

1 A rapid systematic review of measures to protect older people in long term care facilities from

2 COVID-19

3 Kate Frazer^{1*}, Lachlan Mitchell^{2,3*}, Diarmuid Stokes⁴, Ella Lacey⁵, Eibhlin Crowley⁶, Cecily

4 Kelleher^{2,3}.

5 1. School of Nursing, Midwifery and Health Systems, University College Dublin, Belfield,

6 Dublin 4, Ireland

7 2. National Nutrition Surveillance Centre, University College Dublin, Belfield, Dublin 4, Ireland

8 3. School of Public Health, Physiotherapy and Sport Science, University College Dublin,

9 Belfield, Dublin 4, Ireland

10 4. Health Sciences Library, University College Dublin, Belfield, Dublin 4, Ireland

11 5. School of Medicine, University College Dublin, Belfield, Dublin 4, Ireland

12 6. Office for Health Affairs, College of Health and Agricultural Science, University College

13 Dublin, Belfield, Dublin 4, Ireland

14 *Equal contribution

15 Running title: Measures to protect older people from COVID-19

16 Word count: 2431

17 Abstract word count: 232

18 Keywords: Coronavirus, COVID-19, nursing homes, transmission

19

20

21

22

23

24 **Abstract**

25 The global COVID-19 pandemic produced large-scale health and economic complications. Older
26 people and those with comorbidities are particularly vulnerable to this virus, with nursing homes and
27 long term care facilities experiencing significant morbidity and mortality associated with COVID-19
28 outbreaks. The aim of this rapid systematic review was to investigate measures implemented in long
29 term care facilities to reduce transmission of COVID-19 and their effect on morbidity and mortality of
30 residents, staff, and visitors. Databases (including MedRXiv pre-published repository) were
31 systematically searched to identify studies reporting assessment of interventions to reduce
32 transmission of COVID-19 in nursing homes among residents, staff, or visitors. Outcome measures
33 include facility characteristics, morbidity data, case fatalities, and transmission rates. Due to study
34 quality and heterogeneity, no meta-analysis was conducted. The search yielded 1414 articles, with 38
35 studies included. Reported interventions include mass testing, use of personal protective equipment,
36 symptom screening, visitor restrictions, hand hygiene and droplet/contact precautions, and resident
37 cohorting. Prevalence rates ranged from 1.2-85.4% in residents and 0.6-62.6% in staff. Mortality rates
38 ranged from 5.3-55.3% in residents. Novel evidence in this review details the impact of facility size,
39 availability of staff and practices of operating between multiple facilities, and for-profit status of
40 facilities as factors contributing to the size and number of COVID-19 outbreaks. No causative
41 relationships can be determined; however, this review provides evidence of interventions that reduce
42 transmission of COVID-19 in long term care facilities.

43

44

45

46

47

48

49 **Introduction**

50 Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus-2 (SARS-CoV-2) is a novel virus, first identified in
51 China in 2019, resulting in the current global pandemic in 2020.¹ The ensuing disease associated with
52 infection from SARS-CoV-2, termed COVID-19, has produced large-scale public health and
53 worldwide economic effects.²

54 The virus spreads between people through close contact and droplet transmission (coughs and
55 sneezes). While most infected people will experience mild flu-like symptoms, others may become
56 seriously ill and die.³ At-risk groups include older people and those with underlying medical
57 conditions, while men appear to have more susceptibility than women. Symptom severity varies;
58 several individuals remain asymptomatic, others experience fever, cough, sore throat, general
59 weakness, and fatigue, while more severe respiratory illnesses and infections may result, which can be
60 fatal.^{4,5} Deterioration in clinical presentations can occur rapidly, leading to poorer health outcomes.
61 Anosmia and ageusia are reported in evidence from South Korea, China, and Italy in patients with
62 confirmed SARS-CoV-2 infection, in some cases in the absence of other symptoms.⁶

63 The World Health Organization (WHO) declared the COVID-19 outbreak constituted a Public Health
64 Emergency of International Concern (PHEIC) on January 30, 2020.⁵ Two primary goals of action
65 were 1) to accelerate innovative research to help contain the spread and facilitate care for all affected,
66 and 2) to support research priorities globally the learning from the pandemic response for
67 preparedness. Globally, up to October 5, 2020, there are 35 247 104 cases of COVID-19 (following
68 the applied case definitions and testing strategies in the affected countries) including 1 038 069
69 deaths.⁷ Within Europe, over 5 431 510 cases are reported, with 226 869 deaths⁷

70 Presently there is no vaccine; therefore, preventing and limiting transmission is advocated.
71 International and national evidence mandates physical distancing, regular hand hygiene and cough
72 etiquette, and limiting touching eyes, nose or mouth; in addition to regular cleaning of surfaces.⁸

73 As noted older people are an at-risk group for COVID-19, and throughout the pandemic, the impact
74 on this population has resulted in increased mortality, specifically those living in long term care

75 facilities (LTCF) where a high proportion of outbreaks with increased rates of morbidity and case
76 fatality in residents are recorded.⁹ In several EU/EEA countries, LTCF deaths among residents,
77 associated with COVID-19, account for 37% to 66% of all COVID-19-related fatalities.⁹ The specific
78 rationale for their increased susceptibility is less clear. The United Nations (UN) (2020) acknowledge
79 that COVID-19 exposes the inequalities in society and the failures expressed in the 2030 Agenda for
80 Sustainable Development. The UN report the disproportionate fatality rates in those aged over 80
81 years as five times the global average¹⁰ and suggest a need for a more *inclusive, equitable and age-*
82 *friendly society, anchored in human rights* (p.16).¹¹

83 The aim of this rapid review of the literature was to assess the extent to which measures implemented
84 in LTCF reduced transmission of COVID-19 (SARS-CoV-2) among residents, staff, and visitors, and
85 the effect of these measures on morbidity and mortality outcomes.

86 **Methods**

87 The protocol is registered on PROSPERO (CRD42020191569)¹² and reporting follows PRISMA
88 guidelines.¹³

89 *Search strategy*

90 Search strategies comprised search terms both for keywords and controlled-vocabulary search terms
91 MESH and EMTREE (see Supplementary Table 1 for full search terms). EMBASE (via OVID),
92 PubMed (via OVID), Cumulative Index to Nursing and Allied Health Literature (CINAHL),
93 Cochrane Database and Repository, and MedRXiv pre-published databases were searched. No time
94 limits were imposed, and databases were searched up to July 27, 2020. Reference lists of included
95 evidence were checked for further articles.

96 *Eligibility criteria*

97 All study designs (experimental, observational, and qualitative) are included, and no exclusions
98 placed on language. Included studies report an assessment of measures to reduce transmission of
99 COVID-19 (including SARS or MERS) in residents, employees, or visitors of LTCF. To provide as
100 comprehensive a review of the evidence we included any intervention implemented to reduce the

101 transmission of COVID-19 in long-term residential care facilities, including facility measures, social
102 distancing, use of personal protective equipment, and hand hygiene.

103 *Primary outcome measures*

104 Primary outcome measures are morbidity data, case fatality rates, reductions in reported transmission
105 rates, and facility characteristics associated with COVID-19 incidence.

106 *Selection of studies and data extraction*

107 Two authors developed search strings (DS & KF); all database searches were completed by one
108 author (DS) (Supplementary Table 1). Following de-duplication, references were uploaded into
109 Covidence management platform (LM), and two authors independently screened all titles and
110 abstracts (LM & KF). Full texts of all potentially eligible studies were independently reviewed by two
111 authors (LM & KF). Disagreements were resolved by discussion with a third author (CK). Data from
112 included studies were independently extracted in duplicate (LM & KF). A data extraction form was
113 developed and modified from documents used previously by authors (KF & CK). Extracted data
114 included study characteristics (title, lead author, year of publication, country, study setting, study
115 design), description of the intervention, number and characteristics of participants, outcomes, duration
116 of follow-up, sources of funding, peer review status). Study design (required for review of quality)
117 was independently assessed by two authors (LM & KF), with disagreements resolved by a third
118 author (CK).

119 *Assessment of Quality*

120 Two review authors (LM & EL) independently assessed the quality of included studies using Mixed
121 Methods Assessment Tool (MMAT),¹⁴ with disagreements resolved by a third author (KF) and
122 discussed with the lead author (CK) (Supplementary Table 2). The MMAT is used widely and
123 considered a valid indicator of methodological quality using instruments for non-randomised and
124 descriptive studies.

125 *Data synthesis*

126 Meta-analysis was not possible due to heterogeneity in study designs, participants, outcomes, and
127 nature of the interventions and no attempt was made to transform statistical data. The SWiM criteria¹⁵
128 guide a narrative summary, with data presented in tabular format and subgroup reporting of
129 population groups.

130

131 **Results**

132 We identified 1414 articles, and 131 full-text articles were selected for review. After an evaluation
133 against our inclusion criteria, 38 studies (40 papers) are included in this systematic review (Figure 1).

134 *Study characteristics*

135 Geographically we report evidence from eleven countries, the majority (20 studies) are from USA¹⁶⁻³⁵
136 and UK.³⁶⁻⁴⁰ We report evidence from Canada,⁴¹⁻⁴³ France,^{44,45} Hong Kong,^{46,47} Belgium,⁴⁸ Germany,⁴⁹
137 Ireland,⁵⁰ Japan,⁵¹ Korea,⁵² and Spain⁵³ (Table 1).

138 *Infection control measures*

139 Twenty studies report the nature of LTCFs related with outbreaks and transmission of COVID-19
140 infection (Table 2; ^{16,23,28,29,31,33,35-39,41-43,45-47,50-52}). Thirty studies (Table 3a; ^{17-29,32-34,37-43,45-50,53}) report
141 evidence of measures to reduce transmission of COVID-19 in long-term residential care facilities for
142 residents, 25 studies (Table 3b; ^{17-22,24,26-30,32,34,38,39,42-48,50,53}) report evidence for employee outcomes,
143 and two studies report evidence for visitors (Table 3c; ^{28,47}).

