High effectiveness of multimodal infection control interventions in preventing SARS-CoV-2 infections in healthcare professionals: a prospective longitudinal seroconversion study

Thomas Theo Brehm, MD[1,2,#], Dorothee Schwinge, PhD[1,#], Sibylle Lampalzer, MD[1], Veronika Schlicker, BA[1,2], Julia Küchen[1], Michelle Thompson[1], Felix Ullrich[1], Samuel Huber, MD[1], Stefan Schmiedel, MD[1,2], Marylyn M Addo, MD[1,2], Marc Lütgehetmann, MD[2,3], Johannes K Knobloch, MD[2,3], Julian Schulze zur Wiesch, MD[1,2,#], Ansgar W Lohse, MD[1,2,#]

[1] I. Department of Internal Medicine, University Medical Center Hamburg-Eppendorf, Martinistraße 52, 20249 Hamburg, Germany

[2] German Center for Infection Research (DZIF), Partner Site Hamburg-Lübeck-Borstel-Riems

[3] Institute of Medical Microbiology, Virology and Hygiene, University Medical Center Hamburg-Eppendorf, Martinistraße 52, 20249 Hamburg, Germany

[#] contributed equally

Objective: To assess the effectiveness of multimodal infection control interventions in the prevention of SARS-CoV-2 infections in healthcare professionals

Design: Sequential follow-up study

Setting: Largest tertiary care centre in northern Germany

Participants: 1253 employees of the University Medical Center Hamburg-Eppendorf were sequentially assessed for the presence of SARS-CoV-2 IgG antibodies at the beginning of the covid-19 epidemic (20 March – 9 April), one month (20 April – 8 May), and another two months later (22 June – 24 July). Of those, 1026 were healthcare workers (HCWs) of whom 292 were directly involved in the care of covid-19 patients. During the study period, infection control interventions were deployed, those included i) strict barrier nursing of all known covid-19 patients including FFP2 (N95) masks, goggles, gloves, hoods and protective gowns, ii) visitor restrictions with access control at all hospital entries, iii) mandatory wearing of disposable face masks in all clinical settings, and iv) universal RT-PCR admission screening of patients.

Main Outcome Measures: SARS-CoV-2 IgG seroconversion rate

Results: At the initial screening, ten participants displayed significant IgG antibody ratios. Another ten individuals showed seroconversion at the second time point one month later, only two further participants seroconverted during the subsequent two months. The overall SARS-CoV-2 seroprevalence in the study cohort at the last follow-up was 1.8%, the seroconversion rate dropped from 0.81% to 0.08% per month despite a longer observation period. Amongst HCWs seropositivity was increased in those directly involved in the care of patients with SARS-CoV-2 infections (3.8%, n=11) compared to other HCWs (1.4%, n=10, P=0.025). However, after the adoption of all multimodal infection control interventions seroconversions were observed in only two more HCWs, neither of whom were involved in inpatient care.

Conclusion: Multimodal infection control and prevention interventions are highly effective in mitigating SARS-CoV-2 infections of healthcare professionals.

INTRODUCTION

Healthcare workers (HCWs) are at the front line of the coronavirus disease 2019 (covid-19) pandemic response and disproportionally at risk of contracting severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) due to occupational exposure.[1 2] The Chinese ophthalmologist Li Wenliang, who was one of the first physicians to issue emergency warnings about a novel viral pneumonia that was later identified as covid-19 died after being infected when caring for a pre-symptomatic patient. [3] This individual case as well as larger case series illustrate the considerable challenges of HCW protection, especially since the risk of infections from pre- or asymptomatic SARS-CoV-2 infected individuals was initially often underestimated.[4 5] Protection of HCWs from infection requires not only strict application of personal protective equipment (PPE), but also the prompt identification of infected individuals, who may be asymptomatic or oligosymptomatic. Protection of HCWs not only serves as personal protection but is also paramount to mitigate nosocomial transmission to vulnerable patients and fellow HCWs. HCW infections may also lead to critical staff shortages. Various infection prevention and control interventions have been adapted worldwide with various efficacies, including the use of adequate PPE [6-8], universal admission screening of patients [9 10], and RT-PCR surveillance of exposed HCWs.[11 12] However, reports about limited availability of sufficient PPE and high infection rates in HCWs, particularly during the early phase of the outbreak, have raised concerns about whether HCWs can be adequately protected from contracting occupational infections.[13 14] The World Health Organization recently reported that HCWs account for over 10% of overall global covid-19 cases.[15] While strict adherence to adequate PPE in areas caring for covid-19 patients is of major importance, this alone may be insufficient in protecting HCWs and in preventing nosocomial infections due to the infectious risk posed by as yet unidentified patients and colleagues. The aim of our study was to prospectively evaluate the effectiveness of sequentially instituted multimodal infection control interventions at our large tertiary care centre by sequential seroprevalence measurements and assessment of seroconversion rates amongst the various hospital workers.

