

COVID-19 in French Nursing Homes during the Second Pandemic Wave: A Mixed-Methods Cross-Sectional Study

Morgane Dujmovic (0000-0002-0642-6606)^{1,#}, Thomas Roederer (0000-0003-1733-8721)^{2,#}, Séverine Frison (0000-0002-1586-9564)³, Carla Melki⁵, Thomas Lauvin⁶, Emmanuel Grellety (0000-0001-9736-414X)⁴

1 –Epicentre, Paris, France, morgana.dujmovic@gmail.com

2 –Epicentre, Paris, France, thomas.roederer@epicentre.msf.org

3 –Epicentre, Paris, France, severine.frison@gmail.com

4 –Epicentre, Paris, France, emmanuel.grellety@epicentre.msf.org

5 –Médecins Sans Frontières, Paris, France, carla.melki@paris.msf.org

6 –Médecins Sans Frontières, Paris, France, thomas.lauvin@paris.msf.org

- Authors (MD and TR) contributed equally

Correspondence: Thomas Roederer

thomas.roederer@epicentre.msf.org

Epicentre – 14-34 avenue Jean Jaurès 75019 PARIS

Abstract : 288/300

Text : 4110/4500

1 **ABSTRACT**

2 Introduction

3 French nursing homes were deeply affected by the first wave of the COVID-19 pandemic, with 38% of all
4 residents infected and 5% dying. Yet, little was done to prepare these facilities for the second pandemic wave,
5 and subsequent outbreak response strategies largely duplicated what had been done in the spring of 2020,
6 regardless of the unique needs of the care home environment.

7 Methods

8 A cross-sectional, mixed-methods study using retrospective, quantitative data from residents of 14 nursing
9 homes between November 2020 and mid-January 2021. Four facilities were purposively selected as qualitative
10 study sites for additional in-person, in-depth interviews in January and February 2021.

11 Results

12 The average attack rate in the 14 participating nursing facilities was 39% among staff and 61% among residents.
13 One-fifth (20) of infected residents ultimately died from COVID-19 and its complications. Failure-to-Thrive-
14 Syndrome (FTTS) was diagnosed in 23% of COVID-positive residents. Those at highest risk of death were men
15 (HR=1.78; IC95: 1.18 – 2.70; p=0.006) with FTTS (HR=4.04; IC95: 1.93 – 8.48; p<0.001) in facilities with delayed
16 implementation of universal FFP2 masking policies (HR=1.05; IC95: 1.02 – 1.07; p<0.001). The lowest mortality
17 was found in residents of facilities with a partial (HR=0.30; IC95: 0.18 – 0.51; p<0.001) or full-time physician on
18 staff (HR=0.20; IC95: 0.08 – 0.53; p=0.001). Significant themes emerging from qualitative analysis centered on
19 (i) the structural, chronic neglect of nursing homes, (ii) the negative effects of the top-down, bureaucratic
20 nature of COVID-19 crisis response, and (iii) the counterproductive effects of lockdowns on both residents and
21 staff.

22 Conclusion

23 Despite high resident mortality during the first pandemic wave, French nursing homes were ill-prepared for the
24 second, with risk factors (especially staffing, lack of medical support, isolation/quarantine policy etc) that
25 affected case fatality and residents' and caregivers' overall well-being and mental health.
26

27 **SUMMARY BOX**

28 *What is already known?*

- 29 • Though much was learned about COVID-19 in nursing homes during the first pandemic wave (Spring 2020),
30 descriptions of the second wave in these facilities is nearly absent from the scientific literature.
- 31 • Prior COVID-19 research in nursing homes has rarely been qualitative and has almost never interviewed
32 care home residents themselves.
- 33 • First-wave research indicated that much stronger outbreak and infection prevention was urgently needed
34 to bolster nursing facilities' preparedness. Higher staff-to-resident ratios, less staff turnover, more masks,
35 better organization, more medical support, and more epidemiological tools were found to reduce COVID-
36 19's impact.

37 *What are the new findings?*

- 38 • Our results document a lack of preparedness for the second wave, with attack rates among staff (39%
39 overall) and residents (61% overall) similar to levels seen during the first wave peak.
- 40 • Despite authorities' claims to have reinforced these structures' readiness, and despite much research into
41 the needs in these environments, preventive measures (like strict lockdowns) remained largely unchanged
42 and had a direct impact on residents, with 23% of COVID-positives also diagnosed with Failure-to-Thrive
43 Syndrome.
- 44 • Qualitative results detailed how ill-suited and inflexible some preventive measures were for residents and
45 staff alike. Participants described precarious and understaffed living and working conditions as substantial
46 and long-standing difficulties that became critical risks during the COVID-19 outbreak, and compromised
47 the response.

48 *What do the new findings imply?*

- 49 • These results suggest that knowledge gained during the first pandemic wave was not consistently applied
50 to care home policy or practice in France, and that these nursing homes were not always safe
51 environments that considered residents' mental health and well-being alongside infection prevention.
- 52 • Despite the high mortality of the first pandemic wave, French nursing homes were ill-prepared for the
53 second. As a 5th wave descends on France (albeit with much higher COVID-19 vaccination rates), applying
54 the lessons from previous periods (especially with regard to staffing, isolation of the elderly, medical
55 supplies, standard of care procedures) must be prioritized.

56

57 **INTRODUCTION**

58 In France, state-funded nursing and care homes are the most common living arrangement for both
59 independent seniors and those who need daily care and support. These institutions were deeply affected by
60 the first wave of the COVID-19 pandemic, with an estimated 38% of all residents (247,000 cases) infected with
61 SARS-CoV-2 and 5% (30,395) succumbing to the disease from March-July 2020. The workforce that staffs these
62 facilities was also seriously affected, with an estimated 22% of all workers (90,000 cases) testing COVID-19
63 positive from late February to late May 2020 [1,2].

64 In October of 2020, when rising caseloads suggested a second pandemic wave, nursing homes again braced for
65 the worst, since no vaccine was yet approved in France (this occurred in December 2020) and some variants
66 had begun circulating. In November of that year, the non-governmental organization (NGO) Médecins Sans
67 Frontières (MSF) began partnering with select nursing homes in Provence and Occitania provinces, in southern
68 France, to bolster their COVID-19 prevention and care procedures in the midst of rapidly growing medical
69 needs, strained facilities, and understaffing (often aggravated by absenteeism spurred by workplace-acquired
70 infections). As nursing homes transformed into places providing hospital-level care, staff were required to
71 perform more advanced technical procedures and increased disease surveillance at a moment when human
72 resources were depleted due to illness and overwork. Concurrently, health authorities recommended strong
73 lockdown measures for elderly care home residents, including bans on going outside, prohibiting family visits,
74 and confining residents to their rooms.

75 Despite the devastating mortality rates seen in care homes around the world throughout the pandemic,
76 scientific literature has not yet described the second wave of COVID-19 in this environment. Published research
77 is mostly focused on the first pandemic wave period, almost exclusively quantitative studies or systematic
78 reviews on specific topics. Several articles report best practices for infection prevention and control (IPC) (i.e.
79 frequent testing for staff, residents, and visitors, staff cohorting, and strict isolation policies), or recommended
80 better evaluation of the consequences of lockdown restrictions [3-13,14, 15]. Other lessons from the initial
81 crisis period were that more staff [6,8], support [8,9], protective equipment, and overall preparation [8-10]
82 could prevent or reduce outbreaks. Lately, articles focused only on impact of vaccination on transmission
83 among staff and residents [16,17]. The little qualitative research conducted during the first wave was almost

84 never able to conduct in-person interviews [12, 18-24], but found that lockdowns had a significant and
85 deleterious impact on residents, staff well-being, and staff turnover [20,21].

86 Our research attempts to understand the risk factors that influenced the second pandemic wave, the impact of
87 that wave, and how staff and residents experienced this period of the pandemic in a nursing home setting.

88 **METHODS**

89 In this mixed-methods, cross-sectional study, we analyze retrospective COVID-19 data from 14 nursing homes
90 being reinforced by support from MSF in order to assess the impact of the second pandemic wave as well as
91 the effects of prevention measures on resident mortality and comorbidity. These results are given depth and
92 detail through qualitative investigation into staff and resident experiences.

