Ownership and COVID-19 in care homes for older people: A living systematic review of outbreaks, infections, and mortalities

Anders Malthe Bach-Mortensen (0000-0001-7804-7958) [a], Ben Verboom (0000-0003-3693-3833) [a], Michelle Degli Esposti (0000-0002-0068-5754) [a]

[a] University of Oxford, Department of Social Policy and Intervention; Barnett House, 32 Wellington Square; Oxford; UK

Correspondence to Anders Malthe Bach-Mortensen (anders.bach-mortensen@spi.ox.ac.uk)

Abstract
Background: The adult social care sector is being increasingly outsourced to for-profit providers, but the impacts of privatisation on service quality and resident outcomes are unclear. During the COVID-19 pandemic, for-profit providers have been accused of failing their residents by prioritising profits over care, prevention, and caution, which has been reported to result in a higher prevalence of COVID-19 infections and deaths in for-profit care homes. Although many of these reports are anecdotal or based on news reports, there is a growing body of academic research investigating ownership variation across COVID-19 outcomes, which has not been systematically appraised and synthesised.
Objectives: To identify, appraise, and synthesise the available research on ownership variation in COVID-19 outcomes (outbreaks, infections, deaths, shortage of personal protective equipment (PPE) and staff) across for-profit, public, and non-profit care homes for older people, and to update our findings as new research becomes available.
Design: Living systematic review.
Methods: This review was prospectively registered with Prospero (CRD42020218673). We searched 17 databases and performed forward and backward citation tracking of all included studies. Search results were screened and reviewed in duplicate. Risk of bias (RoB) was assessed in duplicate according to the COSMOS-E guidance. The results were synthesised according to RoB, model adjustment, and country context and visualised using harvest plots.
Results: Twenty-eight studies across five countries were included, with 75% of included studies conducted in the Unites States. For-profit ownership was not consistently associated with a higher probability of COVID-19 outbreaks across included studies. However, there was compelling evidence of worse COVID-19 outcomes following an outbreak; with for-profit care homes having higher rates of accumulative infections and deaths. For-profit providers were also associated with shortages in PPE, which may have contributed to the higher incidence of infections and deaths. Chain affiliation was often found to be correlated with higher risk of outbreaks, but not consistently associated with an elevated number of deaths and infections. Private equity ownership was not consistently associated with worse COVID-19 outcomes.
Conclusion: For-profit status was a consistent risk factor for higher cumulative COVID-19 infections and deaths. Thus, ownership among providers may be a key modifiable factor which can be regulated to improve health outcomes in vulnerable populations and reduce health disparities. This review will be updated as new research becomes published, which may change the conclusion of our synthesis.

Introduction

The COVID-19 pandemic has disproportionately affected people living in residential care, who are estimated to account for approximately half of all COVID-19 deaths [1–3]. This disproportionate impact can be understood, in part, in terms of the vulnerability of people residing in such facilities and a lack of early intervention and support [4]. However, the structural and institutional risk factors are not yet well understood. In many countries, adult social care services are delivered by a combination of for-profit, non-profit, and public providers [5]. While it is well documented that quasi-market provision has increased the market share of private, and in particular, for-profit care providers [6,7], it is unclear if this provision design has improved service quality. The question of whether ownership influences quality of care across different provider types is well researched. For example, a 2009 systematic review of 82 studies on ownership variation among nursing homes showed that non-profit providers typically delivered higher quality services compared to for-profit providers[8]; a finding that has since been replicated [6,7,9].

During the COVID-19 pandemic, for-profit providers have been accused of failing their residents by prioritising profits over care, prevention, and caution [10], resulting in reports of higher rates of COVID-19 infections and deaths in for-profit care homes [11,12]. Although many of these reports are not peer-reviewed – located, for example, in newspaper publications – there is a growing body of academic research that investigates ownership variation across COVID-19 outcomes, such as outbreaks, infection rates, and mortality [13,14].

The COVID-19 pandemic has tested the capability of not only individual social care providers, but also the commissioning system in which they operate. It is known that funding for adult social care has been characterised by years of austerity [15] at the expense of staffing, quality, and support, which may have been detrimental to the ability of care homes to cope with the pandemic [16]. As such, the experiences of the adult social care sector during the pandemic must not be forgotten, and the growing body of research on ownership variation across COVID-19 outcomes offers an important opportunity to revisit the impact of outsourcing social care services to FP providers.

Research Question/objectives:

The aim of this living systematic review is to identify, appraise, and synthesise the available research on ownership variation in outbreaks and infections across for-profit, public, and non-profit care homes for older people, and to update our findings as new research becomes available. A review protocol was registered prospectively on OSF [17] and on Prospero (CRD42020218673).

Methods

COVID-19 related research is published at a high frequency and the time between submission and publication is substantially shorter than for non-COVID-19 research[18], which makes it particularly important that this rapidly growing body of evidence is critically appraised and systematically synthesised regularly. To ensure that this review will represent a *recent* and *relevant* synthesis of the available evidence on the topic, it will be conducted as a living systematic review, which is defined as "*a systematic review that is continually updated, incorporating relevant new evidence as it becomes available*" [19]. Specifically, we plan to update our results every 3 months for the first year of publication and twice in the second year. An update will entail (1) running the below search string for the time period, and (2) forward and backward citation tracking of included studies. Any studies added throughout this process will be incorporated in the review and the synthesis, results, and interpretation will be adapted accordingly.

Inclusion criteria

We assessed study eligibility based on three criteria. *First*, studies must investigate variation in COVID-19 outbreaks, infection rates, and/or excess or COVID-19 related mortalities or outcomes related to personal protective equipment (PPE) use and availability, staff shortage, preparedness, and infection and mortality among staff and visitors. *Second*, studies must investigate variation in any of the above outcomes across ownership categories, which is conventionally understood as for-profit, non-profit, and public providers. However, 'ownership' is often understood and interpreted in different ways and in the below section we specify how we define this concept. *Third*, studies must employ an observational research design, including, but not limited to, cross-sectional studies, cohort studies, and secondary analyses of registry data. Both published and unpublished manuscripts (e.g., preprints and reports) were eligible for inclusion.

