCFs only		
	Symptomatic	Confirmed	COVID-19 related deaths	Symptomatic	Confirmed	COVID-19 related deaths
Cases	2,075	951	526	1,807	951	526
N exposed	9,339	9,339	9,339	7,102	7,102	7,102
Total exposure (days)	563,901	623,161	659,843	383,536	430,133·8	466,813
Cumulative incidence (%)	22·2 [21·4; 23·1]	10·2 [9·6; 10·8]	5·6 [5·2; 6·1]	25·4 [24·4; 26·5]	13·4 [12·6; 14·2]	7·4 [6·8; 8·0]
Incidence rate (per 100,000 person-days)	368·0 [352·3; 384·2]	152·6 [143·1; 162·6]	79·7 [73·0; 86·8]	471·1 [449·7; 493·4]	221·1 [207·3; 235·6]	112·7 [103·3; 122·7]



Note: underlying data available on request from authors.

Figure 2: Kaplan-Meier estimates of the cumulative incidence of symptomatic cases, confirmed infections and COVID-related deaths in (A) residents (n=9,339) and (B) staff (n=11,604) according to FSHCG aggregate data (Mar 2020-Jun 2020)

1,892/11,604 staff (16·3% [15·6%; 17·0%]) reported symptoms of infection during the study period, and 585 (5·0% [4·7%; 5·5%]) had a confirmed infection (Table 2, Figure 2).

Table 2: Cumulative incidence and rate of SARS-CoV-2 infections among staff according to FSHCG manager counts (2 Mar 2020-14 Jun 2020)

Staff	Symptomatic	Confirmed
Cases	1,892	585
N exposed	11,604	11,604
Total exposure (days)	856,323	939,312
Cumulative incidence (%)	16·3 [15·6; 17·0]	5·0 [4·7; 5·5]
Incidence rate (per 100,000 person-days)	220·9 [211·1; 231·1]	62·3 [57·3; 67·5]

Estimates of incidence for private residents derived from Datix are reported in supplementary material 2.

Mortality in residents

526 Covid-related resident deaths were reported in the aggregate dataset, equivalent to a crude incidence of 5·6% [5·2; 6·1] or 79·7 [73·0; 86·8] per 100,000 resident-days. 24·7% of these deaths took place in hospital (Table 1).

Individual-level data were available for 8,713 (93·3%) residents. 68·7% of residents received nursing care, and 39·2% received dementia care (Table 3). 1,694 all-cause deaths occurred in residents of LTCF's, equivalent to a crude cumulative incidence of 19·4% [18·6%; 20·3%]. The proportion of resident deaths was two-fold higher in LTCFs with outbreaks compared to those without outbreaks (22·6% versus 11·2%).

217 deaths occurred in residents with confirmed infection, equivalent to an all-cause case-fatality rate in infected residents (Groups C and D) of 35·7% [31·9%; 39·7%] (Table 4). The case-fatality rate increased with age and was higher in men compared to women.

Table 3: Characteristics of FSHCG residents by type of LTCF, sex, age, region and status on study exit (Mar 2020- Jun 2020)

