

**Incidence of outbreak-associated COVID-19 cases by industry in Ontario, Canada, April 1, 2020- March 31, 2021**

Sarah A. Buchan,<sup>1,2</sup> Peter M. Smith,<sup>2,3,4</sup> Christine Warren,<sup>1</sup> Michelle Murti,<sup>1,2</sup> Cameron Mustard,<sup>2,3</sup> JinHee Kim,<sup>1,2</sup> Sandya Menon,<sup>1</sup> Kevin A. Brown,<sup>1,2</sup> Trevor van Ingen,<sup>1</sup> Brendan T. Smith<sup>1,2</sup>

1. Public Health Ontario, Toronto, Ontario, Canada
2. Dalla Lana School of Public Health, University of Toronto, Toronto, Ontario, Canada
3. Institute for Work and Health, Toronto, Ontario, Canada
4. Department of Epidemiology and Preventive Medicine, Monash University, Australia

**Corresponding author:**

Sarah Buchan

661 University Avenue, Floor 17, Toronto, ON, M5G 1M1, Canada

647-260-7274

[sarah.buchan@oahpp.ca](mailto:sarah.buchan@oahpp.ca)

## **Abstract**

### **Objectives**

The objective of our study was to estimate the rate of workplace outbreak-associated cases of COVID-19 by industry in labour market participants aged 15-69 years who reported working the majority of hours outside the home in Ontario, Canada.

### **Methods**

We conducted a population based cross-sectional study of COVID-19 workplace outbreaks and associated-cases reported in Ontario between April 1, 2020 and March 31, 2021. All outbreaks were manually classified into two digit North American Industry Classification System (NAICS) codes. We obtained denominator data from the Statistics Canada Labour Force Survey in order to estimate the incidence of outbreak-associated cases per 100,000,000 hours amongst individuals who reported the majority of hours were worked outside the home. We performed this analysis across industries and in three distinct time periods.

### **Results**

Overall, 12% of cases were attributed to workplace outbreaks among working age adults across our study period. While incidence varied across the time periods, the five industries with the highest incidence rates across our study period were agriculture; healthcare and social assistance; food manufacturing; educational services; and, transportation and warehousing.

### **Conclusions**

Certain industries have consistently increased incidence of COVID-19 over the course of the pandemic. These results may assist in ongoing efforts to reduce transmission of COVID-19, by prioritizing resources, as well as industry-specific guidance, vaccination, and public health messaging.

## Introduction

Understanding the role of workplace exposure to COVID-19, and differential risk by industry, is critical to reducing morbidity and mortality. Occupational risk is an important source of COVID-19 exposure and transmission[1]. Elevated risk of COVID-19 has been documented among healthcare workers[2], given direct contact with COVID-19 patients[3]. However, workplace outbreaks of COVID-19 have consistently been observed across many industries beyond healthcare, especially in essential services where work is unable to be done from home[4]. A comprehensive analysis of the distribution of workplace outbreaks across industries is important to understand the effectiveness and the limitations of workplace infection prevention and control practices, as well to ensure equitable public health measures (including vaccination) to reduce risk in workplaces and prevent ongoing spread in the community.

The location and frequency of workplace outbreaks will vary by region, depending on the prevalence of industries and intensity of COVID-19 [5]. A number of occupational characteristics have been observed to increase COVID-19 risk at work, including physical proximity to others[6], exposure to disease[7], and indoor ventilation; further, protections in the workplace may vary by industry (Smith et al. forthcoming[8]). In Ontario, an analysis of workplace outbreaks early in the pandemic (between January 21, 2020 to June 30, 2020) found that 68% of outbreaks and 80% of cases belonged to manufacturing, agriculture and transportation warehousing after excluding hospital, congregate living and education and childcare settings[9]. Since this period, Ontario has experienced two additional waves of COVID-19, accompanied by adjustments to public health measures that restricted operations in some industries. As such, it is critical to use accurate denominator data in order to estimate risk of COVID-19 through work. Surveillance systems are often limited in their capture of occupational data [10][11]; however, outbreak data present an opportunity to explore cases associated with reported outbreaks within workplaces in order to mitigate this limitation.

Understanding differences in COVID-19 incidence among workers in industries is required to understand risk and inform prevention practices. The objective of our study was to estimate the rate of workplace outbreak-associated cases of COVID-19 by industry in labour market participants aged 15-69 years who reported working the majority of hours outside the home in Ontario, Canada. We also aimed to estimate the proportion of cases in this age group that were associated with a workplace-associated outbreak.

## Methods

We conducted a population based cross-sectional study of COVID-19 workplace outbreaks and associated-cases reported in Ontario between April 1, 2020 and March 31, 2021. All outbreaks and cases in Ontario are entered into the Public Health Case and Contact Management Solution (CCM), the provincial reportable disease surveillance system, by one of 34 local public health units (PHU). We used monthly data from Ontario respondents to Statistics Canada's Labour Force Survey (LFS) to estimate the size of the Ontario workforce to quantify the population at risk from April 2020 through March 2021[12]. The LFS is a monthly household survey that uses a rotating panel sample design consisting of six representative panels, where one panel is replaced each month allowing for efficient estimation of monthly changes in the Canadian labour force. LFS respondents are representative of 98% of Canadians aged 15 years and over, excluding persons living on reserves, full-time members of the Canadian Armed Forces, and institutionalized populations[12]. In response to COVID-19 pandemic, a LFS Supplement was introduced in April 2020, which asked questions on where the respondent had spent the majority of their work hours in the previous week (e.g. at home, at the worksite, or outside of the home, but not in a particular location). Questions in the LFS supplement are only asked of respondents aged 15 to 69 years, so we further restricted our sample to COVID-19 cases aged 15-69 years to focus on labour

market participants. The Public Health Ontario Ethics Review Board determined that this project did not require research ethics committee approval as the activities described were considered public health practice and not research.

