

1 Comparison of COVID-19 Infections Among Healthcare Workers and Non-Healthcare Workers

2

3 Rachel Kim¹, Sharon Nachman², Rafael Fernandes¹, Kristen Meyers¹, Maria Taylor¹, Debra
4 LeBlanc¹, Adam J Singer^{1*}

5

6 ¹Department of Emergency Medicine

7 Renaissance School of Medicine at Stony Brook University

8 Stony Brook, New York, United States of America

9

10 ²Department of Pediatrics

11 Renaissance School of Medicine at Stony Brook University

12 Stony Brook, New York, United States of America

13

14

15

16

17

18 *Corresponding author

19

20 E-mail: adam.singer@stonybrook.edu

21

22

23

24

25 **Abstract**

26 **Objectives**

27 Healthcare workers face distinct occupational challenges that affect their personal
28 health, especially during a pandemic. In this study we compare the characteristics and
29 outcomes of Covid-19 patients who are and who are not healthcare workers (HCW).

30 **Methods**

31 We retrospectively analyzed a cohort of adult patients with known HCW status and a
32 positive SARS-CoV-2 PCR test presenting to a large academic medical center emergency
33 department (ED) in New York State. We routinely collect data on occupation and exposures to
34 suspected Covid-19. The primary outcome was hospital admission. Secondary outcomes were
35 ICU admission, need for invasive mechanical ventilation (IMV), and mortality. We compared
36 baseline characteristics and outcomes of Covid-19 adult patients based on whether they were
37 or were not HCW using univariable and multivariable analyses.

38 **Results**

39 From March 1 2020 through June 2020, 2,842 adult patients (mean age 53+/-19 years,
40 53% male) with positive SARS-CoV-2 PCR tests and known HCW status visited the ED. This
41 included 193 (6.8%) known HCWs and 2,649 (93.2%) non-HCWs. Compared with non-HCW,
42 HCWs were younger (43 vs 53 years, $P<0.001$), more likely female (118/193 vs 1211/2649,
43 $P<0.001$), and more likely to have a known Covid-19 exposure (161/193 vs 946/2649, $P<0.001$),
44 but had fewer comorbidities. On presentation to the ED, HCW also had lower frequencies of
45 tachypnea (12/193 vs 426/2649, $P<0.01$), hypoxemia (15/193 vs 564/2649, $P<0.01$), bilateral

46 opacities on imaging (38/193 vs 1189/2649, $P < 0.001$), and lymphocytopenia (6/193 vs
47 532/2649, $P < 0.01$) compared to non-HCWs. Direct discharges home from the ED were more
48 frequent in HCW 154/193: 80% vs 1275/2649: 48% $p < 0.001$). Hospital admissions (38/193 20%
49 vs 1264/2694 47%, $P < 0.001$), ICU admissions (7/193 3% vs 321/2694 12%, $P < 0.001$), need for
50 IMV (6/193 3% vs 321/2694 12%, $P < 0.001$) and mortality (2/193 1% vs 219/2694 8%, $P < 0.01$)
51 were lower than among non-HCW. After controlling for age, sex, comorbidities, presenting vital
52 signs and radiographic imaging, HCW were less likely to be admitted (OR 0.6, 95%CI 0.3-0.9)
53 than non HCW.

54 **Conclusions**

55 Compared with non HCW, HCW with Covid-19 were younger, had less severe illness, and
56 were less likely to be admitted.

57

58 **Introduction**

59 Illness in healthcare workers (HCWs) is of particular concern in light of the coronavirus
60 disease 19 (Covid-19) pandemic. HCWs are often at risk for increased exposure to infectious
61 diseases compared to the general population, and they may serve as vectors for transmission of
62 these illnesses [1]. The repeated exposure to pathogens may also alter the course of infectious
63 disease in HCWs compared to that in the general population. There is currently little literature
64 studying how HCWs with Covid-19 have fared, and whether their course of disease may be
65 different than non-HCWs.