144 A variety of infection control measures are described (Tables 1 and 3a-c) including: mass
145 testing/point-prevalence testing (22 studies; ^{17,19-22,25-30,32-34,38,39,44,45,48-50,53}), use of personal protective
146 equipment (10 studies; ^{17,18,20,25,28,29,32,45,47,49}), screening of residents, staff, or visitors for symptoms (8
147 studies; ^{18-20,23,25,27,29,32}), restrictions on visitor entry (10 studies; ^{18-20,25,27,29,32,45,49,53}), hand hygiene and
148 contact and droplet precautions (6 studies; ^{19,23,25,32,45,46}), and cohorting/isolation of residents (11
149 studies; ^{19,20,22,25,28,29,32,33,45,47,49}). Thirteen studies examined characteristics of LTCF and their
150 association with COVID-19 infection and risk ^{16,24,31,35-37,39-43,51,52}.

Table 1. Characteristics of studies including infection control measures

Study ID	Country	Study Design	Setting	Population	Intervention/infection control strategy	Outcome groups	Outcome measures
Abrams et al. (2020) ¹⁶	USA	Cross sectional	Nursing homes	Nursing homes across 30 USA States (n=9395 nursing homes). N=6446 facilities without COVID-19 cases; n=2949 facilities with COVID-19 cases.	Nursing homes characteristics associated with COVID-19 outbreaks	Facilities	Estimates on the relationship of nursing home characteristics and documented COVID-19 cases
Arons et al. (2020) ¹⁷	USA, King County, Washington	Cross sectional cohort	Nursing home facility	Residents N=89 N=76 participated in point-prevalence testing.	PPE (eye protection, gown, gloves, face masks); mass testing.	Residents, staff	COVID-19 prevalence, testing, symptoms, hospitalization, mortality
Blackman et al. (2020) ¹⁸	USA	Cross sectional	Skilled nursing facility	A 150-bedded skilled nursing facility. Single story building with four units.	Employee and visitor screening on entry; visitor restrictions; review of PPE and infection control in the building; use of heat maps in a facility to track staff and residents' symptoms	Residents, staff	COVID-19 prevalence, testing, mortality
Borras-Bermejo et al. (2020) ⁵³	Spain	Cross sectional cohort	Nursing homes	N=69 nursing homes in Barcelona. N=3214 residents and N=2655 staff	Surveillance testing program for COVID-19 in nursing homes; introduction of restrictions for visitors	Residents, staff	COVID-19 prevalence, testing, symptoms

Brainard et al. (2020) ³⁶	England, Norfolk	Retrospective cohort	Care homes	N=248 care homes	Statistical modelling assessing detection of COVID-19 infection relative to PPE availability and impact of staffing by non-care workers	Facilities	Descriptive data and statistical modelling for COVID-19, staffing levels, access to PPE
Brown et al. (2020) ⁴¹	Canada, Ontario	Retrospective cohort	Nursing homes	N=623 nursing homes. N=78,607 residents	Impact of home crowding on COVID-19 infection and mortality using nursing home crowding index score	Residents, facilities	COVID-19 incidence, modelling mortality and overcrowding adjusting for facility characteristics
Burton et al. (2020) ³⁹	Scotland	Cross sectional cohort	Nursing homes	N=189 nursing homes included and data for 109 homes (57.7%) for older people reported, representing 5227 beds (89.5% of total beds in 189 care homes)	Surveillance data to understand the evolution of COVID-19 following outbreaks and care home characteristics in one health board	Facilities, residents	COVID-19 outbreaks, mortality, and facility characteristics
Dora et al. (2020) ¹⁹	USA, California	Cross sectional	Veterans Affairs Greater Los Angeles Healthcare System	N=3 skilled nursing facilities (n=150 long term beds) N=99 residents (95% male, age range 50 to 100 years) N=136 staff Visitors	Three point-prevalence surveys; visitor restrictions (initially all visitors screened, then no visitors permitted into buildings); staff screening; hand hygiene, droplet, and contact precautions; cohorting	Residents, staff	COVID-19 prevalence, symptoms, mortality
Dutey-Magni et al. (2020) ³⁸	UK (England, Scotland, and Northern Ireland)	Cohort	Long term care facilities	N=8713 resident's health records Daily counts of infection in 9339 residents and for 11604 staff across 179 LTCF.	The home testing program introduced for all staff and residents in Four Seasons Healthcare Group (representing 9% of all long-term care beds). All	Residents, staff, and facilities	Cumulative incidence of COVID-19, Kaplan-Meier estimates mortality and symptoms.

					tested at least once.		
Eckardt et al (2020) ²⁰	USA, Florida	Cross sectional cohort	Long term care	120-bedded long-term care facility.	PPE; staff and visitor screening; visitor restrictions; distancing of residents; cohorting exposed residents; point-prevalence testing.	Residents, staff	COVID-19 prevalence
Feaster & Goh (2020) ²¹	USA, Pasadena	Cross sectional cohort	Long term care homes	Residents and staff (n=1093) of LTCF (n=9) N=608 residents (age 78 ± 13.3 years; n=332 female) N=485 staff (age 41.8 ± 13.3 years; n=249 female)	Mass surveillance testing	Residents, staff	COVID-19 prevalence, symptoms
Fisman et al. (2020) ⁴²	Canada, Ontario	Cohort	Long term care facilities	N=269 total individuals who died of COVID-19 in Ontario to April 11, 2020, and n=83 individuals who died of COVID-19 in Ontario LTCF to April 7, 2020. Denominators not available for long-term care residents approximated as the total number of long-term care facility beds in Ontario (79 498), assuming complete occupancy. Median beds 120 [9 to 543]	Surveillance data analysed to evaluate the risk of death and identification of risk factors for prevention strategies	Residents, staff, facilities	COVID-19-specific mortality incidence rate ratios (IRRs) of long term care residents were calculated with community-living Ontarians older than 69 years as the comparator group.

Graham et al. (2020) ²²	England	Cross sectional cohort	Four nursing homes in London, England	N=4 nursing homes. N=394 residents (37.6% male, median age 83 years [IQR 15], 75.4% white) N=596 staff.	Mass surveillance testing; isolation of infected residents	Residents, staff	COVID-19 prevalence, symptoms, mortality. Multivariable logistic regression of presenting symptoms in those who had an available test
Guery et al (2020) ⁴⁴	France, Nantes	Cross sectional cohort	Nursing home	N=136 staff (age 39 years [IQR 27-48.5], n=112 female)	Surveillance testing of staff following confirmed index case	Staff	COVID-19 prevalence, symptoms
Hand et al. (2018) ²³	USA, Louisiana	Cross sectional cohort	Long term care facility	Long term care facility provides services for up to 130 residents: report on 20 resident cases	Outbreak surveillance after 20 cases reported. Adherence to standard droplet precautions for symptomatic residents	Residents, facilities	Prevalence of Coronavirus NL63 symptoms, hospitalizations, mortality
Harris et al. (2020) ²⁴	USA, Virginia	Cross sectional cohort	Long term care facility	N=41 of 48 residents (median age 75 years [44-104], 52.1% female (25/48). 60.4% White (29/48)) N=7 staff	Following an outbreak, response developed for the management of residents and the use of telemedicine. Early identification of residents for escalation of care; monitoring and treating patients safe to remain in a facility; care coordination - bidirectional; daily needs assessment related to technology, infection control and staff wellbeing	Residents, staff	COVID-19 prevalence, mortalities, comorbidities, telemedicine consultations

Heung et al (2006) ⁴⁶	Hong Kong	Cross sectional cohort	Residential care home	N=90 residents N=32 staff N=67/90 residents participated; n=7 (10%) aged 65 -75 years, n=32 (48%) 76-85 years, n=28 (42%) >85 years; n=53 (79%) females. Staff 26/32 participated; n=18 (69%) aged 31-50 years, n=8 (31%) >50 years; 85% females; 54% nursing care role, 46% assistance in daily activities.	Surveillance screening in a residential care home with the introduction of infection control precautions: droplet and contact precautions	Resident, staff, facilities	Seroprevalence of SARS-CoV antibodies. Symptoms, transmission, and mortality
Ho et al. (2004) ⁴⁷	Hong Kong	Cross sectional cohort	Nursing home	N=7 residents, staff, visitors in one nursing home (n=4 females aged 65 years to 93 years; n=3 males aged 27 years, 28 years, and 88 years)	Proposed intervention for future management. Community-based outreach teams led by geriatricians, nurses to closely monitor nursing home residents discharged from hospital	Residents, staff, visitors, facilities	Descriptive data on seven cases, the onset of illness, transmission and outcome including mortality
Hoxha et al. (2020) ⁴⁸	Belgium	Cross sectional cohort	Long Term Care Facilities	Reporting for 2074 of 2500 invited facilities; 280,427 COVID-19 tests. 51% residents (N=142,100) and 49% staff (N=138,327)	Mass testing	Residents and staff	COVID-19 prevalence, symptoms, characteristics associated with positive test outcome
Iritani et al. (2020) ⁵¹	Japan	Cross sectional cohort	Across long term care hospitals/facilities, general medical/welfare facilities, and non-medical/welfare	381 clusters with 3786 infected cases accounting for 23.9% of 15,852 cases	Following government recommendation suspension or restricting temporary use of LTCF in areas where infection prevalent	Facilities	Descriptive data on clusters reported, mortality data

facilities							
Kennelly et al. (2020) ⁵⁰	Ireland	Cross sectional cohort	Nursing homes	Nursing home residents in three community health organizations in Ireland (N=28 nursing homes). Represents 2043 residents & 2303 beds	Mass surveillance testing; post testing program	Staff, residents, facilities	COVID-19 prevalence, symptoms, clinical outcomes, including mortality. Characteristics of facilities associated with transmission.
Kim (2020) ⁵²	Korea (South)	Cross sectional cohort	Nursing home	N=142 nursing home residents N=85 health care workers and caregivers working in one facility	Procedures identified to reduce transmission of COVID-19 following confirmed case in a staff member	Facilities	Data on the preparedness of the facility to reduce transmission.
Kimball et al. (2020) ²⁵	USA, King County, Washington	Cross sectional cohort	Long-Term Care Skilled Nursing Facility	Nursing home. N=82 residents; 76/82 (92.7%) underwent symptom assessment and testing; three (3.7%) refused testing	Surveillance testing; PPE; hand hygiene; visitor restrictions; staff screening; daily resident symptom assessments; isolation of positive residents	Residents	COVID-19 prevalence and symptoms
Klein et al (2020) ⁵¹	Germany, Hamburg	Cross sectional	Residential care facility	N=60 resident and report from eight deceased residents.	Mass testing; PPE; resident cohorting; visitor restrictions	Residents	COVID-19 prevalence and symptoms, management