93 **Definitions**

94 *Autonomy Evaluation Score (AES)* measures a care home resident's level of autonomy. An AES of 1 reflects the
95 lowest level of autonomy (i.e. confinement to a bed or armchair, serious mental function impairment,
96 continuous caregiving required), while an AES of 6 refers to people who have fully retained their autonomy in
97 their daily lives. *The Average Weighted Autonomy Score (AWAS)* is the overall AES score for a facility. This score
98 is a proxy for the financial and human resources that a nursing home needs and has access to: the higher the
99 AWAS, the more resources needed (staff-to-residents ratio, equipment, etc.) and the more dependent the
100 residents. *Failure to Thrive Syndrome (FTTS)* is specific to elderly individuals and characterized by a rapid
101 deterioration after a physical or psychological event (Appendix 1).

102 **Study Design and Population**

103 This cross-sectional, mixed-methods study used retrospective, quantitative data from residents living in 14
104 nursing homes between November 2020 to mid-January 2021. Four nursing facilities were purposively selected
105 as qualitative study sites for additional in-person, in-depth interviews conducted between January and
106 February 2021. Qualitative study sites were selected based on whether they had passed their epidemic peak,
107 had high attack and fatality rates, were public or private facilities, and their geographic location.

108 **Data Collection**

109 Facilities' administrative data (number of beds and staff, staff-to-resident ratios, etc), COVID-related data
110 (confirmed cases among residents and staff, episode duration, deaths, etc) and individual, anonymized patient
111 data (demographics, comorbidities, etc) were used for quantitative analysis.

112 Qualitative data was gathered using semi-structured, in-depth interviews (IDIs) during one-week ethnographic
113 immersions in each of the four qualitative study sites. The lead investigator targeted four groups of actors,
114 including facility administrators (directors, coordinating physicians, and nurses), clinical and facilities staff
115 (nurses, caregivers, educators, physical therapists, maintenance crews), the residents themselves, and the
116 residents' visiting family members. Participants were purposively selected to obtain a maximally heterogenous
117 sample of interview participants and reflect the spectrum of opinions and experiences of everyday life nursing
118 homes. Across the 4 qualitative study sites, a total of 47 IDIs were conducted with facility directors (4), staff
119 members (36), and residents (7). Among the 36 staff members, 29 were caregivers and 7 provided other
120 support functions (human resources, maintenance, cleaning, cooking). All interviewed residents were women,
121 as were the majority of study participants overall (82.9%). Interview length varied from 12-171 minutes (54-
122 minute average) (Appendix 4).

123 Telephone and face-to-face interviews were also conducted with 10 residents' family members, though family
124 interviews are not included here in order to focus on experiences from within the nursing homes during
125 lockdown. Nine residents refused to participate (due to fatigue, discomfort with interviewing, or COVID-19
126 related reasons). Caregiver participation was constrained by understaffing, overwork, fatigue, or disease, which
127 left them with very little time or energy for interviewing.

128 Vulnerable residents were pre-selected under the advisement of the coordinating nurse on the permanent
129 caregiver teams. Participants had to be able to give informed consent, capably interact, and have no major
130 cognitive disorders. Level of autonomy (AES) did not constitute an a priori criteria for participant selection.
131 Whenever a legal guardian or curator was designated, the latter was contacted prior to the interview to verify
132 that consent could be obtained from the interviewee.

133 Question guides focused on three primary topics: the outbreak chronology, adaptation to the crisis, and the
134 individual experience of the second pandemic wave (Appendix 3). Individual guides were adapted for those

135 living in the nursing home (residents) or working there (facility administrators and staff). All interviews were
136 voice recorded and direct observations were written in the investigator's field book. All written data were
137 anonymized upon collection. Participants' personal data was assigned a study number that was set on a
138 correspondence table kept separately from other data. Written informed consent was obtained prior to each
139 interview.

140 Preventive measures were implemented with all participants to decrease COVID-19 disease transmission risk:
141 systematic FFP2 face mask use, social distancing, hand and space disinfection, and weekly Rt-PCR tests for the
142 two field investigators.

143 **Statistical Analysis**

144 Patient data were explored using univariate analysis to highlight possible mortality risks. Univariate unadjusted
145 Cox Hazard Ratios, Kaplan-Meier estimations, and Log-Rank tests were used for multivariate analysis. A
146 stepwise procedure was followed, retaining factors with a log-rank test value <0.3. COVID-19 mortality was
147 estimated using a multilevel mixed-effects Cox model using selected factors identified in the univariate analysis.
148 Random effects on individual variables were considered and nested at the facility level [25]. Interactions
149 between potentially correlated factors (comorbidities, failure-to-thrive syndrome, autonomy level, time-related
150 variables) were accounted for while robust standard errors were computed (Appendix 7). 95% confidence
151 intervals are presented and a significance threshold of 5% was chosen for p-values. Statistical analyses were
152 conducted with Stata 15[®] and R Studio 1.4[®].

153 **Qualitative Analysis**

154 Data analysis was performed from January to March 2021, similar to the fieldwork period (January-February)
155 and reporting phase (March-April). Qualitative analysis combined grounded theory and hypothetico-deductive
156 analysis. Preliminary observation in five nursing homes and MSF-team reports were used to create an initial
157 checklist for systematic direct observation. In January and February 2021, 36 semi-structured IDIs were
158 conducted in three nursing homes, in combination with "external participatory observation" [26]. Questions
159 were adjusted in an iterative manner after preliminary analysis was conducted on these initial interviews. Data
160 saturation was sought throughout the interview process and discussed within the research team on a weekly
161 basis. In February 2021, 11 semi-structured IDIs were conducted in a fourth nursing home in order to assess
162 data saturation.

163 Interview data were processed gradually through professional transcription and verified with the interviewees
164 when necessary. De-identification occurred during transcription (names, places, dates, distinctive personal data
165 etc). Interview data were written, analyzed and coded in Excel spreadsheets. A first codebook with 39 data
166 codes emerged from interview transcripts. Five themes were initially analyzed and refined into a final set of 33
167 across four key categories. Three of these were cross-cutting and had up to three sub-themes (Table 3). Results
168 are reported in accordance with the Standards for Reporting Qualitative Research (SRQR) guidelines [27] and
169 the CONSolidated criteria for REporting Qualitative research (COREQ) checklist.

170 **Patient and Public involvement**

171 Administrators and coordinating physicians from 14 nursing homes were actively involved in collecting and
172 anonymizing study data from their residents/patients. During the exploratory phase of research (December
173 2020 to January 2021), any feedback from qualitative study site administrators was included in the study
174 protocol. During data collection (January to February 2021), the research methodology was discussed with MSF
175 nurses and facilities staff and adapted to each nursing home's context and caregiver guidance. At the beginning
176 of each IDI, caregivers and residents were encouraged to further participate in the research by contacting the
177 lead investigator with any suggestions. In the reporting phase (from the 1st March to June 2021), internal
178 reporting was sent to interviewees who wanted to be contacted for this purpose. This report was sent to
179 prominent political COVID-19 crisis management actors (such as the French Ministry of Health). A summary
180 letter will be brought to resident study participants and facility staff to inform them of the results and gather
181 their comments on possible follow-up.

182 **Ethics**

183 This study received approval from the MSF Ethical Review Board (ERB) and the Commission Nationale de
184 l'Informatique et des Libertés (CNIL) in France. Patient data and qualitative observations were fully
185 anonymized. All study procedures were in line with the Declaration of Helsinki.

186 **RESULTS**

187 22 nursing homes were originally included in the study, though data was available for only 14 of them (the
188 others did not send data in time for analysis or the data were not electronically recorded). The 14 participating
189 nursing facilities were largely state supported entities (79%) with an average of 68 residents (median=65; IQR:

190 58-73). Results varied considerably from one nursing home to another. COVID-19 outbreak duration averaged
191 39 days (median=40; IQR: 30-50 days) while Infected residents' individual COVID-19 episodes averaged 24 days
192 (median=30; IQR: 14-51 days). The average attack rate was 39% (median=39%; IQR: 29%-54%) among staff and
193 61% (median=60%; 50%-73%) among residents. One-fifth (median=20%; IQR: 17%-23%) of the residents who
194 were infected ultimately succumbed to COVID-19 and its complications. The mean Average Weighted
195 Autonomy Score (AWAS) was 770 (median=763 ; IQR: 722-804) and the average staff-to-resident ratio was 0.82
196 (median=0.86 ; IQR: 0.72-0.90). The average time to universal masking policies being implemented was 9.6 days
197 (median=6.5 ; IQR: 2-15 days) and average time until a facility was bolstered with MSF support (staff or
198 resources) was 17.5 days (median=15; IQR: 13-28 days). (Appendix 4).

