Healthcare workers' SARS-CoV-2 infection rates during the second wave of the pandemic: prospective cohort study

Anne Mette Würtz,[1] PhD, amlw@ph.au.dk; Martin B. Kinnerup,[1] PhD, MAKINN@rm.dk; Kirsten Pugdahl, PhD, pugdahl@aarhus.rm.dk; Vivi Schlünssen, MD, vs@ph.au.dk; Jesper Medom Vestergaard, Master of IT, jespvest@rm.dk; Kent Nielsen, PhD, kent.nielsen@vest.rm.dk; Christine Cramer, MD, chrichti@rm.dk; Jens Peter Bonde, MD, Jens.Peter.Ellekilde.Bonde@regionh.dk; Karin Biering, PhD, Karin.Biering@vest.rm.dk; Ole Carstensen, MD, olcars@rm.dk; Karoline Kærgaard Hansen, PhD, KAROHN@rm.dk; Annett Dalbøge, PhD, annett.dalboege@rm.dk; Esben Meulengracht Flachs, PhD, esben.meulengracht.flachs@regionh.dk; Mette Lausten Hansen, MD, methasen@rm.dk; Ane Marie Thulstrup, MD, anethuls@rm.dk; Else Toft Würtz, PhD, ELSWUR@rm.dk; Mona Kjærsgaard, MD, Mona.R.K@rm.dk; Mette Wulf Christensen, PhD, metechri@rm.dk; Henrik Albert Kolstad, MD, henkol@rm.dk

Department of Public Health, Work, Environment and Health, Danish Ramazzini Centre, Aarhus University, Aarhus C, Denmark (Würtz, Schlünssen, Cramer); Department of Occupational Medicine, Danish Ramazzini Centre, Aarhus University Hospital, Denmark (Kinnerup, Pugdahl, Vestergaard, Cramer, Kærgaard Hansen, Dalbøge, Lausten Hansen, Thulstrup, Toft Würtz, Christensen, Kolstad); Department of Occupational Medicine, Danish Ramazzini Centre, Goedstrup Hospital, Herning, Denmark (Kinnerup, Nielsen, Biering, Carstensen); Department of Occupational and Environmental Medicine, Bispebjerg and Frederiksberg Hospital, University of Copenhagen, Copenhagen, Denmark (Bonde, Flachs); Department of Clinical Microbiology, Aarhus University Hospital, Aarhus, Denmark (Kjærsgaard); Institute of Clinical Medicine, Aarhus University, Aarhus, Denmark (Kolstad)

[1]Joint first authors

Corresponding author: Henrik A Kolstad (henkol@rm.dk) Department of Occupational Medicine, Danish Ramazzini Centre, Aarhus University Hospital, Palle Juul-Jensens Boulevard 99, 8200 Aarhus N, Denmark, +4578450900

Word count: 3030

Summary box

What is already known on this topic?

During the first wave of the COVID-19 pandemic, preventive measures were inadequate and healthcare workers were at increased risk of SARS-CoV-2 infection.

What this study adds?

During the second wave of the pandemic, despite a strong focus on preventive actions, healthcare workers were still at increased risk of SARS-CoV-2 infection following close contact with COVID-19 patients.

The numbers affected were comparable to the numbers affected following COVID-19 contact outside work.

Healthcare works were also at increased risk following close contact with co-workers.

Abstract

Objectives: To assess if healthcare workers during the second wave of the COVID-19 pandemic had increased SARS-CoV-2 infection rates following close contact with patients, co-workers and persons outside work with COVID-19.

Design: Prospective cohort study.

Setting: Public hospital employees in Denmark.

Participants: 5985 healthcare workers (88.6% women) who daily on a smartphone reported COVID-19 contact.

Main outcome measures: SARS-CoV-2 infection rates defined by the first positive polymerase chain reaction (PCR) test recorded in a register with complete test coverage.

Results: 159 positive and 35 996 negative PCR tests for SARS-CoV-2 were recorded during 514 165 person-days of follow-up November 25, 2020 - April 30, 2021. The SARS-CoV-2 infection rate for healthcare workers who during the previous 3-7 days had close contact with COVID-19 patients was 153.7 per 100 000 person-days (0.15% per day) corresponding with an incidence rate ratio of 3.17 (40 cases, 95% CI 2.15 to 4.66) when compared with no close contact with COVID-19 patients. SARS-CoV-2 incidence rate ratios following close contact with co-workers and persons outside work with COVID-19 were 2.54 (10 cases, 95% CI 1.30 to 4.96) and 17.79 (35 cases, 95% CI 12.05 to 26.28). These estimates were mutually adjusted and further adjusted for age, sex, month and number of previous PCR tests.

Conclusions: Despite strong focus on preventive actions during the second wave of the pandemic, healthcare workers were still at increased risk of SARS-CoV-2 infection when in close contact with patients with COVID-19. The numbers affected were comparable to the numbers affected following COVID-19 contact outside work.

Close contact with co-workers was also a risk factor. This stresses the need for increased focus on preventive actions to secure healthcare workers' health during ongoing and future waves of SARS-CoV-2 and other infections.