Lennon et al. (2020) ²⁶	USA, Massachusetts	Cross sectional cohort	Skilled facilities, nursing homes and assisted living facilities	N=366 skilled nursing facilities N=32,480 residents and staff tested once, and 6.7% tested subsequently. N=16,966 residents (mean age 82 ± 13; 65% female). N=15,514 staff (mean age 45 ± 15; 76% female).	Mass testing and recording of symptoms, comparison of viral levels	Residents, staff	COVID-19 prevalence, symptoms
Louie et al. (2020) ²⁷	USA, San Francisco	Cohort	Three skilled nursing facilities and one assisted living facility	N=431 residents and staff tested as part of initial surveillance. Follow up testing of n=303 asymptomatic cases.	Mass surveillance testing; restrictions on visitors & non-essential staff; increased monitoring/screening of people entering/residing in a facility	Residents, staff	COVID-19 prevalence, hospitalizations, fatalities, management
McMichael et al. (2020) a ²⁸	USA, King County, Washington	Cross sectional cohort	Skilled Nursing Facility	N=167 N=101 residents (median aged 83 (51-100), n=32 (31.7%) male, n=69 (68.3%) female). N=50 health care personnel (median age 43.5 (21-79), n=12 (24%) males, n=38 (76%) female). N=16 visitors (median age 72.5 (52-88), n=11 (68.7%) male, n=5 (31.2%) females).	Mass surveillance testing; contact tracing; quarantine of exposed persons; isolation of confirmed and suspected cases; on-site enhancement of PPE/infection prevention and control.	Residents, staff, visitors, facilities	COVID-19 prevalence, symptoms, mortality, hospitalizations, management

Office for National Statistics (2020) ³⁹	England	Cross sectional cohort	Care homes providing care for older residents and those with dementia only.	N=9081 care homes for people aged 65 years and older - representing 292,301 residents (95% CI 293,168 to 293,434) and 441,498 staff. N=5126 homes participated (56%)	Prevalence of COVID-19 in residents and staff. Factors associated with higher levels of infection.	Residents, staff, facilities	COVID-19 prevalence in residents aged 65 years and older and employees.
Patel et al. (2020) ²⁹	USA, Illinois	Cross sectional cohort	Nursing home (150 bedded unit)	N=127 residents. 9% (n=11) single occupancy rooms, 91% (n=116) double occupancy rooms. N=454 staff	Mass surveillance testing; screening of staff and visitors; visitor restrictions; cohorting of residents; PPE	Residents, staff, facilities	COVID-19 prevalence, symptoms, hospitalizations and survival rates, management
Quicke et al. (2020) ³⁰	USA, Colorado	Longitudinal cohort	Five skilled nursing facilities		Weekly surveillance nasopharyngeal swabs tests were collected.	Staff	COVID-19 prevalence and incidence, symptoms and information on genomic epidemiology
Quigley et al (2020) ³¹	USA, 29 States	Cross sectional cohort	Nursing homes	N=56 nursing homes from 29 States: Midwest (30%), West (25%), Northeast (23%), South (22%).	Reported on preparedness for COVID-19, testing, supplies and staffing levels	Facilities	Preparedness of nursing home facilities during COVID-19

Roxby et al. (2020) ³²	USA, Seattle, Washington	Cross sectional cohort	Assisted living community older adults	Older aged residents and staff in an assisted living community. N=80 residents (mean age 86 years (range, 69-102); n=62 (77%) female). N=62 staff (mean age 40.0 ± 15; n=42 (68%) female). N=83 private apartments, n=45 independent, n=38 assisted living	Mass testing; resident cohorting/isolation; PPE; staff screening; visitor screening; additional hand hygiene stations.	Residents, staff	COVID-19 prevalence and symptoms
Sacco et al (2020) ⁴⁵	France, Maine-et-Loire	Cross sectional cohort	Nursing home	N=87 residents (age 87.9 ± 7.2; 71% female) N=92 staff (age 38.3 ± 11.7; 89% female)	Mass testing; PPE; visitor restrictions; hand hygiene; resident isolation	Residents, staff, facilities	COVID-19 prevalence and case-fatality rates. Resident's clinical signs and symptoms obtained from retrospective chart audit.
Sanchez et al (2020) ³³	USA, Detroit	Time series cohort	Skilled Nursing Facilities	N=26 skilled nursing facilities N=2773 residents' tests reported at baseline (median age 72 years [IQR 64-82 years]); n=2218 1st follow up; n=637 2nd follow up	Two point-prevalence surveys; follow up in 12 facilities following PPE guidelines; resident cohorting	Residents, facilities	COVID-19 prevalence, hospitalizations, and deaths pre and post introduction of testing

Stall (2020) ⁴³	Canada, Ontario	Retrospective cohort	Nursing homes	N=623 nursing homes (n=75,676 residents); 360/623 (57.7%) for-profit homes, 162/623 (26.0%) non-profit, 101/623 (16.2%) municipal homes. Mean number residents: n=113.2 (for profit); n=119.6 (non-profit); n=101 (municipal).	Impact of profit status at the level of a home rather than a resident. Using data from the Ontario Ministries of Health and Long-Term Care as part of the province's emergency "modelling table."	Facilities, residents, and staff	Descriptive data on outbreaks, facility characteristics and mortality rates. Nursing home profit status (for-profit, non-profit or municipal), nursing home COVID-19 outbreaks (at least one resident case), COVID-19 outbreak sizes (total number of confirmed resident cases amongst homes with outbreaks), and the total number of COVID-19 resident deaths (amongst homes with outbreaks). Outbreaks in staff reported. Death rates for residents
Stow (2020) ⁴⁰	England	Longitudinal ecological study	Care home units from 46 local authority areas in England.	N=460 care home units N=6,464 residents	Use of National Early Warning Score (NEWS) for identification of at-risk/surveillance to reduce mortality	Residents	Descriptive data NEWS surveillance on reducing mortality. Time-series comparison with Office for National Statistics weekly reported registered deaths of care home residents and COVID-19 was the underlying cause of death, and all other deaths (excluding COVID-19) up to 10/05/2020.
Telford et	USA State of	Cross	Nursing homes	N=28.	Mass surveillance testing of	Residents,	COVID-19 prevalence,

al. (2020) ³⁴	Georgia (Fulton County and City of Atlanta)	sectional cohort		N=5671 participants; n=2868 (50.6%) residents, n=2803 (49.4%) staff.	staff and residents	staff	hospitalizations, and deaths.
Unruh et al. (2020) ³⁵	USA States New Jersey, New York, Connecticut	Case study	Nursing homes with ≥ 100 beds	N=1162 nursing home facilities	Nursing home characteristics associated with mortality rates	Facilities	Mortality data. Predicted probabilities with Logistic Regression, Independent variables compared on characteristics of facilities

Study setting is presented as defined in original study. PPE, personal protective equipment; LTCF, long term care facilities; IQR, inter quartile range; NEWS, national early warning score.

Table 2. COVID-19 outcomes related to the nature of long term care facilities.

Study	Facilities	Outcomes
Abrams et al. (2020) ¹⁶	Facilities	<p>Average number of cases was 19.8 (range 1 to 256). New Jersey (88.6%, OR 7.16) and Massachusetts (78.0%, OR 4.36) had a higher number of affected facilities.</p> <p>Probability of having a COVID-19 case: Facility size (relative to small): Large OR=6.52; Medium OR=2.63 Location (relative to rural): Urban OR=3.22 % African American residents (relative to low %): Greater % OR=2.05 Nursing home chain status (relative to non-chain status): Chain status OR=0.89 State were significantly related to the probability of having COVID case</p>

		<p>Outbreak size associations: Facility size (relative to small facility size): Large= -15.88; medium= -10.8 (percentage point change) For-profit status (relative to non-profit status) =1.88 State.</p>
Brainard et al. (2020) ³⁶	Facilities	<p>Medicaid dependency, ownership, five-star rating, and prior infection violation were not significantly related to COVID-19 cases. Risk of infection: Facility employee numbers (relative to <10 workers): 11-20 non-care workers HR = 6.502 (95% CI 2.614 -16.17); 21-30 non-care workers HR = 9.870 (95% CI 3.224 -30.22); >30 non-care workers HR = 18.927 (95% CI 2.358 -151.90).</p>
Brown et al. (2020) ⁴¹	Facilities	<p>Predictors of spread and increase in cases per unit after 5th April risk increased 1.0347 (95% CI 1.02-1.05) p < 0.001, reduced availability of PPE for eye protection increased risk 1.6571 (95% CI 1.29-2.13) p < 0.001, PPE for facemasks 1.2602 (95% CI 1.09-1.46) p = 0.002, count of care workers employed 1.0379 (95% CI 1.02-1.05) p < 0.001 count of nurses employed (in bands of 0-10,11-20, 21-30 and 31+) 1.1814 (95% CI 1.13-1.24) p < 0.001. Incidence in high crowding index homes was 9.7% versus 4.5% in low crowding index homes (p<0.001), while COVID-19 mortality was 2.7% versus 1.3%. Likelihood of COVID-19 introduction did not differ (31.3% vs 30.2%, p=0.79). After adjustment for a regional nursing home, and resident covariates, the crowding index remained associated with increased risk of infection (RR=1.72, 95% CI: 1.11-2.65) and mortality (RR=1.72, 95% CI: 1.03-2.86). Simulations suggested that converting all 4-bed rooms to 2-bed rooms would have averted 988 (18.9%) infections of COVID-19 and 271 (18.7%) deaths.</p>
Burton et al. (2020) ³⁷	Facilities	<p>Significant associations between the presence of an outbreak and number of beds (OR per 20-bed increase 3.50), a history of multiple previous outbreaks (OR 3.76), and regulatory risk assessment score (OR high-risk vs low 2.19). However, in the adjusted analysis, only number of beds (OR per 20-bed increase 3.50, 95% CI 2.06 to 5.94 per 20-bed increase).</p>
Dutey-Magni et al. (2020) ³⁸	Facilities	<p>COVID-19 outbreak recorded in 121 of 179 facilities (67.6%). Large LTCF had greater rates of infection (aHR=1.8 [95% CI: 1.4-2.4] for LTCF with ≥70 beds versus <35 beds. The adjusted hazard ratio for confirmed infection was 2.5 times [95% CI: 1.9-3.3] greater in LTCF with 0-85-1 resident per room versus LTCF with 0.7-0.85 resident per room. A ten-percentage point increase in the bed to staff ratio was associated with a 23% increase in infection (aHR=1.23 [95% CI: 1.17-1.31]).</p>
Fisman et al. (2020) ⁴²	Facilities	<p>Covid-19 cases higher in for-profit operators 165/361 (45.7%) compared to charitable 18/57 (31.6%).</p>
Hand et al. (2018) ²³	Facilities	<p>Residents noted to share rooms, walk throughout the facility and spent time in shared areas (e.g., gym, dining rooms, and recreational rooms). Because all case-patients had visited the gym at the facility for recreation or physical therapy before becoming ill, environmental cleaning of this area was performed.</p>