66 In April 2020 a CDC Morbidity and Mortality Report documented that HCWs made up
67 3% of COVID-19 cases in the US, however HCW status was only reported in 16% of cases [2]. In
68 states that reported HCW status of all Covid-19 cases, HCWs made up 11% of cases [2]. In our
69 hospital, routine documentation of healthcare worker status and exposure to patients with
70 suspected Covid-19 was added to the emergency department (ED) patient intake form at the
71 end of February.

72 The objectives of the current study were to compare baseline characteristics and
73 subsequent outcomes in adult HCW or non HCW patients with Covid-19 presenting to a large
74 ED, including those admitted to our hospital and those directly discharged from the ED.

75

76 **Methods**

77 **Study Design**

78 We conducted a structured, retrospective review of all patients presenting to our ED
79 with confirmed Covid-19 based on a positive SARS-CoV-2 PCR. This study followed the
80 Strengthening of Reporting of Observational Studies in Epidemiology (STROBE) reporting
81 guidelines for cross-sectional studies [3]. We also followed the recommended methodology of
82 Kaji et al. for retrospective chart reviews [4]. We received IRB approval with waiver of informed
83 consent due to the retrospective nature of this study.

84 **Patients and Setting**

85 Our hospital is a 650 bed, suburban academic tertiary-care hospital located
86 approximately 60 miles from Manhattan. Patient volume is approximately 110,000 adult and
87 pediatric patients per year. Eligible patients presented from March 1, 2020 to June 30, 2020
88 and included all patients over 18 years of age with Covid-19 confirmed by a positive SARS-Cov-2
89 PCR. In our ED we routinely collected data on patient occupation and exposure to suspected
90 Covid-19 throughout the study period. Patients without information regarding whether they
91 were HCW or not were excluded.

92 **Data Source and Collection**

93 Data included in our analysis were either automatically extracted from the electronic
94 medical record (e.g., vital signs and laboratory results) or were abstracted through manual
95 chart review (e.g., symptoms and HCW status). Specific data extracted included demographics,
96 past medical history and comorbidities based on patient report, baseline vital signs, symptoms

97 at presentation, laboratory test results, radiological findings, treatments, and outcomes (e.g.,
98 disposition, need for IMV, and mortality).

99 We defined all study data and variables prior to initiating the study and trained our data
100 abstractors using a library of definitions. Healthcare workers included physicians, nurses,
101 technicians and any other support staff that come into direct contact with patients. Hypoxemia
102 was defined as an oxygen saturation less than 94% while tachypnea was defined as a
103 respiratory rate greater than 24/min. We periodically monitored data collection and
104 determined the inter-observer agreement on the primary and secondary outcomes on a
105 randomly selected sample of 20 study patients. Interobserver agreement (Kappa statistic)
106 ranged from 0.89 (95% CI, 0.67-0.99) to 1.0.

107 **Study Outcomes**

108 The primary outcome was hospital admission. Secondary outcomes were ICU admission,
109 need for invasive mechanical ventilation, and mortality.

110 **Data Analysis**

111 Discrete data are summarized as numbers and frequencies for nominal data and
112 compared with Chi-square or Fisher's exact tests (when sample sizes were less than 5).
113 Continuous data are summarized as means with standard deviations (SD) or medians with
114 interquartile (IQR) ranges and compared with T-tests or Mann Whitney U tests for normally
115 distributed and skewed data respectively. For all variables and models, we only used the initial
116 findings at ED presentation. Exploratory multivariable analysis of primary and secondary
117 outcomes was performed using potential predictor variables chosen based on biological

118 plausibility and previous reports such as age, sex, comorbidities, presenting vital signs, chest XR
119 findings, and HCW status. Comparisons between groups were performed using logistic and
120 linear regression for binary and continuous data respectively. Level of significance was defined
121 as a P value of 0.05 or less. Data was analyzed using SPSS for Windows version 27 (IBM,
122 Armonk, NY).
123