	Outbreak LTCFs (N=6328)	Other LTCFs (N=2385)	Total (N=8713)
Sex			
Female	4051 (64·0%)	1616 (67·8%)	5667 (65·0%)
Male	2277 (36·0%)	769 (32·2%)	3046 (35·0%)
Age			
<75 years	1069 (16·9%)	355 (14·9%)	1424 (16·3%)
75–84 years	2113 (33·4%)	752 (31·5%)	2865 (32·9%)
85–94 years	2577 (40·7%)	1052 (44·1%)	3629 (41·7%)
95+ years	569 (9·0%)	226 (9·5%)	795 (9·1%)
Resident type			
General/elderly	3799 (60·0%)	1495 (62·7%)	5294 (60·8%)
Dementia	2529 (40·0%)	890 (37·3%)	3419 (39·2%)
Admission type			
Continuing care/ independent living	293 (4·6%)	58 (2·4%)	351 (4·0%)
Permanent	5375 (84·9%)	2065 (86·6%)	7440 (85·4%)
Respite	660 (10·4%)	262 (11·0%)	922 (10·6%)
Funding type			
Residential	1992 (31·5%)	742 (31·1%)	2734 (31·4%)
Nursing	4336 (68·5%)	1643 (68·9%)	5979 (68·6%)
Infection status by 14 June			
A: No evidence of infection	5268 (83·2%)	2274 (95·3%)	7542 (86·6%)
B: Symptomatic not confirmed	453 (7·2%)	111 (4·7%)	564 (6·5%)
C: Asymptomatic confirmed	133 (2·1%)	0 (0·0%)	133 (1·5%)
D: Symptomatic confirmed	474 (7·5%)	0 (0·0%)	474 (5·4%)
Status as of 14 June			
Deceased	1428 (22·6%)	266 (11·2%)	1694 (19·4%)
In LTCF	4558 (72·0%)	2011 (84·3%)	6569 (75·4%)
Permanently Discharged	215 (3·4%)	69 (2·9%)	284 (3·3%)
Temporary Discharged	127 (2·0%)	39 (1·6%)	166 (1·9%)
Region/nation			
East Midlands	333 (5·3%)	285 (11·9%)	618 (7·1%)
East of England	338 (5·3%)	274 (11·5%)	612 (7·0%)
London	619 (9·8%)	0 (0·0%)	619 (7·1%)
North East	821 (13·0%)	197 (8·3%)	1018 (11·7%)
North West	965 (15·2%)	120 (5·0%)	1085 (12·5%)
Northern Ireland	1054 (16·7%)	770 (32·3%)	1824 (20·9%)
Scotland	785 (12·4%)	449 (18·8%)	1234 (14·2%)
South East	567 (9·0%)	26 (1·1%)	593 (6·8%)
South West	171 (2·7%)	71 (3·0%)	242 (2·8%)
West Midlands	105 (1·7%)	127 (5·3%)	232 (2·7%)
Yorkshire and The Humber	570 (9·0%)	66 (2·8%)	636 (7·3%)

Table 4: All-cause case-fatality rates by age and sex among residents (n=8,713; Mar 2020-Jun 2020)

Age	Sex	N	Confirmed infections	Total deaths	Deaths in confirmed infections	Case-fatality rate (%)
<75 years	Female	712	48	87	9	18·8 [8·9; 32·6]
75–84 years	Female	1,687	114	254	31	27·2 [19·3; 36·3]
85–94 years	Female	2,617	173	484	58	33·5 [26·5; 41·1]
95+ years	Female	651	42	171	18	42·9 [27·7; 59·0]
<75 years	Male	712	37	114	12	32·4 [18·0; 49·8]
75–84 years	Male	1,178	96	266	41	42·7 [32·7; 53·2]
85–94 years	Male	1,012	86	277	44	51·2 [40·1; 62·1]
95+ years	Male	144	11	41	4	36·4 [10·9; 69·2]
All	All	8,713	607	1,694	217	35·7 [31·9; 39·7]

Factors associated with confirmed infections in residents

Using individual-level resident data, factors affecting the rate of confirmed cases were investigated in a Cox Proportional Hazard model. Male sex, age ≥85 years, and residence in a nursing LTCF (adjusted HR=1·5 [1·2; 1·8]) were all independently associated with increased risk of confirmed Covid-19 infection (Table 5). Large LTCFs had greater rates of infection (adjusted HR=1.8 [1·4; 2·4] for LTCFs with ≥70 beds versus <35 beds). LTCF baseline occupancy and staffing ratios had the greatest effect on residents' risk of infection. For example, the adjusted hazard ratio for confirmed infection was 2.5 times [1·9; 3·3] greater in LTCFs with 0·85-1 resident per room versus LTCFs with 0·7-0·85 resident per room.