A note on ownership terminology

The literature on ownership variation is characterised by inconsistent and variable terminology, and terms such as 'for-profit', 'non-profit', 'private', 'chain affiliated', and 'public' are rarely clearly defined. In consequence, original ownership archetypes such as for-profit and non-profit are often merged as 'private' providers, while public (e.g. government or local authority providers) and non-profit (registered private not-for-profit) providers are often categorised as 'non-profits'. Table 1 displays our definition of different ownership terms and outlines how these overlap.

Table 1: Ownership categorisation and overlap.

Ownership categories	Definition	Potential overlap
Traditional ownership archetypes		
For-profit	Private profit pursuing providers of social care. This usually includes both individually owned, partnerships, and corporate providers.	This term may include **chain affiliated** and **private equity owned** providers. **For-profits** and **non-profit** providers are sometimes categorised as **private** providers.
Non-profit	Private not-for-profit providers of social care. These providers are usually registered as charities.	This term may include **chain affiliated** providers. **For-profits** and **non-profit** providers are sometimes categorised as **private** providers.
Public	Care providers operated and organised by government bodies and employees. These providers are usually operated at the municipal, council, or local authority level.	**Public** and **non-profit** providers are often categorised as **not-for-profit** providers.
Alternative ownership categories		
Private	Providers that are privately owned, including both for-profit and non-profit providers.	This may include **for-profit, non-profit, chain affiliated, and private equity** providers.
Multifacility chain affiliation	Providers that are part of a multi-location chain of social care facilities.	This may include both **for-profit, private equity,** and **non-profit** providers.
Private equity owned	Providers that have been acquisitioned by private equity firms.	This may include for-**profit** and **chain affiliated** providers.

Important nuances are lost by not defining ownership consistently, which is a challenge in this review (as it has been in previous reviews [8]). Yet, since the objective of this review is to appraise and synthesise research on ownership variation, we consider any definition of ownership. However, all

categorisations are scrutinised, and our results incorporate different conceptualisations where applicable.

Searches and screening process

Before developing our search strategy, we hand-searched Google Scholar and preprint repositories for relevant articles and performed citation searches on all relevant articles. This preliminary sample of includable studies were used to design our search strategy and to test its specificity. The full search strategy can be found in the supplementary material. Our search string was implemented in the following databases: ABI/INFORM Global, Coronavirus Research Database, Criminology Collection International (criminal justice database and NCJRS abstracts database), International Bibliography of the Social Sciences (IBSS), Politics Collection (PAIS index, policy file index, political science database, and worldwide political science abstracts), Social Science Database, Sociology Collection (applied social science index and abstracts, sociological abstracts, and sociology database) via ProQuest. We searched Embase, Global Health, Medline, and PsycINFO via Ovid. Two authors (ABM and MDE) double-screened all search results using Rayyan and subsequently reviewed the full text versions of potentially eligible studies. We undertook a citation search of all studies included as a result of the screening and full-text reviewing.

Data extraction, (selection and coding)

Descriptive information on the citation details (author, title, journal) and study characteristics (research design, analysis, sample details) were retrieved from all included articles. We also extracted detailed information on the data (e.g., country, source, and period of data coverage) and the outcome and exposure variables (e.g., definition, operationalisation, and cut-offs). The results related to ownership variation across COVID-19 related outcomes and accompanying interpretations were extracted for all studies. The results were extracted by ABM with feedback from BV and MDE.

Risk of bias assessment

Risk of bias (RoB) was assessed using the COSMOS-E guidance [20]. We employed this guidance rather than, for example, ROBINS-I for non-randomised intervention studies, as it is specifically designed for systematically reviewing observational and correlational research. Specifically, we evaluated the following bias domains: confounding, selection bias, and information bias. In line with the consistent recommendation to avoid quantitative scoring of risk domains[20,21], all RoB assessments were based on the qualitative subjective assessment of the reviewers, which were decided through discussion and in consensus. All assessments were conducted with the focus of our review (variation in COVID-19 outcomes across ownership) in mind, and the assessments may thus not represent the risk of bias across other investigated associations and outcomes. The overall RoB assessment for each study was based on the lowest assessment in any bias domain. We did not exclude studies based on the RoB assessments.

Data synthesis

Due to a high degree of heterogeneity among the included studies in terms of differing model specifications, operationalisation of outcomes, inconsistent ownership categorisation of the reference group, and overlapping data, we did not perform a statistical meta-analysis of the included results. This decision was made with attention to the pitfalls of employing statistical methods and assumptions designed for the analysis of very homogenous data or randomised controlled trials of interventions to observational and correlational research [22]. If appropriate, we may, however, meta-analyse the results in later versions of this living review. In this version, our synthesis can be

described as follows.

First, we narratively summarised key characteristics of the included studies, such as publication type, sample details, ownership categorisation, and data sources. *Second*, we assessed the risk of bias across all included studies. *Third*, we developed an overview of the outcomes and model adjustments of all included studies. The model adjustment categories were developed according to aspects known to influence the relationship between ownership and care homes. *Fourth*, we constructed a harvest plot to graphically illustrate the direction of the results across different outcomes and ownership categories with attention to the model specifications and risk of bias of the studies supporting a particular direction of effect [23]. Harvest plots serve as a way to synthesise and describe a heterogenous body of evidence, which cannot be meaningfully synthesised by means of meta-analysis. *Last*, we thematically analysed the text of all studies that discuss and interpret results relating to ownership.

Results

Search results

Our search strategy yielded 3,845 results, of which 3,514 were left after removal of duplicates. These were double-screened by ABM and MDE, after which 81 were assessed in full-text. Of these, 19 studies were deemed eligible for inclusion. A citation search was then conducted on this sample, in which an additional 9 eligible studies (primarily preprints and government reports) were identified. Twenty-eight studies were thus included in the first version of this review.

[Figure 1 here]

Description of studies

The descriptive information on all included research can be found in Table 2. Most of the included studies were peer-reviewed publications (22/28), with 2 government reports [24,25] and 4 preprints or working papers. The unit of analysis across all included studies was care homes. For-profit providers were the largest ownership group across all studies that provided detailed sample information. All except for two studies [26,27] were published in July and after. The majority of studies were conducted in the United States (21/28), followed by Canada (3/28), England (2/28), Scotland (1/28), and France (1/28). Most of the studies were cross-sectional in nature, as only three studies included more than one time-point in their analysis [28–30].