128 **METHODS**

129 **Study design**

130 Participants were recruited in the screening period 1 (SP 1) between 20 March and 9 April
131 2020 by informing employees of the University Medical Center Hamburg-Eppendorf. The city-
132 state of Hamburg with 1.8 million inhabitants and a metropolitan catchment area of more
133 than 4.5 million inhabitants was affected by the pandemic relatively early due to public
134 holidays in March 2020, when numerous travelers returned from high-risk regions, especially
135 Italian and Austrian ski resorts. By 24 July, a total of 5291 cases had been confirmed, which
136 constitutes one of the highest rates in Germany.[16] The University Medical Center Hamburg-
137 Eppendorf, which has 1738 hospital beds, has treated more than 170 covid-19 patients during
138 the study period. Of those, 70 were admitted to the intensive care unit, 51 required
139 mechanical ventilation, and 12 patients required extracorporeal membrane oxygenation
140 (ECMO) therapy. Of note, a large number of immunocompromised patients with high viral
141 loads and a protracted course of disease posed a particularly high transmission risk to HCWs.[17]
142 Participants were recruited to the study via an internal email newsletter. To assess the
143 infection rate of employees, we assessed seroconversion at one and three months: i) sampling
144 period 2 (SP 2) one month after SP 1 (20 April to 8 May 2020) and ii) sampling period 3 (SP 3)
145 another 2 months after SP 2 (22 June to 24 July).

146

147 **Data collection**

148 On the day of recruitment, we collected demographic and general work-related data including
149 profession, occupational area, and patient contacts using a questionnaire. In addition, we
150 used another questionnaire to assess known and possible past contact to covid-19 patients
151 with or without sufficient PPE as well as presence of symptoms during the past 4 weeks at SP
152 1 and SP 2 and during the past 8 weeks at SP 3 respectively. Fever, cough, and dyspnea were
153 classified as typical symptoms while rhinorrhea, sore throat, headache, stomach pain, joint
154 and muscle pain, nausea, and diarrhea and were considered as uncharacteristic symptoms.
155 Questionnaires were available both paper-based and via online REDcap electronic data
156 capture tools hosted at our institution.[18 19] Study participants with positive SARS-CoV-2 IgG
157 ratio were contacted again by phone to ask if nasopharyngeal swabs for RT-PCR had been
158 performed and whether a source of infection could be identified.

159

160 **Infection control interventions**

161 A number of infection control measures were undertaken at our institution listed in table 1.

162

163

164 **Table 1 – Infection control interventions at the University Medical Center Hamburg-**

165 **Eppendorf and in Hamburg, Germany**

166

Interventions at the University Medical Center Hamburg-Eppendorf	
27 February	Opening of an on-campus covid-19 testing clinic
11 March	Cancellation of all meetings not directly related to patient care
18 March	Mandatory wearing of face masks in the emergency department
19 March	Implementation of visitor restrictions
22 March	Mandatory wearing of face masks in all clinical settings
10 April	Mandatory wearing of FFP2 masks at all oncology and haematology wards and clinics
20 April	Universal RT-PCR admission screening of patients
11 May	Universal RT-PCR screening of employees caring for covid-19 patients or vulnerable patients
Interventions in Hamburg, Germany	
16 March	Closure of educational facilities
22 March	Stay at home order
27 April	Mandatory wearing of face masks

167

168

169 As a large tertiary referral centre and one of the major infectious diseases units of the country,
170 we have highly trained personnel and a specialized infectious disease ward. In addition,
171 additional covid-19 units were opened both in intensive care and for standard care, following
172 intensive staff training. Thus, patient care with full PPE including FFP2 masks of all identified
173 covid-19 patients was standard of care from the beginning of the pandemic, and even though
174 supply was scarce throughout the first two months, application of strict protocols to limit
175 wasteful use of equipment allowed sufficient supply all through the pandemic. When first

infections in staff members occurred, several further steps were undertaken starting with the universal use of face masks in all clinical settings, and measures were intensified further after a nosocomial outbreak on one of the haematology wards.[17] In addition to separate covid-19 units, use of full PPE in all covid-19 care, and use of surgical face masks in all clinical units of the hospital, universal screening of all hospital admissions was instituted at April 20, with a roll-out period of about ten days until full adherence across all hospital departments. In addition, RT-PCR testing of staff at risk was offered as of May 11, but this measure was primarily instituted as a reassurance measure for our staff rather than an infection control measure.