Higher staff to resident ratios were associated with lower risk of infection: a ten percentage point increase in the bed to staff ratio was associated with a 23% increase in infection (adjusted HR=1·23 [1·17; 1·31]).

Table 5: Risk factors for confirmed infection in residents: hazard ratios (HR) from a Cox proportional hazards model (n=8,713)

	Infections	N	HR (univariate)	HR (multivariate)
Gender				
Female	377 (6·7%)	5667	1.00 (reference)	1.00 (reference)
Male	230 (7·6%)	3046	1.24 (1.06-1.47)	1.32 (1.11-1.56)
Age				
<75 years	85 (6·0%)	1424	1.00 (reference)	1.00 (reference)
75–84 years	210 (7·3%)	2865	1.26 (0.98-1.62)	1.32 (1.03-1.71)
85–94 years	259 (7·1%)	3629	1.24 (0.97-1.59)	1.42 (1.10-1.82)
95+ years	53 (6·7%)	795	1.22 (0.86-1.72)	1.43 (1.01-2.03)
Bed type				
Residential	154 (5·6%)	2734	1.00 (reference)	1.00 (reference)
Nursing	453 (7·6%)	5979	1.38 (1.15-1.66)	1.40 (1.15-1.70)
Care type				
General/elderly	374 (7·1%)	5294	1.00 (reference)	1.00 (reference)
Dementia	233 (6·8%)	3419	0.95 (0.80-1.12)	0.90 (0.76-1.06)
Total beds				
20–34 beds	106 (5·0%)	2129	1.00 (reference)	1.00 (reference)
45–59 beds	341 (7·5%)	4544	1.51 (1.21-1.88)	1.59 (1.27-1.99)
70–84 beds	160 (7·8%)	2040	1.63 (1.28-2.09)	1.87 (1.44-2.43)
Bed:staff ratio				
Mean (SD)		0.9 (0.2)	1.65 (1.09-2.48)	8.22 (4.62-14.63)
Occupants: bedrooms ratio				
(0·7,0·85]	62 (4·0%)	1549	1.00 (reference)	1.00 (reference)
(0·25,0·4]	5 (7·1%)	70	1.94 (0.78-4.82)	0.69 (0.26-1.82)
(0·4,0·55]	9 (3·1%)	286	0.75 (0.37-1.51)	0.44 (0.22-0.90)
(0·55,0·7]	29 (8·1%)	356	2.01 (1.29-3.13)	2.04 (1.29-3.21)
(0·85,1]	438 (7·1%)	6139	1.72 (1.32-2.25)	2.48 (1.84-3.33)
(1,1·15]	64 (20·4%)	313	4.83 (3.41-6.85)	9.28 (6.20-13.90)

259 **Factors associated with all-cause mortality**

260 The time-dependent Cox proportional hazard models in Table 6 examine the relationship
261 between infection status (groups A-D) and mortality. After controlling for other risk factors,
262 increased mortality was associated with older age, male gender (adjusted HR=1·4 [1·3; 1·6]),
263 and receiving nursing care (adjusted HR=1·4 [1·2; 1.5]).

264 We estimated excess mortality in outbreak and non-outbreak LTCFs, taking individuals with
265 no evidence of infection (group A) in non-outbreak LTCFs as the reference group. Risk of all-
266 cause mortality was almost two-fold higher in residents in Group A (no direct evidence of
267 infection) in outbreak versus non-outbreak LTCFs (adjusted HR=2·0 [1·7; 2·2]). Risk of death
268 was also higher in group B (residents with symptoms but unconfirmed infection) in outbreak
269 versus non-outbreak LTCFs relative to the baseline group (adjusted HR=4·3 [3·0; 6·2] versus
270 9·4 [7·6; 12]). All-cause mortality was strongly associated with group C - asymptomatic
271 confirmed infection (adjusted HR=3·3 [2·0; 5·7]) and group D - symptomatic confirmed
272 infection (adjusted HR=13 [11; 16]), compared to baseline.

