

16 **Research in context**

17 *Evidence before this study*

18 A systematic literature search on Pubmed from database inception to October 2020 was conducted.
19 The broad terms included were “COVID-19” OR “SARS-COV-2” OR “coronavirus” AND “prison” OR
20 “correctional facility” OR “place of detention” OR “penitentiary” OR “detention centre”. There were
21 no language restrictions. We reviewed reference lists and forward citations of all articles pertinent
22 to the study objectives. We identified 122 results. Only two prison outbreak reports were identified,
23 both focusing on prisons in the USA. Outbreak guidance identified during the literature review was
24 typically adapted from other institutional settings such as care homes and hospital, with a focus on
25 self-isolation, social distancing, reduced admissions and rapid testing. Many of these features form
26 the basis of CDC, WHO and ECDC prison outbreak guidance. However, these measures have not
27 proven effective in many countries, resulting in major and sustained COVID-19 outbreaks in regions
28 such as the USA and South America. Therefore, alternative and cost-effective approaches need to be
29 considered to reduce the transmission of SARS-COV-2.

30 *Added value of this study*

31 This study outlines novel outbreak control measures (not reported elsewhere in the literature), that
32 were clearly efficacious in preventing the rapid transmission of SARS-COV-2 in a large UK prison.
33 These include: (1) the timely establishment of “Reverse Cohorting Units” to accommodate new
34 prison admissions, allowing emergent infectious cases to be detected before entering the general
35 population; (2) “Protective Isolation Units” for accommodating confirmed / suspected cases and (3)
36 “Shielding Units” to protect prisoners most at risk from COVID-19.

37 *Implications of all the available evidence*

38 The innovative and cost-effective interventions presented here proved effective in controlling the
39 spread of SARS-COV-2, even in the absence of mass testing. The best defence against incursions of

40 future infection into global prisons is implementation of strict outbreak control measures,

41 specifically the screening and quarantining of new prison admissions.

42

43 **ABSTRACT**

44 Background: SARS-CoV-2 can spread rapidly within correctional facilities. On [REDACTED], following
45 identification of a confirmed COVID-19 case in a prisoner in Prison A (UK), an Outbreak Control Team
46 was convened consisting of prison staff and public health experts from Public Health England and
47 the UK National Health Service.

48 Methods: At the start of the outbreak, four prisoners and 40 staff were isolating with COVID-19
49 symptoms. An outbreak was declared and full prison lockdown implemented.

50 Prompt implementation of novel outbreak control measures prevented an explosive prison
51 outbreak, specifically establishment of dedicated isolation and cohorting units, including (i) Reverse
52 Cohorting Units (RCUs) for accommodating new detainees; (ii) Protective Isolation Units (PIUs) for
53 isolating symptomatic prisoners (new detainees and existing residents), and (iii) Shielding Units (SUs)
54 to protect medically vulnerable prisoners.

55 Findings: In total, 120 probable and 25 confirmed cases among prisoners and staff were recorded
56 between [REDACTED]. Among prisoners, there were six possible, 79 probable, and three confirmed
57 cases. Among staff, there were 83 possible, 79 probable, and 22 confirmed cases. Testing of
58 symptomatic prisoners was limited for most of the outbreak, with only 33% of probable cases
59 tested. This explains the low number of confirmed cases (three) among prisoners despite the large
60 number of probable cases (n=81; 92%). Over 50% of the initial cases among prisoners were on the
61 two wings associated with the index case.

62 Interpretation: Rapid transmission of SARS-COV-2 was prevented through proactive steps in
63 identifying and isolating infected prisoners (and staff), cohorting new admissions and shielding
64 vulnerable individuals. These novel and cost-effective approaches can be implemented in a wide
65 range of correctional facilities globally and proved effective even in the absence of mass testing.

66 Funding Source: none

67 INTRODUCTION

68 Severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) has infected more than 35 million
69 people globally, with over 1 million deaths.¹ The focus of interest has been the impact of COVID-19
70 on healthcare and community settings,^{2,3} however, the propensity for explosive COVID-19 outbreaks
71 is of particular concern within prisons and places of detention,⁴ particularly as a second wave of
72 COVID-19 affects many countries.

