

## **Incidence of SARS-CoV-2 infection among asymptomatic frontline health workers in Los Angeles County, California**

1. Megan Halbrook, MPH, Department of Epidemiology, Jonathan and Karin Fielding School of Public Health, University of California, Los Angeles, USA
2. Adva Gadoth, MPH, PhD, Department of Epidemiology, Jonathan and Karin Fielding School of Public Health, University of California, Los Angeles, USA
3. Rachel Martin-Blais, MD, Department of Pediatrics, David Geffen School of Medicine at University of California, Los Angeles, Los Angeles, CA, USA
4. Ashley Grey, MD, Division of Pediatric Hematology/Oncology, David Geffen School of Medicine at University of California, Los Angeles, Los Angeles, CA, USA
5. Deisy Contreras, PhD, David Geffen School of Medicine at University of California, Los Angeles, Los Angeles, CA, USA
6. Saman Kashani, MD, Los Angeles County Fire Department, Los Angeles CA, USA
7. Clayton Kazan, Los Angeles County Fire Department, Los Angeles CA, USA
8. Brian Kane, Los Angeles County Fire Department, Los Angeles CA, USA
9. Nicole H. Tobin, MD, Department of Pediatrics, David Geffen School of Medicine at University of California, Los Angeles, Los Angeles, CA, USA
10. Jennifer A. Fulcher, MD, PhD, Division of Infectious Diseases, Department of Medicine, David Geffen School of Medicine at University of California, Los Angeles, Los Angeles, CA, USA
11. Sarah L. Brooker, PhD, Department of Pediatrics, David Geffen School of Medicine at University of California, Los Angeles, Los Angeles, CA, USA
12. Scott G. Kitchen, PhD, Division of Hematology/Oncology, David Geffen School of Medicine at University of California, Los Angeles, Los Angeles, CA, USA
13. Emmanuelle Faure-Kumar, PhD, Department of Medicine, Division of Digestive Diseases, University of California, Los Angeles, Los Angeles, CA, USA
14. Otto O. Yang, MD, Division of Infectious Diseases, Department of Medicine, David Geffen School of Medicine at University of California, Los Angeles, Los Angeles, CA, USA
15. Kathie G. Ferbas, PhD, David Geffen School of Medicine at University of California, Los Angeles, Los Angeles, CA, USA
16. Grace M. Aldrovandi, MD, David Geffen School of Medicine at University of California, Los Angeles, Los Angeles, CA, USA
17. Anne W. Rimoin, MPH, PhD, Department of Epidemiology, Jonathan and Karin Fielding School of Public Health, University of California, Los Angeles, USA

Authors 1, 2, 3, 4 contributed equally to this manuscript.

**Corresponding Author:**

Dr. Anne Rimoin  
UCLA School of Public Health  
650 Charles E. Young Drive South  
CHS 41-275, Box 177220  
Los Angeles, CA 90095  
[arimoin@ucla.edu](mailto:arimoin@ucla.edu)  
(310) 825-2096

**Alternate Corresponding Author:**

Megan Halbrook  
UCLA School of Public Health  
650 Charles E. Young Drive South  
CHS 41-275, Box 177220  
Los Angeles, CA 90095  
[meganhalbrook@ucla.edu](mailto:meganhalbrook@ucla.edu)

## **Abstract**

Beginning April 8, 2020, we enrolled 1787 frontline health workers who were asymptomatic for COVID-19 into a longitudinal surveillance study. During that time 4 healthcare workers and 6 first responders tested positive for SARS-CoV-2 by RT-PCR. Additionally, 43 healthcare workers and 55 first responders had detectable IgG antibodies to SARS-CoV-2.

Key words: COVID, coronavirus, healthcare workers, surveillance, first responders

## **Introduction**

Our understanding of the epidemiology and pathogenesis of severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) infection remains incomplete. Frontline health workers are at heightened risk for exposure to and transmission of SARS-CoV-2 due to their close physical contact with persons requiring medical attention and interventions and the close work and rest spaces. They also represent an ideal population for the study of asymptomatic and minimally symptomatic spread of COVID-19, with vested interests in frequent screening [1, 2]. With this in mind, we enrolled a cohort of asymptomatic persons employed by the University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA) Health system and the Los Angeles County Fire Department (LACoFD) into a longitudinal research study designed to assess SARS-CoV-2 attack rates, exposure risks, and correlates of immunity during the course of the COVID-19 pandemic in Los Angeles County.