273 It is important to note these hazard ratio estimates do not give a comprehensive measure of
274 effect: hazards were not proportional across these categories (Figure 3).

275

Table 6: Risk factors for all-cause mortality in residents of LTCFs with and without Covid-19 outbreaks: hazard ratios (HR) from a Cox proportional hazards model (n=8,713, Mar 2020-Jun 2020)

	Deaths	N	HR (univariate)	HR (multivariate)
Gender				
Female	996 (17·6%)	5667	1.00 (reference)	1.00 (reference)
Male	698 (22·9%)	3046	1.40 (1.27-1.54)	1.44 (1.30-1.59)
Age				
<75 years	201 (14·1%)	1424	1.00 (reference)	1.00 (reference)
75–84 years	520 (18·2%)	2865	1.30 (1.11-1.53)	1.36 (1.14-1.61)
85–94 years	761 (21·0%)	3629	1.50 (1.28-1.75)	1.75 (1.49-2.06)
95+ years	212 (26·7%)	795	1.93 (1.59-2.35)	2.32 (1.88-2.85)
Bed type				
Residential	420 (15·4%)	2734	1.00 (reference)	1.00 (reference)
Nursing	1274 (21·3%)	5979	1.38 (1.24-1.54)	1.36 (1.21-1.54)
Care type				
General/elderly	1015 (19·2%)	5294	1.00 (reference)	1.00 (reference)
Dementia	679 (19·9%)	3419	1.02 (0.92-1.12)	1.00 (0.90-1.11)
Total beds				
20–34 beds	373 (17.5%)	2129	1.00 (reference)	1.00 (reference)
45–59 beds	872 (19.2%)	4544	1.08 (0.96-1.22)	0.91 (0.80-1.03)
70–84 beds	449 (22.0%)	2040	1.26 (1.09-1.44)	0.96 (0.82-1.13)
Bed:staff ratio				
Mean (SD)		0.9 (0.2)	1.31 (1.02-1.70)	1.23 (0.88-1.73)
Occupants: bedrooms ratio				
(0·7,0·85]	303 (19·6%)	1549	1.00 (reference)	1.00 (reference)
(0·25,0·4]	14 (20·0%)	70	1.08 (0.63-1.84)	0.87 (0.51-1.48)
(0·4,0·55]	53 (18·5%)	286	0.91 (0.68-1.22)	0.82 (0.61-1.11)
(0·55,0·7]	73 (20·5%)	356	1.02 (0.79-1.31)	0.67 (0.51-0.88)
(0·85,1]	1197 (19·5%)	6139	0.95 (0.84-1.08)	0.79 (0.69-0.91)
(1,1·15]	54 (17·3%)	313	0.80 (0.60-1.06)	0.43 (0.32-0.59)
Infection/outbreak status				
Non-outbreak LTCFs				
A Uninfected (other LTCF)	252 (11.1%)	2274	1.00 (reference)	1.00 (reference)
B Symptomatic not confirmed	14 (12.6%)	111	4.44 (3.18-6.21)	4.34 (3.02-6.22)
Outbreak LTCFs				
A Uninfected	1030 (19.6%)	5268	1.93 (1.70-2.20)	1.95 (1.70-2.23)
B Symptomatic not confirmed	181 (40.0%)	453	8.82 (7.31-10.65)	9.44 (7.57-11.77)
C Confirmed asymptomatic	15 (11.3%)	133	3.25 (1.93-5.46)	3.34 (1.97-5.66)
D Confirmed symptomatic	202 (42.6%)	474	12.21 (10.27-14.51)	12.76 (10.50-15.50)



281

282 **Figure 3: Kaplan-Meier estimates of resident (n=8,713) survival by SARS-COV-2 case type**

283 **Attributable mortality**

284 Model-based estimates of attributable mortality were derived from the individual-level data.
285 Overall, 567/1,694 (33%) deaths were attributed to Covid-19. In LTCFs with outbreaks only 28%
286 (159 residents) of the mortality attributable to COVID-19 occurred in people with confirmed
287 infection (Groups C and D), (Table 7). Exclusion of the early pandemic period in sensitivity
288 analysis increased attributable mortality to 560/1,343 (41·7%). Model-based estimates of
289 deaths based on individual-level were slightly higher (8%) than counts from the aggregate
290 data.