The most common way ownership was categorised was to compare for-profit (FP) and non-profit (NP) providers (16/28), usually with FPs as the reference category. Ten studies compared FPs and NPs (11/28), in which NPs included both private NPs and public providers, although this was not always explicitly described. Two studies focused on private equity (PE) providers in their categorisation of ownership [31,32]. Eighteen studies also included chain affiliated (CA) providers as a separate covariate to investigate COVID-19 related outcomes.

The most commonly investigated outcome was COVID-19 outbreaks (15/28), followed by COVID-19 related mortality (13/28), and incidence of COVID-19 infections (12/28). Five studies investigated staff access to PPE and/or shortage of PPE. Three studies included investigated COVID-19 related outcomes among care home staff. Most studies investigated multiple COVID-19 related outcomes.

Table 2: Study and outcome characteristics

Study	Type of study	Publication date	Research design	Country	Categorisation of ownership	Includes chain? (y/n)	Sample size (care homes)	Sample size across ownership groups	COVID- 19 outcomes
(Bui et al., 2020) [24]	Government report	September 18, 2020	Cross-sectional	United States (West Virginia)	For-profit and non-profit.	N	123	For-profit: 95 (77%) Non-profit: 28 (23%)	Outbreaks (two or more cases)
(Chatterjee, Kelly, Qi, & Werner, 2020) [33]	Peer-reviewed publication	July 29 2020	Cross-sectional	United States (23 States)	For-profit and non-profit.	N	8,943	For-profit: 6473 (72%) Non-profit: 2470 (28%)	Outbreaks (any cases)
(Abrams, Loomer, Gandhi, & Grabowski, 2020) [34]	Peer-reviewed publication	June 2 2020	Cross-sectional	United states (30 States)	For-profit, non-profit and government.	Y	9,395	For-profit: 6878 (73%) Non-profit: 2178 (23%) Government: 339 (4%)	Outbreaks (any cases) and number of infections
(Braun et al., 2020) [31]	Peer-reviewed publication	October 28 2020	Cross-sectional	United States (unclear number of states)	Private-equity, for-profit non-profit, and government	Y	11,470	For-profit: 7793 (67.9%) Non-profit: 2523 (22.0%) Government: 511 (5.3%) Private equity: 543 (4.7%)	Number of infections, deaths, supply of PPE, and staffing shortage
(Yue Li, Temkin-Greener, Gao, & Cai, 2020) [13]	Peer-reviewed publication	June 18 2020	Cross-sectional	United States (Connecticut)	For-profit and non-profit (including government)	Y	215	For-profit 179 (83%) Non-Profit: 36 (17%)	Number of infections and deaths
(Yumeng Li, Fang, & He, 2020) [35]	Peer-reviewed publication	October 2020	Cross-sectional	United States (unclear number of states)	For-profit, non-profit and government.	Y	14,062	For-profit: 9,787 (70%) Government: 903 (6.5%) Non-profit: 3286 (23.5%)	Supply of PPE
(Stall, Jones, Brown, Rochon, & Costa, 2020) [36]	Peer-reviewed publication	August 17 2020	Cohort	Canada Ontario	For-profit, non-profit and government (municipal)	Y	623	For-profit: 360 (57.7%) Non-profit: 162 (26.0%) Government: 101 (16.2%).	Outbreaks (any cases), number of infections, and deaths
(He, Li, & Fang, 2020) [37]	Peer-reviewed publication	June 15 2020	Cross-sectional	United States (California)	For-profit, non-profit and government.	N	1,144	For-profit: 956 (84%) Government: 35 (3%) Non-profit: 153 (13%)	Number of infections and deaths
(Sugg et al., 2021) [38]	Peer-reviewed publication	August 25 2020	Cross-sectional	United States (unclear number of states)	For-profit, non-profit and government.	N	13,709	Unclear	Outbreaks (any cases) and number of infections
(Dean, Venkataramani, & Kimmel, 2020) [39]	Peer-reviewed publication	November 2020	Cross-sectional	United States (NY state)	For-profit and non-profit	Y	621	Unclear	Deaths
(Harrington et al., 2020) [40]	Peer-reviewed publication	July 7 2020	Cross-sectional	United States (California)	For-profit, non-profit (including government)	N	1,091	For-profit: 920 (84%) non-profit & government: 171 (16%)	Outbreaks (any cases)
(Unruh, Yun, Zhang, Braun,	Peer-reviewed publication	June 15 2020	Cross-sectional	United States (Connecticut,	For-profit and non-profit.	Y	1,162	Unclear	Deaths (dichotomised as 6 or more)