124 **Results**

125 **General Characteristics**

126 From March 1 to June 30 2020 there were 2,888 Covid-19 infected patients that
127 presented to our ED, of which 2,846 were over 18 years of age. HCW status was unknown in
128 four patients leaving a sample size of 2,842 study patients. Overall, the mean (SD) age for adult
129 patients was 53 (19) years, 1,513 (53%) were male and 1,306 (46%) were white. The total
130 number of patients admitted to the hospital was 1,406 (49%) of which 328 (12%) were
131 admitted to an ICU (either immediately or subsequent to admission to a regular floor). Invasive
132 mechanical ventilation was required in 261/2842 (9.1%) patients and 221/2842 patients (7.8%)
133 died.

134 **Univariable comparisons**

135 A comparison of patient baseline characteristics based on HCW status is presented in
136 Table 1. Compared with non HCW, HCW were younger (43+/-13 vs 53+/-18 years; mean
137 difference 10, 95%CI 8 to 23, P<0.001] more likely female (61% vs. 46%; mean difference 15%,
138 95%CI 8-23, P<0.001), and less likely Hispanic (12% vs. 36%; mean difference 23%, 95%CI 17-28,
139 P<0.001). HCW were less likely to have comorbidities (33% vs 49%; mean difference 16%,
140 95%CI 8-22, P<0.01) but more likely to have reported a known contact with a person with
141 Covid-19 symptoms (83% vs 36%; mean difference 48%, 95%CI 41-53, P<0.001) than non-HCW.
142 While no HCW resided in a skilled nursing facility, 11% of non HCW came from a nursing home.
143

144 **Table 1. Patients General Characteristics**

145

	Non HCW	HCW	Difference in % unless otherwise specified (95% CI)
Total cases	2649	193	
Male gender	1438 (54)	75 (39)	15 (8-23)
Mean age (SD)	53 (18)	43 (13)	10 (8-12)
Ethnicity			
Hispanic	941 (36)	24 (12)	23 (17-28)
Non-Hispanic	1349 (51)	151 (78)	-27 (-33 - -20)
Unspecified	359 (13)	18 (9)	4 (-1-8)
Number of Comorbidities			
0	1357 (51)	129 (67)	-16 (-22 - -8)
1	599 (23)	45 (23)	1 (-8 - 5)
>1	693 (26)	19 (10)	16 (11-20)
Comorbidity			
Diabetes	473 (18)	21 (11)	7 (1-11)
HTN	879 (33)	40 (21)	13 (6-18)
COPD	131 (5)	1 (1)	4 (2-5)
Asthma	173 (7)	18 (9)	-3 (-8 - 1)
Cancer	171 (6)	3 (2)	5 (2-6)
CHF	137 (5)	0 (0)	5 (3-6)
CAD	263 (10)	3 (2)	8 (5-10)
Immunosuppressed	131 (5)	1 (1)	4 (2-5)
CKD	156 (6)	3 (2)	4 (1-6)
Place of Origin			
Home	2346 (89)	193 (100)	-11 (-13 - -9)
Nursing home	302 (11)	0 (0)	11 (9-13)
Contact with sick person (COVID19 or Flu-like Symptoms)	946 (36)	161 (83)	48 (-53 - -41)

146

147

148

149 A comparison of initial vital signs, laboratory results and radiological findings based on
 150 HCW status is presented in Table 2. Compared with non HCW, HCW were less likely to be
 151 tachypneic (6% vs 13%; mean difference 7, 95%CI 2-10, P<0.01), hypoxemic (8% vs 22%; mean
 152 difference 13%, 95%CI 8-17, P<0.01), have bilateral lung opacities on imaging (20% vs 45%;
 153 mean difference 25, 95%CI 18-31, P<0.01), or have lymphopenia (6% vs 20%; mean difference
 154 14, 95%CI 9-17, P<0.01).