Introduction

The first wave of the SARS-CoV-2 pandemic was globally characterised by widespread lack of personal protective equipment (PPE), confusing PPE guidelines and lack of SARS-CoV-2 testing and contact tracing.[1] Healthcare workers were at highly increased risk of COVID-19.[2-4] March - April 2020, front-line healthcare workers in UK and USA reporting adequate PPE use when in direct contact with COVID-19 patients showed a five-fold increased self-reported positive polymerase chain reaction (PCR) testing rate for SARS-CoV-2 of 553 per 100 1000.[3] Increased SARS-CoV-2 seropositivity was reported among healthcare workers in close contact with patients,[5-7] co-workers,[5 6] household members and other persons outside work with COVID-19,[5 6 8-11] but not always.[9-11]

A considerable increase in preventive measures was initiated in multiple countries including Denmark,[12] and it was expected that the pandemic afflicting so many healthcare workers was brought under control during the second wave. We studied healthcare workers' SARS-CoV-2 infection and COVID-19 symptom rates during the second wave of the pandemic following close contact with patients, co-workers and persons outside work with COVID-19 compared with no such contacts.

Methods

Study population

November 17, 2020, all healthcare workers and technical, administrative and other staff of the Central Denmark Region (hereafter named healthcare workers) were invited to participate in a prospective cohort study with daily smartphone reporting of potential risk factors and symptoms of COVID-19.

Surveillance and preventive measures

During the study, PCR testing for SARS-CoV-2 was freely accessible at no cost at the hospitals and nearby testing centres for all citizens in and outside standard work hours and independent of symptoms. Staff with any patient contact was urged to be PCR tested bi-weekly until January 26, 2021, thereafter weekly. PCR test results were provided on average 24-36 hours after sample collection. SARS-CoV-2 infection rates peaked in Denmark December 16, 2020, with 4387 PCR verified cases in a population of 5 771 877 citizens.

All staff were instructed to follow general guidelines for infection control and wear surgical masks in all indoor areas with public or patient access and maintain physical distance to other persons whenever possible. All workers with non-critical functions were sent home December 11, 2021, and for the remaining study period.

During care for patients diagnosed with or under suspicion of COVID-19, all staff were instructed to wear a fluid repellent disposable gown with long sleeves, disposable medical gloves, surgical mask and protective glasses or visor. During procedures with risk of aerosol generation (e.g. high flow oxygen therapy) the surgical mask was replaced by a filtering face piece 2 or 3 (FFP2, FFP3) respirator. There was sufficient supply of PPE during the study period.

Following close contact with persons diagnosed with COVID-19 (within one meter until January 22, 2021, thereafter two meters) without prescribed PPE for 15 minutes or more, any citizen had to go into self-isolation and be PCR tested at day four and six. Self-isolation could be broken following two negative tests or, in case of a positive test, 48 hours after symptom cessation or seven days after the positive test if asymptomatic. Detailed infection control for COVID-19 for employees of the Central Denmark Region during the COVID-19 pandemic can be found in the supplemental material.

COVID-19 contact assessment

Each day during follow-up at 3:30 pm, participants received a text message linking to a questionnaire. They were asked to report close contact within a one-meter distance during the current and the previous 1-2 and 3-4 days with patients and persons outside work with COVID-19. They were also asked if they had close contact with co-workers with COVID-19 during the previous 1-2 and 3-4 days, but not the current day because co-workers with known COVID-19 would not be present at work.

We focused on the 5-day time window starting seven days and ending three days before each day of follow-up to account for the expected incubation period.[13] Participants were classified with close contact with patients with COVID-19 if they reported at least one day with such contact during the 5-day time window, else they were classified with no close contact if they reported this for three or more days. Participants not fulfilling these criteria were classified with unknown contact status. Close contact with co-workers and persons outside work with COVID-19 were classified in a similar way.

SARS-CoV-2 infection, vaccination and COVID-19 symptoms

The main outcome measure was incident SARS-CoV-2 infection defined as the first positive PCR test recorded in a regional register with complete coverage of all tests conducted in the population since February 27, 2020. A regional register also provided information about all COVID-19 vaccinations since December 27, 2020.

The secondary outcome measure was first report of loss of taste and smell as asked in the daily questionnaire. During Spring 2020, persistent loss of taste and smell was in this population strongly associated with a positive PCR test for SARS-CoV-2 with an odds ratio of 57.16 (95% CI 16.71 to 195), corresponding with a specificity of 98% and a positive predictive value of 84%.[14]

Population characteristics

Information on age, sex, occupation and department of employment was obtained from the personnel records of the Central Denmark Region. Information on smoking, BMI, airways disease (chronic obstructive pulmonary disease, asthma, rhinitis) was reported by the participants at baseline. Non-compliance with PPE guidelines was reported in the daily questionnaire.

Statistical analyses

Study participants were followed day-by-day from seven days after the day of the first daily questionnaire response, November 25, 2020, at the earliest until testing positive for SARS-CoV-2, seven days after full vaccination,[15] or April 30, 2021, whichever came first. Each day of follow-up was classified according to close contact 3-7 days earlier with patients, co-workers and persons outside work according to the previously defined criteria and was thus based on questionnaire responses during this time window. Participants may experience all three contact forms several times during follow-up and move in and out of exposure and this was accounted for because person-day was the unit of analysis.