## **Methods**

UCLA Health employs over 38,000 individuals across four hospitals and over 180 primary care practices in Los Angeles County. LACoFD is responsible for the emergency response of 4 million residents across Los Angeles County, and staffs 175 fire stations and all public lifeguard towers with approximately 4000 frontline personnel. Beginning on April 8, 2020 and May 19, 2020, respectively, health system workers (HSW) employed by UCLA Health—including those with and without direct patient care responsibilities— and LACoFD first responders (FR) from eight battalions— including firefighters, paramedics, lifeguards, and dispatchers—were invited to enroll in this study. Eligible participants were over 18 years of age and free of new symptoms associated with COVID-19 in the 2 days prior to enrollment.

Participants were asked to provide monthly blood samples and up to biweekly self-collected mid-turbinate nasal swabs at their workplace; participants also responded to online questionnaires following sample collection to assess demographics and potential exposures to SARS-CoV-2. Nasal swabs were tested for the presence of SARS-CoV-2 using the FDA EUA approved Abbott Molecular dual target real-time multiplex PCR assay for the detection of SARS-CoV-2 RNA. Blood samples were analyzed by enzyme-linked immunosorbent assay (ELISA) to detect anti-SARS-CoV-2 spike receptor-binding domain IgG, as previously described [3, 4].

Tabular counts, attack rates and associations between seroprevalence and demographic factors and occupational exposures were calculated using SAS statistical software version 9.4 (Cary, NC). While some participants may have received additional outside testing prior to enrollment or in between study visits, test results shown here reflect only SARS-CoV-2 PCR and serology performed as a part of study activities.

This study was approved by the UCLA institutional review board on March 25, 2020. New enrollments and follow-up visits are ongoing; results reported here reflect data gathered through August 31, 2020.

## **Results**

From April through August, 2020, we enrolled 1108 HSW and 679 FR. Those aged 60 and older accounted for 4.9% of HSW and 2.2% of FR. Women accounted for almost two-thirds of enrolled HSW (64%), but only a small minority of study FR (6.0%). A majority (add % that include at least 1 exposure) of frontline workers in both groups reported conducting procedures with potential for exposure to COVID-19 patients, clinical samples, or work spaces (Table 1).

During these initial months of observation, 4 (0.4%) HSW and 6 (0.9%) FR tested positive for SARS-CoV-2 by RT-PCR, with 22 (2%) HSW and 12 (1.8%) FR returning indeterminate PCR results. Thus, a five-month attack rate of 0.37 – 2.4% among HSW, and a four-month attack rate of 0.91 – 2.72% was determined for FR. Attack rates between these two groups were not significantly different from one another.

Forty-three HSW (3.9%) had or developed detectable IgG antibodies to SARS-CoV-2 during the study period; among FR, 55 (8.1%) had detectable IgG. Among those with indeterminate PCR tests, 19 (86%) HCW and 8 (66%) first responders did not have or had not yet developed detectable antibodies. Thirty-eight (3.4%) HSW and 49 (7.2%) FR had detectable SARS-CoV-2 antibodies without known history of infection during the initial study period (Table 1). Notably, among those who tested positive by PCR, two-thirds of first responders (n= 4) and half of HSW (n= 2) displayed active infection in late June.

Across both cohorts, rates of seroreactivity did not differ by demographic characteristics, job role, or performed medical procedures. Among the FR, sharing your living space with six or more people was associated with detection of SARS-CoV-2 antibodies ( $p=0.024$ ). The odds of seroreactivity among those living with six or more persons was 7 times greater compared to those living alone (95% CI: 1.36 -36.10). This relationship was not observed across other household sizes (2-5 persons), nor among the HSW.

## **Discussion**

These preliminary baseline data represent the first descriptions of an ongoing longitudinal study of frontline workers in Los Angeles county. As a whole, rates of active infection in this population were lower than in the general population as reported by the LA County Department of Public Health (LACDPH) during the same period [5]. However, a late June peak in active infections among our cohort does appear to mirror the larger LA community, which saw its positive test rate spike in mid-July.