Heung et al. (2006) ⁴⁶	Facilities	67 of 90 residents participated. 26 of 32 staff participated. 2 residents and one staff member were positive during the outbreak. None of the remaining participants was positive for SARS-CoV antibodies. Residents were aged 65+ years, 79% were female, 93% were ambulant, 90% did activities with others, 79% went out. Review of residents who died: Resident A transferred from the hospital and was chair bound and dependent with care needs. Resident B was chair bound and had not left home or had visitors. She was brought to a shared sitting room during mealtimes. This was only time residents A and B were located near each other. One resident shared a room with patient B and tested positive. Staff C was a domestic worker, and contact was via clinical waste in resident A room. Low seroprevalence attributed to precautionary measures taken in the facility to reduce droplet and prevent contact transmission. Risks noted of SARS via fomites possible.
Ho et al. (2004) ⁴⁷	Facilities	3 residents positive for SARS. 1 employee positive for SARS. 3 visitors positive for SARS. The index case was a single resident who was infected during a hospital stay, returned to the LTCF, and the virus spread to another 6 people. Transmission of the virus occurred due to lack of isolation rooms in nursing homes, lack of restricted movement of other patients and relatives, lack of infection control precautions, lack of knowledge among staff.
Iritani et al. (2020) ⁵¹	Facilities	Larger cluster sizes in long term care hospitals/facilities were significantly positively associated with higher morbidity ($p = 0.336$, $P = 0.006$) and higher mortality ($p = 0.317$, $P = 0.009$). Multivariate logistic regression showed larger cluster size (OR = 1.077, 95% CI: 1.017-1.145) and larger cluster number (OR = 2.019, 95% CI: 1.197-3.404) associated with mortality.
Kennelly et al. (2020) ⁵⁰	Facilities	Outbreak recorded in 75.0% (21/28) of facilities – four public and seventeen private. During the study period, 40.1% of residents in 21 nursing homes with outbreaks had a laboratory diagnosis of COVID-19. Correlation between the proportion of symptomatic staff and number of residents with confirmed/suspected COVID-19 ($p=0.81$). No significant correlation between the proportion of asymptomatic staff and number of residents with confirmed/suspected COVID-19 ($p=0.18$ $p=0.61$).
Kim (2020) ⁵²	Facilities	After the management of the outbreak, there were no more infected persons. All patients and employees tested negative 14 days from the start of quarantine.
McMichael et al. (2020) a ²⁸	Facilities	February 28, 2020, four cases COVID-19 identified in County. One person identified as index case from Facility A. Staff roles for confirmed cases reported: therapists, nurses, nurse assistants, health information manager, physician, and case manager. Paper reports that 30 facilities in County had confirmed cases and provides detail on first 9 (Facilities A to I). Facility A shared staff with another facility and two resident transfers from facility A. Surveillance reported inadequate PPE, training, infection control practices, lack of documentation signs and symptoms, working in unfamiliar facilities or sharing staff. On March 10, 2020, the governor of Washington implemented mandatory screening of health care workers and visitor restrictions for all licensed nursing homes and assisted living facilities including screening, testing, policies around visiting, excluding symptomatic staff, close monitoring of residents, testing, training and PPE. Monitoring of staff absences.
Office for National Statistics (2020) ³⁹	Facilities	For each additional member of infected staff working at the care home, the odds of resident infection increase by 11%, i.e. OR = 1.11 (95% CI: 1.1-1.11). Care homes using bank or agency nurses or carers most or every day more likely to have cases in residents (OR= 1.58, 95% CI: 1.5 - 1.65) compared to those who never use bank or agency staff. Residents in care homes outside of London had a lower chance of infection, except West Midlands (OR = 1.09, 95% CI: 1.0 - 1.17). Homes where staff receive sick pay are less likely to have resident cases (OR= 0.82 to 0.93, 95% CI: 7-18%), compared to homes where no sick leave. For each additional infected resident at a home, the odds of staff infection increase by 4% OR=1.04 (95% CI: 4 - 4%). Care homes using bank or agency staff most or every day OR=1.88 (95% CI: 1.77-2.0) compared to homes not using. Homes where staff regularly work elsewhere (most or every day) increase odds (OR=2.4, 95% CI: 1.92 - 3.0) compared to homes who never work elsewhere. Staff at homes

Patel et al. (2020) ²⁹	Facilities	outside London had higher odds of COVID-19 infection. First resident unwell March 9, 67 yr. old female with cough and fever. Hospitalized March 11 and tested positive COVID-19 March 13. 14 residents who were positive developed symptoms over 30 day follow up. 21% (n=7) confirmed cases lived in single occupancy rooms. 55% (n=18) were in a double room with another confirmed case, and 24% (n=8) were in a double room with a resident who was negative March 15. Screening visitors and staff for symptoms, restricting visiting hours from March 6. No visitor access from March 12. Universal masking of all staff and residents from March 14. 15th -19th March on-site team implemented assessment of symptoms, resident cohorting. Staff testing positive isolated and return 7 days or after 72 hours of symptoms resolving. Education and training to staff in facility A infection control, PPE, vital signs
Quigley et al. (2020) ³¹	Facilities	For-profit = 67.86%, non-profit = 26.79% and government-owned = 5.36%. 37.5% were part of a chain. 54% have COVID-19 plans. All had staff training for COVID-19 and 100% processes to restrict/ limit visitors. 29% conducted COVID-19 simulation training. Communication with local Public Health - 96%, and 68% linked to local hospital referral. 66% reported access to COVID-19 tests - available for all residents and 53% of staff. 72% reported inadequate PPE supplies. 83% expected staff shortages. Solutions for staff included staff volunteer for more shifts (55%), non-clinical staff used (45%). 19% reported they would use agency staff.
Sacco et al. (2020) ⁴⁵	Facilities	Restrictions on residents from March 16 - social distancing, remain in single rooms, no communal dining or group activities. No visitors since March 10, individual walks outside only in the presence of one staff member. Mail and packages stored 24 hours before being delivered to residents. Enhanced hygiene and cleaning. Staff had permanent face masks and additional hand hygiene
Sanchez et al. (2020) ³³	Facilities	Of the 12 facilities in the final survey, eight had implemented cohorting in a dedicated COVID-19 unit before 1st follow up. 4 remaining initiating cohorting after receiving results. 4 facilities did not assign dedicated personnel to care for residents with COVID-19 due to staff shortages. Final survey census 80 residents (range 36 to 147). 373 of 1063 (35%) had received positive results 1st follow up.
Stall (2020) ⁴³	Facilities	Adjusted modelling odds of COVID-19 outbreak associated with for-profit status aOR 1.01 (95% CI: 0.64-1.57), Municipal aOR 0.83 (95% CI: 0.45-1.54). Model 2 + Health Region aOR 2.02 (95% CI: 1.20-3.38) population <10,000 rural aOR 0.27 (95% CI: 0.13-0.58); and model 3 + home characteristics. Number of residents (unit of 50) aOR 1.38 (95% CI: 1.18-1.61), older design aOR 1.55 (95% CI: 1.01-2.38), chain ownership vs single home aOR 1.47 (95% CI: 0.86 to 2.51) and staff (full time equivalent/ bed ratio aOR 1.98 (95% CI: 0.39-9.97). The extent of a COVID-19 outbreak with profit aRR 1.83 (95% CI: 1.18-2.84) vs municipal aRR 0.60 (95% CI: 0.28 -1.30) compared with non-profit. Health Region aRR 1.65 (95% CI: 1.02- 2.67), older design standards aRR (95% CI: 1.27 -2.79), chain ownership aRR 1.84 (95% CI: 1.08-3.15) and staff/ bed ratio aRR 0.73 (95% CI: 0.10-5.35). Deaths accounted for 6.5% of all residents in for-profit homes vs 5.5 % in non-profit vs 1.7% municipal LTCF. For-profit associated with total COVID-19 deaths aRR 1.78, (95% CI: 1.03 - 2.07). Adjusted model increased risk of death with for-profit aRR 0.82, (95% CI: 0.44- 1.54), older design facilities aRR 2.08 (95% CI: 1.28-3.36) and chain ownership aRR 1.89, (95% CI: 1.00- 3.59). Number of active residents was protective aRR 0.81, (95% CI: 0.70 -0.95) / 50 beds.
Unruh et al. (2020) ³⁵	Facilities	184 nursing homes (15.8%) had 6 or more COVID-19 deaths. Deaths associated with Medicaid patients (quintile 5: 8.6 PP greater probability vs quintile 1). Patients with higher ADL scores (2.6 (95% CI: 1.4-3.8) PP, p<0.001), more total beds (0.1 (95% CI: 0.0 to 0.1) PP, p<0.001), higher occupancy (0.3 (95% CI: 0.1-0.5) PP, p<0.009), for-profit status (4.8 (95% CI: 0.8-8.8) PP, p=0.019). Comparing States: Higher mortality in those with Medicaid (quintile 5: 6.1 (95% CI: 0.0-12.1) PP, p=0.048). Not significant for other States. More direct care hours per patient day associated with lower COVID-19 deaths All States (-4.8 95% CI: -9.4 - -0.03) PP, p<0.04).

OR, odds ratio; HR, hazard ratio; PPE, personal protective equipment; CI, confidence interval; LTCF, long-term care facility; aHR, adjusted hazard ratio; aRR, adjusted relative risk; ADL, activities of daily living; PP, percentage points.