Study procedures

During all three sampling periods, serum samples were drawn from the study participants. A semi-quantitative SARS-CoV-2 IgG enzyme-linked immunosorbent assay (ELISA) targeting the S1-Domain of the S-protein spike protein subunit was performed using a commercial kit (Euroimmun Medizinische Labordiagnostika, Lübeck, Germany). Testing procedures were performed according to the manufacturer's instructions. According to the manufacturer, a ratio of ≥1.1 should be regarded as positive. The manufacturer reports a specificity of 99.3%. We have recently independently validated those results and showed a specificity of 99.1%.[20] However, an optimized IgG ratio of ≥ 1.5, has been shown to display a specificity of 100% by us and by others.[21] Therefore, we used both the manufacturer's and this more stringent cut-off value for positive results to account for optimal specificity in a low prevalence environment. Given the sequential testing in our study population and the expected rise of IgG antibody ratio ≥1.5 at some time point in infected individuals, this cut-off value is considered the best compromise for optimum sensitivity and specificity. Study participants were classified as seropositive in all future sampling periods, if they had an IgG antibody ratio ≥1.5 at least once, even if antibody ratios waned over time. This was found to be the case in three study participants, who became seronegative at SP 3. However, in order to also look at the data with maximum sensitivity, we also analyzed the participants with a ratio of >1.1.

Statistical analyses

Results were subjected to statistical analysis using SPSS 20.0 (IBM, Armonk, NY, USA). Fishers' exact test was used to the determine association between two categorical variables. A two-sided P value less than 0.05 was considered significant.

Patient and public involvement

The study was presented to and approved by the academic and non-academic workers representation boards of our hospital and the design agreed with both boards as well as the management board of the hospital.

RESULTS

Study population

A total of 1253 individuals were included during SP 1, which represent around 11% of all employees at our centre (table 2).

240 **Table 2 - Characterization of the study population**

n	1253
Sex, n (%)	
Female	934 (74.5)
Male	308 (24.6)
Diverse	11 (0.9)
Age	
Range, years	16-69
Mean, years	38.4
Occupation, n (%)	
HCW	1026 (81.9)
Category	
- Nurse	444 (35.4)
- Physician	275 (21.9)
- Medical technician	105 (8.4)
- Medical student	73 (5.8)
- Physiotherapist	15 (1.2)
- Other	114 (9.1)
Location	
- Regular ward	332 (26.5)
- Outpatient clinic	234 (18.7)
- Intensive care unit	130 (10.4)
- Operating room	111 (8.9)
- Emergency department	63 (5.0)
- Other	156 (12.5)
Non-HCW	227 (18.1)

241

242

243 All study participants participated at the second follow up visit, but 23 (1.8%) missed the first
244 follow-up visit. The average age of the study cohort was 38.4 years; 934 were women and 308
245 were men. The majority of participants (n=1026, 81.9%) were HCWs such as nurses (n=444,

246 35.4%), medical doctors (n=275, 21.9%), medical technicians with regular patient contact
247 (n=105, 8.4%) and physiotherapists (n=15, 1.2%). Altogether, the participants well
248 represented the average workforce of our centre, consisting of 30.1% nurses, 25.8% medical
249 doctors, and 44.1% other staff members, with a somewhat higher proportion of front-line
250 HCWs in the study. Study participants were recruited from all occupational areas of our
251 hospital including regular wards (n=332, 26.5%), outpatient clinics (n=234, 18.7%), the
252 intensive care unit (n=130, 10.4%) and the emergency department (n=63, 5.0%). The
253 remainder of 227 (18.1%) participants not classified as HCWs were research scientists,
254 administrative staff or belonged to other occupational groups not directly involved in patient
255 care. Information on contact with covid-19 was provided by 1253 individuals at SP 1, 1169
256 individuals at SP 2, and 1110 individuals at SP 3 (table 3).
257
258 **Table 3 - Occupational exposure of the study population**

	Seronegative	**Seropositive SP 1**	**Seroconversion SP 2**	**Seroconversion SP 3**
n	1231	10	10	2
Occupation, n (%)				
HCW	1005 (81.6)	9 (90.0)	10 (100)	2 (100)
- Nurse	434 (40.0)	6 (60.0)	4 (40.0)	0 (0)
- Physician	266 (22.4)	2 (20.0)	5 (50.0)	2 (100)
- Other	305 (23.2)	0 (0)	1 (10.0)	0 (0)
Non-HCW	226 (22.5)	1 (10.0)	0	0 (0)
Contact to covid-19 cases, n (%)				
Total	405 (32.9)	6 (60.0)	9 (90.0)	2 (100)
Patients	281 (22.8)	3 (30.0)	6 (60.0)	2 (100)
- only with PPE	218 (17.7)	2 (20.0)	2 (20.0)	1 (50.0)
- without PPE	63 (5.1)	1 (10.0)	4 (40.0)	1 (50.0)
Colleagues	137 (11.3)	2 (20.0)	1 (10.0)	0 (0)
Community	31 (2.5)	1 (10.0)	3 (30.0)	0 (0)