The low overall incidence observed could be indicative of proper and widespread use of personal protective equipment in these high-risk occupational settings, as universal masking protocols were in place in both work settings. Healthy worker bias is likely also an important explanatory factor in our recruitment of asymptomatic and mostly younger adults (below age 60), and in our finding of low infection prevalence among a population at the front lines of SARS-CoV-2 exposure.

Our results are contextualized by SARS-CoV-2 infection and exposure rates demonstrated in other studies of frontline health workers. In a convenience sample from 13 academic medical centers across the United States (including UCLA Health), only 6% of healthcare workers caring for COVID-19 patients displayed antibody evidence of SARS-CoV-2 infection [6]. Other analogous US health worker cohorts found rates of PCR positivity between 3.6-6.5% and antibody prevalence of 7.6% [7, 8]. The lower prevalence of serologic markers for SARS-CoV-2 infection observed in our study makes sense given our inclusion of workers across a spectrum of direct, indirect, and no occupational exposure to COVID-19 patients.

An investigation of SARS-CoV-2 infections by the LACDPH found that, from February-May, 2020, 10% of incident cases reported across the county occurred among healthcare workers [9]. Thus, despite low rates of incident infection observed among HSW and FR, frontline health workers make up an important proportion of new cases identified across the county. Notably, LACDPH investigated positive-testing healthcare workers across 27 distinct settings and identified correctional facilities, schools, and long-term care facilities as outbreak hotspots [9]. In contrast, this study enrolled workers from hospital, outpatient, and first response settings, which may help account for the lower prevalence of positive PCR tests and antibody markers observed. While some high-risk vocations weren't targeted by this study,

11% of HSW reported secondary healthcare jobs in these settings: fifteen participants held positions at long-term care facilities and two reported additional roles at colleges.

While this study was open to all LACoFD and UCLA Health employees, work schedules and study logistics may have created barriers to participation. Rolling enrollment from April 8 to August 31, 2020 may also have introduced some measure of temporal confounding into our analysis, given the variable testing infrastructure, governmental policies, and communal incidence of SARS-CoV-2 infection in LA County over this timeframe. Thus, further analysis at the conclusion of study activities should include an enrollment date-adjusted examination of biological markers of infection.

## **Acknowledgements**

The authors would like to acknowledge the contributions of Patrick Arena, Angie Barrall, Cindy Beard, Sylvia Tangney, Michael Mengual, Marjorie Weiman, Gabby Merlo, Sergio Duron, Faith Landsman, Sarah Zabih, Ana Zamora, Monica Saavedra, Hwee Ng, Lorena Porras-Javier, and La Quinta N. Montgomery.

## **Footnote**

This work was supported by AIDS Healthcare Foundation, The Shurl and Kay Curci Foundation, Elizabeth R. Koch Foundation, The Horn Foundation, and Steven & Alexandra Cohen Foundation.

The authors have no conflicts of interest to declare.

Corresponding Author:

Dr. Anne Rimoin

UCLA School of Public Health

650 Charles E. Young Drive South

CHS 41-275, Box 177220

Los Angeles, CA 90095

[arimoin@ucla.edu](mailto:arimoin@ucla.edu)

(310) 825-2096



## References

1. CDC. Cluster of severe acute respiratory syndrome cases among protected health-care workers-- Toronto, Canada, April 2003. *MMWR Morbidity and mortality weekly report* **2003**; 52:433-6.
2. Ho AS, Sung JJY, Chan-Yeung M. An outbreak of severe acute respiratory syndrome among hospital workers in a community hospital in Hong Kong. *Annals of internal medicine* **2003**; 139:564-7.
3. Ibarondo FJ, Fulcher JA, Goodman-Meza D, et al. Rapid Decay of Anti-SARS-CoV-2 Antibodies in Persons with Mild Covid-19. *The New England journal of medicine* **2020**; 383:1085-7.
4. Stadlbauer D, Amanat F, Chromikova V, et al. SARS-CoV-2 Seroconversion in Humans: A Detailed Protocol for a Serological Assay, Antigen Production, and Test Setup. *Current protocols in microbiology* **2020**; 57:e100.
5. Los Angeles County Department of Public Health. LA County COVID-19 Surveillance Dashboard. Available at: [http://dashboard.publichealth.lacounty.gov/covid19\\_surveillance\\_dashboard/](http://dashboard.publichealth.lacounty.gov/covid19_surveillance_dashboard/).
6. Self WH, Tenforde MW, Stubblefield WB, et al. Seroprevalence of SARS-CoV-2 Among Frontline Health Care Personnel in a Multistate Hospital Network - 13 Academic Medical Centers, April-June 2020. *MMWR Morbidity and mortality weekly report* **2020**; 69:1221-6.
7. Vahidy FS, Bernard DW, Boom ML, et al. Prevalence of SARS-CoV-2 Infection Among Asymptomatic Health Care Workers in the Greater Houston, Texas, Area. *JAMA Network Open* **2020**; 3:e2016451-e.
8. Stubblefield WB, Talbot HK, Feldstein LR, et al. Seroprevalence of SARS-CoV-2 Among Frontline Healthcare Personnel During the First Month of Caring for Patients With COVID-19—Nashville, Tennessee. *Clinical Infectious Diseases* **2020**.