Morbidity and mortality

Morbidity and mortality results from included studies are presented for residents (Table 3a), staff (Table 3b), and visitors (Table 3c). Prevalence of COVID-19 infection was reported in 29 studies, including prevalence in residents (27 studies; ^{17-29,32-34,38,39,41,43,45-50,53}) and staff (22 studies; ^{17,19-22,24,26-30,32,34,38,39,44-48,50,53}), with 2 studies reporting absolute case numbers in visitors.^{28,47} Prevalence rates ranged from 3.8% in a sample of 2074 LTCF⁴⁸ and 1.2% in the third point-prevalence survey at a single facility²⁰ to 85.4% in a single facility that implemented a telemedicine service to limit transmission.²⁴ Staff prevalence ranged from 0.6% in a point-prevalence survey in a single facility²⁰ to 62.6% in a group of nine LTCF.²¹ One study reported 16 COVID-19 positive visitor cases,²⁸ while a study which examined SARS infection following an outbreak in a Hong Kong facility reported 3 positive visitor cases.⁴⁷

The symptom status (symptomatic/presymptomatic/asymptomatic, typical/atypical symptoms) of participants was reported in 16 studies, with resident and staff symptom status reported in 15 ^{17-19,21,22,25-27,29,32,33,45,48,50,53} and 13 studies,^{19-22,26,27,29,32,44,45,48,50,53} respectively. No studies reported symptom status of visitors. The proportion of COVID-19 positive residents presenting with symptoms ranged from 26.3%^{19,26} to 59.8% (a sample of both residents and healthcare workers).²⁷ Asymptomatic cases in residents were reported in 13 studies,^{17,19,21,22,25-27,29,32,45,48,50,53} with proportions of COVID-19 positive residents presenting with no symptoms varying from 2.4%⁴⁵ to 75.3%.⁴⁸ Among COVID-19 positive staff, the proportion of symptomatic cases ranged from 6.4%²⁶ to 100%,³² and asymptomatic cases ranged from 23.6%⁵⁰ to 100%.^{20,22}

Mortality results were reported in 22 studies, including information on mortality of residents (22 studies; ^{17-19,22-24,27-29,33,34,37-43,45,47,49,50}), staff (4 studies; ^{28,34,45,47}), and visitors (2 studies; ^{28,47}). Mortality rates in COVID-19 positive residents ranged from 5.3%¹⁹ to 55.3%.³⁸ One study reported a 66.7% death rate in residents who tested positive for the SARS virus.⁴⁷ A study examining the mortality risk in Ontario LTCF reported a death rate of 0.1% across all residents.⁴² Across the three studies which presented mortality results in COVID-19 positive staff, mortality rates were 0%.^{28,34,45} One study presenting mortality rates in a nursing home following a SARS outbreak reported one death of a

member of staff.⁴⁷ Mortality rates reported in visitors in two studies was 0%⁴⁷ and 6.2%,²⁸ respectively.

Characteristics of LTCFs on COVID-19 transmission

Numerous facility-specific characteristics were linked with risk of COVID-19 cases (Table 2). These include size of LTCF;^{16,37,38,51} staffing levels and/or use of agency care staff;^{28,31,36,38,39,43,50} part of larger chain of organisations and/or for profit status;^{16,31,35,42,43,50} and related staffing, crowding, or availability of single rooms.^{23,29,39,41,43,45-47}

Table 3a. Resident-specific outcomes of strategies implemented in nursing homes

Study	Interventions	Prevalence	Mortality	Other outcomes
Arons et al. (2020) ¹⁷	Mass testing (two point-prevalence surveys) PPE	48/76 (63%) across two surveys, 17/48 typical symptoms, 4/48 atypical symptoms, 3/48 asymptomatic, 24/48 presymptomatic 57/89 through point-prevalence, clinical evaluation, post-mortem	15/57 (26%)	Common symptoms: fever (71%), cough (54%), malaise (42%) Estimated doubling time: 3.4 days (95% CI: 2.5-5.3)
Blackman et al. (2020) ¹⁸	PPE Symptom screening Visitor restrictions	12 positive cases, 2 awaiting results, 47 symptomatic residents	3 COVID-19 related deaths	
Borras-Bermejo et al (2020) ⁵³	Mass testing Visitor restrictions	768/3214 (23.9%), 486 (69.5% of those with symptom information) were asymptomatic		2624 of all residents reported symptoms in the previous 14 days
Brown et al. (2020) ⁴¹ Burton et al. (2020) ³⁷	Facility characteristics Facility characteristics	5218/78607 (6.6%)	1452/5218 (27.8%) 403 deaths recorded in care homes	472 excess deaths in care homes with an outbreak (399 COVID-19 related)
Dora et al. (2020) ¹⁹	Mass testing (three point-prevalence surveys) Symptom screening Visitor restrictions Hand hygiene, contact precautions Cohorting	19/96 (19.8%) across three surveys, 5/19 symptomatic, 8/19 presymptomatic, 6/19 asymptomatic	1/19 (5.3%)	Symptoms: fever (58%), myalgia (58%), cough (47%), dyspnoea (32%), nausea (32%) Oxygen therapy required for 4/8 presymptomatic, 4/5 symptomatic cases
Dutey-Magni et al. (2020) ³⁸	Mass testing	951/9339 (10.2%)	526/951 (55.3%)	2075/9339 (22.2%) experienced infection symptoms
Eckardt et al. (2020) ²⁰	Mass testing (three point-prevalence surveys) PPE Symptom screening Visitor restrictions Cohorting	Survey 1: 5/105 (4.8%) Survey 2: 4/86 (4.7%) Survey 3: 1/85 (1.2%)		
Feaster & Goh (2020) ²¹	Mass testing	408/582 (49.5%), 202/408 (49.5%) symptomatic 237/332 (71.4%) female residents positive, 121/237 (51.1%) asymptomatic		

Fisman et al. (2020) ⁴²	Facility characteristics	171/250 (68.4%) male residents positive, 81/171 (47.4%) asymptomatic	83/79498 (0.1%)	IRR (COVID-19 related death in LTCF residents) = 13.1 (95% CI: 9.9-17.3) compared with community-living adults older than 69 years
Graham et al (2020) ²²	Mass testing (two point-prevalence surveys) Cohorting	Survey 1: 126/313 (40%), 72/126 (57.1%) symptomatic, 50 typical symptoms, 22 atypical symptoms, 54/126 (42.9%) asymptomatic Survey 2: 5/176 (2.8%)	53/131 (40.4%)	Increased risk of death: men (48% of deaths vs. 34% in those who survived; whole group 38% male, p=0.02); the trend for median age to be greater among those who died (p = 0.058) Increased odds of COVID-19 positive: new onset anorexia (OR = 3.74, 95% CI: 1.5-9.8); cough and/or shortness of breath (OR = 3.72, 95% CI: 1.8-7.8); fever, altered mental state/behaviour, diarrhoea not associated with positive test No new cases identified after November 18 2017
Hand et al. (2018) ²³	Symptom screening Hand hygiene, contact precautions	20/130 residents suspected cases, 13/20 tested 7/13 (54%) tested positive; 6/7 required hospitalization	3/7 (42.9%)	
Harris et al. (2020) ²⁴	Facility characteristics	41/48 (85.4%) 18/48 residents hospitalised, 11/18 returned to facility from hospital	6/48 (12.5%)	13/48 (27.1%) of residents received telemedicine consultations
Heung et al. (2006) ⁴⁶	Hand hygiene, contact precautions	2 residents were positive during the outbreak, 0/67 residents positive for SARS-CoV antibodies upon screening		2/67 reported symptoms
Ho et al. (2004) ⁴⁷	PPE Cohorting	3 residents positive	2/3 (66.7%)	
Hoxha et al. (2020) ⁴⁸	Mass testing	5390/142100 (3.8%), 4059/5390 (75.3%) asymptomatic		Infection odds: Women compared to men OR = 1.2 (95% CI: 1.1-1.2); symptomatic compared to asymptomatic OR = 8.5 (95% CI: 8.0-9.0)
Kennelly et al. (2020) ⁵⁰	Mass testing	710/1741 (40.1%), 54/1741 (3.1%) residents	183/710 (25.8%)	Non-COVID-19 mortality rate

	Facility characteristics	were suspected COVID-19, 193/710 (27.2%) asymptomatic, 396/710 (55.8%) had recovered by the completion of surveillance period		similar between outbreak and non-outbreak NHS (5.1% vs. 4%, p=0.4)
Kimball et al. (2020) ²⁵	Mass testing (three point-prevalence surveys) PPE Symptom screening Visitor restrictions Hand hygiene, contact precautions Cohorting	23/76 (30.3%), 10/23 symptomatic (8/10 typical symptoms, 2/10 atypical symptoms), 3/23 asymptomatic, 10/23 presymptomatic		Symptoms: fever (61.5%), malaise (46.2%), cough (38.5), Presymptomatic mean interval from testing to symptom onset was 3 days
Klein et al. (2020) ⁴⁹	Mass testing PPE Visitor restrictions Cohorting	39/60 (65%)	8/39 (20.5%)	Symptoms: exhaustion, loss of appetite, dysphagia, fever, cough, colds, diarrhoea
Lennon et al. (2020) ²⁶	Mass testing	2654/16966 (15.5%), 1692/2654 (63.8%) asymptomatic, 699/2654 (26.3%) symptomatic, (263/2654 symptom data missing)		
Louie et al. (2020) ²⁷	Mass testing Symptom screening Visitor restrictions	214/431 (49.7%) residents and healthcare workers, 128/214 (59.8%) symptomatic (78/128 were residents), 86/214 (40.2%) asymptomatic Additional 156 asymptomatic residents subsequently tested: 63/156 COVID-19 positive	12/78 (15.4%) symptomatic residents died	22/78 (28.2%) symptomatic residents hospitalized
McMichael et al. (2020) ^{a28}	Mass testing PPE Cohorting	101/118 (85.6%)	34/101 (33.7%)	55/101 (54.5%) hospitalized; (37/101 no data on hospitalisation status)
Office for National Statistics (2020) ³⁹	Mass testing Facility characteristics	19.9% (95% CI: 18.5-21.3) in homes with a confirmed outbreak 10.7% (95% CI: 10.1-11.3) in all homes	15606 across all homes	Odds of resident infection: Each additional infected staff member at a home OR = 1.11 (95% CI: 1.0-1.17) Homes using bank or agency nurses most or all days OR = 1.58 (95% CI: 1.5-1.65) compared with homes never using these staff Homes outside of London had lower infection chance, except West Midlands (OR = 1.09, 95%