& Jung, 2020) [26]				New Jersey, New York)					
(Bowblis & Applebaum, 2020) [28]	Peer-reviewed publication	October 11 2020	Cohort	United States (Ohio)	For-profit, non-profit and government.	Y	942	For-profit: 749 (79.4%) Non-profit: 178 (19%) Government: 15 (1.6%)	Outbreaks and number of infections (dichotomised as more than 20% of residents)
(Yue Li, Cen, Cai, & Temkin-Greener, 2020) [41]	Peer-reviewed publication	21 September 2020	Cross-sectional	United States (unclear number of states)	For-profit, non-profit and government.	Y	12,576	For-profit: 8,861 (70%) Non-profit: 2,938 (23%) Government: 777 (7%)	Number of infections and deaths
(Fisman, Bogoch, Lapointe-Shaw, McCready, & Tuite, 2020) [42]	Peer-reviewed publication	July 22 2020	Cohort	Canada (Ontario)	For-profit, non-profit, municipal, and charitable.	N	627	For-profit: 361 (57%) Non-profit: 117 (18%) Municipal: 101 (16%) Charitable: 57 (9%)	Outbreaks (any cases)
(Xu, Intrator, & Bowblis, 2020) [43]	Peer-reviewed publication	11 August 2020	Cross-sectional	United States (unclear number of states)	For-profit, non-profit, government.	Y	11,920	For-profit: 8561 (72%) government: 647 (5%) Not-for-profit: 2712 (23%)	Shortage of staff
(Gorges & Konetzka, 2020) [44]	Peer-reviewed publication	August 8 2020	Cross-sectional	United States (unclear number of states)	For-profit, non-profit, government	Y	13,167	For-profit: 9164 (69.6%) Non-profit: 3265 (24.8 %) Government: 5.6% (737)	Outbreak (any cases), number of infections (dichotomised as >10%confirmed cases/beds or >20% confirmed + suspected cases/beds, or 10+ deaths), and deaths
(McGarry, Grabowski, & Barnett, 2020) [29]	Peer-reviewed publication	October 2020	Cohort	United States (unclear number of states)	For-profit, non-profit, government	Y	15,035	For-profit 10539 (70.1%) Non-profit: 3518 (23.4%) Government: 977 (6.5%)	PPE and staff shortage
(Gibson & Greene, 2020) [45]	Peer-reviewed publication	October 2020	Cross-sectional	United States (unclear number of states)	For-profit, government, and non-profit	Y	13,445	For-profit: 9398 (69.9%) Non-profit: 3200 (23.8%) Government: 847 (6.3%)	Supply of PPE and staff shortage
(Rowan et al., 2020) [25]	Report by Mathematica	30 September 2020	Cross-sectional	United States (Connecticut)	For-profit and non-profit	Y	212	For-profit: 176 (83%) Non-profit: 36 (17%)	Outbreak (any cases), number of infections, and deaths
(Brown et al., 2020) [27]	Peer-reviewed publication	November 9, 2020	Cohort	Canada (Ontario)	For-profit, non-profit, and government (municipal)	N	618	For-profit: 358 (58%) Non-profit: 159 (26%) Municipal: 101 (16%)	Outbreaks (any cases), number of infections and deaths per 100 resident
(Burton et al., 2020) [46]	Peer-reviewed publication	October 2020	Cross-sectional	Scotland	Private, non-profit (voluntary or not for profit), and government (local authority)	N	189	Private: 98 (52%) Non-profit: 37 (20%) Local authority: 54 (28%)	Outbreaks (any cases)
(Shen, 2020) [47]	Medrxiv preprint	September 11 2020	Cross-sectional	United States (18 states)	For-profit and non-profit	Y	6,132	For-profit: 4476 (73%) Non-profit: 1472 (24%)	Number of deaths per 100 beds

					(including government)			Public: 184 (3%)	
(Chen, Chevalier, & Long, 2020) [48]	NBER working paper	October 2020	Cross-sectional	United States (22 states)	For-profit and non-profit	N	6,337	For-profit: 4689 (74%) Non-profit: 1648 (26%)	Number of cases (inverse hyperbolic sine)
(Gandhi, Song, & Upadrashta, 2020) [32]	Preprint	October 20	Cross-sectional	United States (49 states)	Private equity Prior Private equity For-Profit Chain Facility	Y	13,398	Non-Private equity: 11,788 (88%) Prior Private equity: 1,219 (9%) Private equity: 391 (3%) No info on for-profit	Number of confirmed and suspected infections, deaths, and PPE shortage
(Shallcross et al., 2020) [49]	Medrxiv preprint	October 4, 2020	Cross-sectional	England	For-profit and non-profit	Y	5,126	Profit: 4289 (83.7%) Not-for-profit: 837 (16.3%)	Outbreaks (any cases) and number of infections (dichotomised as more than one third of resident)
(Rolland et al., 2020) [14]	Peer-reviewed publication	July 13, 2020	Cross-sectional	France	For-profit, non-profit, and government.	N	124	For-profit: 54 (44%) Non-profit: 35 (28%) Public: 35 (28%)	Outbreaks (any cases)
(Morciano, Stokes, Kontopanteli, Hall, & Turner, 2020) [30]	Medrxiv preprint	November 13, 2020	Cohort	England	For-profit, and non-profit	Y	15,524	For-profit: 13397 (86.3%) Non-profit: 2127 (14.7%)	Deaths (defined as at least one suspected or confirmed COVID-19 death)

Note: Unless otherwise specified, outbreaks refer to the presence of at least one confirmed or suspected COVID-19 infection. Number of infections refer to the cumulative or relative number of confirmed or suspected COVID-19 infections. Deaths refer to the cumulative or relative mortality number unless otherwise specified. Only outcomes investigated in relation to ownership are included in this table.

Data sources
Most of the included research merged multiple data sources across COVID-19 outcomes, information on the care facilities, and area characteristics to construct their dataset. Less than 15% of included studies (4/28) collected primary data on the investigated COVID-19 outcomes. The majority of studies used data routinely reported by care homes to public health departments and other government-collected data. Almost a third of the included studies (9/28) used data from the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services (CMS), who require American nursing homes to report COVID-19 related data, including confirmed and suspected infections and deaths among residents and staff [50] from May 24. Providers were encouraged, but not required, to retrospectively self-report COVID-19 outcomes before this date. Table A1 in the supplementary material provides an overview of the data sources and the time period of the dependent variables across all included studies.

Risk of bias assessments
The RoB assessments are detailed in Table A2 in the supplementary material. The main concerns related to systematic missing data and selection bias in the included studies. For example, studies that investigated the characteristics of care homes excluded from the CMS dataset (due to missing or incomplete data) found that such facilities were more likely to be FPs and also correlated to many risk factors, such as the ethnicity and socio-economic status of residents (discussed in detail below) [29,41,43,45]. This is a potentially serious limitation of the studies using this data (for the purpose of this review), as it suggests that poorly performing FPs may be systematically underrepresented in the sample, which may underestimate the observed effect of ownership on COVID-19 outcomes. Because of this limitation, all studies using this dataset were downgraded to (at least) moderate risk. For all studies using public and government data, we assumed the risk of information bias to be low.