9. Hartmann S, Rubin Z, Sato H, O Yong K, Terashita D, Balter S. Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) Infections Among Healthcare Workers, Los Angeles County, February–May 2020. *Clinical Infectious Diseases* **2020**.

**Table 1. Test Results & Participant Demographics**

	HSW (n=1108)			FR (n=679)		
	All	Antibodies	Antibodies	All	Antibodies	Antibodies
	n= 1108	Detected n= 43	not Detected n=1065		Detected n=55	not Detected n=624
	n (col%)	n (col%)	n (col%)	n (col%)	n (col%)	n (col%)
<b>PCR Result</b>						
Positive	4 (0.36)	2 (4.65)	2 (0.19)	6 (0.88)	2 (3.64)	4 (0.64)
Indeterminant	22 (1.99)	3 (6.98)	19 (1.78)	12 (1.77)	4 (7.27)	8 (1.28)
Negative	1082 (97.65)	38 (88.37)	1044 (98.03)	661 (97.35)	49 (89.09)	612 (98.08)
<b>Age</b>						
20-29	172 (15.52)	10 (23.81)	162 (16.43)	53 (7.81)	5 (10.2)	48 (7.74)
30-39	418 (37.73)	15 (35.71)	403 (40.87)	237 (34.90)	23 (46.94)	214 (34.52)
40-49	235 (21.21)	5 (11.9)	230 (23.33)	182 (26.80)	12 (24.49)	170 (27.42)

50-59	148 (13.36)	8 (19.05)	140 (14.2)	182 (26.80)	8 (16.33)	174 (28.06)
60+	55 (4.96)	4 (9.52)	51 (5.17)	15 (2.21)	1 (2.04)	14 (2.26)
<b>Sex</b>						
Male	312 (28.16)	15 (35.71)	297 (30.24)	629 (92.64)	46 (93.88)	583 (93.88)
Female	710 (64.08)	27 (64.29)	683 (69.55)	41 (6.04)	3 (6.12)	38 (6.12)
<b>Race</b>						
Asian	300 (27.08)	13 (30.23)	287 (26.95)	36 (5.30)	1 (2.04)	35 (5.61)
American Indian/ Alaskan Native	9 (0.81)	0 (0)	9 (0.85)	11 (1.62)	0 (0)	11 (1.76)
Black/ African American	47 (4.24)	3 (6.98)	44 (4.13)	41 (6.04)	4 (8.16)	37 (5.93)
Native Hawaiian/ Pacific Islander	34 (3.07)	2 (4.65)	32 (3)	18 (2.65)	0 (0)	18 (2.88)
White	566 (51.08)	21 (48.84)	545 (51.17)	433 (63.77)	13 (26.53)	227 (36.38)
Other	94 (8.48)	1 (2.33)	93 (8.73)	98 (14.43)	8 (16.33)	90 (14.42)
<b>Ethnicity</b>						
Hispanic/Latino	139 (12.55)	6 (15.38)	133 (14.18)	212 (31.22)	21 (46.67)	191 (33.63)
Non-Hispanic/ Latino	788 (71.12)	33 (84.62)	755 (80.49)	322 (47.42)	19 (42.22)	303 (53.35)