155 **Table 2. Signs, Imaging and Laboratory Characteristics on Presentation**

156

	Non HCW	HCW	Difference in % unless otherwise specified (95% CI)
Fever>38° C	426 (16)	30 (16)	1 (-5 – 6)
Tachypnea (RR>24/min.)	335 (13)	12 (6)	7 (2-10)
Hypoxemia			
>94%	2065 (79)	176 (92)	-13 (-17 - -8)
89-93%	364 (14)	10 (5)	9 (4-12)
<88%	200 (8)	5 (3)	5 (1-7)
Bilateral opacities on imaging	1189 (45)	38 (20)	25 (18-31)
Leukopenia<4000/ml	157 (9)	9 (13)	-3 (-14 – 3)
Lymphocytopenia <1000/ml	532 (20)	12 (6)	14 (9-17)
Creatinine >1.5 mg/dL	272 (16)	5 (7)	9 (-1 – 14)
D-Dimer>750 mg/L	223 (23)	5 (10)	12 (-1 – 19)
CRP >8.2 mg/ml	650 (45)	21 (43)	2 (-13 – 16)
Procalcitonin>0.5 ng/ml	256 (18)	6 (13)	5 (-10 – 13)
AST>40 U/ml	721 (46)	30 (50)	-4 (-18 – 9)
Troponin >0.06 ng/ml	130 (9)	2 (4)	5 (-6 – 9)
Mean (SD) length of symptoms prior to ED arrival, days	6 (7)	5 (5)	1.5 (0.5 – 2.5)

157

158 HCW: healthcare worker; RR: respiratory rate; SD: standard deviation.

159

160
 161 HCW were more likely than non HCW to be directly discharged from the ED (154 /193
 162 [80%] vs 1275/2649 [48%]; mean difference 32, 95%CI 25-37 [P<0.001]). By comparison, non
 163 HCW were more likely to require ICU admission (321/2649 [12%] vs 7/193 [4%]; mean
 164 difference 8, 95%CI 4-11, P<0.001), invasive mechanical ventilation (6/193 [10%] vs 255/2649
 165 [3%]; mean difference 7, 95%CI 3-9, P<0.01), and to die (2/193 [8%] vs 219/2649 [1%]; mean
 166 difference 7, 95%CI 4-9, P<0.001) than HCW. See table 3 for complete results.

167 **Table 3. Disposition**
 168

No. (%)	Non HCW	HCW	Difference in % unless otherwise specified (95% CI)
Discharged from ED	1275 (48)	154 (80)	-32 (-37 - -25)
Admitted to regular floor	1264 (48)	38 (20)	28 (21-34)
Direct admit to ICU	103 (4)	1 (0.5)	3 (1-4)
Died in ED	7 (0.3)	0 (0)	0.3 (-0.2 - 0.2)
Length of stay			
All	5.4 (10.1)	1.4 (4.0)	4.0 (3.3-4.7)
Discharged	0.05 (0.40)	0.02 (0.14)	0.03 (-0.04 - 0.09)
Admitted	10.5 (12.1)	6.9 (6.5)	3.6 (1.4-5.8)
Patients requiring IMV	255 (10)	6 (3)	7 (3-9)
Patients requiring ICU	321 (12)	7 (4)	8 (4-11)
Overall mortality	219 (8)	2 (1)	7 (4-9)

169
 170 HCW: healthcare worker; ED: emergency department; CIU: intensive care unit; IMV: invasive mechanical
 171 ventilation.
 172

173

174 **Multivariable Analyses**

175 After controlling for known potential confounders (including age, sex, comorbidities,
 176 vital signs, and CXR findings), variables significantly associated with admission included age (OR
 177 1.05/year, 95%CI 1.04-1.06), fever (OR 2.1, 95%CI 1.57-2.81), tachypnea (OR 6.0, 95%CI 3.56-
 178 1.53), hypoxemia (OR 1.46, 95%CI 1.39-1.53) and presence of comorbidities (OR 1.75, 95%CI
 179 1.35-2.25 and 4.1, 95%CI 3.0-5.5 for one or more comorbidities respectively). HCW were less
 180 likely than non HCW to require hospital admission (OR 0.58, 95%CI 0.36-0.92) even after
 181 adjusting for confounders (Table 4).