73 There have been 42,107 confirmed cases and 510 deaths amongst prisoners in the USA and 540
74 confirmed cases and 44 deaths among prisoners/probation service users in the UK.^{5,6} Prison
75 populations are at substantial risk of COVID-19 due to staffing,⁷ environmental and host
76 characteristics.^{4,8} Outbreak guidance for prisons from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention
77 (CDC)⁹ and World Health Organization (WHO)¹³ emphasises the importance of hand-hygiene, social-
78 distancing/isolation, reduced admissions and rapid testing. However, these measures can be difficult
79 to implement^{10,11} particularly against long-term under-investment in European and US prisons.¹²
80 Other novel and cost-effective approaches are therefore needed.

81 UK guidance, advised by Public Health England (PHE)^{14,15} outlines specific actions to manage COVID-
82 19 outbreaks, including the establishment of: (i) Reverse Cohorting Units (RCUs) to accommodate
83 new prison admissions; (ii) Protective Isolation Units (PIUs) for isolating confirmed and suspected
84 cases; and (iii) Shielding Units (SUs) to protect the clinically vulnerable. Here we describe the first
85 prison outbreak in Europe (Prison A) and highlight the vital role of cohorting and isolating in
86 preventing an 'explosive' outbreak.

87

88

89

90


91 DESCRIPTION OF THE OUTBREAK

92 Prison A was notified of a confirmed COVID-19 case in a prisoner (index case) on [REDACTED]. The case
93 was tested for SARS-CoV-2 following admission to hospital on [REDACTED]. The case did not display
94 COVID-19 symptoms and was discharged on [REDACTED] the first Outbreak Control Team meeting was
95 convened (attended by Prison A, PHE public health experts and NHS representatives), four prisoners
96 and 40 staff were isolating with COVID-19 symptoms. An outbreak was declared and prison
97 lockdown implemented (i.e. cessation of all admissions/transfers from courts and other prisons). The
98 outbreak was declared over following on [REDACTED] when there had been no confirmed cases among
99 staff or prisoners for over 28 days.

100 *Establishment of Cohorting and Isolation Units*

101 A SU was established on J-Wing on [REDACTED] to safeguard 35 prisoners with chronic medical
102 conditions. Enhanced levels of biosecurity (i.e. measures to prevent introduction of COVID-19)
103 included controlled access via one entrance; full use of PPE by staff; appointment of dedicated
104 prison/healthcare staff and unlocking a maximum of 11 prisoners at one time.

105 Despite evidence of an on-going outbreak, Prison A reopened to new admissions on [REDACTED] due to
106 prison population pressures across England. At this time, an RCU was established with the dual
107 purpose of protecting the main prison population from imported infections, as well as protecting
108 new admissions from any outbreak among the existing prison population. A PIU was also established
109 to isolate confirmed/suspected COVID-19 cases and close contacts for the duration of the infectious
110 period (i.e. seven and 14 days, respectively) (Fig. 1).



111

112 **Figure 1.** Outbreak control pathway for new admissions and the general prison population in Prison A.

113 Key features of the outbreak response are the Reverse Cohorting Unit (RCU), Protective Isolation Unit (PIU)

114 and Shielding Unit (SU) From [REDACTED] onward, new arrivals underwent healthcare screening for

115 COVID-19 symptoms and were either (i) quarantined in the RCU for 14 days if symptom free, or (ii)

116 held in the PIU for seven days if symptomatic (Fig. 1). Admissions identified as clinically vulnerable to

117 COVID-19 were transferred to the SU once released from the RCU.

118 Shielding and cohorting units were established in non-central locations, away from the main

119 population, with no thoroughfare and a single point of entry. Single cells were preferred, and

120 facilities (showers, phones, exercise yard etc.) separated from those used by the main population.

121 The Units had designated medical treatments rooms and access to a constant interaction cell

122 (location used for prisoners deemed high risk of suicide). The RCU also had a dedicated area to

123 conduct interviews and clinical assessments.