All assessments of the risk of bias of confounding were based on consideration of factors known to exacerbate the effect of COVID-19 [51,52] and the performance of care homes for older people [6,7]. Almost all studies adjusted for the size of the care homes (24/28), and characteristics on quality and staffing were also commonly included. Nineteen studies adjusted for the ethnic composition and 17/28 included information about the socio-economic status of residents. Rurality and/or population density was included in 11/28 of the studies. See Table A3 in the supplementary material for details on the direction of effect and model adjustment of all included studies.

Direction of effects
Figure 2 displays the direction of effect for all included studies across different ownership and outcome categories. Bar height indicates overall risk of bias (with taller bars indicating lower RoB) and colour denotes study context. See Figure A1 in the supplementary material for a harvest plot on the direction of effect across different data sources and Table A4 for details on the confidence of each finding.

In most studies investigating outbreaks (11/14), FP status was not associated with a higher risk of outbreak, suggesting that FP providers were not more or less likely to have at least one infected resident. The evidence on COVID-19 incidence was mixed – though most of the studies found FP providers to be associated with a higher number of cumulative COVID-19 infections. This direction of effect (i.e., positive effect) was consistent across multiple contexts, including the US, England and Canada. Null effects were only reported in US studies.

Higher rates of COVID-19 related deaths were consistently associated with FP status in Canadian and US contexts. Five studies using state data in the US and in England did not find a positive effect. However, the study conducted in England only investigated variation in the probability of having at least 1 COVID-19 related death and did not analyse variation in the cumulative numbers of deaths [30]. Studies using CMS data usually reported a statistically significant relationship between FP and mortality, which was less frequently identified in studies using data from individual states. Studies conducted in Canada generally found FP status to be associated with a higher incidence of infections and deaths among residents, whereas the direction of effect was mixed in the English studies [27,36,49].

All studies that investigated PPE outcomes found FP status to be positively associated with insufficient access to or shortage of PPE [29,32,35,45]. FP status was not consistently associated with staffing shortages.

[Figure 2 here]

Chain status was often correlated with a higher likelihood of COVID-19 outbreaks, but not with a higher incidence of infections. Five studies from Canada, England, and the US found chain affiliation to be associated with a higher incidence of COVID-19 deaths, but most studies that included this variable did not identify any statistically significant variation. The one Canadian study that investigated this category found CA to be associated with higher incidence and mortality [36]. The two studies conducted in England did not identify any variation in outbreaks and incidence across chain status [49], but one found CA to be associated with higher risk of at least one COVID-19 deaths among residents [30].

Care homes owned by private equity (PE) firms were not found to be consistently associated with worse outcomes than other ownership categories, and one study even found PE providers to be less likely to report PPE shortages and confirmed COVID-19 outbreaks [32].

Evidence on the relationship between ownership variation and risk of infection among staff was scarce, with only three studies investigating this population. In England, FP status was associated with a higher risk of infection among staff [49], but there was no difference for CA providers. The two studies conducted in the US did not identify any statistically significant variation related to FP status, but one study found CA status to be correlated with a higher risk of infection and deaths among staff [32].

Indirect ownership effects

In most studies, ownership was treated as a covariate for model adjustment, and the specific results relating to this variable were not often directly discussed and interpreted. In the studies which discussed the implications of ownership (16/28), the most common theme involved reflections about mediating pathways through which for-profit status indirectly influenced COVID-19 outcomes.

Importantly, FPs were more likely to report PPE shortages [29,31,45], which was interpreted by some to mean that this provider type was less willing to challenge the financial bottom-line by making additional investments, even during a pandemic [13,29]. Yet private equity did not report PPE shortages [31,32], raising questions about whether the profit motive is the main driving factor. FP providers were more likely to be affiliated with corporate chains, which was reported by some to mediate the effect

of FP status on COVID-19 outcomes. For example, one Canadian study found the effect of FP status to dissipate when controlling for chain status, which was interpreted by the authors to mean that CA mediates the effect of FP status on COVID-19 [36]. The only study that controlled for union membership among care homes did not find FP status to influence COVID-19 deaths.

FP facilities were also more likely to be larger (in terms of number of served clients)[13], to serve minority groups and people on Medicaid [41], to have lower quality ratings and a history of regulatory deficiencies [24,40], and to be more crowded [27]. This multicollinearity between ownership and important mediating characteristics may have biased the observed correlations, in that most of these factors are known to influence COVID-19 outcomes. However, a substantial body of studies with low to moderate risk of bias identified a significant difference across ownership, even when controlling for these characteristics [47], indicating a direct effect of ownership independent of mediating variables. Importantly, this direction of effect is consistent with previous research on care quality and FP ownership [8,53]. See Figures A2-A3 in the supplementary material for directed acyclic graphs (DAGs) of the hypothesised relationships between ownership, risk factors, and COVID-19 outcomes.

Discussion

Summary of findings

Our synthesis and critical appraisal of 28 studies suggests that FP ownership is not consistently associated with a higher probability of COVID-19 outbreaks. Yet, there is compelling evidence suggesting that the consequences of outbreaks, in terms of cumulative infections and deaths, may be exacerbated by FP ownership. The finding that FP providers are consistently associated with PPE shortages, may help to explain why these care homes suffer from higher rates of infections and deaths following a COVID-19 outbreak – because these care homes were often ill-prepared and underequipped.

However, there are other factors that may instead be mediating this relationship, as FP status is associated with other risk factors, such as resident ethnicity, socio-economic status, low quality ratings, and facility size.

Chain affiliation was often found to be correlated with higher risk of outbreaks, but was not consistently associated with elevated numbers of infections. There was some evidence demonstrating a higher incidence of COVID-19 deaths among chain affiliated providers. PE ownership was not consistently associated with inferior COVID-19 outcomes.

Implications

The findings of this review highlight the importance of ownership in accounting for poor COVID-19 outcomes across care homes. It is known that the adult social care sector found itself exceedingly exposed in the beginning of the pandemic [54], in large part due to delayed government support and intervention, but also as a result of many years of political and financial neglect [10]. With this review, we do not suggest that the challenges faced by care homes during the pandemic can (or should) be understood through the lens of ownership alone (as illustrated in the Figures A2-A3 in the supplementary material). It is clear that providers of all types have faced severe challenges, which cannot be reduced to ownership status. However, outsourcing to for-profit providers has become the status-quo in many care markets, often based on the rationale that open market competition will optimise the functioning of these facilities. This claim has been extensively criticised and is not supported by empirical work [6–8,53,55]. This review adds to this evidence base by systematically appraising and synthesising the available research on how the consequences of the COVID-19

pandemic in care homes has varied by their ownership status. Although our results represent multiple national settings, most of the included research was conducted the US due to the availability of the national CMS dataset. Efforts are currently being made in the UK to create a similar type of systematic, live, and linked dataset on care homes [56], which is an important endeavour if the consequences of this pandemic are to be understood and addressed going forward.