291

Table 7: Model-based estimates of attributable death in residents of LTCFs with and without Covid-19 outbreaks (n=8,713, Mar 2020- Jun 2020)

Infection/outbreak status	Adjusted HR	Resident-days	Total deaths	Deaths attributable to Covid-19 (% all-cause deaths)#
Non-outbreak LTCFs				
A Uninfected	1·00 [1·00; 1·00]	470,234	733	0 (0·00)
B Symptomatic not confirmed	4·36 [3·03; 6·25]	6,680	37	26 (4.59)
Outbreak LTCFs				
A Uninfected	1·93 [1·69; 2·20]	234,480	549	261 (46.03)
B Symptomatic not confirmed	9·33 [7·48; 11·64]	15,944	158	120 (21.16)
C Confirmed asymptomatic	3·28 [1·93; 5·55]	5,316	15	11 (1.94)
D Confirmed symptomatic	12·47 [10·26; 15·17]	15,033	202	148 (26.10)
TOTAL		747,687	1,694	567 (33·45)*

column percent; *row percent

Interpretation

Main findings

This population-level study demonstrates the major impact of Covid-19 on LTCFs, with 22% of residents and 16% of staff experiencing symptoms and overall case-fatality of 35·7%. Residents with no direct evidence of infection in LTCFs with outbreaks had twice the mortality of the equivalent group in LTCFs without outbreaks, implying substantial case under-ascertainment. Less than one-third of deaths attributable to COVID-19 in outbreak LTCFs were confirmed which is likely due to poor availability of testing until late in the pandemic. In addition to the need for active surveillance linked to increased testing capacity, higher staff to resident ratios and reduced LTCF occupancy are critically important to reducing the spread of infection.

Our estimates of the prevalence of confirmed Covid-19 infections and deaths in residents are comparable to a large survey of managers of LTCFs in England.[20] However, both studies are likely to have underestimated the proportion of residents who became infected due to limited testing, asymptomatic infection[12] and moderate sensitivity of PCR testing.[21] Our estimate of 35·7% case-fatality in residents with confirmed infection over a mean of 71 days is higher than previous literature,[12] but is based on longer follow-up, a larger number of residents, and our study population had higher overall mortality. For example, an outbreak investigation[22] in 4 LTCFs in London, UK measured a case-fatality rate of 17% among 126 residents over a period of 62 days, while Stall et al.[23] measured a rate of 28% in over a period of 53 days in a Canadian study.

315 Whereas two-thirds of LTCFs in our study reported at least one case of infection or death, just
316 44% of LTCFs have notified an outbreak to PHE. This suggests that nationally, local health
317 protection teams may be unaware of Covid-19 infections in up to 1 in 5 LTCFs. Integration of
318 data systems, so that test results can be accessed and acted upon by local public health teams
319 is fundamental to the pandemic response.

320 In common with a Canadian cohort study,[24] we found strong associations between infections
321 and LTCF occupancy. We also identified lower staff to resident ratios as a risk factor for
322 infection. These organisational factors, linked to chronic underfunding of the care sector, are
323 likely to facilitate the implementation of infection control procedures[25] such as isolating or
324 cohorting infected residents, staff training, and regular environmental deep cleaning. When
325 staff care for fewer residents they also have reduced likelihood of spreading infection between
326 residents. Higher staff to resident ratios may also decrease reliance on agency staff who may
327 spread infection between LTCFs, and indicate better resourced LTCFs.