We used generalised linear models with log-link assuming a Poisson distribution with person-time for an offset representing the time at risk to derive incidence rate ratios (IRRs) with 95% confidence intervals (CIs) for SARS-CoV-2 infection. We estimated crude and adjusted IRRs and the latter were mutually adjusted for the other COVID-19 contact forms, sex, age (continuous) and month (6 categories, November 2020-April 2021) as decided a priori. Person-days at risk with missing information on close contact with patients, co-workers or persons outside work were not included in these analyses. We abstained from imputing missing values of COVID-19 contact. This was because a high fraction of participants worked part time or irregular shifts with at least two days off work with no contact with patients or co-workers at unpredictable days during a given week. Information on the covariates of the adjusted models were complete without missings.

Earlier (negative) PCR tests before, during or after COVID-19 contact should not be causally associated with SARS-CoV-2 infection as detected by a positive PCR test on a given day of follow-up but may be indicators of unobserved risk factors of SARS-CoV-2 infection that may confound associations. We therefore, furthermore, adjusted for number of PCR tests made 1-2, 3-7 and ≥ 8 days earlier. However, this only affected IRR estimates marginally, and in the final models, we included the cumulative number of earlier PCR tests as a continuous variable. This and all other variables were treated as time-varying day-by-day.

Analyses of loss of taste and smell followed a similar setup, but we did not censor subjects when testing PCR positive for SARS-CoV-2 and did not include number of earlier PCR tests in the adjusted models.

In a sensitivity analysis of possible differential recall of COVID-19 contact, we only included COVID-19 contact information that was obtained on a given day of follow up before PCR test results were available because they were provided with a 24-36 hours' delay. This excluded information on contact with co-workers with COVID-19 because this was first reported on the subsequent day. All analyses were conducted with Stata version 17.

Results

A total of 26 089 healthcare workers were invited to the study. After excluding 724 healthcare workers who were PCR tested positive for SARS-CoV-2 before start of follow-up, 25 365 persons provided 3 253 671 person-days of follow-up until the first positive PCR test, seven days after full vaccination or April 30, 2021 (Table 1). 6337 healthcare workers (24%) participated and provided 753 607 person-days at risk and 471 986 daily questionnaire responses during follow-up. For 239 442 person-days (352 participants), information on close contact during the previous 3-7 days with patients, co-workers or persons outside work with COVID-19 was missing and they were not

included in the analyses. Thus, the study population included 5985 healthcare workers providing 514 165 person-days at risk.

A total of 177 511 negative and 929 positive PCR tests were conducted in the invited population and 35 996 negative and 159 positive PCR tests in the study population. This corresponded with daily testing rates of 5.5% and 7.1% (ratio 1.29). From the study population, 448 748 daily questionnaire responses were collected, corresponding with an 87.3% coverage. SARS-CoV-2 infection rates in the invited population and the study population were 28.6 and 30.9 per 100 000 person-days (ratio 1.08).

Table 2 presents characteristics (person days) of the invited population and the study population of participants. The study population included 88.6% women and the mean age was 48.0 years compared with 83% women and a mean age of 43.6 years of the invited population. Study participation was higher in December, January and February and more participants had been PCR tested 1-2 and 3-7 days, but not ≥8 days earlier than was the case for the invited population. Only minor occupation and department differences between the invited and the participating population was seen.

Participants with close contact 3-7 days earlier with COVID-19 patients more often reported close contact 3-7 days earlier with co-workers and persons outside work with COVID-19 and vice versa. More participants reported close contact with patients, co-workers and persons outside work with COVID-19 in December when population infection rate was high, and less in April.

Participants, who 3-7 days earlier had close contact with co-workers and persons outside work with COVID-19, were during the 1-2 previous days PCR tested 2 to 3-fold more often than participants with no such contact. Participants with close contact with patients with COVID-19 were PCR tested

1.4-fold more often. Comparable but attenuated testing patterns were seen for the earlier 3-7 days. Small testing differences were seen for the earlier ≥8 days.

Participants with close contact with patients and co-workers with COVID-19 included more nurses than other occupations when compared with participants with no close contact. Small differences were seen for department, smoking status, BMI and lung diseases by COVID-19 contact status.

Infection rate declined from January to April, 2021, increased by number of PCR tests 3-7 days earlier, and were higher for departments of medicine and other specialities compared with departments with less patient contact, and were higher among nurses and other occupations compared with medical secretaries. No clear infection rate patterns were seen for the other population characteristics (Supplemental table S1).

Participants reported an overall 2% non-compliance with PPE guidelines during 187 413 daily procedures. For respiratory procedures with potential for higher exposure levels, this percentage was 4.8% (Supplemental table S2).

40 participants tested positive for SARS-CoV-2 had close contact 3-7 days earlier with COVID-19 patients (Table 3). This corresponded with an infection rate of 153.7 per 100 000 person-days and an adjusted IRR of 3.17 (95% CI 2.15 to 4.66) when compared with no close contact with COVID-19 patients. 10 and 35 participants had close contact 3-7 days earlier with co-workers and persons outside work with COVID-19 corresponding with SARS-CoV-2 infection rates of 240.8 and 728.1 per 100 000 person-days and adjusted IRRs of 2.54 (95% CI 1.30 to 4.96) and 17.79 (95% CI 12.05 to 26.28).