### **Outbreak definition and Industry Assignment**

In Ontario, PHUs are responsible for declaring COVID-19 outbreaks based on provincial guidance regarding the assessment of risk of acquisition and transmission in a workplace. The outbreak definition varied by industry setting[13], with individual cases constituting an outbreak in long-term care homes (and childcare settings until November 9, 2020), or two cases occurring within 14 days with an epidemiologic link in other settings[14]. For hospitals, long-term care homes, and education settings, outbreaks were classified on PHU entry using existing look up tables available in CCM. All other outbreaks were reviewed retrospectively based on locations (address and outbreak name as entered by the PHU) to ensure consistency with data entry across PHUs and to assign two digit (i.e., sector) North American Industry Classification System (NAICS) industry codes based on a manual lookup[15]. Based on reported outbreaks, 13 categories were examined in our study: agriculture, forestry, fishing and hunting; mining and utilities; construction; manufacturing – food; manufacturing – other; wholesale trade; retail trade; transportation and warehousing; educational services; health care and social assistance; accommodation and food services; public administration; and, other service industries. Additional details on the NAICS and classification of industries are available in **Supplementary Appendix 1**.

### **Workplace outbreak-associated cases**

We restricted our primary sample to only include workplace outbreak-associated cases. All laboratory-confirmed (i.e., those meeting provincial case definition[16]) COVID-19 cases and hospitalizations were obtained from CCM. For healthcare and congregate care/living settings, we included outbreak-associated cases in workers indicated by an occupational flag in CCM in order to exclude patients or residents. For the education industry, we included all non-students aged over 18 years or had an educational staff flag who were linked to a childcare, elementary or secondary school outbreak. All other cases among the working aged population, defined as ‘non-workplace outbreak-associated cases’ were retained as a comparison group, but were not included in the primary analyses. This group included cases in the community, as well as outbreak-related cases in residents of congregate care/living, and outbreak-related cases in settings where working status data were not available and transmission was unlikely to be restricted to workers only – these included recreational fitness settings (e.g., gyms), other recreational settings (e.g., visual arts class) and places of worship.

### **Covariates**

We distinguished dates of cases and outbreaks across three time periods: April 1- August 31, 2020 (period 1), September 1 – December 31, 2020 (period 2), and January 1 – March 31, 2021 (period 3). These time periods coincided with changes to public health measures (i.e., stay at home order)[17], the rise of prevalence of variants of concern [18], and allowed for adequate sample size to be obtained from the LFS based on the survey’s sampling strategy [12]. Demographic information on outbreak-associated cases included: gender, age (10-year categories), and diagnosing PHU. Further, quintiles of neighbourhood material deprivation and diversity (measured using the ethnic concentration dimension) were measured using the Ontario Marginalization Index (ON-MARG)[19].

### **Statistical Analyses**

We examined COVID-19-related cases and hospitalizations across characteristics of workplace and to non-workplace associated cases. Further, we aggregated these outcomes by industry across three time

periods. For each period, we estimated industry-specific incidence rates per 100,000,000 work hours and per 100,000 workers who reported the majority of hours were worked outside the home. Respondents were asked 'the location where the respondent worked the most hours in the previous week' and our analyses were restricted to individuals reporting the majority of hours were worked outside the home.

We calculated a standardized incidence ratio (SIR) and 95% confidence intervals[20], as the ratio of the workplace outbreak-associated COVID-19 incidence rate to the overall incidence rate in Ontarians aged 15-69, for each industry and time period. We estimated the overall rate by summing the number of COVID-19 cases in Ontario and dividing it by the sum of waking hours (assuming 16 hours of awake time per person per day multiplied by the Ontario population aged 15-69 estimated from projection data for 2020 sourced from Ministry, IntelliHEALTH Ontario).

We performed sensitivity analyses to: 1) include an estimate of temporary foreign workers in agricultural settings who are captured in the case data but not in the LFS denominator[21]; and, 2) reclassify the hours of those self-employed (with employees) on farms to working outside the home (i.e., to ensure their exposure to others was enumerated).

All analyses were conducted in R-Studio (Version 1.2.5019).

## Results

Between April 1, 2020 and March 31, 2021, there were 282,539 COVID-19 cases reported in Ontarians aged 15-69 years. Of these, 247,371 were excluded as they were non-workplace outbreak-associated cases (i.e., cases not associated with an outbreak, residents of congregate care/living, or not meeting workplace associated outbreak definition, **Supplementary Appendix 2 and 3**). Our final study population included 35,168 cases associated with 5,759 workplace outbreaks.