Patel et al. (2020) ²⁹	Mass testing Symptom screening Visitor restrictions Cohorting	33/118 (28.0%), 19/33 (58%) symptomatic (8 typical symptoms, 4 atypical symptoms, 10 both typical and atypical symptoms); 1/33 (3%) presymptomatic, 13/33 (39%) asymptomatic	10/35 (28.6%) (5/10 symptomatic) 30-day survival = 71% (95% CI 52-83)	CI: 1.0-1.17) Homes where staff receive sick pay OR = 0.82-0.93 (95% CI: unknown) 1/91 negative residents reported symptoms 35/90 negative asymptomatic residents developed symptoms during 30-day surveillance, 2/35 COVID-19 positive upon re-testing 13/35 COVID-19 residents hospitalized All residents clinically stable 14 days after second test 21 days after the test, all cases continued their usual state of health
Roxby et al. (2020) ³²	Mass testing Symptom screening Visitor restrictions Hand hygiene, contact precautions Cohorting	Survey 1: 3/80 (3.8%), 1/3 reported resolved cough and loose stool during the preceding 14 days Survey 2: 1/77 (1.3%)		
Sacco et al. (2020) ⁴⁵	Mass testing PPE Visitor restrictions Hand hygiene, contact precautions Cohorting	41/87 (47.1%) 3/41 asymptomatic	11/41 (27%) All-cause mortality: 13% (95% CI 7.2-21.2), compared to 3% for the same period during the previous 5 years 287/2773 (24%)	Incidence rate for residents = 1.54 per 100 person-days 14/87 (16.1%) residents hospitalized
Sanchez et al (2020) ³³	Mass testing (two point-prevalence surveys) Cohorting	Survey 1: 716/2218 (32.3%), 344/716 (48%) symptomatic Survey 2: 115/637 (18.1%), 5/115 (4%) symptomatic Total surveillance period: 1207/2773 (44%)		446/2773 (37%) hospitalised
Stall et al. (2020) ⁴³	Facility characteristics	5218/75676 (6.9%) 3599/5218 (69.0%) for-profit home residents 1239/5218 (23.7%) non-profit home residents 380/5218 (7.3%) municipal home residents	1452/5218 (27.8%) 989/3599 (27.5%) for-profit home 368/1239 (29.7%) non-profit home 95/380 (25.0%) municipal home 1532 COVID-19	
Stow et al. (2020) ⁴⁰	Facility characteristics			Highest correlation of increased

			related deaths	NEWS and deaths observed for a two-week lag ($r=0.82$, $p<0.05$) Above baseline measures of high respiratory rate ($r=0.73$, $p<0.05$ for a two-week lag) and low oxygen saturation ($r=0.8$, $p<0.05$ for a two-week lag) appear to follow the pattern of COVID-19 and non-COVID-19 deaths
Telford et al (2020) ³⁴	Mass testing (15 facilities in response to outbreak, 13 facilities as prevention)	821/2868 (28.6%) Response group: 804/1703 (47.2%) Preventive group: 17/1133 (1.5%), ($p<0.0001$)	Response group: 131/804 (16.3%) Preventive group: 3/17 (17.6%)	Response group: 171/804 (21.3%) residents hospitalised Preventive group: 5/17 (29.4%) residents hospitalised

PPE, personal protective equipment; CI, confidence interval; IRR, incidence risk ratio; LTCF, long-term care facility; OR, odds ratio; NEWS, national early warning score.

Table 3b. Staff-specific outcomes of strategies to reduce transmission

Study	Interventions	Prevalence	Mortality	Other outcomes
Arons et al. (2020) ¹⁷	Mass testing PPE	26/51 (51.0%) 17/26 (65%) were nursing staff, 9/26 (35%) had roles that provided care/therapies across multiple units		0/26 hospitalized
Blackman et al. (2020) ¹⁸	PPE Symptom screening Visitor restrictions			26 staff members absent from work due to sickness
Borras-Bermejo et al (2020) ⁵³	Mass testing Visitor restrictions	403/2655 (15.2%), 144/403 (35.7%) asymptomatic		1772/2665 (66.7%) staff reported fever or respiratory symptoms in the preceding 14 days
Dora et al. (2020) ¹⁹	Mass testing (three point-prevalence surveys) Symptom screening Visitor restrictions Hand hygiene, contact precautions	8/136 (6%) 4/8 (50%) asymptomatic 3/8 nursing staff 5/8 licensed vocational nurses		

Dutey-Magni et al. (2020) ³⁸	Cohorting Mass testing	585/11604 (5.0%)	1892/11604 (16.3%) reported symptoms
Eckardt et al. (2020) ²⁰	Mass testing (three point-prevalence surveys) PPE Symptom screening Visitor restrictions Cohorting	Survey 1: 10/176 (5.7%), 10/10 (100%) asymptomatic Survey 2: 5/175 (2.9%), 5/5 (100%) asymptomatic Survey 3: 1/173 (0.6%), 1/1 (100%) asymptomatic	
Feaster & Goh (2020) ²¹	Mass testing	223/356 (62.6%), 55/223 (24.7%) asymptomatic	Infection prevalence higher in staff with direct resident contact (150/219, 68.5%) compared with staff with no direct resident contact (25/52, 48.1%)
Fisman et al. (2020) ⁴²	Facility characteristics		Infection among LTCF staff was associated with death among residents with a 6-day lag (adjusted IRR for death per infected staff member, 1.17; 95% CI: 1.11-1.26) and a 2-day lag (relative increase in risk of death per staff member with infection, 1.20; 95% CI: 1.14-1.26)
Graham et al. (2020) ²²	Mass testing (two point-prevalence surveys) Cohorting	3/70 (4.3%) 3/3 (100%) asymptomatic	Staff absence due to sickness/self-isolation between March 1 and May 1 elevated relative to background level (215.9% increase, 95% CI: 80-352)
Guery et al. (2020) ⁴⁴	Mass testing	3/136 (2.2%) 1/3 (33.3%) asymptomatic 1/3 (33.3%) presymptomatic 1/3 (33.3%) symptomatic	
Harris et al. (2020) ²⁵	Facility characteristics	7 staff COVID-19 positive prior to intervention 0 further staff positive after intervention implemented	
Heung et al. (2006) ⁴⁶	Hand hygiene, contact precautions	1 staff member SARS-CoV positive during outbreak (a domestic worker) 0/26 staff positive for SARS-CoV antibodies	

Ho et al. (2004) ⁴⁷	PPE Cohorting	1 staff member SARS positive	1/1 (100%)	
Hoxha et al. (2020) ⁴⁸	Mass testing	2953/138327 (2.1%) 2185/2953 (74.0%) asymptomatic		
Kennelly et al. (2020) ⁵⁰	Mass testing Facility characteristics	675 staff COVID-19 positive 159/675 (23.6%) asymptomatic		Proportion of symptomatic staff correlated with number of residents with confirmed/suspected COVID-19, $\rho = 0.81$ ($p < 0.001$)
Lennon et al. (2020) ²⁶	Mass testing	624/15514 (4.1%) 487/624 (78.0%) asymptomatic 40/624 (6.4%) symptomatic		
Louie et al. (2020) ²⁷	Mass testing Symptom screening Visitor restrictions	214/431 (49.7%) residents and staff COVID-19 positive 86/214 asymptomatic 128/214 symptomatic (50/128 were health care workers) Additional asymptomatic staff testing: 23/147 (15.6%) staff COVID-19 positive		0/50 symptomatic health care workers hospitalized
McMichael et al (2020) ^{a28}	Mass testing PPE Cohorting	50 staff COVID-19 positive	0/50 (0%)	3/50 (6%) hospitalised Staff roles for confirmed cases: therapists, nurses, nurse assistants, health information manager, physician, case manager Odds of staff infection: for each additional infected resident, staff infection OR = 1.04 (95% CI: 1.04-1.04) Care homes using bank or agency staff most or every day OR = 1.88 (95% CI: 1.77-2.0) compared to homes not using these staff Homes where staff work in other homes most or every day OR = 2.4 (95% CI: 1.92-3.0) compared to homes where staff never work elsewhere Staff at homes outside London had higher odds of COVID-19 infection
Office for National Statistics (2020) ³⁹	Mass testing Facility characteristics	Estimated 6.9% (95% CI 5.9-7.9%) staff COVID-19 positive across homes that reported an outbreak		

Patel et al. (2020) ²⁹	Mass testing Symptom screening Visitor restrictions Cohorting	19/42 (45.2%) 11/19 symptomatic (57.9%) 8/19 (42.1%) asymptomatic		
Quicke et al. (2020) ³⁰	Mass testing (five point-prevalence surveys)	Site A: all staff uninfected Site B: low prevalence in week 1, weeks 2-5 no infections detected, week 6 increase in cases Site C: initial infection prevalence was lower (6.9%), and the incidence declined to zero by week 3 Site D: 22.5% of workers at site D had prevalent infections at the start of the study and incidence was high initially (12.2 per 100 workers per week), declining over time Site E: low prevalence in week 1 saw an increase in cases in subsequent weeks		
Roxby et al. (2020) ³²	Mass testing Symptom screening Visitor restrictions Hand hygiene, contact precautions Cohorting	2/62 (3.2%) (1 worked in dining facilities, 1 was a health aide) 2/2 (100%) symptomatic		
Sacco et al (2020) ⁴⁵	Mass testing PPE Visitor restrictions Hand hygiene, contact precautions Cohorting	22 staff COVID-19 positive 9/22 (40.1%) asymptomatic	0/22 (0%)	Staff incidence: Care givers = 0.48/100 person-days Non-care givers with resident contact = 0.36/100 person-days Non-care givers with no resident contact = 0.04/100 person-days Outbreak involving staff and residents' for-profit homes 59/360 and staff only 44/360 Non-profit homes staff only 18/162. Municipal homes = outbreak staff only 16/101
Stall (2020) ⁴³	Facility characteristics			
Telford et al (2020) ³⁴	Mass testing (15 facilities in response to outbreak, 13 facilities as prevention)	264/2803 (9.4%) Response group: 249/264 (94.3%) Preventive group: 15/264 (5.7%) (d) Prevalence: Response group 12.8% vs	1/264 (0.4%) Response group: 0/249 (0%) Preventive group:	16/264 (6.1%) hospitalised Response group: 15/249 (6.0%) hospitalised Preventive group: 1/15 (6.7%)

Preventive group 1.7%, p<0.0001	1/15 (6.7%)	hospitalised 15/249
---------------------------------	-------------	---------------------

LTCF, long-term care facility; IRR, incidence risk ratio; CI, confidence interval.