Prefer not to say	50 (4.51)	0 (0)	50 (5.33)	79 (11.63)	5 (11.11)	74 (13.03)
<b>Number of persons sharing living space*</b>						
I live by myself	187 (16.88)	10 (23.81)	177 (18.01)	54 (7.95)	2 (4.08)	52 (8.51)
2 people	407 (36.37)	14 (33.33)	393 (39.98)	177 (26.07)	16 (32.65)	161 (26.35)
3 people	163 (14.71)	11 (26.19)	152 (15.46)	137 (20.18)	6 (12.24)	131 (21.44)
4 people	169 (15.25)	4 (9.52)	165 (16.79)	180 (26.51)	12 (24.49)	168 (27.5)
5 people	65 (5.87)	1 (2.38)	64 (6.51)	79 (11.63)	6 (12.24)	73 (11.95)
6 or more people	34 (3.07)	2 (4.76)	32 (3.26)	33 (4.86)	7 (14.29)	26 (4.26)
<b>Community contact with symptomatic person</b>						
Yes	28 (2.53)	2 (4.76)	26 (97.36)	31 (4.57)	4 (8.33)	27 (4.38)
No	998 (90.07)	40 (95.24)	958 (97.36)	634 (93.37)	44 (91.67)	590 (95.62)
<b>Workplace Department (HSW only)</b>						
Emergency Department	73 (6.59)	3 (7.32)	70 (7.58)			
Intensive care unit	244 (22.02)	15 (36.59)	229 (24.78)			

Hospital ward	167 (15.07)	4 (9.76)	163 (17.64)			
Pulmonology service	20 (1.81)	1 (2.44)	19 (2.06)			
Anesthesiology service	47 (4.24)	1 (2.44)	46 (4.98)			
ENT/Otolaryngology service	4(0.36)	0 (0)	4 (0.43)			
Infectious disease service	22 (1.99)	0 (0)	22 (2.3)			
Surgical unit	77 (6.95)	2 (4.88)	75 (8.12)			
Other Hospital position	296 (26.71)	13 (31.71)	283 (30.63)			
I work remotely	15 (1.35)	2 (4.88)	13 (1.41)			
<b>Procedures Conducted</b>						
Nasopharyngeal (NP) swabs	156 (14.08)	3 (6.98)	153 (14.37)			
Bronchialveolar lavage (BAL)	69 (6.23)	4 (9.3)	65 (6.1)			
Collecting Sputum	91 (8.21)	3 (6.98)	88 (8.26)			
Intubation/airway procedures	191 (17.24)	7 (16.28)	184 (17.28)	91 (13.40)	6 (12.24)	85 (13.62)
CPR	41 (3.70)	1 (2.33)	40 (3.76)	227 (33.43)	21 (42.86)	206 (33.01)
COVID+ patient care	306 (27.62)	16 (37.21)	290 (27.23)			
Respiratory therapy	88 (7.94)	6 (13.95)	82 (7.7)			
Drawing blood from COVID+	124 (11.19)	8 (18.6)	116 (10.86)			

patients						
Cleaning hospital rooms or care spaces	85 (7.67)	3 (6.98)	82 (7.7)	225 (33.14)	18 (36.73)	207 (33.17)
Cleaning high touch surfaces	245 (22.11)	10 (23.26)	235 (22.07)	472 (69.51)	31 (63.27)	441 (70.67)
Cleaning non-patient spaces	160 (14.44)	5 (11.63)	155 (14.55)			
Collecting fecal/rectal samples	59 (5.32)	2 (4.65)	57 (5.35)			
Clinical laboratory work	45 (4.06)	1 (2.33)	44 (4.13)			
SARS CoV-2-research-lab work/processing	22 (1.99)	1 (2.33)	21 (1.97)			
Trauma medicine				361 (53.17)	24 (48.98)	337 (54.01)
Arrests				98 (14.43)	10 (20.41)	88 (14.1)
Servicing homeless encampments				164 (24.15)	11 (22.45)	153 (24.52)
Routine traffic stops				37 (5.45)	3 (6.12)	34 (5.45)
Minor house calls				86 (12.67)	5 (10.2)	81 (12.98)
Telephone-based emergency dispatch				99 (14.58)	5 (10.2)	94 (15.06)
None	440 (39.71)	19 (44.19)	421 (39.53)	111 (16.35)	9 (18.37)	102 (16.35)

\* chi-sq p-value for FR cohort = 0.0244