The number of COVID-19 cases and hospitalizations across sociodemographic characteristics by workplace outbreak and non-workplace outbreak-associated cases are presented in **Table 1**. Overall, 12% of cases and 7% of hospitalizations were attributed to workplace outbreaks among working age adults, with 2% and 3% workplace and non-workplace outbreaks-associated cases requiring hospitalization, respectively. Despite an increase in COVID-19 cases and hospitalizations occurring in periods 2 and 3 (September 1 – December 31, 2020 and January 1 – March 31, 2021) compared to period 1 (April 1- August 30, 2020) overall, a lower percentage of workplace compared to non-workplace outbreak-associated cases and hospitalization were observed. The proportion of workplace outbreak-associated cases was higher among females (14%) compared to males (11%) but hospitalizations were similar across gender. The proportion of workplace outbreak-associated cases differed by geography (i.e. PHU), ranging from approximately 5% of all cases among the working population to 27% of all cases, depending on the PHU.

**Table 1: Socio-demographic characteristics of COVID-19 cases and hospitalizations among 15-69 year olds, reported April 1, 2020 - March 31, 2021 in workplace and non-workplace outbreak-associated cases in Ontario, Canada**

	Cases				Hospitalizations			
	Workplace Outbreak	Non- workplace outbreak	Proportion related to workplace outbreak	p-value	Workplace Outbreak	Non- workplace outbreak	Proportion related to workplace outbreak	p-value
	N	N	%		N	N	%	
<b>Total (Ontario)</b>	35,168	247,371	12%		557	7,376	7%	
<b>Time</b>				<0.001				<0.001
Period 1 (April 1st - Aug 31st 2020)	6,648	22,721	23%		187	1,881	9%	
Period 2 (Sept 1st - Dec 31st 2020)	12,995	105,125	11%		130	2,205	6%	
Period 3 (Jan 1st - March 31st 2021)	15,525	119,525	11%		240	3,290	7%	
<b>Gender</b>				<0.001				0.3135
Female	19,534	119,207	14%		243	3,050	7%	
Male	15,397	126,882	11%		311	4,305	7%	
Other*	237	1,282	16%		3	21	13%	
<b>Age (in years)</b>				<0.001				<0.001
15-24	4,245	52,581	7%		9	239	4%	
25-34	8,400	58,002	13%		48	629	7%	
35-44	7,544	43,380	15%		72	839	8%	
45-54	8,089	42,887	16%		183	1,567	10%	
55-64	6,023	38,679	13%		206	2,593	7%	
65-69	867	11,842	7%		39	1,509	3%	
<b>Material Deprivation Quintile **</b>				<0.001				<0.001
1 - low	4,419	36,358	11%		57	831	6%	
2	5,800	38,690	13%		110	965	10%	
3	6,765	45,369	13%		115	1,129	9%	
4	7,424	49,634	13%		115	1,345	8%	
5 - high	8,607	58,644	13%		145	2,235	6%	
Missing	2,153	14,284	13%		15	369	4%	

<b>Diversity Quintile**</b>				<0.001				<0.001
1 - low	2,700	11,893	19%		36	391	8%	
2	4,045	17,161	19%		74	532	12%	
3	4,445	26,572	14%		75	786	9%	
4	6,550	48,028	12%		116	1,299	8%	
5 - high	15,275	125,041	11%		241	3,497	6%	
Missing	2,153	14,284	13%		15	369	4%	
<b>Public Health Unit</b>				<0.001				<0.001
Algoma District	16	179	8%		1	1	50%	
Brant County	187	1,609	10%		1	30	3%	
Chatham-Kent	295	1,021	22%		2	22	8%	
City Of Hamilton	1,344	8,733	13%		23	328	7%	
City Of Ottawa	1,703	11,312	13%		37	383	9%	
Durham Region	1,592	9,729	14%		31	284	10%	
Eastern Ontario	275	2,099	12%		4	80	5%	
Grey Bruce	81	557	13%		4	11	27%	
Haldimand-Norfolk	448	846	35%		11	24	31%	
Haliburton, Kawartha, Pine Ridge	126	698	15%		3	19	14%	
Halton Region	909	7,381	11%		15	152	9%	
Hastings & Prince Edward Counties	82	345	19%		3	8	27%	
Huron Perth	186	837	18%		1	15	6%	
Kingston, Frontenac, Lennox & Addington	121	618	16%		3	7	30%	
Lambton County	235	1,966	11%		2	28	7%	
Leeds, Grenville And Lanark District	193	634	23%		7	23	23%	
Middlesex-London	896	4,978	15%		7	174	4%	
Niagara Region	1,748	5,579	24%		31	155	17%	
North Bay Parry Sound District	16	221	7%		0	18	0%	
Northwestern	26	506	5%		1	26	4%	
Southwestern	498	1,655	23%		6	48	11%	
Peel Region	7,272	51,759	12%		74	933	7%	
Peterborough County-City	61	647	9%		0	17	0%	

Porcupine	43	206	17%	1	13	7%
Renfrew County And District	85	233	27%	0	5	0%
Simcoe Muskoka District	1,123	5,150	18%	35	171	17%
Sudbury And District	203	865	19%	3	34	8%
Thunder Bay District	216	2,029	10%	3	95	3%
Timiskaming	22	80	22%	0	8	0%
Toronto	7,933	80,016	9%	158	3,013	5%
Waterloo Region	1,445	8,221	15%	16	237	6%
Wellington-Dufferin-Guelph	852	3,377	20%	11	94	10%
Windsor-Essex County	2,724	8,481	24%	25	282	8%
York Region	2,212	24,804	8%	38	638	6%

\*Includes individuals for which gender was not reported or missing, as well as individuals reporting transgender or non-binary gender.