328 **Strengths and limitations**

329 The unique surveillance system we established in partnership with FSHCG allowed us to track
330 infections throughout the entire pandemic period across a large number of LTCFs, and identify
331 symptomatic as well as confirmed and asymptomatic cases. To our knowledge, this is the most
332 complete reporting system for Covid-19 infections in LTCFs published to date. It is possible
333 that LTCFs that paid less attention to active surveillance to support control will have had higher
334 levels of uncontrolled outbreaks compared to those seen in this study.

335 A limitation is lack of access to information on comorbidity and ethnicity, both of which have
336 been shown to be important risk factors for adverse outcomes in Covid-19.[6] However, we were
337 able to identify individuals with dementia, and adjust for receipt of nursing care which will
338 partially capture comorbidity. We also lacked information on the overall rate of testing in each
339 LTCF.

340 **Clinical, research and policy implications**

341 In the UK the number of infected residents and staff has been underestimated, due to limited
342 availability of testing until late in the pandemic. High levels of asymptomatic infection will also
343 lead to under-ascertainment. It is important to note however, that mortality rates were also
344 increased in those recorded as asymptomatic infections suggesting that in an elderly cohort

residents may have atypical presentations that do not conform to standard case definitions. Although our findings support increased use of testing to improve case ascertainment, frequent testing in residents of LTCFs may not always be desirable if the risk of infection is low, because the testing procedure (nasopharyngeal swabs) is invasive and may distress vulnerable residents. Since the incubation period and serial interval of COVID-19 is short,[26] the interval between successive screens required to interrupt transmission may also need to be short. Rapid early diagnosis of symptomatic cases in residents and staff and expansion of more widespread testing after a case is identified may also be effective strategies to prevent transmission. Such approaches depend on strengthened surveillance in LTCFs and would be greatly facilitated by the availability of near patient testing platforms, which may be achievable in larger LTCFs.

Our findings of excess deaths in those with no direct evidence of infection may be due to under-ascertainment, direct effects of Covid-19 control measures on delivery of care, and/or indirect effects due to additional disruption caused by the outbreak. Studies from other healthcare settings[27,28] have highlighted the ways in which Covid-19 has impacted delivery of care associated with excess mortality in individuals who are uninfected . Detailed analysis of cause of death and reasons for hospital admission in residents of LTCFs will be important to understand how the pandemic has affected the quality of care in LTCFs. Our analysis provides a method that could be widely applied to estimate excess mortality, provided LTCF's with outbreaks can be reliably identified.

Globally, there is an opportunity to mitigate the impact of future waves of infection on staff and residents in LTCF's. Our findings suggest that countries can achieve this most effectively by adopting a holistic approach, which integrates surveillance and focused testing for Covid-19 with increased investment to reduce LTCF occupancy and increase staffing.

Contributors

LS conceived the research question. LS and PDM designed the study, with advice from GR and AJ. PDM undertook the statistical analysis. HW extracted the dataset and undertook the data linkage. LS obtained the research funding. LS and PDM wrote the first draft of the manuscript. All authors interpreted the data and edited and revised the final manuscript.

Declaration of interests

FL, GR, LS are supported by research funding from the ESRC. LS is a member of the Care Home working group, a subgroup of the Scientific Advisory Group for Emergencies. AH is a member of the New and Emerging Respiratory Virus Threats Advisory Group (NERVTAG). All other authors declare no competing interests.

Data sharing

All computer syntax used in the analysis is available through an online repository. The data that support the findings of this study are available from the Four Seasons Healthcare Group but restrictions apply to the availability of these data, which were used under a data sharing agreement for the current study and so are not publicly available. Data are however available from the authors upon reasonable request and with permission of Four Seasons Healthcare Group.