124

125

126 **METHODS**

127 *Study population*

128 Prison A is a Category B (housing prisoners taken directly from courts) men's prison in the UK, with a
129 high turnover population and capacity for 977 prisoners. It is composed of seven wings, a social care
130 unit, separation unit and healthcare unit. Each wing accommodates 100–175 prisoners in a
131 combination of single and double occupancy cells. It was holding 950 prisoners and employing 910
132 staff at the start of the outbreak.

133 *Case definitions*

134 Definitions of possible and probable cases were made in the context of a confirmed outbreak and
135 therefore deviate from UK national definitions.^{14,15} Possible cases were individuals reporting
136 symptoms consistent with an upper respiratory tract infection but without COVID-19 symptoms.
137 Probable cases were individuals reporting one or more COVID-19 symptom, i.e. fever or temperature
138 $\geq 37.8^{\circ}\text{C}$, new continuous cough or anosmia. Confirmed cases were individuals with a positive SARS-
139 CoV-2 test result.

140 *Laboratory testing*

141 In the early part of the outbreak, only a minority of symptomatic prisoners were tested because of
142 logistical difficulties in arranging testing undertaken by external healthcare staff. Once infection had
143 been identified in the first cases, those in the prison with symptoms were assumed probable.

144 By [REDACTED], arrangements were established for on-site swabbing, allowing all symptomatic
145 prisoners to be tested. In total, 309 prisoners had been tested by the end of the outbreak ([REDACTED]),
146 with 294 negative, 13 rejected and two positive results. Five prisoners refused to be tested. Staff
147 sourced testing in the community via local NHS providers.

148 Prisoners had a throat swab collected by a member of the prison healthcare team using the woven
149 swab from a cobas[®] PCR Dual or Uni Swab collection kit. These were referred to a local NHS provider

150 and tested using the cobas® SARS-CoV-2 dual target real time PCR assay (Roche Diagnostics,
151 Switzerland). Results were returned electronically to the prison healthcare team.

152 *Data analysis*

153 An epidemic curve was constructed for staff and prisoners using date of onset of symptoms
154 (symptomatic cases) or date of positive test result (asymptomatic cases). The date of
155 implementation of outbreak control measures are demarcated in the epidemic curve. Demographic
156 and clinical data and SARS-CoV-2 test results were abstracted from prison records by healthcare
157 staff.

158 The attack rate (AR) was calculated for each prison wing using occupancy data from the start of the
159 outbreak. Prisoner location is defined as the wing the prisoner was located on when symptoms first
160 developed or immediately prior to being tested if asymptomatic.

161

162 **RESULTS**

163 Between [REDACTED], 88 prisoners (n = 950, 35.2%) and 184 staff were identified as possible, probable
164 or confirmed COVID-19 cases (Table 1).

165

166 **Table 1.** Demographic Characteristics and COVID-19 Diagnosis in Prisoners and Staff at Prison A

Characteristics	Prisoners (N = 88; 9% of total prison population)	Staff (N = 184; 20% of total staff population)
Age - no. (%)		
20 - 29	26 (30)	32 (17)
30 - 39	25 (28)	23 (13)
40 - 49	19 (22)	37 (20)
50 - 59	5 (6)	34 (18)
60 - 69	3 (3)	3 (2)
70 - 79	1 (1)	0 (0)

80 - 89	0 (0)	0 (0)
90 - 99	1 (1)	0 (0)
Unknown	8 (9)	55 (30)
Sex - no. (%)		
Male	88 (100)	0 (0)
Female	0 (0)	0 (0)
Unknown	0 (0)	184 (100)
Hospitalised - no. (%)		
Yes	4 (5)	1 (0.5)
No	84 (95)	183 (99.5)
COVID-19 diagnosis - no. (%)		
<i>Confirmed COVID-19: Total</i>	3 (3)	22 (12)
COVID-19 confirmed: Asymptomatic	1 (1)	2 (1)
COVID-19 confirmed: Atypical symptoms	0 (0)	4 (2)
COVID-19 confirmed: Typical symptoms	2 (2)	16 (9)
<i>Probable COVID-19: Total</i>	79 (90)	79 (43)
Probable COVID-19: Not tested	54(61)	61 (33)
Probable COVID-19: Tested negative	25 (28)	18 (10)
<i>Possible COVID-19: Total</i>	6 (7)	83 (45)
Possible COVID-19: Not tested	4 (5)	83 (45)
Possible COVID-19: Tested negative	2 (2)	0 (0)