199 **Patient Risk factors**

200 Retrospective COVID-19 data were obtained for 14 nursing homes, finding 585 COVID-19 cases among 930
201 residents (61% attack rate) (Table 1). Cases were mostly women (78%) who were >85 years old (68%).
202 Individual Autonomy Scores (IAS) were low (<2) in a majority of cases (60%), indicating a very low-level of
203 autonomy overall. One-fifth (21%) of cases were transferred to a hospital, while half (46%) were put on oxygen
204 therapy. One-tenth (12%) of COVID-cases received palliative care, and nearly one-quarter (22%) died. Failure-
205 to-Thrive Syndrome was diagnosed in nearly one-quarter (23%) of COVID-positive residents. At least one other
206 comorbidity was found in over half (61%) of infected residents. AWAS, nursing home size, and staff-to-resident
207 ratios were all strongly correlated, as were time-related variables (time until external MSF support was
208 received, time until universal masking policies were applied, and duration of COVID episode) (Table 1).

209 Table 1. Univariate Analysis of Nursing Home Resident and Facility Data, Provence and Occitania Provinces,
210 France, 2021

211

212

213 **Figure 1.** Likelihood of survival by resident and nursing facility characteristic, Univariate (Kaplan-Meier) Analysis, Provence and Occitania Provinces, France, 2021

214 Univariate analysis using Cox modelling (Table 1) and Kaplan-Meier estimations (Figure 1) suggested that
215 individual characteristics like gender (log rank $p < 0.001$) and IAS ($p = 0.008$) were associated with COVID-19
216 mortality, while age and specific comorbidities were not. Survival curves also suggested that facility
217 characteristics like low AWAS ($p < 0.001$), the absence of a permanent physician on site (< 0.001), larger nursing
218 home size (> 70 residents) ($p = 0.036$), and a high staff attack rate ($p = 0.025$) were also associated with resident
219 mortality. Predictably, hospitalization ($p < 0.001$), palliative care ($p < 0.001$), and oxygen therapy ($p < 0.001$) were
220 all strongly correlated with the risk of death, as was the presence of FTTS ($p < 0.001$) and the presence of more
221 than 4 co-morbidities (risk increased with the number of co-morbidities present, $p = 0.045$). Additional Kaplan-
222 Meier Curves for non-significant factors can be found in the supplementary information (Appendix 5).

223 Multilevel Cox Hazard modelling highlighted mortality associated factors adjusted for potential confounders
224 (Figure 2). Those at highest risk of death were men (HR=1.78; IC95: 1.18 - 2.70; $p = 0.006$) with an FTTS diagnosis
225 (HR=4.04; IC95: 1.93 - 8.48; $p < 0.001$) in facilities with delayed implementation of universal masking policies
226 (HR=1.05; IC95: 1.02 - 1.07; $p < 0.001$). The lowest mortality risk was found in residents of facilities with a partial
227 (HR=0.30; IC95: 0.18 - 0.51; $p < 0.001$) or full-time physician on staff (HR=0.20; IC95: 0.08 - 0.53; $p = 0.001$), with
228 individual AES scores > 3 (HR=0.38; IC95: 0.16 - 0.89; $p = 0.026$). Noticeably, higher AWAS (a proxy for staff-to-
229 resident ratios and a nursing home's overall means) was associated with a lower risk of death (HR=0.99; IC95:
230 0.99 - 1.00; $p = 0.020$) (Table 2). Sensitivity analysis can be found in the supplementary information (Appendix 6).

231 Table 2. Multivariate Cox Hazard adjusted analysis of mortality associated factors in French nursing facilities,
232 Provence and Occitania provinces, 2021 (Information Criteria: AIC*=1171; BIC=1226)

233

234 Figure 2. Final Cox Model: Forest Plot of mortality associated factors in French nursing facilities, Provence and
235 Occitania provinces, 2021

236 **Qualitative Results**

237 The qualitative approach richly described interviewees' lived experiences during the COVID-19 crisis, revealing
238 difficult-to-quantify social influences on the outbreak's evolution and impact. Three significant themes
239 emerged from our discussions (Table 3).

240 *Structural, Chronic Neglect of Nursing Homes*

241 Staff members described a long-standing lack of physicians in nursing homes, exacerbated by lockdowns and
242 growing medical needs during a period of rising COVID-19 infections. One nurse explained, "the nursing home
243 was almost like a hospital ward at one point...There was more supervision [needed], more care...We didn't have
244 the staff to do all that." All groups of interviewees emphasized that working in precarious and understaffed
245 conditions was a substantial difficulty that became a critical risk during the COVID-19 outbreak and
246 compromised the response. Assistant nurses described extremely challenging working conditions: "When they
247 ask you to help 13 people to bath before noon, you don't work well." This situation was worse during the
248 second pandemic wave when, as one psychologist explained, "no one counted the hours. We had to be there,
249 we put our private lives on hold, but it was important to do it." All directors described a structural lack of a
250 "permanent medical presence" and the need of a "strict staffing ratio."

251 *Top-down Crisis Management*

252 Personnel highlighted the "top-down" approach of French health authorities, including a lack of communication
253 and time-consuming processes for staff and administrators alike, "The ARS [Regional Health Authorities] have
254 been absent during the whole crisis. (...) Since March, I haven't seen the authorities giving us any support, nor
255 any real help, except for claiming statistics back." These officials worked far from the frontline environment of a
256 nursing home and were removed from the suffering of residents and staff. As a result, it was felt that they
257 encouraged ill-informed, unrealistic, and inconsistent crisis-response measures: limiting contact with residents,
258 confining them to their (small) rooms, abruptly relocating them in new rooms (very disturbing for them) or
259 even physically restraining residents in distress. A psychologist described how "some people had to be

260 uprooted from their rooms“ where they had “spatial-temporal and autobiographical markers”, while others
261 “had to be restrained” by assistant nurses. All of these were deeply disheartening to staff and residents,
262 creating feelings of shame and guilt among caregivers and the potential for cognitive disorders among
263 residents. A resident explained that “it was hard, staying in the room for a whole day, without going out,” and
264 that “anyone would become nuts!” Weak crisis response mechanisms also manifested as poor prevention
265 measures (a lack of universal masking requirements initially, facemask shortages during the first wave), lack of
266 state medical relief staff, and such an extreme lack of preparedness that assistance from a non-state
267 humanitarian actor like MSF was needed. As a director told us, calling MSF, a disaster-response organization
268 “showed what a disaster we were experiencing.”

269 *Counterproductive Effects of Lockdowns*

270 Finally, participants described the counterproductive effects of lockdowns, including negative medical
271 outcomes and even violence. Physiotherapists described “a decline in motor skills, but even more in cognitive
272 skills” and “completely accelerated failure-to-thrive syndrome” which corroborates other descriptions of
273 “bedridden patients, depressive states, failure-to-thrive” because “the residents haven't gone out for a year.”
274 Participants were discouraged that lessons from the first pandemic wave did not translate into better
275 preparedness and smoother, more nuanced, and less restrictive lockdown policies during the second. Despite
276 feeling secure in their nursing home environment during the pandemic period, interviews with residents
277 revealed the depth of their dislike for the extreme physical and social isolation they faced while alone in their
278 rooms, especially when facilities’ social activities, family visits, and outings were suspended or strictly
279 supervised with social distancing measures. Extreme fatigue occurred after a year of lockdown and social
280 restrictions, as one nursing home’s 90-year-old resident explained “if we could go out, we would bear it
281 better.” Since facility administrators were urged to follow the ARS recommendations, only a few directors or
282 staff were willing to soften lockdown measures, allow family visits, or take residents’ end-of-life wishes or
283 needs for social interaction into account.

284 These interviews show some overlap with the risk factors that were highlighted in the quantitative data
285 (mortality risks linked to understaffing, the absence of a permanent staff physician, low staff-to-resident ratios,
286 lockdowns linked to FTTS). Other qualitative factors associated with better pandemic management also

287 appeared in interviews, such as reliable communication with local health authorities, the presence of an
288 effective national health strategy, and collaboration with other medical sectors.

289 Table 3. Representative quotes for the 3 themes

290 **DISCUSSION**

291 Our study is the first mixed-methods investigation of nursing homes during the COVID-19 pandemic in France,
292 and one of the first in Europe. MSF staff's close, in-person work with these care facilities gave investigators
293 privileged access during a challenging period and lead to particularly rich interviews. This lies in contrast to
294 most other qualitative investigation of the geriatric population during the COVID period, which have usually
295 been conducted remotely or via surrogates (caregiving staff or family members), without being able to
296 interview residents themselves. These results show clearly that the second wave looked largely similar to the
297 first wave in French nursing homes, in both response and impact, and that these facilities were not sufficiently
298 prepared and supported when facing subsequent threats to their vulnerable tenants.