Acknowledgements

This work was supported by the Economic and Social Research Council [ES/V003887/1]. This work was also supported by a National Institute for Health Research (NIHR) Clinician Scientist award (CS-2016-007 to L.S.); In-Practice fellowship (NIHR300293 to A.J.); the NIHR School of Primary Care Research (G.R). AH and HH are NIHR Senior Investigators. AH and HH are supported by Health Data Research UK (grant No. LOND1), which is funded by the UK Medical Research Council, Engineering and Physical Sciences Research Council, Economic and Social Research Council, Department of Health and Social Care (England), Chief Scientist Office of the Scottish Government Health and Social Care Directorates, Health and Social Care Research and Development Division (Welsh Government), Public Health Agency (Northern Ireland), British Heart Foundation, Wellcome Trust. HH is funded by the NIHR University College London Hospitals Biomedical Research Centre, The BigData@Heart Consortium, funded by the Innovative Medicines Initiative-2 Joint Undertaking under grant agreement No. 116074.

References

1. European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control. COVID-19 situation update for the eu/eea and the uk, as of 10 july 2020, https://web.archive.org/web/20200710104730/https://www.ecdc.europa.eu/en/cases-2019-ncov-eueea (2020).
2. Hale T, Webster S, Petherick A, et al. Oxford COVID-19 Government Response Tracker, Blavatnik School of Government, https://www.bsg.ox.ac.uk/research/research-projects/coronavirus-government-response-

tracker (2020).
3. England Office for National Statistics. *Coronavirus (COVID-19) Infection Survey pilot: 18 June 2020*, https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/healthandsocialcare/conditionsanddiseases/bulletins/coronaviruscovid19infectionsurveypilot/latest#covid-19-infection-survey-data.
4. Public Health England. COVID-19: Number of outbreaks in care homes – management information, https://www.gov.uk/government/statistical-data-sets/covid-19-number-of-outbreaks-in-care-homes-management-information (2020).
5. LaingBuisson. Care of Older People UK Market Report 30th Edition, https://www.laingbuisson.com/ (2019).
6. Zhou F, Yu T, Du R, et al. Clinical course and risk factors for mortality of adult inpatients with COVID-19 in Wuhan, China: a retrospective cohort study. *The Lancet* 2020; 395: 1054–1062.
7. England Office for National Statistics. *Deaths involving COVID-19 in the care sector, England and Wales: deaths occurring up to 12 June 2020 and registered up to 20 June 2020 (provisional)*, https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/birthsdeathsandmarriages/deaths/articles/deathsinvolvingcovid19inthecaresectorenglandandwales/deathsoccurringupto12june2020andregisteredupto20june2020provisional (2020).
8. England Office for National Statistics. *Coronavirus (COVID-19) related deaths by occupation, England and Wales: deaths registered between 9 March and 25 May 2020*, https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/healthandsocialcare/causesofdeath/bulletins/coronaviruscovid19relateddeathsbyoccupationenglandandwales/deathsregisteredbetween9marchand25may2020 (2020).
9. UK Department of Health & Social Care. Press release: Government launches new portal for care homes to arrange coronavirus testing, https://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20200616160922/https://www.gov.uk/government/news/government-launches-new-portal-for-care-homes-to-arrange-coronavirus-testing.
10. McMichael TM, Currie DW, Clark S, et al. Epidemiology of Covid-19 in a Long-Term Care Facility in King County, Washington. *New England Journal of Medicine* 2020; 382: 2005–2011.
11. Dora AV, 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 Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report*; 69. Epub ahead of print 2020. DOI: 10.15585/mmwr.mm6921e1.
12. Salcher-Konrad M, Jhass A, Naci H, et al. COVID-19 related mortality and spread of disease in long-term care: First findings from a living systematic review of emerging evidence. *medRxiv*. Epub ahead of print 2020. DOI: 10.1101/2020.06.09.20125237.
13. Smith CM, Williams H, Jhass A, et al. Antibiotic prescribing in UK care homes 2016–2017: retrospective cohort study of linked data. *BMC Health Services Research* 2020; 20: 555.
14. England Care Quality Commission..
15. England Office for National Statistics. *COVID-19 Infection Survey Datasets*, https://www.ons.gov.uk/file?uri=%2fpeoplepopulationandcommunity%2fhealthandsocialcare%2fconditionsanddiseases%2fdatasets%2fcoronaviruscovid19infectionsurveydata%2f2020/covid19infectionsurveydatasets20200618full1.xlsx.
16. Samuelsen SO, Eide GE. Attributable fractions with survival data. *Statistics in Medicine* 2008; 27: 1447–1467.
17. Aragon TJ. *Epitools: Epidemiology tools*, https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=epitools (2020).
18. Therneau TM. *A package for survival analysis in s*, https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=survival (2015).
19. Dutey-Magni P, Shallcross L. Covid-19 infection and attributable mortality in residents of UK care homes: Cohort study using electronic records (March-June 2020), https://github.com/peterdutey/ch-covid19 (2020).
20. England Office for National Statistics. *Impact of coronavirus in care homes in England (Vivaldi): 26 May to 19 June 2020*, https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/healthandsocialcare/conditionsanddiseases/articles/impactofcoronavirusincarehomesinenglandvivaldi/26mayto19june2020/previous/v1 (2020).
21. Kucirka LM, Lauer SA, Laeyendecker O, et al. Variation in False-Negative Rate of Reverse Transcriptase Polymerase Chain Reaction–Based SARS-CoV-2 Tests by Time Since Exposure. *Annals of Internal Medicine* 2020; M20–1495.
22. Ladhani S, Zambon M, Shetty N, et al. Investigation of SARS-CoV-2 Outbreaks in Six Care Homes in London: The Easter 6 Care Home Investigation.
23. Stall NM, Jones A, Brown KA, et al. For-profit nursing homes and the risk of COVID-19 outbreaks and resident deaths in Ontario, Canada. *medRxiv*. Epub ahead of print 2020. DOI: 10.1101/2020.05.25.20112664.
24. Brown KA, Jones A, Daneman N, et al. Association between nursing home crowding and covid-19 infection and mortality in ontario, canada. *medRxiv*. Epub ahead of print 2020. DOI: 10.1101/2020.06.23.20137729.
25. UK Department of Health & Social Care. *Admission and Care of Residents in a Care Home during COVID-19*.