259
260

261 A total of 23.3% (n=292) of participants reported having been in contact with known covid-19
262 patients. The majority of those (n=223) worked exclusively in the direct care of patients with
263 diagnosed SARS-CoV-2 infections and thus reported to always be equipped with appropriate
264 PPE. Another 69 HCWs had contact with patients that were diagnosed with covid-19 only
265 later, i.e. after exposure, and did therefore not wear adequate PPE at the time. Occupational
266 contact to infected colleagues was reported by 11.2% (n=140), and known community
267 contacts by 2.8% (n=35) of participants.
268
269 **Serological results**
270 At the initial screening period a total of 0.8% (n=10, 95% confidence interval [CI] 0.3 to 1.3)
271 participants were found to be SARS-CoV-2 seropositive (figure 1). Another ten individuals,
272 representing 0.8% of all study participants at SP 2, showed seroconversion at the first follow-
273 up visit, giving a seroprevalence of 1.6% (95% CI 0.9 to 2.3). At SP 3, two more individuals had
274 developed SARS-CoV-2 IgG antibodies, giving a seroconversion rate of 0.16% between SP 2
275 and SP 3, or 0.08% per month, and thus a total seroprevalence of 1.8% (n=22, 95% CI 1.0 to
276 2.5) by the end of the study when using the optimized IgG ratio of ≥ 1.5. One of the two
277 participants showing seroconversion only at SP 3 had indeed a positive RT-PCR for SARS-CoV-
278 2 and missed the first follow-up visit since he was in quarantine. While it is likely that that this
279 seroconversion took place before SP 2, we have no proof of this, thus the case was counted
280 as converting in the second observation period.
281 Three participants with an IgG ratio of ≥ 1.5 at SP 1 subsequently had a negative test result at
282 SP 2 and SP 3 respectively suggesting that their infection had occurred early. This
283 demonstrates that a cross-sectional study with a single measurement only at SP 3 would have
284 missed these three infections. When analyzing the serological data with of maximum
285 sensitivity, i.e. with a cut-off value of ≥ 1.1, the overall results were very similar: 19
286 participants showed anti-SARS-CoV2 antibodies with a ratio ≥ 1.1 at SP 1, another 13
287 participants showed seroconversion during the first month between SP 1 and SP 2. Only 2
288 additional participants showed seroconversion with this lower cut-off in the subsequent two
289 months, bringing the total of possible seroconverters in the last two months up to four, or
290 two per month (figure 2).
291
292

293 **RT-PCR testing history of seroconverted participants**

294 Out of all clearly seropositive study participants, a total of 40.9% (n=9), one of them before
295 SP 1 and the others between SP 1 and SP 2, had been diagnosed with covid-19 by RT-PCR and
296 thus had been placed under quarantine during the study period. Another six seropositive
297 HCWs reported that they had at least one nasopharyngeal swab performed due to symptoms
298 or close contact with a covid-19 case but were tested negative at that time. The remainder of
299 seven clearly seropositive individuals had not been tested by RT-PCR at all.

300

301 **Risk factors for seroconversion**

302 Complete information on symptoms throughout the study period was provided by 1061
303 (84.7%) of the study participants. Of those, 54.9% (n=582) reported covid-19 related
304 symptoms (see supplementary table). Only 10.6% (n=112) did not report any symptoms
305 throughout the study period, the rest reported symptoms not considered typical for covid-
306 19. Typical SARS-CoV-2 symptoms were reported by 72.7% (n=16) of seropositive and 54.4%
307 (n=566) of seronegative study participants (P=0.4). The probable source of infection could be
308 identified for the majority of seropositive study participants. A total of six HCWs presumably
309 got infected when caring for patients that were only subsequently diagnosed with covid-19
310 and had thus not used appropriate PPE at the time of exposure. Five HCWs most likely
311 contracted SARS-CoV-2 while caring for covid-19 patients with adequate PPE. Other probable
312 infection routes in our cohort were close contact with infected colleagues (n=3), community
313 transmission in high-risk regions (n=3), and infected household contacts (n=1). For the
314 remainder of four seropositive employees, the source of infection could not be established.
315 Seropositivity was not statistically significantly higher in HCWs (2.0%, n=21/1026) compared
316 to other hospital workers (0.4%, n=1/227, P=0.16). When only addressing HCWs directly
317 involved in the care of patients with SARS-CoV-2 infections (3.8%, n=11/292) compared to
318 other HCWs (1.4%, n=10/734, P=0.025) seropositivity was significantly increased.
319 Importantly, both seroconverters of SP3 were not involved in inpatient care, but exclusively
320 worked in the outpatient clinics.