167

168

Prisoners

169

Among prisoners, date of onset of symptoms ranged from [REDACTED] (Fig. 2). All three confirmed

170

cases and 22 (35%) of the probable cases occurred in the 29-day period before the PIU and RCU

171

were established on [REDACTED]. Over the remainder of the outbreak there were no further confirmed

172

cases and 23 probable cases among the resident population – and 15 probable cases imported from

173

the courts. Four prisoners required hospitalisation. All positive cases were isolated in the PIU as per

174

national guidance.¹⁵

175

All seven wings reported probable or confirmed cases of COVID-19, with at least one case identified

176

on each wing before the PIU and RCU were established on [REDACTED]. The attack rate (AR) among

177

prisoners was greatest on D-wing, at 20.0%, followed P-wing (7.8%) and L-wing (5.7%). The attack

178

rate was lowest on K-wing, at 2.9%. Following the PIU and RCU being implemented on the [REDACTED],


179

the majority of new cases were among new admissions to the prison (15; 23.8%).

180 *Staff*

181 Among staff, there were 83 possible cases, 79 probable cases, and 22 confirmed cases. Two of the
182 22 confirmed cases had no symptoms and four had atypical symptoms. Only 18 (23%) of the 79
183 probable staff cases were tested for SARS-CoV-2. Onset of symptoms ranged from [REDACTED]. One
184 staff member required hospitalisation (Fig. 2).

185



188 **Figure 2:** Probable and confirmed cases of COVID-19 by date of onset of symptoms among prisoners and staff linked to Prison A and timeline of key events

189 **DISCUSSION**

190 This is the first COVID-19 outbreak report in a European prison setting. In the absence of adequate
191 SARS-CoV-2 testing, Prison A was able to control the outbreak through the prompt implementation
192 of novel (RCUs, PIUs and SUs) and standard (social distancing, enhanced cleaning) outbreak control
193 measures. In total, 120 probable and 25 confirmed cases among prisoners and staff were recorded.
194 Here we focus on two main issues that merit further discussion: (i) use of isolation and cohorting
195 units for symptomatic, vulnerable and newly received admissions and (ii) limitations in SARS-CoV-2
196 testing capabilities.

197 The WHO have highlighted the importance of increased testing as an essential part of the response
198 to COVID-19. Testing allows effective isolation of true cases and contacts of cases to be identified
199 and quarantined. However, the effectiveness of isolating symptomatic individuals in a COVID-19
200 outbreak depends on the extent of transmission from pre-symptomatic and asymptomatic infection,
201 and the proportion of cases that are asymptomatic. Data suggests that 20-50% of infections may be
202 asymptomatic^{16,17} and that 40% of transmission occurs before symptoms develop.^{18,19} The
203 infectiousness of asymptomatic individuals is similar to or less than those with symptoms.²⁰ Wider
204 testing of individuals with no symptoms therefore allows the identification and isolation of
205 asymptomatic cases who can transmit infection, and identification and quarantining of their
206 contacts. While the original source of infection was likely an asymptomatic staff member moving
207 between wings, as the outbreak progressed it can be assumed that staff continued to be infected
208 from both prisoners and the wider community.

209 For technical reasons, testing of prisoners was unavailable for most of the outbreak, so only 33% of
210 probable cases were tested. This in part explains the low incidence of confirmed cases (three) among
211 prisoners despite the large number (81; 92%) with classic symptoms. Additionally, there was a delay
212 in Prison A receiving the positive SARS-CoV-2 test result for the index case – subsequently more than
213 50% of initial cases (██████) were on the wings (G and K) associated with the index case.

214 The adverse impact on outbreak control of failure to test symptomatic prisoners was mitigated by
215 aggressive identification and isolation of symptomatic prisoners and their contacts. This allowed
216 Prison A to avoid the kind of ‘explosive’ outbreak predicted within prison settings.^{4,8} Even possible
217 cases, without classic COVID-19 symptoms, and their contacts were isolated. It must be noted all
218 members of the prison population (prisoners, staff and visitors) can facilitate the spread of infection.
219 However, a lack of co-ordination between staff and prisoner testing means that the outbreak control
220 team had limited access to staff testing results undertaken by local NHS providers.