299 Nursing home data is not routinely collected by French national health information services because residents
300 are considered to "live at home." Thus, considering how difficult it is to access even the most basic data from
301 these facilities (such as number of cases or deaths), we managed to construct a large dataset containing
302 detailed information about COVID-19 cases, which affected 30% of all residents in the 14 participating nursing
303 homes. The study also allowed a thorough examination of COVID-19 as experienced by the staff and residents
304 who most suffered from the pandemic. To the best of our knowledge, French crisis management measures
305 during the second pandemic wave were never informed by qualitative data. In this study, patients' risk factors
306 could be explored in relation to influential social and structural determinants of health, such as understaffing,
307 strict lockdown measures, isolation from other medical actors/lack of medical support or the top-down and
308 bureaucratic crisis management by health authorities.

309 Our multivariate analyses confirmed mortality trends seen in other settings. Similar to other studies, we found
310 that men died more often despite their being a minority of nursing home residents, and that residents'
311 autonomy was a strong factor in their survival, with those who were more reliant on staff for daily support
312 most likely to succumb to their disease [8-10, 28-32]. Living with multiple comorbidities (especially diabetes
313 and dementia) was also strongly predictive of COVID-mortality in our group [8, 10, 28-32]. The negative effects
314 of understaffing (seen as sick leave or AWAS in our data) were similar to those reported in the United States
315 [8], Spain [32], and the United Kingdom [33-34], and constitute a vicious cycle: during periods of high

316 transmission, more staff needed sick leave. Yet, the medical and staffing needs of residents were
317 simultaneously surging, forcing many sick (and infectious) caregivers back into the workplace. The cycle was
318 compounded by the destructive effects that an enormous workload and an anxiety-producing work
319 environment is known to have on caregivers' wellbeing [12, 18, 20, 21, 36].

320 The efficacy of universal masking to prevent respiratory disease is well established [37,38], though we were not
321 able to measure the impact of staff/resident masking because mask mandates were often put in place at the
322 same time that extra resources and support from MSF arrived and bolstered the nursing facility overall.
323 Nevertheless, our results do suggest that higher transmission and case fatality were associated with delays in
324 mandatory mask requirements for staff, confirming the utility of these rules in uniquely vulnerable and high-
325 risk nursing home settings. The facemask issue is not easy, however, in a nursing home context. The health
326 benefits of masking have trade-offs with other social needs: care home residents may live with hearing or
327 cognitive disorders, and masking may prevent voice and facial recognition or communication. The absence of
328 others' daily smiles or expression may have led to cognitive decline, a point that has been shown in previous
329 research and was emphasized in our interviews with caregivers, managers, and residents alike [39, 40].

330 Finally, the benefit of confining residents to their rooms is strongly questioned by these results. While such
331 measures undeniably reduce virus transmission among residents [6-10, 14-15, 33, 37-38, 41-43]; the
332 consequences for their mental health and nutritional status have also been shown to be considerable [12,
333 13,20-24, 36, 44-48]. Strict lockdowns in our cohort were associated with higher FTTS incidence, triggered by
334 individuals' difficult living conditions over multiple months (the long duration of the crisis, an anxiety-provoking
335 atmosphere, social isolation, other residents' deaths, etc.). We found a strong statistical association between
336 COVID-19 case fatality and FTTS diagnoses, a result that was triangulated by qualitative interview data and is
337 consistent with other research from France [41], the United Kingdom [42], Finland [46], Spain [48,50], Italy [49],
338 and the United States [47].

339 **Limitations**

340 Our study is limited by the fact that study site selection was not random but was instead steered by discussions
341 with MSF. Moreover, since MSF targeted mostly struggling nursing homes, the study included only a small
342 number that did not have major outbreaks (or contained their outbreaks early). As a result, comparing these

343 facilities to others in Provence and Occitania (or France) should be made with care. Participant selection was
344 biased by the fact that only residents who were fully capable of interacting with investigators and were able to
345 give informed consent could be interviewed, thus excluding anyone with major cognitive disorders (a relatively
346 frequent condition in nursing homes). Quantitative data were neither exhaustive nor always electronically
347 recorded. Associations between COVID-19 deaths and FTTS were complicated by the co-morbidities that many
348 residents also lived with, though adjusted analysis attempted to control for potential confounding.

349 **CONCLUSION**

350 These results raise questions about French health authorities' approach to managing the second wave of the
351 COVID-19 pandemic, as seen through the lens of those living through the crisis. If institutional management of
352 older age, loss of autonomy and end of life is a chronic issue for a long time in France, solutions exist to
353 support nursing homes in times of acute crisis. Future debates about pandemic response in this setting should
354 take into account things like the social needs of residents, understaffing as a risk factor for higher COVID-
355 related deaths, and should refine general health policies and prevention measures in nursing homes.

356 Moreover, once an outbreak has occurred, tough questions must be asked: Are restrictive measures for all
357 residents worth the personal and mental health toll? How can facilities improve residents' end-of-life
358 conditions in a controlled, safe way that will allow them (and their families) dignity and care? Is this reasonable
359 to do if it involves a modicum of increased risk exposure for the facility overall? These results remind us that
360 effective COVID-19 response should be context-adapted, patient-centered, and humane.

361

362 **FIGURES**

363

364 Figure 1 Legend: On the X axis: Number of weeks from Oct 15th, 2020 ; On the Y axis: probability of resident' survival.

365 Figure 1 Title: Likelihood of survival by resident and nursing facility characteristic, Univariate (Kaplan-Meier)

366 Analysis, Provence and Occitania Provinces, France, 2021

367 Figure 2 Legend: (HR>1), full-lines in green for protective factors (HR<1) and dashed-lines in grey for CI95% of non-significant factors.

368 Figure 2 title: Final Cox Model: Forest Plot of mortality associated factors in French nursing facilities, Provence

369 and Occitania provinces, 2021

370

371

372

373 **CONTRIBUTORS**

374 CM, TR, MD, TL and EG conceived the study (literature search, study design, etc). MD, SF, TR, CM, TL and EG
375 developed the study protocol. MD performed field data collection (qualitative interviews) and SF collected
376 epidemiological data. TR and SF performed data management and statistical data analysis. MD performed
377 interview transcription and qualitative analysis. MD and TR performed literature search and wrote the first
378 version of the manuscript. TR and EG verified the underlying data and performed additional analyses. All
379 authors interpreted the results, contributed to writing the manuscript, and approved the final version for
380 submission.

381 **ACKNOWLEDGMENTS**

382 First and foremost, authors are very grateful and thank Janet Ousley for her help on article editing. Authors also
383 thank Marie Thomas, Tommaso Fabbri, Klaudia Porten, Michel-Olivier Lacharité, Marc Gastelly-Etchegorry, and
384 the whole MSF team in the field. This study would not have been possible without the collaboration of the
385 nursing home managers, staff, and residents. A very special thanks go to each and every one of them.

386 **COMPETING INTERESTS**

387 Authors declare having no competing interests.

388 **FUNDING AND ALL OTHER REQUIRED STATEMENTS**

389 This study was entirely funded by Médecins Sans Frontières-France.










390 **REFERENCES**

- 391 1. Etude DREES. "En 2020, trois Ehpad sur quatre ont eu au moins un résident infecté par la Covid-
392 19". <https://drees.solidarites-sante.gouv.fr/sites/default/files/2021-07/ER1196.pdf>
- 393 2. Comas-Herrera, A., Zalakain, J., Lemmon et al. (2021). Mortality associated with COVID-19 in care
394 homes: international evidence. Last updated: 1st February, 2021.
395 [https://tccovid.org/2020/04/12/mortality-associated-with-covid-19-outbreaks-in-care-homes-early-
396 international-evidence/](https://tccovid.org/2020/04/12/mortality-associated-with-covid-19-outbreaks-in-care-homes-early-international-evidence/)
- 397 3. Belmin, J., Um-Din, N., Donadio et al.(2020). Coronavirus Disease 2019 Outcomes in French Nursing
398 Homes That Implemented Staff Confinement With Residents. JAMA Network Open, 3(8), e2017533.
399 <https://doi.org/10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2020.17533>
- 400 4. Blain, H., Rolland, Y., & Tuailon et al. (2020). Efficacy of a Test-Retest Strategy in Residents and Health
401 Care Personnel of a Nursing Home Facing a COVID-19 Outbreak. Journal of the American Medical
402 Directors Association, January. J Am Med Dir Assoc. 2020 Jul;21(7):933-936. doi:
403 10.1016/j.jamda.2020.06.013.