24 participants with incident loss of taste and smell had close contact 3-7 days earlier with COVID-19 patients (Table 4). This corresponded with an infection rate of 41.4 per 100 000 person-days and an adjusted IRR of 1.48 (95% CI 0.95 to 2.29) (Table 4). Following close contact with co-workers

and persons outside work with COVID-19, the adjusted IRRs of loss of taste and smell were 2.56 (95% CI 1.24 to 5.30) and 10.82 (95% CI 7.33 to 15.98). Among those reporting loss of taste and smell, 36% had an earlier positive PCR test.

Sensitivity analyses that only included COVID-19 contact information obtained before results of the PCR tests were available, showed an infection rate of 155.2 per 100 000 person-days and an adjusted IRR of 3.52 (95% 2.41 to 5.13) following contact with COVID-19 patients (Supplemental table S3). The IRR following contact with persons outside work with COVID-19 was 14.19 (95% CI 8.27 to 24.33). No results were available for contact with co-workers with COVID-19, because this information was obtained after PCR test results were available for those tested.

Discussion

Principal findings

This prospective cohort study was conducted from November 25, 2020 to April 30, 2021 during the second wave of the pandemic in Denmark. The SARS-CoV-2 infection rate following close contact 3-7 days earlier with COVID-19 patients was 153.7 per 100 000 person-days or 0.15% per day. This corresponded with a three-fold increased adjusted IRRs compared with no contact with COVID-19 patients. Close contact with persons outside work with COVID-19 showed an almost 18-fold increased infection rate. A comparable number of healthcare workers were affected following contact with patients and following contact with persons outside work with COVID-19. Contact with co-workers was also associated with an increased risk of SARS-CoV-2 infection. Comparable patterns of increased risks of loss of taste and smell were seen for all three COVID-19 contact forms. Participants reported high but not complete day-by-day compliance with PPE guidelines.

Strengths and limitations

Major strengths are the prospective cohort design with day-by-day information that allowed precise account for incubation period and day-by-day change in exposure, the complete follow-up for PCR test results, and information on incident loss of taste and smell that is a signature of SARS-CoV-2 infection.[14 16] Other strengths are the free access to PCR testing that required no symptoms and the high testing rate of 7.1% per day. The decision to be PCR tested was therefore unlikely to be strongly associated with COVID-19 contact and result of the PCR test, and we regard collider bias a minor problem.[17]

Participants were tested 29% more often, participated more often December to February, when population infection rate was high, and showed an 8% higher infection rate than the invited population. Otherwise, participants were comparable with the invited target population and this neither suggest strong collider bias.[17]

Participants with one COVID-19 contact form more often experienced the other COVID-19 contact forms and the mutually adjusted IRR estimates were substantially reduced and are expected to provide the best estimates of the separate effects. Participants with close contact with co-workers and persons outside work with COVID-19 had been PCR tested for SARS-CoV-2 infection more often than those with no such contact, but this should not have biased the current findings.

COVID-19 contact information was partly obtained after the results of the PCR tests results were available for the tested participants, which may have inflated results. Sensitivity analyses relying only on contact information obtained before results of the PCR tests were available showed only slightly lower IRRs for close contact with patients and persons outside work with COVID-19 indicating no substantial recall bias. Knowledge of PCR test results as well as COVID-19 contact may, on the other hand, have inflated results for loss of taste and smell.

Being classified with no COVID-19 contact during the 5-day exposure window allowed missing information for two of the five days. Because there may have been COVID-19 contact during these days, this may have deflated IRRs.

The low number of SARS-CoV-2 infected cases was a limitation of the study and restricted the number of potential confounders adjusted for.

Comparisons with other studies

This study showed an overall SARS-CoV-2 infection rate of 30.9 per 100 000 person-days, which was below the self-reported positive PCR test rates of 132 per 100 0000 person-days observed in a prospective cohort of frontline healthcare worker of the first wave by Nugyen et al.[3] Our observed infection rate of 153.7 per 100 000 person-days following contact with COVID-19 patients was also lower than the 553 per 100 000 person-days reported by Nugyen et al. following such contact among healthcare workers reporting adequate PPE use.[3] These findings are, however, not directly comparable with ours because of differences in population compositions and definitions of COVID-19 contact and SARS-CoV-2 infection.

Norwegian nurses and physicians showed tree-fold increased odds of SARS-CoV-2 infection during the first wave (26 February – 17 July 2020) compared with the general working population.[18] During the second wave (18 July – 18 December 2020), odds ratios were well below 1.5 for these two occupations.[18] However, the absolute infection proportions were comparable for the two waves.

We observed a SARS-CoV-2 infection rate of 728.1 per 100 000 person-days following close contact with persons outside work with COVID-19, which was half the average household infection rate of 1660 per 100 000 person-days reported for the first wave.[8] This may partly reflect that we included any close contact with a person outside work with COVID-19 and not only household contacts that are expected to be closer and last longer.

Conclusion

During the second wave of the pandemic, this healthcare worker population was at increased risk of SARS-CoV-2 infection when in close contact with COVID-19 patients. The numbers affected were comparable to the numbers affected following COVID-19 contact outside work. Close contact with co-workers was also a risk factor. PPE was not in shortage, guidelines for proper PPE use and other infection control measures were implemented and compliance with required PPE was high but not complete.

Vaccination will not eliminate risks.[19] The current findings thus stress the need for increased focus on use of recommended PPE, correct donning, doffing and other procedures,[20-22] ventilation[23] and training.[24] The aim is to secure healthcare workers' health and reduce transmission into the community[25] during ongoing and future waves of SARS-CoV-2 and other infections.