182 **Table 4. Multivariable Predictors of Outcomes**

183

	OR	95% CI
Hospital Admission		
Male sex	1.09	0.88-1.35
Age per year	1.05	1.04-1.06
Non-HCW	Reference	-
HCW	0.58	0.36-0.92
Temp > 38° C	2.10	1.57-2.81
Tachypnea >24/min.	6.00	3.56-10.11
Hypoxemia <94%	1.46	1.39-1.53
Any exposure	0.50	0.40-0.63
# comorbidities		
0	Reference	-
1	1.75	1.35-2.25
2+	4.06	3.01-5.47
Invasive Mechanical Ventilation		
Male	2.04	1.48-2.81
Age per year	0.99	0.98-1.00
Non-HCW	Reference	-
HCW	0.97	0.38-2.45
Temp > 38° C	1.30	0.92-1.83
Tachypnea > 24/min.	1.24	0.96-1.78
Hypoxemia <94%	1.09	1.06-1.12
Any exposure	1.22	0.88-1.68
# comorbidities		
0	Reference	-
1	1.36	0.91-2.04
2+	1.30	0.87-1/93
ICU Admission		

Male sex	1.73	1.30-2.29
Age per year	0.99	0.98-1.00
Non-HCW	Reference	-
HCW	0.80	0.33-1.91
Temp > 38° C	1.16	0.85-1.60
Tachypnea >24/min.	1.54	1.11-2.13
Hypoxemia	1.08	1.05-1.10
Any exposure	1.13	0.84-1.52
# comorbidities		
0	Reference	-
1	1.32	0.91-1.90
2+	1.40	0.97-2.00
Mortality		
Male	1.97	1.38-2.82
Age per year	1.05	1.04-1.07
Non-HCW	Reference	-
HCW	0.94	0.21-4.24
Temp > 38° C	0.77	0.48-1.22
Tachypnea >24/min.	1.45	0.97-2.16
Hypoxemia <94%	1.09	1.06-1.12
Any exposure	0.80	0.54-1.19
# comorbidities		
0	Reference	-
1	1.03	0.61-1.76
2+	1.50	0.94-2.41

184

185

186 Variables associated with ICU admission after adjusting for confounders were male sex
 187 (OR 1.73, 95%CI, 1.3-2.3), tachypnea (OR 1.54, 95%CI 1.1-2.13), and hypoxemia (OR 1.08, 95%CI
 188 1.05-1.10). Variables associated with IMV were male sex (OR 2.04, 95%CI, 1.48-2.81) and
 189 hypoxemia (OR 1.09, 95%CI, 1.06-1.12). Variables independently associated with mortality
 190 included male sex (OR 1.97, 95%CI 1.38-2.82), age (OR 1.05/year, 95%CI 1.04-1.07) and
 191 hypoxemia (OR 1.09, 95%CI 1.06-1.12). Being a HCW was not associated with increased risk of
 192 ICU admission, IMV, or mortality.

193

194 **Discussion**

195 Our study identifies clear differences in HCWs with Covid-19 presenting to the emergency
196 department compared to non-HCWs. HCW were generally younger and with fewer comorbidities than
197 non HCW. Compared with non HCW, HCW were less severely ill as evidenced by lower rates of
198 tachypnea, hypoxemia, lymphopenia and the presence of bilateral opacities on radiographic imaging.
199 As a result, HCW were less likely to be admitted to the hospital, to require ICU level of care, require
200 invasive mechanical ventilation and to ultimately die than non HCW. This seemingly milder course of
201 disease in HCWs compared to the general population is reported in other studies of Covid-19 in HCWs
202 [5]. Given the large number of HCW in our catchment area and their potential high risk of exposure to
203 Covid-19 [6], it is reassuring to find low rates of severe illness when compared to the general
204 population. In our study we found that being a HCW was not associated with poor outcomes even
205 after adjusting for age and comorbidities.