- 404 5. Bernadou, A., Bouges, S., Catroux et al.(2021). High impact of COVID-19 outbreak in a nursing home in
405 the Nouvelle-Aquitaine region, France, March to April 2020. *BMC Infectious Diseases*, 21(1), 1–6.
406 <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12879-021-05890-6>
- 407 6. Shallcross, L., Burke, D., Abbott et al.(2021). Factors associated with SARS-CoV-2 infection and
408 outbreaks in long-term care facilities in England : a national cross-sectional survey. *The Lancet Healthy
409 Longevity*, 2(3), e129–e142. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s2666-7568\(20\)30065-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/s2666-7568(20)30065-9)
- 410 7. Gopal, R., Han, X., & Yaraghi, N. (2021). Compress the curve: A cross-sectional study of variations in
411 COVID-19 infections across California nursing homes. *BMJ Open*, 11(1).
412 <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2020-042804>
- 413 8. Dutey-Magni PF, Williams H, Jhass A et al (2021). COVID-19 infection and attributable mortality in UK
414 care homes: cohort study using active surveillance and electronic records (March-June 2020). *Age
415 Ageing*. 2021 Jun 28;50(4):1019-1028. doi: 10.1093/ageing/afab060.
- 416 9. Burton, J. K., Bayne, G., Evans et al.(2020). Evolution and effects of COVID-19 outbreaks in care homes
417 : a population analysis in 189 care homes in one geographical region of the UK. *The Lancet Healthy
418 Longevity*, 1(1), e21–e31. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s2666-7568\(20\)30012-x](https://doi.org/10.1016/s2666-7568(20)30012-x)
- 419 10. Rutten, J. J. S., van Loon, A. M., van Kooten, J. et al. (2020). Clinical Suspicion of COVID-19 in Nursing
420 Home residents : symptoms and mortality risk factors. *Journal of the American Medical Directors
421 Association*, 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jamda.2020.10.034>
- 422 11. Mas Romero, M., Avendaño Céspedes, A., Tabernero Sahuquillo et al.(2020). COVID-19 outbreak in
423 long-term care facilities from Spain. Many lessons to learn. *PloS One*, 15(10), e0241030.
424 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0241030>
- 425 12. Sriram, V., Jenkinson, C., & Peters, M. (2021). Impact of Covid-19 restrictions on carers of persons with
426 dementia in the UK - A qualitative study. *Age and Ageing*, 1–10. 2021 Jul 5:afab156. doi:
427 10.1093/ageing/afab156.
- 428 13. Mo, S., & Shi, J. (2020). The psychological consequences of the Covid-19 on residents and staff in
429 nursing homes. *Work, Aging and Retirement*, 6(4), 254–259. <https://doi.org/10.1093/workar/waaa021>
- 430 14. Giri, S., Chenn, L. M., & Romero-Ortuno, R. (2021). Nursing homes during the COVID-19 pandemic: a
431 scoping review of challenges and responses. *European Geriatric Medicine*, 0123456789.
432 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s41999-021-00531-2>
- 433 15. Dykgraaf, S. H., Matenge, S., Desborough, J. et al. (2021). Protecting Nursing Homes and Long Term
434 Care Facilities From Covid-19: a Rapid Review of International Evidence. *Journal of the American
435 Medical Directors Association*, August. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jamda.2021.07.027>
- 436 16. Lefèvre, B., Tondeur, L., Madec, Y et al (2021). Beta SARS-CoV-2 variant and BNT162b2 vaccine
437 effectiveness in long-term care facilities in France. *The Lancet Healthy Longevity*, 7568(21), 21–23.
438 [https://doi.org/10.1016/s2666-7568\(21\)00230-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/s2666-7568(21)00230-0)
- 439 17. Blain H, Tuillon E, Gamon L et al. (2021). Antibody response after one and two jabs of the BNT162b2
440 vaccine in nursing home residents: The CONsort-19 study. *Allergy*. 2021 Jul 19:10.1111/all.15007. doi:
441 10.1111/all.15007. Epub ahead of print. PMID: 34286856; PMCID: PMC8441741.
- 442 18. Sarabia-Cobo C, Pérez V, de Lorena P et al.(2021). Experiences of geriatric nurses in nursing home
443 settings across four countries in the face of the COVID-19 pandemic. *J Adv Nurs*. 2021 Feb;77(2):869-
444 878. doi : 10.1111/jan.14626. Epub 2020 Nov 22. PMID : 33150622.
- 445 19. Belmin, Joël, Um Din, Nathavy, Pariel, Sylvie et al. (2020). « Confinement du personnel d'Ehpad avec
446 les résidents : une solution contre le Covid-19 ? », *Gériatrie et Psychologie Neuropsychiatrie du
447 Vieillessement*, Vol 18, n°3. [https://www.ile.com/fr/revues/gpn/e-
448 docs/confinement-du-personnel-dehpad-avec-les-residents-une-solution-contre-le-covid-19-31-
449 8443/article.phtml](https://www.ile.com/fr/revues/gpn/e-docs/confinement-du-personnel-dehpad-avec-les-residents-une-solution-contre-le-covid-19-31-8443/article.phtml)
- 450 20. Kaelen S, van den Boogaard W, Pellicchia U et al. (2021) How to bring residents' psychosocial well-
451 being to the heart of the fight against Covid-19 in Belgian nursing homes—A qualitative study. *PLOS
452 ONE* 16(3) : e0249098. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0249098>

- 453 21. Lood, Q., Haak, M., & Dahlin-, S. (2021). Everyday life in a Swedish nursing home during the COVID-19
454 pandemic: a qualitative interview study with persons 85 to 100 years. *BMJ Open*, October 2020.
455 <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2020-048503>
- 456 22. Rutten, J. E. R., Backhaus, R., PH Hamers, J. et al. (2021). Working in a Dutch nursing home during the
457 COVID-19 pandemic: Experiences and lessons learned. *Nursing Open*, May, 1–10.
458 <https://doi.org/10.1002/nop2.970>
- 459 23. Leontjevas, R., Knippenberg, I. A. H., Smalbrugge et al.(2020). Challenging behavior of nursing home
460 residents during COVID-19 measures in the Netherlands. *Aging and Mental Health*, 0(0), 1–6.
461 <https://doi.org/10.1080/13607863.2020.1857695>
- 462 24. Verbeek, H., Gerritsen, D. L., Backhaus, R. et al. (2020). Allowing Visitors Back in the Nursing Home
463 During the COVID-19 Crisis : A Dutch National Study Into First Experiences and Impact on Well-Being.
464 *Journal of the American Medical Directors Association*, 21(January), 900–904.
465 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jamda.2020.06.020>
- 466 25. Austin PC. A Tutorial on Multilevel Survival Analysis: Methods, Models and Applications. *Int Stat Rev*.
467 2017 Aug;85(2):185-203. doi: 10.1111/insr.12214.
- 468 26. Adler, P., Adler, P. (1987), *Membership Roles in Field Research*, Sage Publications, Newbury Park, CA,
469 95 p.
- 470 27. O'Brien BC, Harris IB, Beckman TJ et al. Standards for reporting qualitative research: a synthesis of
471 recommendations. *Acad Med*. 2014 Sep;89(9):1245-51. doi: 10.1097/ACM.0000000000000388. PMID:
472 24979285.
- 473 28. Suñer, C., Ouchi, D., Mas, M.A. et al. (2021). A retrospective cohort study of risk factors for mortality
474 among nursing homes exposed to COVID-19 in Spain. *Nature Aging*, 1(July).
475 <https://doi.org/10.1038/s43587-021-00079-7>
- 476 29. Couderc, A.-L., Correard, F., Hamidou, Z. et al. (2021). Factors Associated With COVID-19
477 Hospitalizations and Deaths in French Nursing Homes. *Journal of the American Medical Directors*
478 *Association*, January.
- 479 30. Martinsson, L., Strang, P., Bergström, J. et al. (2021). Dying from COVID-19 in nursing homes-sex
480 differences in symptom occurrence. *BMC Geriatrics*, 21(1), 1–8. [https://doi.org/10.1186/s12877-021-](https://doi.org/10.1186/s12877-021-02228-4)
481 [02228-4](https://doi.org/10.1186/s12877-021-02228-4)
- 482 31. Meis-Pinheiro, U., Lopez-Segui, F. et al.(2021). Clinical characteristics of COVID-19 in older adults. A
483 retrospective study in long-term nursing homes in Catalonia. *Plos One*, 16(7), e0255141.
484 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0255141>
- 485 32. Bielza, R., Sanz, J., Zambrana, F., et al (2020). Clinical Characteristics, Frailty, and Mortality of Residents
486 With COVID-19 in Nursing Homes of a Region of Madrid. *Journal of the American Medical Directors*
487 *Association*, January.
- 488 33. Candel, F. J., Barreiro, P., San Román, J. et al. (2021). The demography and characteristics of SARS-CoV-
489 2 seropositive residents and staff of nursing homes for older adults in the Community of Madrid: the
490 SeroSOS study. *Age and Ageing*, 50(4), 1038–1047. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ageing/afab096>
- 491 34. Landes, S. D., Turk, M. A., Damiani, M. R. et al. (2021). Risk factors associated with covid-19 outcomes
492 among people with intellectual and developmental disabilities receiving residential services. *JAMA*
493 *Network Open*, 4(6), 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2021.12862>
- 494 35. Roselló, A., Barnard, R. C., Smith, D. R. M. et al. (2021). Impact of non-pharmaceutical interventions on
495 SARS-CoV-2 outbreaks in English care homes: a modelling study Members of the Centre for
496 Mathematical Modelling of Infectious Diseases (CMMID) COVID-19 modelling working group (
497 random order): *MedRxiv*, 1–21.
- 498 36. Hugelius, K., Harada, N., & Marutani, M. (2021). Consequences of visiting restrictions during the
499 COVID-19 pandemic: An integrative review. *International Journal of Nursing Studies*, January.
- 500 37. McGarry BE, Grabowski DC, Barnett ML. Severe staffing and personal protective equipment shortages
501 faced by nursing homes during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Health Aff (Millwood)* 2020;39:1812e1821
- 502 38. Li, Y., Fang, F., & He, M. (2021). Exploring the N95 and Surgical Mask Supply in U.S. Nursing Homes
503 During COVID-19. *Journal of Applied Gerontology*, 40(3), 257–
504 262. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0733464820969015>