321

322 **DISCUSSION**

323 This study demonstrates a very low overall SARS-CoV-2 seroprevalence in hospital workers at
324 our tertiary care centre, and the increasing effectiveness of a combination of infection control

325 measures. The low overall in-hospital SARS-CoV-2 transmission rates of healthcare personnel
326 were achieved despite both substantial community transmission in the city-state of Hamburg,
327 and, more importantly, a large number of covid-19 patients treated, some with very high and
328 long-lasting viral loads, at our tertiary care centre. While the relatively early detection of the
329 first cases in Germany [22] may have increased preparedness, the addition of further
330 multimodal infection prevention and control measures was instrumental in minimizing
331 occupational exposure risks. While seropositivity amongst HCWs was initially higher in HCWs
332 directly involved in the care of patients with SARS-CoV-2 infections compared to other
333 employees, only two more seroconversions were observed after the implementation of all
334 multimodal infection during the last two months, and both of these did not involve inpatient
335 care but seemed to have occurred during outpatient clinics or from the community. Also, one
336 of those two physicians had been tested positive for SARS-CoV-2 by RT-PCR between SP 1 and
337 SP 2 and did therefore not attend the first follow-up visit, so that this seroconversion may
338 also have also occurred the first observation period. Thus, presumably only one study
339 participant, a physician employed in an outpatient clinic, contracted a SARS-CoV-2 infection
340 in the two months between SP 2 and SP 3. All other participants were protected despite a
341 considerable number of covid-19 patients being treated at our centre during that time period
342 (figure 3). Considerably higher seroprevalence has been reported for HCWs in Belgium (6,4 –
343 12,6%) [23 24], Spain (11 – 31,6%) [25 26], the United Kingdom (24 - 43.5%) [27 28] and the United
344 States of America (7,6 - 36%) [29 30]. Those high infection rates are likely to be at least partially
345 attributable to insufficient protection of exposed HCWs. While the effectiveness of universal
346 use of face masks at hospitals has been shown to significantly decrease hospital transmission
347 [6 7], shortages of appropriate PPE for HCWs in many hospitals have emerged particularly during
348 the early phase of the pandemic. However, adequate PPE when caring for confirmed covid-
349 19 patients alone is not sufficient to prevent healthcare transmission, since asymptomatic
350 and pre-symptomatic individuals can play a pivotal role in the transmission of SARS-CoV-2.[4]
351 Also at our centre, the repeated detection of SARS-CoV-2 positive yet asymptomatic patients
352 presented an important exposure risk leading to occupational infections. Systematic RT-PCT
353 testing of all hospital admissions, either prior to scheduled admissions or in the emergency
354 department, instituted at the end of April, reduced this infection risk to practically zero. The
355 fact that three HCWs seroconverted during the study period despite reporting use of
356 appropriate PPE when caring for covid-19 patients underlines that PPE alone is not sufficient

357 to prevent viral transmission to HCWs. To our surprise, the majority of seropositive study
358 participants had not been diagnosed with SARS-CoV-2 infections despite a very low threshold
359 in our hospital for RT-PCR screening, with more than 7.300 nasopharyngeal swab
360 examinations of hospital HCWs performed during the study period. Furthermore, symptoms
361 compatible with covid-19 were widely prevalent in healthcare professionals regardless of
362 serological results, a number of seropositive employees did not report any such symptoms
363 and were thus not tested. This demonstrates that symptom-based testing of HCWs, while an
364 important tool to mitigate nosocomial infections, has limited sensitivity and very low
365 specificity in detecting infected HCWs. Complete protection of HCWs is not only helpful for
366 their direct protection but is also key for preventing nosocomial infections in patients.
367

368 **Limitations**

369 There are some limitations to our study: firstly, we did not recruit a strictly representative
370 sample of healthcare professionals at our institution, since participation was voluntary.
371 However, the distribution of professions was close to the overall hospital workforce
372 distribution. We included a somewhat higher proportion of clinically exposed HCWs, in
373 particular front-line HCWs from the emergency department, intensive care and infectious
374 diseases departments, most likely because these HCWs were highly exposed and thus more
375 motivated to participate in the study. Secondly, since several multimodal infection control
376 interventions were sequentially adopted and the study did not include a control group, this
377 study is not able to answer the question which measures are most effective in preventing
378 healthcare transmission, and which might have been superfluous. Thirdly, sensitivity and
379 specificity of serological assays is limited, so a precise assessment of the number of infected
380 HCWs is not possible. However, the results were independent of the cut-off levels used for
381 serological testing (figure 2), supporting the reliability of the results.
382