206 Certain characteristics of HCWs with COVID-19 may be attributed to common characteristics of
207 HCWs in general. Although men constitute a larger percentage of total HCWs in the United States,
208 women make up the majority of most types of healthcare occupations including registered nurses,
209 home health aides, medical assistants, and physician assistants [7]. This may be reflected by the large
210 majority of HCW Covid-19 cases in female HCWs. The higher frequency of HCW Covid-19 infection in
211 females and those in the age group 16-44 has been repeatedly found in most studies that report this
212 demographic information [2,5,8-15].

213 Overall, morbidity and mortality studies for HCWs are sparse, however those that exist suggest
214 that HCWs, particularly physicians, tend to live longer than age and sex matched non HCW [16]. While
215 some studies have found that physicians are more likely to have chronic conditions like obesity,

216 metabolic syndromes, hypertension and cardiovascular disease, others have found that they are at
217 lower risk for these illnesses [1]. HCWs are also more likely to have come in contact with a sick person
218 because of the nature of their job [16]. This strongly supports the importance of continued use of
219 appropriate PPE for all HCW. All of these factors have the potential to contribute to an altered course
220 of Covid-19 in HCWs.

221 Our study has several notable limitations. Most importantly, our study was retrospective and
222 subject to considerable selection bias and residual confounding. In addition, the number of healthcare
223 workers was relatively limited. We also did not distinguish between various types of healthcare
224 workers based on their specific profession. Furthermore, our study is representative of a single large
225 academic center near the epicenter of the Covid-19 pandemic and may be less representative of other
226 centers. We also did not control for ethnicity.

227 **Conclusions**

228 In summary, we found that when compared to adult non-healthcare workers with Covid-19
229 presenting to the ED, healthcare workers with Covid-19 were more likely to have an identified COVID
230 exposure, present less severely ill, and less likely to be admitted to the hospital. Longer term follow-up
231 of HCW will be needed to better assess the risk of HCW.

232 **Acknowledgments**

233 Research reported in this publication was supported by the Stony Brook University's
234 Renaissance School of Medicine COVID-19 Data Repository Quality Initiative instituted by the Office of
235 the Dean of the Renaissance School of Medicine and supported by the Department of Biomedical Informatics.
236

238 References

- 239
- 240 1. Mohanty, A., Kabi, A., and Mohanty, A.P. Health problems in healthcare workers: A review. J
241 Family Med Prim Care. 2019 Aug; 8(8): 2568–2572. doi: 10.4103/jfmprc.jfmprc_431_19:
242 10.4103/jfmprc.jfmprc_431_19
- 243
- 244 2. CDC COVID-19 Response Team. Characteristics of Health Care Personnel with COVID-19 —
245 United States, February 12–April 9, 2020. CDC Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report. April
246 2020. <https://cdc.gov/mmwr/volumes/69/wr/mm6915e6.htm>. Accessed on August 5,
247 2020.
- 248
- 249 3. STROBE Guidelines for Cross-Sectional Studies. Enhancing the QUALity and Transparency Of
250 health Research (EQUATOR) Network October 22, 2019. [https://www.equator-](https://www.equator-network.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/10/STROBE_checklist_v4_cross-sectional.pdf)
251 [network.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/10/STROBE_checklist_v4_cross-sectional.pdf](https://www.equator-network.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/10/STROBE_checklist_v4_cross-sectional.pdf)
252 Accessed on May 6, 2020.
- 253
- 254 4. Kaji AH, Schriger D, Green S. Looking Through the Retrospectoscope: Reducing Bias in
255 Emergency Medicine Chart Review Studies. *Annals of Emergency Medicine* 2014;64(3):292-
256 298. doi:10.1016/j.annemergmed.2014.03.025
- 257
- 258 5. Chou, R., Dana, T., Buckley, D.I., Selph, S., Fu, R., and Totten, A.M. Epidemiology of and Risk
259 Factors for Coronavirus Infection in Health Care Workers. *Ann Intern Med*. May 2020.
260 doi:10.7326/M20-1632
- 261
- 262 6. Nguyen LH, Drew DA, Graham MS, et al. Risk of COVID-19 among front-line health-care workers
263 and the general community: a prospective cohort study. *Lancet* July 31, 2020.
264 Doi.org/10.1016/S2468-2667(20)30164-X.
- 265
- 266 7. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Health Resources and Services Administration,
267 National Center for Health Workforce Analysis. Sex, Race, and Ethnic Diversity of U.S, Health
268 Occupations (2011-2015), Rockville, Maryland. 2017.
- 269
- 270 8. Wang, X., Pan, Z., and Cheng, Z. Association between 2019-nCoV transmission and N95
271 respirator use. *J Hosp Infect*. March 2020;105, 104-105.
272 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhin.2020.02.021>
- 273
- 274 9. Dai, Y.H., G.; Xiong, H.; Qiu, H.; Yuan, X. Psychological impact of the corona- virus disease
275 2019 (COVID-19) outbreak on healthcare workers in China. medRxiv. March 2020. doi:
276 <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.03.03.20030874>
- 277
- 278 10. Liu, M, He, P., Liu, HG.; et al. (2020). Clinical characteristics of 30 medical workers infected
279 with new coronavirus pneumonia. *Prime*. March 2020.
- 280