- 505 39. Marler H, Ditton A. "I'm smiling back at you" : Exploring the impact of mask wearing on
506 communication in healthcare. *Int J Lang Commun Disord*. 2021 Jan;56(1):205-214. doi : 10.1111/1460-
507 6984.12578. Epub 2020 Oct 10. PMID : 33038046; PMCID : PMC7675237.
- 508 40. van Wassenhove V, Grant KW, Poeppel D. Visual speech speeds up the neural processing of auditory
509 speech. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*. 2005 Jan 25;102(4):1181-6. doi : 10.1073/pnas.0408949102. Epub
510 2005 Jan 12. PMID : 15647358; PMCID : PMC545853.
- 511 41. Canoui-poitrine, F., Rachas, A., & Thomas, M. (2021). Magnitude, change over time, demographic
512 characteristics and geographic distribution of excess deaths among nursing home residents during the
513 first wave of COVID-19 in France : a nationwide cohort study. *MedRxiv*, 1–23.
- 514 42. Jeffery-Smith, A., Dun-Campbell, K., Janarthanan, R. et al.(2021). Infection and transmission of SARS-
515 CoV-2 in London care homes reporting no cases or outbreaks of COVID-19 : prospective observational
516 cohort study, England 2020. *The Lancet Regional Health - Europe*, 3(January 2020), 100038.
517 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lanepe.2021.100038>
- 518 43. Mehta, H. B., Li, S., & Goodwin, J. S. (2021). Risk Factors Associated With SARS-CoV-2 Infections,
519 Hospitalization, and Mortality Among US Nursing Home Residents. *JAMA Network Open*, 4(3),
520 e216315. <https://doi.org/10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2021.6315>
- 521 44. Levere, M., Rowan, P., & Wysocki, A. (2021). The Adverse Effects of the COVID-19 Pandemic on
522 Nursing Home Resident Well-Being. *Journal of the American Medical Directors Association, January*.
- 523 45. Van der Roest HG, Prins M, van der Velden C et al. (2020). The Impact of COVID-19 Measures on Well-
524 Being of Older Long-Term Care Facility Residents in the Netherlands. *J Am Med Dir Assoc*. 2020
525 Nov;21(11):1569-1570. doi : 10.1016/j.jamda.2020.09.007. Epub 2020 Sep 10. PMID : 33036911;
526 PMCID : PMC7833500.
- 527 46. Paananen, J., Rannikko, J., & Harju, M. (2021). The impact of Covid-19-related distancing on the well-
528 being of nursing home residents and their family members: a qualitative study. *International Journal of*
529 *Nursing Studies Advances*, January.
- 530 47. Huda ELSheikh, H. ELSheikh, H. Oh, A. Bender et al.(2021). Examining the Effects of Modified
531 Recreational Activities on the Mental Health of Nursing Home Residents During COVID-19, *Journal of*
532 *the American Medical Directors Association*, Volume 22, Issue 3, 2021.
533 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jamda.2021.01.026>.
- 534 48. Araújo, M. P. D., Nunes, V. M. de A., Costa, L. de A. et al. (2021). Health conditions of potential risk for
535 severe Covid-19 in institutionalized elderly people. *Plos One*, 16(1), e0245432.
536 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0245432>
- 537 49. De Vito, A., Fiore, V., Princic, E. et al. (2021). Predictors of infection, symptoms development, and
538 mortality in people with SARS-CoV-2 living in retirement nursing homes. *Plos One*, 16(3 March), 1–14.
539 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0248009>
- 540 50. Pérez-Rodríguez, P., Díaz de Bustamante, M., Aparicio Mollá, S. et al. (2021). Functional, cognitive, and
541 nutritional decline in 435 elderly nursing home residents after the first wave of the COVID-19
542 Pandemic. *European Geriatric Medicine*, 0123456789. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s41999-021-00524-1>






Table 1. Univariate Analysis of Nursing Home Resident and Facility Data, Provence and Occitania Provinces, France, 2021

| | | Deceased N=131 (22%) | | Survived N=454 (78%) | | Hazard Ratio (non adj.) | IC 95% | Log-Rank Test p-value |
|----------------------------|---------|-------------------------|------|-------------------------|------|----------------------------|--------------|--------------------------|
| | | n | % | n | % | | | |
| Individual Data | | | | | | | | |
| Gender | Female | 89 | 19.5 | 368 | 80.5 | Ref | | <0.001 |
| | Male | 42 | 33.1 | 85 | 66.9 | 2.06*** | 1.41 - 3.02 | |
| Age (cat.) | 65-75 y | 10 | 20 | 40 | 80 | Ref | | 0.971 |
| | 75-85 y | 29 | 22 | 103 | 78 | 1.14 | 0.74 - 1.76 | |
| | 85-95 y | 65 | 23 | 218 | 77 | 1.19 | 0.62 - 2.28 | |
| | >95 y | 27 | 22.7 | 92 | 77.3 | 1.14 | 0.67 - 1.93 | |
| Autonomy Score | 1 | 33 | 29.2 | 80 | 70.8 | Ref | | 0.008 |
| | 2 | 62 | 26.2 | 175 | 73.8 | 0.96 | 0.58 - 1.59 | |
| | 3 | 24 | 20.9 | 91 | 79.1 | 0.71 | 0.35 - 1.45 | |
| | 4 | 11 | 10.9 | 90 | 89.1 | 0.38*** | 0.19 - 0.75 | |
| | 5 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 100 | 0.00*** | 0.00 - 0.00 | |
| | 6 | 1 | 14.3 | 6 | 85.7 | 0.52 | 0.08 - 3.55 | |
| Autonomy Score (cat.) | AES=1 | 33 | 29.2 | 80 | 70.8 | Ref | | <0.001 |
| | 2 | 62 | 26.2 | 175 | 73.8 | 0.96 | 0.59 - 1.59 | |
| | 3 | 24 | 20.9 | 91 | 79.1 | 0.71 | 0.35 - 1.46 | |
| | >=4 | 12 | 10.1 | 107 | 89.9 | 0.35 | 0.19 - 0.65 | |
| Hospitalization | | 60 | 56.6 | 46 | 43.4 | 5.11*** | 3.57 - 7.30 | <0.001 |
| Oxygene Therapy | | 97 | 41.5 | 137 | 58.5 | 5.69*** | 3.17 - 10.22 | <0.001 |
| Palliative Care | | 33 | 86.8 | 5 | 13.2 | 8.11*** | 3.77 - 17.45 | <0.001 |
| Failure-to-thrive Syndrome | | 74 | 61.2 | 47 | 38.8 | 9.45*** | 3.09 - 28.89 | <0.001 |
| Number Comorbidities of | 0 | 43 | 19 | 183 | 81 | Ref | | 0.187 |
| | 1 | 30 | 20.5 | 116 | 79.5 | 1.05 | 0.65 - 1.69 | |
| | 2 | 35 | 26.3 | 98 | 73.7 | 1.25 | 0.81 - 1.93 | |
| | 3 | 16 | 27.6 | 42 | 72.4 | 1.42 | 0.85 - 2.37 | |
| | >=4 | 7 | 31.8 | 15 | 68.2 | 1.85** | 1.05 - 3.25 | |
| Cancer | | 9 | 30 | 21 | 70 | 1.36 | 0.87 - 2.12 | 0.294 |
| Obesity | | 4 | 26.7 | 11 | 73.3 | 0.87 | 0.51 - 1.49 | 0.887 |
| Cardiovasc. Disease | | 32 | 28.6 | 80 | 71.4 | 1.30 | 0.84 - 2.00 | 0.257 |
| High Blood Pressure | | 50 | 24.4 | 155 | 75.6 | 0.89 | 0.65 - 1.24 | 0.927 |
| Dementia | | 41 | 24.1 | 129 | 75.9 | 1.00 | 0.74 - 1.35 | 0.522 |
| Denutrition | | 9 | 39.1 | 14 | 60.9 | 1.97* | 0.91 - 4.23 | 0.098 |

| | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------------|---------------------------|----|------|-----|------|---------|-------------|--------|
| Diabetes | | 15 | 31.9 | 32 | 68.1 | 1.23 | 0.73 - 2.07 | 0.217 |
| Respiratory Dis. | | 5 | 20.8 | 19 | 79.2 | 1.04 | 0.43 - 2.51 | 0.753 |
| Other comorbidity | | 4 | 20 | 16 | 80 | 1.19 | 0.29 - 4.83 | 0.875 |
| Facility-Level Data | | | | | | | | |
| Facility Type | Private | 21 | 18.6 | 92 | 81.4 | Ref | | 0.287 |
| | Public | 95 | 24.9 | 287 | 75.1 | 1.07 | 0.62 - 1.85 | |
| | Public NH within Hospital | 15 | 16.7 | 75 | 83.3 | 0.73 | 0.42 - 1.29 | |
| AWAS (cat.) | High (>=800) | 73 | 29.1 | 178 | 70.9 | 1.54** | 1.05 - 2.28 | <0.001 |
| | Medium (750-800) | 13 | 12 | 95 | 88 | 0.56 | 0.23 - 1.39 | |
| | Low (<750) | 45 | 19.9 | 181 | 80.1 | Ref | | |
| Time to FFP2 use (cat) | Immediate (<=1 day) | 27 | 22.9 | 91 | 77.1 | Ref | | 0.525 |
| | Late (1-7 days) | 32 | 18.9 | 137 | 81.1 | 0.90 | 0.53 - 1.53 | |
| | Very Late (>=7 days) | 72 | 24.2 | 226 | 75.8 | 1.03 | 0.52 - 2.06 | |
| Staff to Resident Ratio (cat) | Good (>0.9) | 67 | 27.8 | 174 | 72.2 | 1.56** | 1.02 - 2.38 | 0.018 |
| | Medium (0.8-0.9) | 34 | 17.9 | 156 | 82.1 | 0.95 | 0.59 - 1.55 | |
| | Low (<0.8) | 30 | 19.5 | 124 | 80.5 | Ref | | |
| Presence of a Physician (cat) | None/Absent | 39 | 35.8 | 70 | 64.2 | Ref | | <0.001 |
| | Half-Time | 61 | 18.6 | 267 | 81.4 | 0.50*** | 0.31 - 0.80 | |
| | Full Time | 31 | 20.9 | 117 | 79.1 | 0.43*** | 0.24 - 0.75 | |
| NH Size | >=70 residents | 81 | 25.6 | 235 | 74.4 | 1.43 | 0.83 - 2.44 | 0.036 |
| | <70 | 50 | 18.6 | 219 | 81.4 | Ref | | |
| Staff Sick Leave Proportion (cat) | High (>50%) | 61 | 27.5 | 161 | 72.5 | Ref | | 0.030 |
| | Low (<=50%) | 47 | 20.7 | 180 | 79.3 | 0.62** | 0.41 - 0.95 | |
| Staff Attack Rate (cat) | High (>50%) | 75 | 27,5 | 198 | 72,5 | 2.23** | 1.13 - 4.39 | 0.025 |
| | Medium (25-50%) | 46 | 19,7 | 188 | 80,3 | 1.56 | 0.77 - 3.14 | |
| | Low (<25%) | 10 | 12,8 | 68 | 87,2 | Ref | | |
| Time to MSF Intervention (cat) | Long (>20 days) | 45 | 24.9 | 136 | 75.1 | Ref | | 0.234 |
| | Medium (10 to 20d) | 73 | 22.4 | 253 | 77.6 | 0.78 | 0.47 - 1.28 | |
| | Short (<10d) | 13 | 16.7 | 65 | 83.3 | 0.57** | 0.37 - 0.89 | |
| | <14 days | 26 | 14.6 | 152 | 85.4 | Ref | | |
| COVID outbreak | Yes | 24 | 19.4 | 100 | 80.6 | 0.76 | 0.30 - 1.93 | 0.336 |

It is made available under a [CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license](#) .

| | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| during the first wave | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|

* p <0.1 ** p<0.05 *** p<0.01

Table 2. Multivariate Cox Hazard adjusted analysis of mortality associated factors in French nursing facilities, Provence and Occitania provinces, 2021 (Information Criteria: AIC*=1171; BIC=1226)

| VARIABLES | | Adjusted Hazard Ratio | CI95 | p-value |
|----------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------|--------------|---------|
| Age | Continuous | 1.00 | 0.98 - 1.03 | 0.876 |
| Autonomy Score | 2 vs 0 | 0.66 | 0.35 - 1.27 | 0.216 |
| | 3 vs 0 | 0.38 | 0.16 - 0.89 | 0.026 |
| | ≥4 vs 0 | 0.22 | 0.07 - 0.66 | 0.007 |
| Gender | M vs F | 1.78 | 1.18 - 2.70 | 0.006 |
| Comorbidities | 1 vs 0 | 1.92 | 1.04 - 3.57 | 0.038 |
| | 2 vs 0 | 1.76 | 0.93 - 3.32 | 0.081 |
| | 3 vs 0 | 2.08 | 0.98 - 4.42 | 0.056 |
| | >=4 vs 0 | 2.51 | 0.96 - 6.59 | 0.061 |
| Failure-to-thrive Syndrome | Y v N | 4.04 | 1.93 - 8.48 | 0.000 |
| Presence of a physician | Half Time vs None/Absent | 0.30 | 0.18 - 0.51 | 0.000 |
| | Full Time vs None/Absent | 0.20 | 0.08 - 0.53 | 0.001 |
| Time to FFP2 use (in days) | continuous | 1.05 | 1.02 - 1.07 | 0.000 |
| AWAS | continuous | 0.99 | 0.99 - 1.00 | 0.020 |
| Staff Attack Rate (%) | continuous | 2.71 | 0.59 - 12.42 | 0.198 |
| Interaction Terms | AES=2#FTTS=1 | 2.26 | 0.90 - 5.67 | 0.083 |
| | AES =3#FTTS=1 | 3.10# | 1.00 - 9.58 | 0.050 |
| | AES =4#FTTS=1 | 4.79# | 1.16 - 19.87 | 0.031 |

interaction term significant -> FTTS effect amplified at each level of AES effect. *Akaike Information Criteria

Table 3. Representative quotes for the 3 themes

| Subthemes | Quote number | Quotes ⁽¹⁾ | Interviewee number, Function |
|---|--------------|--|------------------------------|
| THEME 1. The Structural and Chronic Neglect of Nursing Homes | | | |
| Long-Standing Medical Isolation | 1 | The problem is that we no longer have enough physicians in our areas: the older ones are retiring without being replaced and those who are still there, they're overloaded with work. | 1, Director |
| | 2 | In March 2020, businesses closed, shops closed, hospitals deprogrammed. (...) However, in the NHs, our activity stayed the same, we remained full, even with a much higher nervous intensity than usual. | 49, Director |
| | 3 | What was tough was that the Nursing Home turned to a medical service. And before that it wasn't a medical service at all, it was more of a living space. | 10, Coordinating Physician |
| | 4 | The nursing home was almost like a hospital ward at one point. Blood tests, all the time, sometimes 12 a day. There was more supervision, more care. It was weird because we didn't have the staff to do all that. | 23, Nurse |
| Working in Precarious and Understaffed Conditions | 5 | Right now, we have 1 nurse for 50 [residents]. So it's not enough! (...) I am convinced that the key issue for nursing homes is strict staffing ratios. | 49, Director |
| | 6 | My fellow caregivers are telling me, outside of the COVID crisis: "When I go home, I'm not happy with what I did because I could have done more, but I can't afford to do more, I don't have enough time". I think that's pretty pathetic. | 20 Psychologist |
| | 7 | Working in a Nursing Home, I did it, but it's not by choice. It's too hard, it's not a question of vocation, but that the work is too hard. They ask you to do 15 toilets...Connections with people are rich, you learn a lot. But the working conditions are hard. When they ask you to help 13 people to bathe before noon, you don't work well. I see people who were there for 30 years and who say "we have no choice". Nursing homes are hard. | 21, Assistant Nurse |
| | 8 | You see, the nurses: when I first came in, there were two of them, each taking a round. But now...They | 3, Resident, Mrs. E. |