Table 3c. Visitor-specific outcomes following the implementation of strategies

Study	Interventions	Prevalence	Mortality	Other outcomes
Ho et al. (2004) ⁴⁷	PPE	3 visitors SARS positive	0/3 (0%)	
McMichael et al (2020) ^{a28}	Cohorting Mass testing PPE Cohorting	16 visitors COVID-19 positive	1/16 (6.2%)	8/16 (50%) hospitalized Underlying conditions: hypertension (2/8, 12.5%); cardiac disease (3/8, 18.8%); renal disease (2/8, 12.5%); obesity (3/8, 18.8%), pulmonary disease (2/8, 12.5%)

PPE, personal protective equipment

Quality review

The quality ratings of included studies are presented in Supplementary Table 2. Overall quality of evidence in this review is considered low based on MMAT assessment criteria.

Discussion

Evidence in this review indicates the impact of COVID-19 on LTCF, demonstrating the vulnerability of this setting. A novel outcome highlights the characteristics of LTCF associated with COVID-19 outbreaks, in addition to reporting the prevalence rates of COVID-19 and associated mortality and morbidity for residents, staff, and visitors. A variety of measures were implemented in LTCF, of which many were instigated locally by facility managers, and others through agile public health policy. Mass testing of residents with or without staff testing was the primary measure used to reduce transmission of COVID-19. This provides objective evidence of infection rates in facilities, and enables application of subsequent measures, including isolation of residents who are infected with re-designation of specific staff to care for them. Repeated point-prevalence testing allows facilities to grasp the spread of the virus along with the impact of their mitigation strategies.

Further measures implemented in facilities echoed public health recommendations to the broader community to limit the spread of the virus. These included guidance on hand hygiene, and contact and droplet precautions. Restricting visitor access to facilities was implemented generally to reduce the likelihood of introducing COVID-19 into LTCF, with assessment of body temperature and symptom screening of staff and visitors on entry.

The prevalence of COVID-19 infection varied throughout included studies, with no distinct pattern emerging between prevention strategies and infection prevalence. Similarly, the mortality rate varied widely among studies and prevention measures. However, patterns emerged regarding associations between facility characteristics and the risk of a COVID-19 outbreak and spread.

The facility size/number of beds was significantly associated with the probability of having a COVID-19 case, and the resulting size of an outbreak. For example, in a sample of 30 US nursing homes, the probability of having a COVID -19 case was increased in medium and large facilities compared with

small facilities,¹⁶ while in 121 UK homes reporting an outbreak, facilities with ≥ 70 beds had 80% greater infection rates than facilities with < 35 beds.³⁸ A sample of 623 Canadian nursing homes demonstrated facilities with a high crowding index had more infections and deaths than those with a low crowding index. Simulations conducted suggested nearly 20% of infections and deaths may have been averted by converting all 4-bed rooms into 2-bed rooms.⁴¹ Similarly, facilities with a greater number of staff, staff who work in multiple facilities, and greater number of infected staff, were also more likely to experience a COVID -19 outbreak.^{36,39,50} However, facilities where staff receive sick leave were shown to be less likely to have positive cases.³⁹ Reduced availability of PPE predicted the spread and increase in case number in facilities,³⁶ while for-profit status of facilities was commonly identified as increasing the odds of case outbreaks relative to non-profit status.^{16,31,35,42,43}

Quality review

The quality of evidence in this review is technically low, primarily reported from observational studies, expert opinion, reporting of outbreaks and describing the process and management (Supplementary Table 2). Factors associated with lower quality of evidence includes the reliance of self-reporting of symptoms, recall bias, use of datasets which may be incomplete, and use of convenience sampling. However, confirmation of COVID-19 in the majority of studies was via laboratory testing. We did not remove any study following our review of quality and the evidence is consistent with real time reporting of data to learn from outbreaks. The Institute of Medicine (2004)⁵⁴ advocates for early detection of epidemics, effective communication to the public, and promotion of research and development for strategic planning.

Limitations in the review process

A key strength of this review is that it addresses a knowledge gap and has collated evidence from a broad methodological base to report the measures to reduce transmission of COVID-19 in LTFC and reports characteristics of facilities.

Due to the heterogeneity of studies, meta-analysis was not performed, while the descriptive nature of studies prevents identification of a causative relationship between measures and outcomes. Despite

this, the systematic approach to this review has identified the scope of interventions implemented in LTFC to reduce COVID -19 transmission.

Publication bias was minimized with inclusion of pre-published evidence, follow up contacts with authors for early reporting, and through the inclusion of observational study designs. Most studies reported are in English, we translated papers from German and Spanish as part of the assessment and review. Outbreak reports include convenience samples or smaller cohorts of residents in LTCF with limited data reported in brief reports and letters. However, real time reporting of outbreaks provides immediate evidence and shared understanding advocated by the Institute of Medicine.⁵⁴

While the present review builds on a review by Salcher-Konrad, Jhass, Naci, Tan, El-Tawil, Comas-Herrera⁵⁵, a recent report from WHO,⁵⁶ and from an Irish review report,⁵⁷ data on the role of facilities in the transmission of COVID-19 are reported.

Conclusion

This novel, rapid review summarises the evidence base to date identifying specific factors for consideration as part of preparedness plans to reduce transmission of COVID-19 outbreaks in LTCF. Future research should incorporate methodologically robust study designs with longer follow up to assess the impact on reducing transmission.

Funding

Authors declare no funds were provided for the production of this review.

Author Contributions

CK, KF, and LM designed the study; KF and DS developed the search strategy; DS conducted the literature search; KF and LM screened titles and full texts to select studies, and extracted data; LM, EL, KF, and CK conducted quality ratings; all authors interpreted and synthesised data; all authors were involved in writing. All authors have approved the final version of the manuscript.

Conflicts of Interest

The authors declare no conflicts of interest. CK was a member of an expert panel investigating COVID-19 in nursing homes in Ireland.

References

1. European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control (ECDC). Timeline of ECDC's response to COVID-19. 2020; <https://www.ecdc.europa.eu/en/covid-19/timeline-ecdc-response>. Accessed 4th October, 2020.
2. World Health Organization. *Coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) Situation Report – 94*. 2020.
3. Nussbaumer-Streit B, Mayr V, Dobrescu AI, et al. Quarantine alone or in combination with other public health measures to control COVID-19: a rapid review. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*. 2020;4(4):Cd013574 doi: 10.1002/14651858.cd013574.
4. European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control (ECDC). Risk assessment: Outbreak of acute respiratory syndrome associated with a novel coronavirus, Wuhan, China. 2020; <https://www.ecdc.europa.eu/en/publications-data/rapid-risk-assessment-cluster-pneumonia-cases-caused-novel-coronavirus-wuhan>, 2020.
5. World Health Organization. Statement on the second meeting of the International Health Regulations (2005) Emergency Committee regarding the outbreak of novel coronavirus (2019-nCoV). . 2020; [https://www.who.int/news-room/detail/30-01-2020-statement-on-the-second-meeting-of-the-international-health-regulations-\(2005\)-emergency-committee-regarding-the-outbreak-of-novel-coronavirus-\(2019-ncov\)](https://www.who.int/news-room/detail/30-01-2020-statement-on-the-second-meeting-of-the-international-health-regulations-(2005)-emergency-committee-regarding-the-outbreak-of-novel-coronavirus-(2019-ncov)).
6. Meng X, Deng Y, Dai Z, Meng Z. COVID-19 and anosmia: A review based on up-to-date knowledge. *Am J Otolaryngol*. 2020;41(5):102581-102581 doi: 10.1016/j.amjoto.2020.102581.
7. European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control (ECDC). COVID-19 situation update worldwide, as of 5 October 2020. 2020; <https://www.ecdc.europa.eu/en/geographical-distribution-2019-ncov-cases>. Accessed 5th October, 2020.
8. European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control (ECDC). *Surveillance of COVID-19 at longterm care facilities in the EU/EEA. Technical Report*. 19 May 2020 2020.
9. ECDC Public Health Emergency Team, Danis K, Fonteneau L, et al. High impact of COVID-19 in long-term care facilities, suggestion for monitoring in the EU/EEA, May 2020. *Euro Surveillance*. 2020;25(22):2000956 doi: 10.2807/1560-7917.ES.2020.25.22.2000956.

10. United Nations. *Policy Brief: The Impact of COVID-19 on older persons*. May 2020.
11. World Health Organization. *Policy Brief: The Impact of COVID-19 on older persons*. May 2020 2020.
12. Frazer K, Mitchell L, Stokes D, Crawley E, Kelleher CC. Systematic review of measures to protect older people in long term care facilities from COVID 19. *PROSPERO: International prospective register of systematic reviews*. 2020;CRD42020191569
13. Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, Altman DG, The PRISMA Group. Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses: The PRISMA Statement. *PLoS Medicine*. 2009;6(7):e1000097 doi: 10.1371/journal.pmed.1000097.
14. Hong QN, Fàbregues S, Bartlett G, et al. The Mixed Methods Appraisal Tool (MMAT) version 2018 for information professionals and researchers. *Education for Information*. 2018;34:285-291 doi: 10.3233/EFI-180221.
15. Campbell M, McKenzie JE, Sowden A, et al. Synthesis without meta-analysis (SWiM) in systematic reviews: reporting guideline. *BMJ*. 2020;368:l6890 doi: 10.1136/bmj.l6890.
16. Abrams HR, Loomer L, Gandhi A, Grabowski DC. Characteristics of U.S. Nursing Homes with COVID-19 Cases. *Journal of the American Geriatrics Society*. 2020 doi: 10.1111/jgs.16661.
17. Arons MM, Hatfield KM, Reddy SC, et al. Presymptomatic SARS-CoV-2 infections and transmission in a skilled nursing facility. *New England Journal of Medicine*. 2020;382(22):2081-2090 doi: 10.1056/NEJMoa2008457.
18. Blackman C, Farber S, Feifer RA, Mor V, White EM. An Illustration of SARS-CoV-2 Dissemination Within a Skilled Nursing Facility Using Heat Maps. *Journal of the American Geriatrics Society*. 2020;68(10):2174-2178 doi: 10.1111/jgs.16642.
19. 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*. 2020;69(21):651-655 doi: 10.15585/mmwr.mm6921e1.
20. Eckardt P, Guran R, Hennemyre J, et al. Hospital affiliated long term care facility COVID-19 containment strategy by using prevalence testing and infection control best practices. *American Journal of Infection Control*. 2020 doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ajic.2020.06.215>.
21. Feaster M, Goh Y-Y. High Proportion of Asymptomatic SARS-CoV-2 Infections in 9 Long-Term Care Facilities, Pasadena, California, USA, April 2020. *Emerging Infectious Disease journal*. 2020;26(10):2416 doi: 10.3201/eid2610.202694.
22. Graham N, Junghans C, Downes R, et al. SARS-CoV-2 infection, clinical features and outcome of COVID-19 in United Kingdom nursing homes. *J Infect*. 2020 doi: 10.1016/j.jinf.2020.05.073.