- 281 11. Kang, L., Ma, S., Chen, M., Yang, J., Wang, Y., Li, R., Yao, L., Bai, H., Cai, Z., Xiang Yang, B., *et*
282 *al.* Impact on mental health and perceptions of psychological care among medical and
283 nursing staff in Wuhan during the 2019 novel coronavirus disease outbreak: A cross-
284 sectional study. *Brain Behav Immun.* March 2020. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bbi.2020.03.028>
285
- 286 12. Lai, J., Ma, S., Wang, Y., Cai, Z., Hu, J., Wei, N., Wu, J., Du, H., Chen, T., Li, R., *et al.* (2020).
287 Factors Associated With Mental Health Outcomes Among Health Care Workers Exposed to
288 Coronavirus Disease 2019. *JAMA Netw Open.* March 2020. 3, e203976.
289 doi:10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2020.3976
290
- 291 13. Liu, J., Ouyang, L.; Guo, P.; Wu, H.; Fu, P.; Chen, Y.; Yang, D.; Han, X.; Cao, Y.; Alwalid, O.;
292 Tao, J.; Peng, S.; Shi, H.; Yang, F.; Zheng, C. Epidemiological, clinical character- istics and
293 outcome of medical staff infected with COVID-19 in Wuhan, China: a retrospective case
294 series analysis. *medRxiv.* March 2020.
295 <https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.03.09.20033118v1>
296
- 297 14. Kluytmans, M.B., A.; Pas, S.; Bentvelsen, R. G.; Bijllaardt, W.; Oudheusden, A. J. G.; van Rijen,
298 M. M. L.; Verweji, J. J.; Koopmans, M. P. G.; Kluytmans, J.A.J.W. SARS-CoV-2 infection in 86
299 healthcare workers in two Dutch hospitals in March 2020. *medRXiv.* March 2020.
300 <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.03.23.20041913>
301
- 302 15. McMichael, T.M., Currie, D.W., Clark, S., Pogosjans, S., Kay, M., Schwartz, N.G., Lewis, J.,
303 Baer, A., Kawakami, V., Lukoff, M.D., *et al.* Epidemiology of Covid-19 in a Long-Term Care
304 Facility in King County, Washington. *N Engl J Med.* March 2020;382, 2005-2011. DOI:
305 10.1056/NEJMoa2005412
306
- 307 16. Frank, E.B., H.; Burnett, C.A. Mortality Rates and Cases Among U.S. Physicians. *Am J Prev Med*
308 2000;19(3): 155–159.
309
310