465 *Version 2. Updated 19 June 2020*, https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/coronavirus-covid-19-
466 admission-and-care-of-people-in-care-homes (2020).
467 26. To KK-W, Tsang OT-Y, Leung W-S, et al. Temporal profiles of viral load in posterior oropharyngeal saliva samples
468 and serum antibody responses during infection by SARS-CoV-2: an observational cohort study. *The Lancet*
469 *Infectious Diseases* 2020; 20: 565–574.
470 27. Lai AG, Pasea L, Banerjee A, et al. Estimating excess mortality in people with cancer and multimorbidity in the
471 covid-19 emergency. *medRxiv*. Epub ahead of print 2020. DOI: 10.1101/2020.05.27.20083287.
472 28. Weinberger DM, Chen J, Cohen T, et al. Estimation of Excess Deaths Associated With the COVID-19 Pandemic
473 in the United States, March to May 2020. *JAMA Internal Medicine*. Epub ahead of print July 2020. DOI:
474 10.1001/jamainternmed.2020.3391.
475
476

Figures

Figure 1: Study overview: location of FSHCG LTCF's and diagram of data sources

Figure 2: Kaplan-Meier estimates of the cumulative incidence of symptomatic cases, confirmed infections and COVID-related deaths in (A) residents (n=9,339) and (B) staff (n=11,604) according to FSHCG aggregate data (Mar 2020-Jun 2020)

Figure 3: Kaplan-Meier estimates of resident (n=8,713) survival by SARS-COV-2 case type

Supplementary material

Supplementary material 1: Quality and methodology report

Supplementary material 2: Incidence of confirmed and symptomatic in residents based on Datix incident reports

Supplementary material 3: Kaplan-Meier estimators data (available on request)