Limitations

Our findings should be interpreted in light of certain caveats, most of which relate to the characteristics of the included studies. First, most studies were conducted in the US and Canada and relied on CMS data, which means that (1) the results primarily relate to North America, and (2) there may be overlap in the analysed data across certain studies. Second, the body of included research was too heterogenous to be meaningfully meta-analysed and this version of the review thus represents a critical appraisal and narrative synthesis conducted in line with best practice standards [20,57]. Last, throughout our risk of bias assessments, we assumed that the reporting of COVID-19 outcomes was not systematically related to ownership. However, there is some suggestive evidence of a longer turnaround period for resident test results among for-profit providers [58], which if generally true, may bias the effect of FP status towards the null due to underreporting.

Conclusion and future research

This review constitutes the first version of a living appraisal and synthesis of evidence on ownership variation across COVID-19 outcomes. It will be updated as new research becomes available, which may change the conclusion of our synthesis. Based on our synthesis of the available research, we find FP status to be a consistent and credible risk factor of higher cumulative COVID-19 infections and deaths. Therefore, ownership among care home providers may be a key regulatable factor that can be addressed to improve health outcomes in vulnerable populations and reduce health disparities. Going forward, we hope future research will incorporate other national contexts and clearly define their ownership categories of interest.

Contributors: ABM conceived the idea for the manuscript and designed the study protocol with feedback from BV and MDE. ABM and MDE double-screened and selected the included studies. ABM extracted and analysed all data with feedback from MDE and BV. All authors contributed to quality assessing the included research in duplicate. MDE and ABM developed the visualisations for the paper. ABM wrote the manuscript with feedback from MDE and BV. The corresponding author attests that all listed authors meet authorship criteria and that no others meeting the criteria have been omitted.

Funding: Anders Bach-Mortensen is supported by a research fellowship from the Carlsberg Foundation. The funder was not involved in the research process.

Competing interests: All authors have completed the ICMJE uniform disclosure form at www.icmje.org/coi_disclosure.pdf and declare: no competing interests.

Ethical approval: Not applicable.

Data sharing: Most of the data represented in available in the manuscript or in the supplementary material. Additional data is available upon request. Our protocol is available online on Prospero (CRD42020218673) and on OSF (osf.io/c8dq9/). The authors affirm that this manuscript is an honest, accurate, and transparent account of the study being reported; that no important aspects of the study have been omitted; and that any discrepancies from the study as planned have been explained.

Dissemination to participants and related patient and public communities: Our protocol is available online on Prospero (CRD42020218673) and on OSF (osf.io/c8dq9/).

References

1. Oliver D. David Oliver: Let's be open and honest about covid-19 deaths in care homes. *BMJ*. 2020;369. doi:10.1136/bmj.m2334
2. Comas-Herrera A, Zalakain J. *Mortality Associated with COVID-19 Outbreaks in Care Homes: Early International Evidence*.; 2020.
3. Burki T. England and Wales see 20 000 excess deaths in care homes. *Lancet (London, England)*. 2020;395(10237):1602. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(20)31199-5
4. Iacobucci G. Covid-19: Lack of PPE in care homes is risking spread of virus, leaders warn. *BMJ*. 2020;368. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1136/bmj.m1280
5. Le Grand J. Quasi-Markets and Social Policy. *Econ J*. 1991;101(September):1256-1267. doi:10.2307/2234441
6. Barron DN, West E. The quasi-market for adult residential care in the UK: Do for-profit, not-for-profit or public sector residential care and nursing homes provide better quality care? *Soc Sci Med*. 2017;179:137-146. doi:10.1016/j.socscimed.2017.02.037
7. Bach-Mortensen AM, Montgomery P. Does sector matter for the quality of care services? A secondary analysis of social care services regulated by the Care Inspectorate in Scotland. *BMJ Open*. 2019;9(2). doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2018-022975
8. Comondore VR, Devereaux PJ, Zhou Q, et al. Quality of care in for-profit and not-for-profit nursing homes: Systematic review and meta-analysis. *BMJ*. 2009;339(7717):381-384. doi:10.1136/bmj.b2732
9. Stolt R, Blomqvist P, Winblad U. Privatization of social services: Quality differences in Swedish elderly care. *Soc Sci Med*. 2011;72(4):560-567. doi:10.1016/J.SOCSCIMED.2010.11.012
10. O'Neill D. Covid-19 in care homes: The many determinants of this perfect storm. *BMJ*. 2020;369. doi:10.1136/bmj.m2096
11. Covid-19 outbreaks up to 20 times more likely in large care homes, study finds | World news | The Guardian. *The Guardian*. https://www.theguardian.com/world/2020/jul/14/covid-19-outbreaks-up-to-20-times-more-likely-in-large-care-homes-uk-study. Published 2020. Accessed November 13, 2020.
12. Push for Profits Leaves Nursing Homes Struggling to Provide Care During Coronavirus Pandemic - The New York Times. *New York Times*. https://www.nytimes.com/2020/05/07/business/coronavirus-nursing-homes.html. Published 2020. Accessed November 13, 2020.
13. Li Y, Temkin-Greener H, Gao S, Cai X. COVID-19 infections and deaths among Connecticut nursing home residents: facility correlates. *J Am Geriatr Soc*. June 2020. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/jgs.16689
14. Rolland Y, Lacoste MH, De Mauleon A, et al. Guidance for the Prevention of the COVID-19 Epidemic in Long-Term Care Facilities: A Short-Term Prospective Study. *J Nutr Heal Aging*. 2020;24(8):812-816. doi:10.1007/s12603-020-1440-2
15. Glasby J, Zhang Y, Bennett MR, Hall P. A lost decade? A renewed case for adult social care reform in England. *J Soc Policy*. 2020:1-32. doi:10.1017/s0047279420000288
16. Oliver D. David Oliver: Let's not forget care homes when covid-19 is over. *BMJ*. 2020;369. doi:10.1136/bmj.m1629
17. OSF | Ownership and COVID-19 in residential care facilities for the elderly: A living systematic review of outbreaks and mortalities. https://osf.io/c8dq9/. Accessed December 10, 2020.