23. Hand J, Rose EB, Salinas A, et al. Severe Respiratory Illness Outbreak Associated with Human Coronavirus NL63 in a Long-Term Care Facility. *Emerg Infect Dis*. 2018;24(10):1964-1966 doi: 10.3201/eid2410.180862.
24. Harris DA, Archbald-Pannone L, Kaur J, et al. Rapid Telehealth-Centered Response to COVID-19 Outbreaks in Postacute and Long-Term Care Facilities. *Telemedicine and e-Health*. 2020;0(0):null doi: 10.1089/tmj.2020.0236.
25. Kimball A, Hatfield KM, Arons M, et al. Asymptomatic and Presymptomatic SARS-CoV-2 Infections in Residents of a Long-Term Care Skilled Nursing Facility - King County, Washington, March 2020. *MMWR Morbidity and mortality weekly report*. 2020;69(13):377-381 doi: 10.15585/mmwr.mm6913e1.
26. Lennon NJ, Bhattacharyya RP, Mina MJ, et al. Comparison of viral levels in individuals with or without symptoms at time of COVID-19 testing among 32,480 residents and staff of nursing homes and assisted living facilities in Massachusetts. *medRxiv*. 2020:2020.2007.2020.20157792 doi: 10.1101/2020.07.20.20157792.
27. Louie JK, Scott HM, DuBois A, et al. Lessons from Mass-Testing for COVID-19 in Long Term Care Facilities for the Elderly in San Francisco. *Clinical Infectious Diseases*. 2020 doi: 10.1093/cid/ciaa1020.
28. 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(21):2008-2011 doi: 10.1056/NEJMoa2005412.
29. Patel MC, Chaisson LH, Borgetti S, et al. Asymptomatic SARS-CoV-2 Infection and COVID-19 Mortality During an Outbreak Investigation in a Skilled Nursing Facility. *Clinical Infectious Diseases*. 2020 doi: 10.1093/cid/ciaa763.
30. Quicke K, Gallichote E, Sexton N, et al. Longitudinal Surveillance for SARS-CoV-2 RNA Among Asymptomatic Staff in Five Colorado Skilled Nursing Facilities: Epidemiologic, Virologic and Sequence Analysis. *medRxiv*. 2020:2020.2006.2008.20125989 doi: 10.1101/2020.06.08.20125989.
31. Quigley DD, Dick A, Agarwal M, Jones KM, Mody L, Stone PW. COVID-19 Preparedness in Nursing Homes in the Midst of the Pandemic. *Journal of the American Geriatrics Society*. 2020;68(6):1164-1166 doi: 10.1111/jgs.16520.
32. Roxby AC, Greninger AL, Hatfield KM, et al. Outbreak Investigation of COVID-19 among Residents and Staff of an Independent and Assisted Living Community for Older Adults in Seattle, Washington. *JAMA Internal Medicine*. 2020 doi: 10.1001/jamainternmed.2020.2233.
33. Sanchez GV, Biedron C, Fink LR, et al. Initial and Repeated Point Prevalence Surveys to Inform SARS-CoV-2 Infection Prevention in 26 Skilled Nursing Facilities — Detroit, Michigan, March–May 2020. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep*. 2020;69:882-886 doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.15585/mmwr.mm6927e1external>.

34. Telford CT, Onwubiko U, Holland D, et al. Mass Screening for SARS-CoV-2 Infection among Residents and Staff in Twenty-eight Long-term Care Facilities in Fulton County, Georgia. *medRxiv*. 2020:2020.2007.2001.20144162 doi: 10.1101/2020.07.01.20144162.
35. Unruh MA, Yun H, Zhang Y, Braun RT, Jung H-Y. Nursing Home Characteristics Associated With COVID-19 Deaths in Connecticut, New Jersey, and New York. *Journal of the American Medical Directors Association*. 2020;21(7):1001-1003 doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jamda.2020.06.019>.
36. Brainard JS, Rushton S, Winters T, Hunter PR. Introduction to and spread of COVID-19 in care homes in Norfolk, UK. *medRxiv*. 2020:2020.2006.2017.20133629 doi: 10.1101/2020.06.17.20133629.
37. Burton JK, Bayne G, Evans C, et al. Evolution and impact of COVID-19 outbreaks in care homes: population analysis in 189 care homes in one geographic region. *medRxiv*. 2020:2020.2007.2009.20149583 doi: 10.1101/2020.07.09.20149583.
38. Dutey-Magni PF, Williams H, Jhass A, et al. Covid-19 infection and attributable mortality in UK Long Term Care Facilities: Cohort study using active surveillance and electronic records (March-June 2020). *medRxiv*. 2020:2020.2007.2014.20152629 doi: 10.1101/2020.07.14.20152629.
39. Office for National Statistics. *Impact of coronavirus in care homes in England: 26 May to 19 June 2020*. 2020.
40. Stow D, Barker RO, Matthews FE, Hanratty B. National Early Warning Scores (NEWS / NEWS2) and COVID-19 deaths in care homes: a longitudinal ecological study. *medRxiv*. 2020:2020.2006.2015.20131516 doi: 10.1101/2020.06.15.20131516.
41. Brown KA, Jones A, Daneman N, et al. Association Between Nursing Home Crowding and COVID-19 Infection and Mortality in Ontario, Canada. *medRxiv*. 2020:2020.2006.2023.20137729 doi: 10.1101/2020.06.23.20137729.
42. Fisman DN, Bogoch I, Lapointe-Shaw L, McCready J, Tuite AR. Risk Factors Associated With Mortality Among Residents With Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) in Long-term Care Facilities in Ontario, Canada. *JAMA Network Open*. 2020;3(7):e2015957-e2015957 doi: 10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2020.15957.
43. Stall NM, Jones A, Brown KA, Rochon PA, Costa AP. For-profit long-term care homes and the risk of COVID-19 outbreaks and resident deaths. *Cmaj*. 2020;192(33):E946-e955 doi: 10.1503/cmaj.201197.
44. Guery R, Delaye C, Brule N, et al. Limited effectiveness of systematic screening by nasopharyngeal RT-PCR of medicalized nursing home staff after a first case of COVID-19 in a resident. *Médecine et Maladies Infectieuses*. 2020 doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.medmal.2020.04.020>.

45. Sacco G, Foucault G, Briere O, Annweiler C. COVID-19 in seniors: Findings and lessons from mass screening in a nursing home. *Maturitas*. 2020;141:46-52 doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.maturitas.2020.06.023>.
46. Heung LC, Li T, Mak SK, Chan WM. Prevalence of subclinical infection and transmission of severe acute respiratory syndrome (SARS) in a residential care home for the elderly. *Hong Kong Med J*. 2006;12(3):201-207.
47. Ho WW, Hui E, Kwok TC, Woo J, Leung NW. An outbreak of severe acute respiratory syndrome in a nursing home. *J Am Geriatr Soc*. 2003;51(10):1504-1505 doi: 10.1046/j.1532-5415.2003.514841.x.
48. Hoxha A, Wyndham-Thomas C, Klamer S, et al. Asymptomatic SARS-CoV-2 infection in Belgian long-term care facilities. *The Lancet Infectious Diseases*. 2020 doi: [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1473-3099\(20\)30560-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1473-3099(20)30560-0).
49. Klein A, Edler C, Fitzek A, et al. Der erste COVID-19-Hotspot in einer Hamburger Senioreneinrichtung. *Rechtsmedizin*. 2020;30(5):325-331 doi: 10.1007/s00194-020-00404-1.
50. Kennelly SP, Dyer AH, Martin R, et al. Asymptomatic carriage rates and case-fatality of SARS-CoV-2 infection in residents and staff in Irish nursing homes. *medRxiv*. 2020:2020.2006.2011.20128199 doi: 10.1101/2020.06.11.20128199.
51. Iritani O, Okuno T, Hama D, et al. Clusters of COVID-19 in long-term care hospitals and facilities in Japan from 16 January to 9 May 2020. *Geriatrics & Gerontology International*. 2020;20(7):715-719 doi: 10.1111/ggi.13973.
52. Kim T. Improving Preparedness for and Response to Coronavirus Disease 19 (COVID-19) in Long-Term Care Hospitals in the Korea. *Infect Chemother*. 2020.
53. Borrás-Bermejo B, Martínez-Gómez X, San Miguel MG, et al. Asymptomatic SARS-CoV-2 Infection in Nursing Homes, Barcelona, Spain, April 2020. *Emerging Infectious Disease Journal*. 2020;26(9):2281 doi: 10.3201/eid2609.202603.
54. Institute of Medicine (IOM). Learning from SARS: Preparing for the Next Disease Outbreak: Workshop Summary. In: Knobler S, Mahmoud A, Lemon S, Mack A, Sivitz L, Oberholtzer K, eds. *Learning from SARS: Preparing for the Next Disease Outbreak: Workshop Summary*. Washington (DC): National Academies Press (US), Copyright © 2004, National Academy of Sciences.; 2004.
55. Salcher-Konrad M, Jhass A, Naci H, Tan M, El-Tawil Y, Comas-Herrera A. COVID-19 related mortality and spread of disease in long-term care: a living systematic review of emerging evidence. *medRxiv*. 2020:2020.2006.2009.20125237 doi: 10.1101/2020.06.09.20125237.
56. World Health Organization. *Preventing and managing COVID-19 across long-term care services: policy brief*. Geneva2020. WHO/2019-nCoV/Policy_Brief/Long-term_Care/2020.1.

57. Kelleher CC, Doherty B, Donnelly P, Twomey C. *COVID-19 Nursing Homes Expert Panel. Examination of Measures to 2021. Report to the Minister for Health.* 2020.

Figure 1 PRISMA Flowchart