383 **Conclusion**

384 We report a very low seroprevalence amongst HCWs and other healthcare professionals at
385 our tertiary care centre at the beginning of the covid-19 epidemic and very few
386 seroconversions after the implementation of multimodal infection prevention and control
387 interventions. When in addition to personal protection and universal face masks RT-PCR
388 screening of hospital admissions was instituted, occupational transmission could be brought

down to zero cases in inpatient care and only one or two related to outpatient clinics. Taken together, our findings demonstrate that multimodal infection control measures are able to effectively prevent healthcare transmission for SARS-CoV-2, and thus protect both HCWs and patients.

Contributors

TTB, DS, JSzW, and AWL contributed equally to this paper. TTB, DS, JSzW, and AWL conceived and designed the study. TTB, SL, VS, JK, MT, and FU contributed to recruitment of healthcare professionals, data collection and data analysis. DS, ML and JKK contributed to literature search, data collection and data analysis. TTB and DS contributed to data visualization. SH, SS, MMA, ML, and JKK contributed to data interpretation. TTB, JSzW, and AWL drafted the manuscript. DS, SH, SS and ML reviewed and edited the manuscript. TTB, DS, JSzW, and AWL are the guarantors. The corresponding author attests that all listed authors meet authorship criteria and that no others meeting the criteria have been omitted

Transparency declaration

The guarantors affirm that this manuscript is an honest, accurate, and transparent account of the study being reported; that no important aspects of the study have been omitted; and that any discrepancies from the study as planned (and, if relevant, registered) have been explained.

Funding

The authors received no external funding for this work.

Competing interests

All authors have completed the ICMJE uniform disclosure form at www.icmje.org/coi_disclosure.pdf and declare: AWL had a material transfer agreement with Euroimmun GmbH, which included ten ELISA plates as well as technical help provided by the company when setting up the newly established ELISA. All other authors declare no support from any organisation for the submitted work. All authors declare no financial relationships with any organisations that might have an interest in the submitted work in the previous three

420 years; no other relationships or activities that could appear to have influenced the submitted
421 work.
422
423 **Ethical approval**
424 The study protocol was reviewed and approved by the Ethics Committee of the Medical
425 Council of Hamburg (PV 7298). Written informed consent was obtained by all study
426 participants prior to enrolment.
427
428 **Dissemination to participants and related patient and public communities**
429 The findings of this study will be disseminated to all departments of the University Medical
430 Center Hamburg-Eppendorf and to all employees of our institution via an internal newsletter.
431
432 **Acknowledgments**
433 We thank all study participants and departments of the University Medical Centre Hamburg-
434 Eppendorf for active participation in the study. We thank Sabrina Kreß, Jennifer Wigger,
435 Martina Schulz, Corinna Eggers, Angelika Schmidt, Silke Kummer, Robin Woost, Nils
436 Dittberner, and Marcus Wurlitzer for excellent technical assistance.
437
438 **Data sharing**
439 No additional data available.
440
441 **References**
442 1. Zhan M, Qin Y, Xue X, et al. Death from Covid-19 of 23 Health Care Workers in China. *N*
443 *Engl J Med* 2020 doi: 10.1056/NEJMc2005696
444 2. Remuzzi A, Remuzzi G. COVID-19 and Italy: what next? *Lancet* 2020;395(10231):1225-28.
445 doi: 10.1016/s0140-6736(20)30627-9
446 3. Petersen E, Hui D, Hamer DH, et al. Li Wenliang, a face to the frontline healthcare worker.
447 The first doctor to notify the emergence of the SARS-CoV-2, (COVID-19), outbreak.
448 *Int J Infect Dis* 2020;93:205-07. doi: 10.1016/j.ijid.2020.02.052
449 4. Arons MM, Hatfield KM, Reddy SC, et al. Presymptomatic SARS-CoV-2 Infections and
450 Transmission in a Skilled Nursing Facility. *N Engl J Med* 2020;382(22):2081-2090. doi:
451 10.1056/NEJMoa2008457