\*\*Individuals residing in congregate care were not assigned to a quintile (4,392 cases and 502 hospitalizations). Quintile 5 represents the highest quintile of deprivation or diversity. The material deprivation measure combines information on income, quality of housing, educational attainment and family structure characteristics to assess the ability of individuals and communities to access and attain basic material needs. The ethnic concentration dimension is based on the proportion of non-white and non-Indigenous residents and/or the proportion of immigrants that arrived in Canada within the past five years.



The number of workplace outbreak-associated COVID-19 outbreaks, cases and hospitalizations and SIRs by industry and time period are presented in **Table 2**. A SIR greater than 1.0 indicates that there was a higher rate of COVID-19 cases per hour exposed in a given industry compared to what was observed in the overall working age population, while a SIR less than 1.0 indicates a decreased rate. The majority of workplace-associated cases were attributed to select industries; these industries were consistent over time but the distribution varied between periods and was impacted by public health measures. In period 1, excess workplace outbreak-associated cases (SIR) were observed in agriculture (24.9), healthcare and social assistance (9.3) and food manufacturing (5.0) industries. Similar trends were observed in period 2 and 3, although to a lesser extent, with cases 2.4 and 4.3 times higher in agriculture, 2.6 and 2.2 times higher in health care and social assistance and 2.6 and 2.4 times higher in food manufacturing industries. In addition, excess cases were observed in transportation and warehousing (period 2: 1.1; period 3: 1.5) and education (period 1: 1.2; period 3: 1.1) industries. The incidence of workplace outbreak-associated COVID-19 cases per 100,000,000 hours worked by industry and time period are presented in **Figure 1**.

The incidence of workplace outbreak-associated COVID-19 cases per 100,000 workers by industry and time period are presented in **Supplementary Appendix 4**. The distribution of COVID-19 incidence rates were consistent across industries using both the number of workers and hours worked as denominators.

### **Sensitivity analyses**

When we updated our results to account for the seasonal variation of temporary foreign workers in agricultural settings and to account for the home also being the work setting for self-employed agriculture workers, the incidence in the agricultural setting decreased in all time periods (**Supplementary Appendix 5**). However, the ranking of incidence as compared to other industries did not change.

**Table 2: COVID-19 cases and hospitalizations workplace outbreak-associated cases and standardized incidence ratio (SIR), by industry and period among workers aged 15-69 in Ontario, Canada reported April 1, 2020 – March 31, 2021**

Time period & Industry	Workplace outbreaks	Cases		Hospitalizations		SIR (95%CI)
	N	N	%	N	%	
<b><u>Period 1 (April 1st - Aug 31st 2020)</u></b>						
Accommodation and Food Service	16	49	1%	4	2%	0.4 (0.3, 0.6)
Agriculture	29	1,339	20%	21	11%	24.9 (23.5, 24.9)
Construction	11	43	1%	0	0%	0.1 (0.1, 0.4)
Education	17	45	1%	0	0%	1.2 (0.9, 1.5)
Healthcare and Social Assistance	549	4,050	61%	130	70%	9.3 (9.0, 9.3)
Manufacturing - Food	32	474	7%	17	9%	5.0 (4.6, 5.1)
Manufacturing - Other	63	313	5%	6	3%	0.8 (0.7, 0.9)
Mining and Utilities	1	21	0%	1	1%	0.5 (0.3, 0.9)
Other Service Industries	19	70	1%	1	1%	0.1 (0.1, 0.4)
Public Administration	5	32	0%	3	2%	0.3 (0.2, 0.6)
Retail Trade	16	42	1%	0	0%	0.1 (0.1, 0.4)
Transportation and Warehousing	29	164	2%	4	2%	0.8 (0.7, 0.9)
Wholesale Trade	3	6	0%	0	0%	0.1 (0.0, 0.9)
<b><u>Period 2 (Sept 1st - Dec 31st 2020)</u></b>						
Accommodation and Food Service	114	528	4%	6	5%	0.6 (0.6, 0.7)
Agriculture	26	532	4%	4	3%	2.4 (2.2, 2.5)
Construction	58	192	1%	2	2%	0.1 (0.1, 0.3)
Education	445	923	7%	8	6%	0.8 (0.8, 0.9)
Healthcare and Social Assistance	1,113	5,862	45%	60	46%	2.6 (2.6, 2.7)
Manufacturing - Food	72	861	7%	5	4%	2.6 (2.4, 2.7)
Manufacturing - Other	214	1,577	12%	15	12%	0.8 (0.7, 0.8)
Mining and Utilities	6	19	0%	0	0%	0.1 (0.1, 0.5)
Other Service Industries	100	457	4%	7	5%	0.2 (0.2, 0.3)
Public Administration	31	130	1%	1	1%	0.3 (0.2, 0.5)

Retail Trade	96	528	4%	7	5%	0.3 (0.3, 0.4)
Transportation and Warehousing	64	1,153	9%	12	9%	1.1 (1.0, 1.1)
Wholesale Trade	32	233	2%	3	2%	0.5 (0.4, 0.6)