References

1. Godlee F. Protect our healthcare workers. *BMJ* 2020;369:m1324. doi: 10.1136/bmj.m1324
2. Chou R, Dana T, Selph S, et al. Update Alert 9: Epidemiology of and Risk Factors for Coronavirus Infection in Health Care Workers. *Ann Intern Med* 2021;174(7):W63-w64. doi: 10.7326/l21-0302 [published Online First: 2021/06/01]
3. Nguyen LH, Drew DA, Graham MS, et al. Risk of COVID-19 among front-line health-care workers and the general community: a prospective cohort study. *Lancet Public Health* 2020;5(9):e475-e83. doi: 10.1016/s2468-2667(20)30164-x [published Online First: 2020/08/04]
4. 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 doi: 10.1136/oemed-2020-106731 [published Online First: 2020/12/11]
5. Akinbami LJ, Chan PA, Vuong N, et al. Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 Seropositivity among Healthcare Personnel in Hospitals and Nursing Homes, Rhode Island, USA, July-August 2020. *Emerg Infect Dis* 2021;27(3):823-34. doi: 10.3201/eid2703.204508 [published Online First: 2021/02/25]
6. Naesens R, Mertes H, Clukers J, et al. SARS-CoV-2 seroprevalence survey among health care providers in a Belgian public multiple-site hospital. *Epidemiol Infect* 2021;149:e172. doi: 10.1017/s0950268821001497 [published Online First: 2021/08/11]
7. Nygren D, Norén J, De Marinis Y, et al. Association between SARS-CoV-2 and exposure risks in health care workers and university employees - a cross-sectional study. *Infect Dis (Lond)* 2021;53(6):460-68. doi: 10.1080/23744235.2021.1892819 [published Online First: 2021/03/11]
8. Madewell ZJ, Yang Y, Longini IM, Jr., et al. Household Transmission of SARS-CoV-2: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. *JAMA Netw Open* 2020;3(12):e2031756. doi: 10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2020.31756 [published Online First: 2020/12/15]
9. Baker JM, Nelson KN, Overton E, et al. Quantification of Occupational and Community Risk Factors for SARS-CoV-2 Seropositivity Among Health Care Workers in a Large U.S. Health Care System. *Ann Intern Med* 2021;174(5):649-54. doi: 10.7326/m20-7145 [published Online First: 2021/01/30]
10. Milazzo L, Lai A, Pezzati L, et al. Dynamics of the seroprevalence of SARS-CoV-2 antibodies among healthcare workers at a COVID-19 referral hospital in Milan, Italy. *Occup Environ Med* 2021 doi: 10.1136/oemed-2020-107060 [published Online First: 2021/02/06]
11. Jacob JT, Baker JM, Fridkin SK, et al. Risk Factors Associated With SARS-CoV-2 Seropositivity Among US Health Care Personnel. *JAMA Netw Open* 2021;4(3):e211283. doi: 10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2021.1283 [published Online First: 2021/03/11]
12. Statens Serum Institut. Instructions for handling COVID-19 in the health care system (in Danish) 2020 [Available from: https://www.sst.dk/da/Udgivelser/2020/Retningslinjer-for-haandtering-af-COVID-19 accessed October 21 2021.
13. Lauer SA, Grantz KH, Bi Q, et al. The Incubation Period of Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) From Publicly Reported Confirmed Cases: Estimation and Application. *Ann Intern Med* 2020;172(9):577-82. doi: 10.7326/m20-0504 [published Online First: 2020/03/10]
14. Nielsen KJ, Vestergaard JM, Schlünssen V, et al. Day-by-day symptoms following positive and negative PCR tests for SARS-CoV-2 in non-hospitalized healthcare workers: A 90-day follow-up study. *Int J Infect Dis* 2021;108:382-90. doi: 10.1016/j.ijid.2021.05.032 [published Online First: 2021/05/23]