452 5. Gandhi M, Yokoe DS, Havlir DV. Asymptomatic Transmission, the Achilles' Heel of Current
453 Strategies to Control Covid-19. *N Engl J Med* 2020 doi: 10.1056/NEJMe2009758
454 6. Liu M, Cheng SZ, Xu KW, et al. Use of personal protective equipment against coronavirus
455 disease 2019 by healthcare professionals in Wuhan, China: cross sectional study.
456 *BMJ* 2020;369:m2195. doi: 10.1136/bmj.m2195
457 7. Wang X, Ferro EG, Zhou G, et al. Association Between Universal Masking in a Health Care
458 System and SARS-CoV-2 Positivity Among Health Care Workers. *JAMA* 2020 doi:
459 10.1001/jama.2020.12897
460 8. Pan A, Liu L, Wang C, et al. Association of Public Health Interventions With the
461 Epidemiology of the COVID-19 Outbreak in Wuhan, China. *JAMA* 2020;323(19):1-9.
462 doi: 10.1001/jama.2020.6130
463 9. Sutton D, Fuchs K, D'Alton M, et al. Universal Screening for SARS-CoV-2 in Women
464 Admitted for Delivery. *N Engl J Med* 2020;382(22):2163-64. doi:
465 10.1056/NEJMc2009316
466 10. Al-Shamsi HO, Coomes EA, Alrawi S. Screening for COVID-19 in Asymptomatic Patients
467 With Cancer in a Hospital in the United Arab Emirates. *JAMA Oncol* 2020 doi:
468 10.1001/jamaoncol.2020.2548
469 11. Treibel TA, Manisty C, Burton M, et al. COVID-19: PCR screening of asymptomatic health-
470 care workers at London hospital. *The Lancet* 2020 doi: 10.1016/s0140-
471 6736(20)31100-4
472 12. Black JRM, Bailey C, Przewrocka J, et al. COVID-19: the case for health-care worker
473 screening to prevent hospital transmission. *Lancet* 2020;395(10234):1418-20. doi:
474 10.1016/s0140-6736(20)30917-x
475 13. Ranney ML, Griffeth V, Jha AK. Critical Supply Shortages - The Need for Ventilators and
476 Personal Protective Equipment during the Covid-19 Pandemic. *N Engl J Med*
477 2020;382(18):e41. doi: 10.1056/NEJMp2006141
478 14. Wang J, Zhou M, Liu F. Reasons for healthcare workers becoming infected with novel
479 coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) in China. *J Hosp Infect* 2020;105(1):100-01. doi:
480 10.1016/j.jhin.2020.03.002
481 15. World Health Organization (WHO) Coronavirus disease (COVID-2019) press briefings.
482 https://www.who.int/docs/default-source/coronaviruse/transcripts/covid-19-
483 virtual-press-conference---17-july.pdf?sfvrsn=dd7f91a1_0 [Accessed on 29 July 2020]

484 16. Robert Koch Institute. Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) Daily Situation Report of
485 the Robert Koch Institute.
486 https://www.rki.de/DE/Content/InfAZ/N/Neuartiges_Coronavirus/Situationsberichte
487 /2020-07-27-en.pdf?__blob=publicationFile [Accessed on 29 July 2020]
488 17. Weisel KC, Morgner-Miehlke A, Petersen C, et al. Implications of SARS-CoV-2 Infection
489 and COVID-19 Crisis on Clinical Cancer Care: Report of the University Cancer Center
490 Hamburg. *Oncol Res Treat* 2020;43(6):307-13. doi: 10.1159/000508272
491 18. Harris PA, Taylor R, Thielke R, et al. Research electronic data capture (REDCap)--a
492 metadata-driven methodology and workflow process for providing translational
493 research informatics support. *J Biomed Inform* 2009;42(2):377-81. doi:
494 10.1016/j.jbi.2008.08.010
495 19. Harris PA, Taylor R, Minor BL, et al. The REDCap consortium: Building an international
496 community of software platform partners. *J Biomed Inform* 2019;95:103208. doi:
497 10.1016/j.jbi.2019.103208
498 20. Pflüger LS, Bannasch JH, Brehm TT, et al. Clinical evaluation of five different automated
499 SARS-CoV-2 serology assays in a cohort of hospitalized COVID-19 patients. *J Clin Virol*
500 2020:104549. doi: 10.1016/j.jcv.2020.104549
501 21. Meyer B, Torriani G, Yerly S, et al. Validation of a commercially available SARS-CoV-2
502 serological Immunoassay. *medRxiv* 2020:2020.05.02.20080879. doi:
503 10.1101/2020.05.02.20080879
504 22. Stafford N. Covid-19: Why Germany's case fatality rate seems so low. *BMJ*
505 2020;369:m1395. doi: 10.1136/bmj.m1395
506 23. Steensels D, Oris E, Coninx L, et al. Hospital-Wide SARS-CoV-2 Antibody Screening in
507 3056 Staff in a Tertiary Center in Belgium. *JAMA* 2020 doi: 10.1001/jama.2020.11160
508 24. Martin C, Montesinos I, Dauby N, et al. Dynamic of SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR positivity and
509 seroprevalence among high-risk health care workers and hospital staff. *J Hosp Infect*
510 2020 doi: 10.1016/j.jhin.2020.06.028
511 25. Garcia-Basteiro AL, Moncunill G, Tortajada M, et al. Seroprevalence of antibodies against
512 SARS-CoV-2 among health care workers in a large Spanish reference hospital.
513 *medRxiv* 2020:2020.04.27.20082289. doi: 10.1101/2020.04.27.20082289