---

**Period 3 (Jan 1st - March 31st 2021)**

Accommodation and Food Service	88	391	3%	9	4%	0.5 (0.5, 0.6)
Agriculture	78	705	5%	9	4%	4.3 (4.0, 4.4)
Construction	118	562	4%	6	3%	0.3 (0.3, 0.4)
Education	484	1,138	7%	20	8%	1.1 (1.1, 1.2)
Healthcare and Social Assistance	1,011	5,471	35%	51	21%	2.2 (2.2, 2.3)
Manufacturing - Food	65	991	6%	27	11%	2.4 (2.2, 2.4)
Manufacturing - Other	267	2,450	16%	56	23%	1.1 (1.0, 1.1)
Mining and Utilities	14	75	0%	1	0%	0.3 (0.2, 0.5)
Other Service Industries	146	688	4%	19	8%	0.3 (0.3, 0.4)
Public Administration	53	376	2%	5	2%	0.7 (0.6, 0.8)
Retail Trade	128	718	5%	11	5%	0.3 (0.3, 0.4)
Transportation and Warehousing	106	1,739	11%	22	9%	1.5 (1.4, 1.5)
Wholesale Trade	39	221	1%	4	2%	0.4 (0.3, 0.5)

---

## Discussion

In a population based study including all workplace outbreaks and their associated cases in Ontario, Canada between April 2020 and March 2021, we observed that workplace outbreak-associated cases accounted for 12% of all cases in the working age population. When broken down by industry, incidence rates were highest in healthcare and social assistance, food manufacturing, agriculture, other manufacturing, educational services, and transportation and warehousing. This reflects only cases linked to identified and reported workplace outbreaks and does not account for non-outbreak cases in workers or further spread within households related to index cases associated with workplace outbreaks; as such, the total number of cases resulting from workplace outbreaks is likely to be larger than what is presented in this study[9][22].

Our work is an expansion of previously published estimates for Ontario's first wave[9], for which denominator data were not available. That study coincides with period 1 in our analysis, reflecting a time when restrictions for essential services were stronger than during subsequent periods and when asymptomatic testing was limited. Similar to these previous results, we found a high incidence of outbreak-related cases in manufacturing (including food), agriculture, and transportation and warehousing industries. In our updated results, we also found high incidence (based on hours worked outside the home) in the education industry during periods that included timeframes when schools had reopened for in-person learning. The incidence across industries was highest in the third period of our study, which encompassed the peak of the second wave and beginning of the third wave of COVID-19 in Ontario[18]. This period also overlapped with the rapid rise of variants of concern (predominantly B.1.1.7), which are not only more transmissible but which also led to the lowering of thresholds for contact and outbreak management, and thereby could have resulted in increased case detection. This period also coincided with the roll out of COVID-19 vaccines to staff working in hospitals and long-term care homes [23], which may explain the comparatively smaller increase in rates for healthcare and social assistance between periods 3 and 2 relative to other industries.

The majority of published estimates report on specific occupations[24][25][26] or industries of interest, particularly healthcare [3] and food processing[27][28]. Other studies have focused on ecological comparisons of rates in neighbourhoods by proportion employed in 'essential work'[29], but were unable to assess risk across occupations or industries. Few other papers have comprehensively estimated incidence across all industries. Independent analyses of workplace outbreaks by industry in Utah from March to June 2020[30] and Los Angeles County from March to September 2020[31] assessing incidence using NAICS classification and both identified manufacturing, wholesale trade, transportation and warehousing and construction (Utah only) as industries with the highest incidence during these time frames. Chen et al.'s[32] recent analysis in the UK also identified workplace outbreaks by geographical region and industrial sector from May to October 2020 and reported the highest outbreak rate in food manufacturing, followed by warehouses and other manufacturing.

These studies all excluded a combination of healthcare, congregate-living and education settings and included denominator data from 2019 to estimate incidence within their industry classifications, which are unlikely to accurately reflect labour force participation during the pandemic period, given closures to industries and the large proportion of workers currently working remotely (which varies by industry). However, similar to these studies, we identified manufacturing industries as having some of the highest rates of COVID-19, but separated food manufacturing from other manufacturing. Our results demonstrate higher incidence of outbreak-associated COVID-19 in food manufacturing relative to all other manufacturing and align with other studies that have identified outbreaks in food processing

facilities [27][28]. Factors that relate to higher risk of COVID-19, including high-density settings, close proximity, prolonged duration of contact, may be particularly prevalent in manufacturing settings[33].

Comparisons to other studies across industries are challenging due to differences in study methodology and data sources (e.g., compensation claims[34], time frames, use of occupational versus industry data [24][25][26], and restrictions in place for the specified geography, including workplace closures. Further, industry, occupation as well as other sociodemographic data on cases and contacts, is often limited in surveillance data. For example, we were unable to disentangle industry-specific risk from the role of other factors in our data, such as occupational risk (including within industries), socioeconomic and racial inequities, household size, and financial barriers to isolate, all of which may be associated with increased risk of COVID-19 [35]. Improved occupational surveillance for COVID-19, along with the collection of other socioeconomic determinants[36], would enhance capabilities to effectively respond to COVID-19 as well as future pandemics[4][5].