15. Moustsen-Helms IR, Emborg H-D, Nielsen J, et al. Vaccine effectiveness after 1st and 2nd dose of the BNT162b2 mRNA Covid-19 Vaccine in long-term care facility residents and healthcare workers – a Danish cohort study. *medRxiv* 2021:2021.03.08.21252200. doi: 10.1101/2021.03.08.21252200
16. Menni C, Valdes AM, Freidin MB, et al. Real-time tracking of self-reported symptoms to predict potential COVID-19. *Nat Med* 2020;26(7):1037-40. doi: 10.1038/s41591-020-0916-2 [published Online First: 2020/05/13]
17. Griffith G, Morris TT, Tudball M, et al. Collider bias undermines our understanding of COVID-19 disease risk and severity. *medRxiv* 2020:2020.05.04.20090506. doi: 10.1101/2020.05.04.20090506
18. Magnusson K, Nygård K, Methi F, et al. Occupational risk of COVID-19 in the first versus second epidemic wave in Norway, 2020. *Euro Surveill* 2021;26(40) doi: 10.2807/1560-7917.Es.2021.26.40.2001875 [published Online First: 2021/10/09]
19. Bergwerk M, Gonen T, Lustig Y, et al. Covid-19 Breakthrough Infections in Vaccinated Health Care Workers. *N Engl J Med* 2021;385(16):1474-84. doi: 10.1056/NEJMoa2109072 [published Online First: 2021/07/29]
20. Kang J, O'Donnell JM, Colaianne B, et al. Use of personal protective equipment among health care personnel: Results of clinical observations and simulations. *Am J Infect Control* 2017;45(1):17-23. doi: 10.1016/j.ajic.2016.08.011 [published Online First: 2017/01/10]
21. Suen LKP, Guo YP, Tong DWK, et al. Self-contamination during doffing of personal protective equipment by healthcare workers to prevent Ebola transmission. *Antimicrob Resist Infect Control* 2018;7:157. doi: 10.1186/s13756-018-0433-y [published Online First: 2019/01/05]
22. McCarthy R, Gino B, d'Entremont P, et al. The Importance of Personal Protective Equipment Design and Donning and Doffing Technique in Mitigating Infectious Disease Spread: A Technical Report. *Cureus* 2020;12(12):e12084. doi: 10.7759/cureus.12084 [published Online First: 2021/01/26]
23. Tang JW, Marr LC, Li Y, et al. Covid-19 has redefined airborne transmission. *Bmj* 2021;373:n913. doi: 10.1136/bmj.n913 [published Online First: 2021/04/16]
24. Houghton C, Meskell P, Delaney H, et al. Barriers and facilitators to healthcare workers' adherence with infection prevention and control (IPC) guidelines for respiratory infectious diseases: a rapid qualitative evidence synthesis. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2020;4(4):Cd013582. doi: 10.1002/14651858.Cd013582 [published Online First: 2020/04/22]
25. Adams JG, Walls RM. Supporting the Health Care Workforce During the COVID-19 Global Epidemic. *Jama* 2020;323(15):1439-40. doi: 10.1001/jama.2020.3972 [published Online First: 2020/03/13]

Contributions

Kinnerup and Kolstad had full access to all the data in the study and take responsibility for the integrity of the data and the accuracy of the data analysis.

Concept and design: Kinnerup, Schlünssen and Kolstad

Acquisition of data: all authors

Drafting the manuscript: Kolstad and Würtz

Critical revision of the manuscript for important intellectual content: all authors

Statistical analysis: Kinnerup and Kolstad.

Administrative, technical, or material support: Pugdahl, Toft Würtz, Nielsen, Vestergaard, Kærgaard Hansen.

Supervision: Kolstad

Public and Patient Involvement statement

Patients and the public were not involved in this study. No patients were involved in setting the research question or the outcome measures, nor were they involved in developing plans for design of the study. No patients were asked to advise on interpretation or writing up of results.

Transparency declaration

The lead author (HAK)* affirms 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 (and, if relevant, registered) have been explained. *The manuscript's guarantor.

Funding

This research has received funding from Central Denmark Region (grant number RR 20200527) and Danish Working Environment Fund (grant number 20205100734). The sponsors had no role in the design and conduct of the study; collection, management, analysis, and interpretation of the data; preparation, review, or approval of the manuscript; or decision to submit the manuscript for publication.

Competing interests

All authors have completed the ICMJE uniform disclosure form at ww.icmje.org/coi_disclosure.pdf and declare: no support from any other organisation for the submitted work; no financial relationships with any organisations that might have an interest in the submitted work in the previous three years; no other relationships or activities that could appear to have influenced the submitted work.

Ethics approval

All participants gave written informed consent. The study was registered at the repository of the Central Denmark Region (1-16-02-150-20) and approved by the Danish Patient Safety Authority (Jnr 1-45-70-25-20). The Central Denmark Regional Scientific Ethical Committee approved that ethical approval was not required (Jnr 1-10-72-1-20).

Provenance and peer review

Not commissioned; externally peer reviewed.

Data sharing

No additional data available. For legal and ethical reasons, individual level patient data cannot be shared by the authors and are only accessible to authorised researchers after application to the Danish Health Data Authority.

Table 1. Study profile

Populations	Persons, n	Person-days, n	Daily questionnaire responses, n	Fully vaccinated, persons, n	Negative PCR tests, n	Positive PCR tests, n	Daily testing rate, %	SARS-CoV-2 infection rate per 100 000 person-days
Invited with follow-up information*	25 365	3 253 671	-	17 815	177 511	929	5.5	28.6
Participants†	6337	753 607	471 986	5082	53 266	213	7.1	28.3
Missing information on COVID-19 contact‡	352	239 442	23 238	261	17 270	54	7.1	22.6
Study population	5985	514 165	448 748	4821	35 996	159	7.1	30.9

* Follow-up from November 25, 2020, until the first positive PCR test, 7 days after full vaccination or April 30, 2021

† Follow-up from 7 days after first questionnaire response until first positive PCR test, 7 days after full vaccination or April 30, 2021

‡ Person-days at risk with missing information on close contact 3-7 days earlier with patients, co-workers or persons outside work with COVID-19 that were not included in the analyses

Table 2. Population characteristics (person-days) according to participation status and contact 3-7 days earlier with patients, co-workers and persons outside work with COVID-19