514 26. Galan I, Velasco M, Casas ML, et al. SARS-CoV-2 seroprevalence among all workers in a
515 teaching hospital in spain: unmasking the risk. *medRxiv* 2020:2020.05.29.20116731.
516 doi: 10.1101/2020.05.29.20116731
517 27. Houlihan C, Vora N, Byrne T, et al. SARS-CoV-2 virus and antibodies in front-line Health
518 Care Workers in an acute hospital in London: preliminary results from a longitudinal
519 study. *medRxiv* 2020:2020.06.08.20120584. doi: 10.1101/2020.06.08.20120584
520 28. Shields AM, Faustini SE, Perez-Toledo M, et al. SARS-CoV-2 seroconversion in health care
521 workers. *medRxiv* 2020:2020.05.18.20105197. doi: 10.1101/2020.05.18.20105197
522 29. Mansour M, Leven E, Muellers K, et al. Prevalence of SARS-CoV-2 Antibodies Among
523 Healthcare Workers at a Tertiary Academic Hospital in New York City. *J Gen Intern*
524 *Med* 2020:1-2. doi: 10.1007/s11606-020-05926-8
525 30. Stubblefield WB, Talbot HK, Feldstein L, et al. Seroprevalence of SARS-CoV-2 Among
526 Frontline Healthcare Personnel During the First Month of Caring for COVID-19
527 Patients - Nashville, Tennessee. *Clin Infect Dis* 2020 doi: 10.1093/cid/ciaa936
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545

546 **Figure 1 - Serologic results of the study population**



547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566

567 **Figure 2 – Seroconversion rates in study participants using different cut-off ratios**



568

569 *One of the study participants with seroconversion between SP 2 and SP 3 had been tested
570 positive for SARS-CoV-2 by RT-PCR between SP 1 and SP 2, did therefore not attend the first
571 follow-up visit, and was thus counted as seroconverting between SP 2 and SP 3.

572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585

586 **Figure 3 - Timeline of the covid-19 epidemic at the University Medical Center Hamburg-**
587 **Eppendorf and in Hamburg, Germany.**



588

589 Grey bars represent the number of covid-19 patients hospitalized at the University Medical
590 Center Hamburg-Eppendorf (UKE) on the respective days. The blue line represents the
591 cumulative covid-19 incidence in the 11.348 employees of the UKE detected by the low
592 threshold contact- and symptom-based RT-PCR screening. The seroprevalence in the study
593 cohort at the respective sampling periods is represented by blue squares with error bars for
594 95% confidence intervals.

595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605

606 **Supplementary table – Symptoms reported by seropositive and -negative study participants**

607

	Total (n=1061)	Seropositive (n=22)	Seronegative (n=1041)
Any symptoms, n(%)	949 (89.4)	20 (90.9)	929 (89.1)
Typical symptoms, n(%)	582 (54.9)	16 (72.7)	566 (54.4)
Fever, n(%)	112 (10.6)	8 (36.4)	104 (1.0)
Cough, n(%)	498 (46.9)	11 (50.0)	487 (46.8)
Dyspnea, n(%)	231 (21.8)	9 (40.9)	222 (21.3)
Rhinorrhea, n(%)	717 (67.7)	17 (77.3)	700 (67.2)
Sore throat, n(%)	560 (52.8)	11 (50.0)	549 (52.7)
Headache, n(%)	704 (66.4)	16 (72.7)	688 (66.1)
Abdominal pain, n(%)	295 (27.8)	8 (36.4)	287 (27.6)
Muscle aches, n(%)	244 (23.0)	13 (59.1)	231 (22.2)
Nausea, n(%)	213 (20.1)	8 (36.4)	205 (19.7)
Diarrhea, n(%)	296 (27.9)	8 (36.4)	288 (27.7)

608

609 Respective symptoms as stated by the study participants at SP 1 or SP 2 for the preceding
610 month and at SP 3 for the preceding 2 months. Complete information was provided by a total
611 of 1061 participants.