### **Strengths and Limitations**

Our study is not without limitations. We restricted our analyses to workplace outbreak-associated cases; as a result, they do not represent overall rates of COVID-19 among workers. Additionally, not all included outbreak-associated cases were acquired in the workplace, or while on duty – we were unable to distinguish risks incurred in work areas versus work-related activities or circumstances, e.g., carpooling, mealtimes or breaks. There were also likely differences in declaring/managing outbreaks across the study period (e.g., due to capacity for contact tracing and identifying common exposures, access to testing for outbreaks) and by PHU. This would have impacted the overall number of cases linked to workplace outbreaks and their proportion of total cases. Workplace-outbreak related guidance was issued in June 2020 and updated in February 2021 to a lower threshold for identifying contacts for testing and quarantine in the context of variants of concern; as such, there may be additional inconsistency across periods in our study [14]. Further, there may be differential identification of outbreaks across industries. First, enhanced testing initiatives (including certain funded testing programs) [37] implemented in some industries (i.e., healthcare, education) may have led to increased case and outbreak identification. Second, outbreak definitions were not consistent across industries and some changed over time. For example, a single case constituted an outbreak in long-term care settings which may have inflated outbreak-associated cases in the healthcare relative to other industries whereas an outbreak required two epidemiologically linked cases. Another example includes the agricultural industry, for which many outbreaks also had a component of congregate living given many staff reside in provided accommodation. We were unable to distinguish infections acquired in the workplace from those due to co-habiting workers; this factor may be a significant driver of the high incidence in this industry. We have underestimated the incidence in industries where settings were excluded[38], such as gyms and places of worship, where outbreaks were less likely to have been restricted to staff only based on what is known about transmission dynamics in these settings[39][40]. Third, public health measures and interventions changed over the study period and would have impacted the likelihood of transmission in the workplace. For example, in Ontario, schools were closed from March to September 2020 and healthcare workers were among the highest prioritized during the vaccination roll-out (beginning December 2020). Thus, the changing context of closures and other interventions during the periods makes it challenging to compare the estimated incidence across time periods.

Additional limitations include that the data are reflective of an individual's self-reported main and inability to include data from March 2020 as LFS denominator data were only available as of April 2020. However, few workplace outbreak-associated cases were reported during this month. Finally, there may

have been some misclassification related to outbreaks being classified manually into industry; however, as we reported outbreaks at the two digit level, we believe this is minimal.

Our study also has several strengths. First, we were able to estimate the incidence of all workplace outbreak-associated cases, a limitation to previous studies that use general population cohorts (less representative and higher SES [11] or only include information on specific settings. While this approach may not have captured all workplace associated cases, declaration of a workplace outbreak is an indication that workplace transmission was considered reasonable [14]. By using a combination of risk factors in the provincial surveillance system, along with the manual classification of settings and industry, we were able to create a comprehensive dataset of all workplace outbreak-associated cases. This has allowed us to examine industry-specific incidence, including comparisons between non-healthcare and healthcare industries, responding to the stated need to quantify the COVID-19 burden on all workers [4]. These results provide a unique perspective of workplace COVID-19 transmission across all industries, over a time period that spans more than the initial phase of the pandemic for a jurisdiction of over 14 million individuals. Given the severity of restrictions in many jurisdictions during the first half of 2020, results from this time period cannot be extrapolated to other time periods. Second, our analyses incorporate denominator data from 2020/21 and are more reflective of the changes in the number of individuals actually employed, and working outside of the home within an industry during the pandemic than those that rely on older estimates. This stratification mitigates concerns in comparing incidence by restrictions on certain industries, as we have estimated incidence in those individuals who worked outside the home and could therefore be considered 'at-risk'.

Our results demonstrate that cases associated with workplace-outbreaks continue to contribute to the burden of COVID-19 in working-aged populations in Ontario, although a considerable proportion of COVID-19 cases among working-aged adults in Ontario are not associated with workplace outbreaks. We have also shown that under varying circumstances of changing restrictions and policy guiding outbreak declaration/management, certain industries consistently had increased incidence of COVID-19 over the course of the pandemic. These results may assist in ongoing efforts to reduce transmission of COVID-19, by prioritizing resources, as well as industry-specific guidance, vaccination, and public health messaging.

**Acknowledgements:** We thank the staff at the Statistics Canada's Toronto Research Data Centre for their assistance in accessing the data to the LFS and vetting the output for this project.

**Author Contribution:** SAB, PMS and BTS designed the study. SAB, SM and TVI extracted surveillance data on cases from CCM and classified outbreaks by industry while PMS extracted denominator data from the Labour Force Survey. CW conducted all the data analysis. SAB, CW and BTS drafted the manuscript. SAB, PMS, CW, MM, CM, JHK, SM, KAB, TVI and BTS all contributed to the interpretation of the data, revising the manuscript and final approval.

**Competing Interest:** The authors have declared no competing interest.

**Funding:** This study was supported by Public Health Ontario.

The Institute for Work & Health is supported through funding from the Ontario Ministry of Labour, Training and Skills Development (MLTSD). The analyses, conclusions, opinions and statements expressed herein are solely those of the authors and do not reflect those of the MLTSD; no endorsement is intended or should be inferred.

**Data Sharing:** Public Health Ontario (PHO) cannot disclose the underlying data. Doing so would compromise individual privacy contrary to PHO's ethical and legal obligations. Restricted access to the data may be available under conditions prescribed by the Ontario Personal Health Information Protection Act, 2004, the Ontario Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act, the Tri-Council Policy Statement: Ethical Conduct for Research Involving Humans (TCPS 2 (2018)), and PHO privacy and ethics policies. Data are available for researchers who meet PHO's criteria for access to confidential data. Information about PHO's data access request process is available on-line at <https://www.publichealthontario.ca/en/data-and-analysis/using-data/data-requests>.

Access to the anonymized microdata for the Labour Force Survey Supplement is available through Statistics Canada to accredited researchers and government employees for research purposes.

**Ethical Approval:** The Public Health Ontario Ethics Review Board determined that this project did not require research ethics committee approval as the activities described were considered public health practice and not research.