221 Establishment of the RCU and PIU was critical in controlling this outbreak. The RCU allowed Prison A
222 to accommodate new admissions to the prison for a period of 14 days to detect any emergent
223 infectious cases before entering the general population.²¹ Previous literature have confirmed that
224 new admissions are sources of infectious diseases including HIV, Hepatitis B and TB infection.²² Data
225 presented here demonstrates that new admissions are an important source of COVID-19. The
226 routine quarantining of new admissions is not advocated by the WHO¹³ or practiced in US prisons,
227 with CDC advising prisons ‘consider’ quarantining ‘if possible’.⁹ This could in part explain the
228 relatively low AR reported for Prison A (6.4%) and other UK prisons⁶ in comparison to the AR of 80%
229 reported for the Marion Correctional Institution²³ in Ohio and 13% in the Cook County Jail in Illinois,
230 USA.²⁴

231 This investigation has several limitations. Inadequate community and prison testing during the early
232 stages of the outbreak means there is likely an under estimate of confirmed cases among prisoners
233 and staff. As Prison A introduced multiple interventions over a similar timeframe it is difficult to
234 ascertain effectiveness of individual interventions. Due to the nature of the data collected it is not
235 possible to make inferences into behavioural/socio-economic risk factors associated with infection.

236 In conclusion, In the absence of a vaccine or effective treatment, risks of large outbreaks in prison
237 settings will continue for the foreseeable future. These risks may be escalated as wider community
238 restrictions are relaxed, a second wave of COVID-19 affects many countries and new prison

239 admissions increase as normal criminal justice proceedings resume. The best defence against
240 incursions of future infection into global prisons is implementation of strict outbreak control
241 measures, continued surveillance and testing (specifically the protecting the vulnerable) and,
242 importantly, isolating and cohorting of new prison admissions via approaches such as reverse
243 cohorting unites, protective isolation units and shielding units.

244 REFERENCES

- 245 1. World Health Organisation. Coronavirus disease (COVID-19) Situation Report-202. 2020
246 (<https://www.who.int/emergencies/diseases/novel-coronavirus-2019/situation-reports>).
- 247 2. Arons MM, Hatfield KM, Reddy SC, et al. Presymptomatic SARS-CoV-2 infections and
248 transmission in a skilled nursing facility. *N Engl J Med* 2020;382:2081–90.
- 249 3. McMichael TM, Currie DW, Clark S, et al. Epidemiology of covid-19 in a long-term care facility
250 in King County, Washington. *N Engl J Med* 2020;382:2008–11.
- 251 4. Kinner SA, Young JT, Snow K, et al. Prisons and custodial settings are part of a comprehensive
252 response to COVID-19. *Lancet Public Health* 2020;5:e188–9.
- 253 5. Saloner B, Parish K, Ward JA, Dilaura G, Dolovich S. COVID-19 Cases and Deaths in Federal and
254 State Prisons. *JAMA* 2020;324:602-03.
- 255 6. Ministry of Justice. HM Prison and Probation Service COVID-19 Official Statistics. 2020
256 (<https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/prison-population-figures-2020>).
- 257 7. Hawks L, Woolhandler S, McCormick D. COVID-19 in Prisons and Jails in the United States.
258 *JAMA Internal Medicine* 2020;180:1041-42.
- 259 8. Akiyama MJ, Spaulding AC, Rich JD. Flattening the curve for incarcerated populations - Covid-
260 19 in jails and prisons. *N Engl J Med* 2020;382:2075-77.
- 261 9. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Guidance on Management of Coronavirus Disease
262 2019 (COVID-19) in Correctional and Detention Facilities. 2020
263 ([https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/community/correction-detention/guidance-](https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/community/correction-detention/guidance-correctional-detention.html)
264 [correctional-detention.html](https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/community/correction-detention/guidance-correctional-detention.html)).
- 265 10. Okano JT, Blower S. Preventing major outbreaks of COVID-19 in jails. *Lancet* 2020;395:1542–
266 43.