		COVID-19 contact among participants					
	Invited population	Patients		Co-workers		Persons outside work	
Characteristics	n = 3 253 671	No (n = 488 147)	Yes (n = 26 018)	No (n = 510 012)	Yes (n = 4 153)	No (n = 509 358)	Yes (n = 4 807)
Women n (%)	2 708 710 (83)	435 986 (89)	22 650 (87)	455 003 (89)	3 633 (87)	454 360 (89)	4 276 (89)
Age, mean (SD)	43.4 (12.1)	49.5 (10.3)	47.3 (11.1)	49.4 (10.4)	49.2 (10.6)	49.4 (10.4)	48.4 (10.5)
COVID-19 contact, n (%)							
Patients	-	-	-	24658 (5)	1360 (33)	25504 (5)	514 (11)
Co-workers	-	2793 (1)	1360 (5)	-	-	4039 (1)	114 (2)
Persons outside work	-	4293 (1)	514 (2)	4693 (1)	114 (3)	-	-
Months, n (%)							
November	760 392 (23)	15 286 (3)	922 (4)	16 039 (3)	169 (4)	16 005 (3)	203 (4)
December	571 757 (18)	129 414 (27)	9 527 (37)	136 712 (27)	2 229 (54)	135 885 (27)	3 056 (64)
January	535 177 (16)	126 987 (26)	11 459 (44)	136 899 (27)	1 547 (37)	137 437 (27)	1 009 (21)
February	456 640 (14)	85 888 (18)	2 507 (10)	88 306 (17)	89 (2)	88 222 (17)	173 (4)
March	152 046 (5)	73 007 (15)	913 (4)	73 861 (14)	59 (1)	73 759 (14)	161 (3)
April	777 659 (24)	57 565 (12)	690 (3)	58 195 (11)	60 (1)	58 050 (11)	205 (4)
PCR tests, 1-2 days earlier, n (%)							
0	2 909 178 (89)	421 861 (86)	21 117 (81)	440 408 (86)	2 570 (62)	439 936 (86)	3 042 (63)
1-2	343 106 (11)	66 108 (14)	4 808 (19)	69 362 (14)	1 554 (38)	69 176 (14)	1 740 (37)
PCR tests, 3 to 7 days earlier, n (%)							
0	2 460 903 (76)	334 339 (68)	15 461 (59)	347 771 (68)	2 029 (49)	347 449 (68)	2 351 (49)
1	753 731 (23)	147 119 (30)	9 269 (36)	154 621 (30)	1 767 (43)	154 484 (30)	1 904 (40)
≥2	39 037 (1)	6 689 (1)	1 288 (5)	7 620 (1)	357 (9)	7 425 (1)	552 (11)

PCR tests, ≥ 8 days earlier, n (%)							
0	647 158 (20)	53 070 (11)	1 921 (7)	54 586 (11)	405 (10)	54 415 (11)	576 (12)
1 – 4	1 346 111 (41)	215 792 (44)	11 404 (44)	224 818 (44)	2 378 (57)	224 339 (44)	2 857 (59)
5 – 9	861 939 (26)	141 699 (29)	9 720 (37)	150 303 (29)	1 116 (27)	150 374 (30)	1 045 (22)
≥10	398 463 (12)	77 586 (16)	2 973 (11)	80 305 (16)	254 (6)	80 230 (16)	329 (7)
Occupation, n (%)							
Nursing staff *	1 264 494 (39)	180 659 (37)	13 532 (52)	192 065 (38)	2 126 (51)	192 077 (38)	2 114 (44)
Medical doctors	451 218 (14)	43 574 (9)	3 092 (12)	46 275 (9)	391 (9)	46 184 (9)	482 (10)
Biomedical Laboratory	156 073 (5)	36 657 (8)	3 398 (13)	39 788 (8)	267 (6)	39 769 (8)	286 (6)
Medical secretaries	277 011 (9)	61 854 (13)	864 (3)	62 357 (12)	361 (9)	62 091 (12)	627 (13)
Other	1 094 735 (34)	165 260 (34)	5 127 (20)	169 379 (33)	1 008 (24)	169 089 (33)	1 298 (27)
Missing	10 140 (0)	143 (0)	5 (0)	148 (0)	(0)	148 (0)	(0)
Department, n (%)							
Emergency	120 912 (4)	9 413 (2)	2 509 (10)	11 602 (2)	320 (8)	11 686 (2)	236 (5)
Medicine †	776 923 (24)	123 542 (25)	6 557 (25)	128 932 (25)	1 167 (28)	128 827 (25)	1 272 (26)
Surgery ‡	603 097 (19)	86 542 (18)	2 897 (11)	88 877 (17)	562 (14)	88 581 (17)	858 (18)
Biochemistry	184 158 (6)	38 959 (8)	3 273 (13)	42 018 (8)	214 (5)	41 942 (8)	290 (6)
Service§	109 284 (3)	6 509 (1)	651 (3)	7 104 (1)	56 (1)	7 137 (1)	23 (0)
Anaesthesiology	123 557 (4)	16 121 (3)	3 325 (13)	19 169 (4)	277 (7)	19 246 (4)	200 (4)
Radiology and Nuclear Medicine	134 114 (4)	21 574 (4)	1 500 (6)	22 826 (4)	248 (6)	22 821 (4)	253 (5)
Psychiatry	427 205 (13)	61 721 (13)	1 266 (5)	62 474 (12)	513 (12)	62 343 (12)	644 (13)
Departments with less frequent patient contact ¶	455 684 (14)	92 302 (19)	2 483 (10)	94 281 (18)	504 (12)	94 051 (18)	734 (15)
Other **	308 597 (9)	31 321 (6)	1 552 (6)	32 581 (6)	292 (7)	32 576 (6)	297 (6)
Missing	10 140 (0)	143 (0)	5 (0)	148 (0)	(0)	148 (0)	0 (0)
Smoking, n (%)							
Current smoker	-	26 498 (5)	1 951 (7)	28 222 (6)	227 (5)	28 150 (6)	299 (6)
Previous smoker	-	142 411 (29)	7 660 (29)	148 682 (29)	1 389 (33)	148 549 (29)	1 522 (32)
Never smoker	-	315 544 (65)	16 251 (62)	329 287 (65)	2 508 (60)	328 822 (65)	2 973 (62)