18. Palayew A, Norgaard O, Safreed-Harmon K, Andersen TH, Rasmussen LN, Lazarus J V. Pandemic publishing poses a new COVID-19 challenge. *Nat Hum Behav*. 2020;4(7):666-669. doi:10.1038/s41562-020-0911-0
19. Elliott JH, Synnot A, Turner T, et al. Living systematic review: 1. Introduction—the why, what, when, and how. *J Clin Epidemiol*. 2017;91:23-30. doi:10.1016/j.jclinepi.2017.08.010
20. Dekkers Id OM, Vandenbroucke JP, Cevallos M, Renehanid AG, Altman DG, Eggerid M. COSMOS-E: Guidance on conducting systematic reviews and meta-analyses of observational studies of etiology. 2019. doi:10.1371/journal.pmed.1002742
21. Sterne JA, Hernán MA, Reeves BC, et al. ROBINS-I: A tool for assessing risk of bias in non-randomised studies of interventions. *BMJ*. 2016;355:4-10. doi:10.1136/bmj.i4919
22. Mueller M, D'Addario M, Egger M, et al. Methods to systematically review and meta-analyse observational studies: A systematic scoping review of recommendations. *BMC Med Res Methodol*. 2018;18(1):1-18. doi:10.1186/s12874-018-0495-9
23. Ogilvie D, Fayter D, Petticrew M, et al. The harvest plot: A method for synthesising evidence about the differential effects of interventions. *BMC Med Res Methodol*. 2008;8. doi:10.1186/1471-2288-8-8
24. Bui DP, See MD I, Hesse MD EM, et al. *Association Between CMS Quality Ratings and COVID-19 Outbreaks in Nursing Homes - West Virginia, March 17–June 11, 2020*. Atlanta: U.S. Center for Disease Control; 2020. https://www.cdc.gov/mmwr/volumes/69/wr/mm6937a5.htm.
25. Rowan P, Rebecca Lester P, Michael Levere B, Libersky J, Debra Lipson M, Julie Robison M. *A Study of the COVID-19 Outbreak and Response in Connecticut Long-Term Care Facilities Interim Report.*; 2020.
26. Unruh MA, Yun H, Zhang Y, Braun RT, Jung HY. Nursing Home Characteristics Associated With COVID-19 Deaths in Connecticut, New Jersey, and New York. *J Am Med Dir Assoc*. 2020;21(7):1001-1003. doi:10.1016/j.jamda.2020.06.019
27. Brown K, Jones A, Daneman N, et al. Association Between Nursing Home Crowding and COVID-19 Infection and Mortality in Ontario, Canada. *Jama Intern Med*. 2020:1-8. doi:10.1101/2020.06.23.20137729
28. Bowblis J, Applebaum R. Prevalence of COVID-19 in Ohio Nursing Homes: What's Quality Got to Do with It? *J Aging Soc Policy*. 2020;00(00):1-17. doi:10.1080/08959420.2020.1824542
29. McGarry BE, Grabowski DC, Barnett ML. Severe Staffing And Personal Protective Equipment Shortages Faced By Nursing Homes During The COVID-19 Pandemic. *Health Aff*. 2020;39(10):1812-1821,1821A-1821I. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1377/hlthaff.2020.01269
30. Morciano M, Stokes JM, Kontopantelis E, Hall I, Turner AJ. Excess mortality for care home residents during the first 23 weeks of the COVID-19 pandemic in England a national cohort study. *medRxiv*. 2020. https://medrxiv.org/cgi/content/short/2020.11.11.20229815.
31. Braun RT, Yun H, Casalino LP, et al. Comparative Performance of Private Equity-Owned US Nursing Homes During the COVID-19 Pandemic. *JAMA Netw open*. 2020;3(10):e2026702. doi:10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2020.26702
32. Gandhi A, Song Y, Upadrashta P. Have Private Equity Owned Nursing Homes Fared Worse Under COVID-19? *SSRN Electron J*. 2020. doi:10.2139/ssrn.3682892
33. Chatterjee P, Kelly S, Qi M, Werner RM. Characteristics and Quality of US Nursing Homes Reporting Cases of Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19). *JAMA Netw open*. 2020;3(7):e2016930. doi:10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2020.16930
34. Abrams HR, Loomer L, Gandhi A, Grabowski DC. Characteristics of U.S. Nursing Homes with COVID-19 Cases. *J Am Geriatr Soc*. June 2020. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/jgs.16661
35. Li Y, Fang F, He M. Exploring the N95 and Surgical Mask Supply in U.S. Nursing Homes