- 267 11. Malloy GSP, Puglisi L, Brandeau ML, Harvey TD, Wang EA. The effectiveness of interventions
268 to reduce COVID-19 transmission in a large urban jail. Preprint from medRxiv 2020
269 (<http://medrxiv.org/content/early/2020/06/18/2020.06.16.20133280.abstract>).
- 270 12. House of Commons Justice Committee. Coronavirus-19: The impact on prisons. Third Report
271 of Session 2019–21. 2020
272 (<https://committees.parliament.uk/publications/1944/documents/18919/default/>).
- 273 13. World Health Organisation. Preparedness, prevention and control of Covid-19 in prisons and
274 other places of detention. 2020
275 ([https://www.euro.who.int/__data/assets/pdf_file/0019/434026/Preparedness-prevention-](https://www.euro.who.int/__data/assets/pdf_file/0019/434026/Preparedness-prevention-and-control-of-COVID-19-in-prisons.pdf?ua=1)
276 [and-control-of-COVID-19-in-prisons.pdf?ua=1](https://www.euro.who.int/__data/assets/pdf_file/0019/434026/Preparedness-prevention-and-control-of-COVID-19-in-prisons.pdf?ua=1)).
- 277 14. Public Health England. COVID-19 population management strategy for prisons, 2020
278 ([https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/covid-19-population-management-strategy-](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/covid-19-population-management-strategy-for-prisons)
279 [for-prisons](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/covid-19-population-management-strategy-for-prisons)).
- 280 15. Public Health England. Multi-agency contingency plan for the management of outbreaks of
281 communicable diseases or other health protection incidents in prisons and other places of
282 detention in England. 2020 ([https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/multi-agency-](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/multi-agency-contingency-plan-for-disease-outbreaks-in-prisons)
283 [contingency-plan-for-disease-outbreaks-in-prisons](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/multi-agency-contingency-plan-for-disease-outbreaks-in-prisons)).
- 284 16. Verity R, Okell LC, Dorigatti I, et al. Estimates of the severity of coronavirus disease 2019: a
285 model-based analysis. *The Lancet Infect Dis* 2020;20:669–77.
- 286 17. Mizumoto K, Kagaya K, Zarebski A, Chowell G. Estimating the asymptomatic proportion of
287 coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) cases on board the Diamond Princess cruise ship,
288 Yokohama, Japan, 2020. *Eurosurveillance*. 2020;25(10):2000180.
- 289 18. Ferretti L, Wymant C, Kendall M, et al. Quantifying SARS-CoV-2 transmission suggests
290 epidemic control with digital contact tracing. *Science* 2020;368:eabb6936.

- 291 19. He X, Lau EHY, Wu P, et al. Temporal dynamics in viral shedding and transmissibility of
292 COVID-19. *Nature Medicine* 2020;26:672–75.
- 293 20. Liu Y, Yan LM, Wan L, et al. Viral dynamics in mild and severe cases of COVID-19. *Lancet*
294 *Infect Dis* 2020;20:656–67.
- 295 21. European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control. Infection prevention and control and
296 surveillance for coronavirus disease (COVID-19) in prisons in EU/EEA countries and the UK.
297 2020 ([https://www.ecdc.europa.eu/en/publications-data/infection-prevention-and-control-](https://www.ecdc.europa.eu/en/publications-data/infection-prevention-and-control-and-surveillance-covid-19-prisons)
298 [and-surveillance-covid-19-prisons](https://www.ecdc.europa.eu/en/publications-data/infection-prevention-and-control-and-surveillance-covid-19-prisons)).
- 299 22. Kamarulzaman A, Reid SE, Schwitters A, et al. Prevention of transmission of HIV, hepatitis B
300 virus, hepatitis C virus, and tuberculosis in prisoners. *The Lancet*. 2016;388:1115–26.
- 301 23. Burki T. Prisons are “in no way equipped” to deal with COVID-19. *The Lancet* 2020;395:1411–
302 12.
- 303 24. Zawitz C, Welbel S, Ghinai I, et al. Outbreak of COVID-19 and Interventions in One of the
304 Largest Jails in the United States: Cook County, IL, 2020. Preprint from medRxiv 2020
305 (<https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.07.12.20148494v1>)
306
307