Missing	-	3 694 (1)	156 (1)	3 821 (1)	29 (1)	3 837 (1)	13 (0)
BMI (kg/m^2), n (%)							
<20	-	32 317 (7)	1 710 (7)	33 764 (7)	263 (6)	33 715 (7)	312 (6)
20-24	-	228 612 (47)	11 608 (45)	238 506 (47)	1 714 (41)	237 771 (47)	2 449 (51)
25-29	-	146 236 (30)	7 777 (30)	152 586 (30)	1 427 (34)	152 662 (30)	1 351 (28)
≥30	-	77 116 (16)	4 734 (18)	81 143 (16)	707 (17)	81 168 (16)	682 (14)
Missing	-	3 866 (1)	189 (1)	4 013 (1)	42 (1)	4 042 (1)	13 (0)
Lung disease							
Hay fever	-	100 096 (21)	4 827 (19)	104 107 (20)	816 (20)	103 924 (20)	999 (21)
Asthma	-	34 659 (7)	1 668 (6)	36 036 (7)	291 (7)	35 900 (7)	427 (9)
COPD	-	3 091 (1)	188 (1)	3 232 (1)	47 (1)	3 231 (1)	48 (1)

* Nurses, social- and healthcare assistants, and radiographers
† Internal medicine, paediatrics, oncology, and neurology
‡ All surgical departments, including: obstetrics and gynaecology; otorhinolaryngology, head and neck surgery; and ophthalmology
§ Cleaning services; hospital porters; clothing and waste management; depot and archive; telephone switchboard; and guidance for patients, relatives, and staff
¶ Occupational and social medicine; physio- and occupational therapy; administration; department of technical services; and kitchen
** Administrative, technical and pedagogical staff
†† COPD Chronic obstructive pulmonary disease

Table 3. Close contact 3-7 days earlier with patients, co-workers and persons outside work with COVID-19 and incidence rate ratios of SARS-CoV-2

Contact with persons with COVID-19	Person-days	Positive SARS-CoV-2 PCR tests	Infection rate per 100 000 person-days	Incidence rate ratios (95% CI)			
				Model 1*	Model 2†	Model 3‡	Model 4§
Patients							
No contact	488 147	119	24.4	Reference	Reference	Reference	Reference
Contact	26 018	40	153.7	6.31 (4.41 to 9.02)	4.62 (3.21 to 6.65)	3.72 (2.55 to 5.44)	3.17 (2.15 to 4.66)
Co-workers							
No contact	510 012	149	29.2	Reference	Reference	Reference	Reference
Contact	4153	10	240.8	8.24 (4.34 to 15.63)	5.44 (2.86 to 10.35)	2.68 (1.37 to 5.24)	2.54 (1.30 to 4.96)
Persons outside work							
No contact	509 358	124	24.3	Reference	Reference	Reference	Reference
Contact	4807	35	728.1	29.91 (20.55 - 43.52)	21.75 (14.75 - 32.06)	18.87 (12.78 - 27.88)	17.79 (12.05 to 26.28)

*Crude model
†Adjusted for age (continuous), sex and month (6 categories, November 2020-April 2021)
‡ As model 2 and additionally adjusted for the other types of COVID-19 contact
§ As model 3 and additionally adjusted for number of previous PCR tests.

Table 4. Close contact 3-7 days earlier with patients, co-workers and persons outside work with COVID-19 and incidence rate ratios of loss of taste and smell

Close contact with persons with COVID-19	Person-days*	Positive SARS-CoV-2 PCR tests	Infection rate per 100 000 person-days	Incidence rate ratios (95% CI)		
				Model 1†	Model 2‡	Model 3§
Patients						
No contact	488 451	202	41.4	Reference	Reference	Reference
Contact	26 748	24	89.7	2.17 (1.42 to 3.31)	1.70 (1.11 to 2.61)	1.48 (0.95 to 2.29)
Co-workers						
No contact	511 010	218	42.7	Reference	Reference	Reference
Contact	4189	8	191.0	4.48 (2.21 to 9.07)	3.20 (1.57 to 6.49)	2.56 (1.24 to 5.30)
Persons outside work						
No contact	510 123	195	38.2	Reference	Reference	Reference
Contact	5076	31	610.7	15.98 (10.94 to 23.34)	11.21 (7.60 to 16.54)	10.82 (7.33 to 15.98)

*This population was slightly different from that of table 3 because of the different outcome
†Crude model
‡Adjusted for age (continuous), sex and month (6 categories, November 2020-April 2021)
§ As model 2 and additionally adjusted for the other types of COVID-19 contact