During COVID-19. *J Appl Gerontol*. 2020:733464820969015. doi:10.1177/0733464820969015
36. 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
37. He M, Li Y, Fang F. Is There a Link between Nursing Home Reported Quality and COVID-19 Cases? Evidence from California Skilled Nursing Facilities. *J Am Med Dir Assoc*. 2020;21(7):905-908. doi:10.1016/j.jamda.2020.06.016
38. Sugg MM, Spaulding TJ, Lane SJ, et al. Mapping community-level determinants of COVID-19 transmission in nursing homes: A multi-scale approach. *Sci Total Environ*. 2021;752:141946. doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.141946
39. Dean A, Venkataramani A, Kimmel S. Mortality Rates From COVID-19 Are Lower In Unionized Nursing Homes. *Health Aff*. 2020:10.1377/hlthaff. doi:10.1377/hlthaff.2020.01011
40. Harrington C, Ross L, Chapman S, Halifax E, Spurlock B, Debra B. Nurse Staffing and Coronavirus Infections in California Nursing Homes. *Policy Polit Nurs Pract*. 2020;21(3):174-186. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1527154420938707
41. Li Y, Cen X, Cai X, Temkin-Greener H. Racial and Ethnic Disparities in COVID-19 Infections and Deaths Across U.S. Nursing Homes. *J Am Geriatr Soc*. 2020:1-8. doi:10.1111/jgs.16847
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 Netw open*. 2020;3(7):e2015957. doi:10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2020.15957
43. Xu H, Intrator O, Bowblis JR. Shortages of Staff in Nursing Homes During the COVID-19 Pandemic: What are the Driving Factors? *J Am Med Dir Assoc*. 2020;21(10):1371-1377. doi:10.1016/j.jamda.2020.08.002
44. Gorges RJ, Konetzka RT. Staffing Levels and COVID-19 Cases and Outbreaks in U.S. Nursing Homes. *J Am Geriatr Soc*. 2020:1-5. doi:10.1111/jgs.16787
45. Gibson DM, Greene J. State Actions and Shortages of Personal Protective Equipment and Staff in U.S. Nursing Homes. *J Am Geriatr Soc*. 2020:1-6. doi:10.1111/jgs.16883
46. Burton J, 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. *Lancet Heal Longev*. 2020;1(1):e21-e31. doi:10.1101/2020.07.09.20149583
47. Shen K. Relationship between nursing home COVID-19 outbreaks and staff neighborhood characteristics. *medRxiv*. 2020;3:2020.09.10.20192203. https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.09.10.20192203v1%0Ahttps://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.09.10.20192203v1.abstract.
48. Chen MK, Chevalier JA, Long EF. Nursing Home Staff Networks and COVID-19. *NBER Work Pap*. 2020. doi:10.3386/w27608
49. Shallcross L, Burke D, Stat OAC, et al. Risk factors associated with SARS-CoV-2 infection and outbreaks in Long Term Care Facilities in England: a national survey. *medRxiv*. 2020:133-155.
50. Centers for Medicaid and Medicare Services. *Interim Final Rule Updating Requirements for Notification of Confirmed and Suspected COVID-19 Cases Among Residents and Staff in Nursing Homes*.; 2020. https://nhsn.cdc.gov/RegistrationForm/index. Accessed November 18, 2020.
51. Finch WH, Hernández Finch ME. Poverty and Covid-19: Rates of Incidence and Deaths in the United States During the First 10 Weeks of the Pandemic. *Front Sociol*. 2020;5:47. doi:10.3389/fsoc.2020.00047
52. Patel P, Hiam L, Sowemimo A, Devakumar D, McKee M. Ethnicity and covid-19. *BMJ*.

2020;369. doi:10.1136/bmj.m2282
53. Ronald LA, McGregor MJ, Harrington C, Pollock A, Lexchin J. Observational Evidence of For-Profit Delivery and Inferior Nursing Home Care: When Is There Enough Evidence for Policy Change? *PLoS Med*. 2016;13(4). doi:10.1371/journal.pmed.1001995
54. Ouslander JG, Grabowski DC. COVID-19 in Nursing Homes: Calming the Perfect Storm. *J Am Geriatr Soc*. July 2020. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/jgs.16784
55. Ben-Ner A, Karaca-Mandic P, Ren T. Ownership and quality in markets with asymmetric information: Evidence from nursing homes. *BE J Econ Anal Policy*. 2012;12(1):42. doi:10.1515/1935-1682.3038
56. Hanratty B, Burton JK, Goodman C, Gordon AL, Spilsbury K. Covid-19 and lack of linked datasets for care homes: The pandemic has shed harsh light on the need for a live minimum dataset. *BMJ*. 2020;369. doi:10.1136/bmj.m2463
57. Campbell M, McKenzie JE, Sowden A, et al. Synthesis without meta-analysis (SWiM) in systematic reviews: Reporting guideline. *BMJ*. 2020;368. doi:10.1136/bmj.l6890
58. Mcgarry BE, Steelfisher GK, Grabowski DC, Barnett ML. COVID-19 Test Result Turnaround Time for Residents and Staff in US Nursing Homes. *JAMA Intern Med*. 2020;(July):5-7. doi:10.1001/jamainternmed.2020.7330

Figure 1: Prisma flow diagram.

Figure 2: Harvest plot on the direction of effect across ownership, risk of bias, and study context. Bar height indicates overall risk of bias and colour denotes study context. *Positive* and *negative* effects are understood as associations in either directions that are statistically significant at the 5% level. Note that positive effects refer to elevated COVID-19 outcome values. *Null effect* is understood as differences that are not statistically significant at the 5% level. Outbreaks usually refer to the presence of any COVID-19 infections, except for one study that defined outbreaks as at least two cases [24]. COVID-19 incidence usually refers to the cumulative number of COVID-19 infections, but also includes binary outcomes on large outbreaks (e.g. [44,49]). COVID-19 mortality usually refers to cumulative cases, except for one study which used a binary indicator of at least 6 deaths [26], and another which analysed a dichotomised outcome of any number of deaths vs no deaths [30].


Identification
Screening
Eligibility
Included
Records identified through database searching (n = 3845)
Additional records identified through citation search (n = 9)
Records after duplicates removed (n = 3514)
Records screened (n = 3514)
Records excluded (n = 3433)
Full-text articles assessed for eligibility (n = 81)
Full-text articles excluded due to the following reasons:
– No ownership comparison (n=40)
– Not empirical (n=20)
– Not quantitative (n=2)
Studies included in synthesis (n =28)


COVID−19 outbreak
Negative effect
Null effect
Positive effect
For−profit
Chain affiliation
Private−equity
COVID−19 incidence
Negative effect
Null effect
Positive effect
For−profit
Chain affiliation
Private−equity
COVID−19 mortality
Negative effect
Null effect
Positive effect
For−profit
Chain affiliation
Private−equity
Personal Protective Equipment
Negative effect
Null effect
Positive effect
For−profit
Chain affiliation
Private−equity
Staffing shortage
Negative effect
Null effect
Positive effect
For−profit
Chain affiliation
Private−equity
Risk of Bias
High
Medium
Low
Country
Canada
France
England
Scotland
USA (single state)
USA (multiple states)