## References

- 1 Burdorf A, Porru F, Rugulies R. The COVID-19 (Coronavirus) pandemic: consequences for occupational health. *Scand J Work Environ Health* 2020;**46**:229–30. doi:10.5271/sjweh.3893
- 2 Schwartz KL, Achonu C, Buchan SA, *et al.* Epidemiology, clinical characteristics, household transmission, and lethality of severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus-2 infection among healthcare workers in Ontario, Canada. *PLoS ONE* 2020;**15**:e0244477. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0244477
- 3 Gholami M, Fawad I, Shadan S, *et al.* COVID-19 and healthcare workers: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *International Journal of Infectious Diseases* 2021;**104**:335–46. doi:10.1016/j.ijid.2021.01.013
- 4 Carlsten C, Gulati M, Hines S, *et al.* COVID-19 as an occupational disease. *Am J Ind Med* 2021;**64**:227–37. doi:10.1002/ajim.23222
- 5 Sim MR. The COVID-19 pandemic: major risks to healthcare and other workers on the front line. *Occup Environ Med* 2020;**77**:281–2. doi:10.1136/oemed-2020-106567
- 6 European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control. COVID-19 clusters and outbreaks in occupational settings in the EU/EEA and the UK. 2020. <https://www.ecdc.europa.eu/en/publications-data/covid-19-clusters-and-outbreaks-occupational-settings-eueea-and-uk> (accessed 23 Jun 2021).
- 7 Baker MG, Peckham TK, Seixas NS. Estimating the burden of United States workers exposed to infection or disease: A key factor in containing risk of COVID-19 infection. *PLoS ONE* 2020;**15**:e0232452. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0232452
- 8 Smith PM, Smith BT, Warren C, *et al.* The prevalence and factors associated with workplace-based practices to reduce COVID-19 in a representative sample of Canadian labour force participants between July and September 2020. *Health Reports*
- 9 Murti M, Achonu C, Smith BT, *et al.* COVID-19 Workplace Outbreaks by Industry Sector and their Associated Household Transmission, Ontario, Canada, January – June, 2020. *Journal of Occupational & Environmental Medicine* 2021;**Publish Ahead of Print**. doi:10.1097/JOM.0000000000002201
- 10 De Matteis S. COVID-19: are not all workers 'essential'? *Occup Environ Med* 2021;**78**:305–6. doi:10.1136/oemed-2020-107272
- 11 Kromhout H. Learning from a global pandemic. *Occup Environ Med* 2020;**77**:587–8. doi:10.1136/oemed-2020-106801
- 12 Statistics Canada. Guide to the Labour Force Survey 2020. Statistics Canada 2020. <https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/n1/pub/71-543-g/71-543-g2020001-eng.htm> (accessed 23 Jun 2021).
- 13 Ministry of Health. COVID-19 Guidance for the Health Sector. Toronto, ON: 2021. [https://www.health.gov.on.ca/en/pro/programs/publichealth/coronavirus/2019\\_guidance.aspx](https://www.health.gov.on.ca/en/pro/programs/publichealth/coronavirus/2019_guidance.aspx) (accessed 23 Jun 2021).



- 14 Ministry of Health. COVID-19 Guidance: Workplace Outbreaks. Toronto, ON: 2020.  
[https://www.health.gov.on.ca/en/pro/programs/publichealth/coronavirus/docs/2019\\_workplace\\_outbreak\\_guidance.pdf](https://www.health.gov.on.ca/en/pro/programs/publichealth/coronavirus/docs/2019_workplace_outbreak_guidance.pdf) (accessed 23 Jun 2021).
- 15 Statistics Canada. North American Industry Classification System (NAICS) Canada 2017 Version 3.0. 2021.<https://www23.statcan.gc.ca/imdb/p3VD.pl?Function=getVD&TVD=1181553> (accessed 23 Jun 2021).
- 16 Ministry of Health. Case Definition – Coronavirus Disease (COVID-19). Toronto, ON: 2021.  
[https://www.health.gov.on.ca/en/pro/programs/publichealth/coronavirus/docs/2019\\_case\\_definition.pdf](https://www.health.gov.on.ca/en/pro/programs/publichealth/coronavirus/docs/2019_case_definition.pdf) (accessed 23 Jun 2021).
- 17 Government of Ontario. Ontario Declares Second Provincial Emergency to Address COVID-19 Crisis and Save Lives. 2021.<https://news.ontario.ca/en/release/59922/ontario-declares-second-provincial-emergency-to-address-covid-19-crisis-and-save-lives>
- 18 Ontario Agency for Health Protection and Promotion (Public Health Ontario). Epidemiologic summary: COVID-19 in Ontario – January 15, 2020 to June 22, 2021. Toronto, ON: 2021.  
<https://files.ontario.ca/moh-covid-19-report-en-2021-06-23.pdf> (accessed 23 Jun 2021).
- 19 Matheson FI; van Ingen T. 2016 Ontario marginalization index [Internet]. Toronto, ON: St. Michael's Hospital; 2018 [cited 2020 May 12]. Available from:  
<https://www.publichealthontario.ca/en/data-and-analysis/health-equity/ontario-marginalization-index>.
- 20 Rothman KJ, Greenland S, Lash TL. *Modern epidemiology*. Third edition. Philadelphia: : Wolters Kluwer Health/Lippincott Williams & Wilkins 2008.
- 21 Statistics Canada. COVID-19 Disruptions and Agriculture: Temporary Foreign Workers. 2020.<https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/n1/pub/45-28-0001/2020001/article/00002-eng.htm> (accessed 23 Jun 2021).
- 22 Tibebu S, A. Brown K, Daneman N, *et al*. Household secondary attack rate of COVID-19 by household size and index case characteristics. *Epidemiology* 2021. doi:10.1101/2021.02.23.21252287
- 23 Government of Ontario. Ontario's COVID-19 vaccination plan. <https://covid-19.ontario.ca/ontarios-covid-19-vaccination-plan#phase-1> (accessed 23 Jun 2021).
- 24 Mutambudzi M, Niedwiedz C, Macdonald EB, *et al*. Occupation and risk of severe COVID-19: prospective cohort study of 120 075 UK Biobank participants. *Occup Environ Med* 2020;:oemed-2020-106731. doi:10.1136/oemed-2020-106731
- 25 Chen Y-H, Glymour M, Riley A, *et al*. Excess mortality associated with the COVID-19 pandemic among Californians 18–65 years of age, by occupational sector and occupation: March through October 2020. *Occupational and Environmental Health* 2021. doi:10.1101/2021.01.21.21250266
- 26 Nafilyan V, Pawelek P, Ayoubkhani D, *et al*. Occupation and COVID-19 mortality in England: a national linked data study of 14.3 million adults. *Epidemiology* 2021. doi:10.1101/2021.05.12.21257123

- 27 Dyal JW, Grant MP, Broadwater K, *et al.* COVID-19 Among Workers in Meat and Poultry Processing Facilities — 19 States, April 2020. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep* 2020;**69**. doi:10.15585/mmwr.mm6918e3
- 28 Waltenburg MA, Rose CE, Victoroff T, *et al.* Coronavirus Disease among Workers in Food Processing, Food Manufacturing, and Agriculture Workplaces. *Emerg Infect Dis* 2021;**27**:243–9. doi:10.3201/eid2701.203821
- 29 Rao A, Ma H, Moloney G, *et al.* A disproportionate epidemic: COVID-19 cases and deaths among essential workers in Toronto, Canada. *Public and Global Health* 2021. doi:10.1101/2021.02.15.21251572
- 30 Bui DP, McCaffrey K, Friedrichs M, *et al.* Racial and Ethnic Disparities Among COVID-19 Cases in Workplace Outbreaks by Industry Sector — Utah, March 6–June 5, 2020. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep* 2020;**69**:1133–8. doi:10.15585/mmwr.mm6933e3
- 31 Contreras Z, Ngo V, Pulido M, *et al.* Industry Sectors Highly Affected by Worksite Outbreaks of Coronavirus Disease, Los Angeles County, California, USA, March 19–September 30, 2020. *Emerg Infect Dis* 2021;**27**:1769–75. doi:10.3201/eid2707.210425
- 32 Chen Y, Aldridge T, UK COVID-19 National Core Studies Consortium, *et al.* COVID-19 outbreak rates and infection attack rates associated with the workplace: a descriptive epidemiological study. *Epidemiology* 2021. doi:10.1101/2021.05.06.21256757
- 33 Center for Disease Control and Prevention. Manufacturing Workers and Employers Interim Guidance from CDC and the Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA). 2021. <https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/community/guidance-manufacturing-workers-employers.html#exposure-risk> (accessed 23 Jun 2021).
- 34 Marinaccio A, Boccuni F, Rondinone BM, *et al.* Occupational factors in the COVID-19 pandemic in Italy: compensation claims applications support establishing an occupational surveillance system. *Occup Environ Med* 2020;**77**:818–21. doi:10.1136/oemed-2020-106844
- 35 van Ingen T, Akingbola S, Brown KA, *et al.* Neighbourhood-level risk factors of COVID-19 incidence and mortality. *Epidemiology* 2021. doi:10.1101/2021.01.27.21250618
- 36 Khalatbari-Soltani S, Cumming RG, Delpierre C, *et al.* Importance of collecting data on socioeconomic determinants from the early stage of the COVID-19 outbreak onwards. *J Epidemiol Community Health* 2020;**jech-2020-214297**. doi:10.1136/jech-2020-214297
- 37 Government of Ontario. Ontario Deploys Rapid Tests to More Essential Workplaces and Settings. 2021. <https://news.ontario.ca/en/release/60337/ontario-deploys-rapid-tests-to-more-essential-workplaces-and-settings> (accessed 23 Jun 2021).
- 38 Ontario Agency for Health Protection and Promotion (Public Health Ontario). Enhanced epidemiologic summary: COVID-19 outbreaks and cases in Ontario, by setting: February 16, 2020 to December 26, 2020. Toronto, ON: 2021.

- 39 Groves LM, Usagawa L, Elm J, *et al.* Community Transmission of SARS-CoV-2 at Three Fitness Facilities — Hawaii, June–July 2020. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep* 2021;**70**:316–20. doi:10.15585/mmwr.mm7009e1
- 40 Katelaris AL, Wells J, Clark P, *et al.* Epidemiologic Evidence for Airborne Transmission of SARS-CoV-2 during Church Singing, Australia, 2020. *Emerg Infect Dis* 2021;**27**:1677–80. doi:10.3201/eid2706.210465

**Figure 1. Cumulative case rate (per 100,000,000 hours worked outside the home) of COVID-19 among Ontario workers aged 15-69 by industry and period**