| | | | |
|--|----|--|----------------------------|
| | | only pass by, they don't even stay. I didn't think this could be to that extent. | |
| | 9 | I think that what's structurally lacking in nursing homes is permanent medical presence. The attending physicians come whenever they can. But even then, we trigger hospitalizations way too late... I don't think that attending physicians can deal with crisis management. (...) From the moment the staff started to get sick, in terms of organization and functioning, it became very complicated. (...) We managed to recruit, but there were so many sick leaves for COVID that the replacement staff just filled the gaps. A cluster of residents, plus a cluster of employees. | 31, Director |
| | 10 | Yes, there were days when we worked 11 and a half hours. Just one missing person and that was finished: we'd have our lunch break between noon and two, and we couldn't take an afternoon break." | 11, Assistant Nurse |
| | 11 | No one counted the hours. We had to be there, we put our private lives on hold but it was important to do it. (...) We have no life anymore, since March. | 20, Psychologist |
| THEME 2. Top-down crisis management | | | |
| A "top-down" approach to crisis management | 12 | The ARS [Regional Health Authorities] have been absent during the whole crisis. (...) Since March, I haven't seen the authorities giving us any support, nor any real help, except for claiming statistics back. Ah, "Data"! That was very important: entering data on the national online reporting platform. (...) The ARS implemented teleworking [for their staff], and you couldn't reach them for a while. (...) Imagine, you are looking for a contact, anybody, but email address is not personalized at all. | 24, Director |
| | 13 | This morning, that's all I did: tracking of the COVID vaccine doses. First, the HAS [National Scientific Authority] told us that a recovered from COVID could only get a single booster dose. Then the MoH just told us that they did not agree and that they needed two booster doses. So I had to reorganize the entire vaccination schedule in light of this setback. | 10, Coordinating Physician |
| | 14 | We see that the people who make these recommendations don't know the field. That's what made me angry, I think. Hey, bureaucrats, come and see what a nursing home is like, when you lower the ratio of caregivers to elderly people, saying that they should be given 10 minutes, no more. (...) They should first give us more help, those who write the protocols and texts, they should come and see what it's like for elderly people in institution, with or without cognitive disorders. | 20, Psychologist |

| | | | |
|--|----|---|----------------------|
| Inconsistent and guilt-laden recommendations | 15 | We are in an environment where we touch each other all the time. You touch them to change them, to handle them, to feed them. You spend your time touching! And from one day to the next, you are told: "don't touch, you'll spread the virus". (...) See, they [the residents] were in jail. They were in a cell. Really, when the rooms were closed, the nursing homes was empty. And that must have disturbed the residents but also the caregivers, who were used to touching. | 24, Director |
| | 16 | Look, some people had to be uprooted from their rooms. Our residents have cognitive disorders; they are very attached to their rooms. They have spatial-temporal and autobiographical markers inside. And suddenly, we had to remove everything, to put them in a different room, without their belongings, because they were potentially contaminated. This was difficult, I opposed it. I said we couldn't do that. Okay, there is COVID, but we are a Nursing Home! (...) Here, I have seen colleagues, assistant nurses, crying while tying people up, telling them: "I'm sorry I have to tie you up, because it is to protect you, in fact". (...) It was really a war, they told me: "but we have to do this". Just like me, I said to myself: "but at some point, we haven't signed up for this", we are Nursing Home! | 20, Psychologist |
| | 17 | For example, I remember in the service I was in, two people had a very hard time with the confinement, who had to be restrained, and it was really not easy for us and for the residents. | 16, Assistant Nurse |
| | 18 | At one point, during the first lockdown, we had to stay in our room. We had dinner in the rooms. Then it was hard. It lasted for a long time. We were not allowed to go out anymore. Even those who were not sick! The time to get everything sorted. It was hard, staying in the room for a whole day, without going out...Anyone would become nuts! | 57, Resident, Mrs C. |
| Weakly armed mechanisms and actors for crisis situations | 19 | We experienced successive stresses. The masks, which we could not find! We had to beg, practically. (...) I remember going to the pharmacies to find overcoats on Saturdays. (...) It wasn't a lack of foresight, it was that we couldn't find them, people were rushing to stock them, there were no supplies. | 24, Director |
| | 20 | I had already warned the ARS about the shortage of caregivers. I asked them to activate the health reserve, and I never got any help in managing the situation. We feel very lonely in dealing with given situations. (...) No matter how many times I called the ARS, they sent me to platforms that don't work. The national recruitment platform. And we've lost a lot of time. (...) Staff turnover was also an infection risk. Many of the people we took on as replacements got sick later on. | 31, Director |
| | 21 | You can feel that the fatigue of the first lockdown is still here [for the staff]. Because it is still an overload. | 57, Resident, Mrs C. |

| | | | |
|---|----|---|----------------------------|
| | | The teams are reinforced, but it's still a lot of work. | |
| | 22 | We were so paranoid that we disinfected everything. At first, I would even disinfect the lunch tray as soon as I left the room, I would smear disinfectant all over it [laughs]. Once we had a good protocol, it was smoother. When MSF arrived and told us: "This is how you do it, like this, like that". They helped us tremendously, in the organization, in the daily work, otherwise we would have gotten lost. | 11, Assistant Nurse |
| | 23 | Well, it's sad, in a way. Because MSF intervenes in places of disaster, in Haiti, in countries at war. So, calling for your help because you have know-how is positive. But calling you because you intervene in places of disaster showed what a disaster we were experiencing. | 49, Director |
| | 24 | Fortunately, I had the help of [the MSF doctor]. I don't know if I could have managed it on my own. Being only part-time in two establishments, it would have been very complicated. (...) The workload was huge, alone it was not feasible. And when I was in the other nursing home, he [the MSF doctor] was there, so at least the residents had a doctor every day. (...) It's also reassuring to be able to share about a new disease, all these discussions between colleagues, on an unknown disease. | 10, Coordinating Physician |
| THEME 3. Counterproductive effects of the confinement of residents | | | |
| Impacts of lockdowns during the first wave | 25 | We had a lot of containment-related impacts, which we still have today, even among COVID-negative residents. A lot of degradation, deaths. (...) Bedridden patients, depressive states, failure-to-thrive syndromes. We've been locked up for a year now. Can you imagine? The residents haven't gone out for a year! It is terrible. | 10, Coordinating Physician |
| | 26 | They had to stay without anything [in terms of physiotherapy care]. 15 days, it's still feasible, but a month and a half! This was very long for them, and we saw the difference. (...) For all of them, there was a decline in motor skills, but even more in cognitive skills. The patients who already had a little difficulty at the cognitive level suddenly have fallen into mutism, with a completely accelerated failure-to-thrive syndrome. (...) Regarding pathologies, we've lost so much. In a month and a half, patients whom I used to make walk, now they are in an armchair. (...) It's not just a few points on a vigilance scale, no, it's quite massive. | 33, Physiotherapist |
| | 27 | This protocol we put in place was shocking, stressful at first. We saw a family climbing up to come hug their mother. Yeah, there were moments during the first wave, a little...a little violent. Yeah, violent, | 20, Psychologist |

| | | | |
|---|----|---|--|
| | | outright. | |
| The silenced opinions of nursing home residents | 28 | Finally, we did not ask the residents their opinion. We confined as recommended. We didn't have much choice. (...) We have residents here who never had any symptoms, so it's a bit of a double whammy: I'm sick, I'm fine, but then I'm stuck in my room. | 1, Director |
| | 29 | What bothered me about the lockdown was that the resident's opinion was never asked. (...) The only things I was hearing of was disaster scenarios, with many deaths, many sick staff. A lot of confinements in rooms, and in the end the results were not necessarily conclusive. | 49, Director |
| | 30 | Finally, I'm glad I arrived here before, because I was in a fragile period before, it would have been even more difficult. So I'm glad I came. Right now I'm in the right place at the right time. | 57, Resident, Mrs C. |
| | 31 | When this microbe is gone, as soon as we can go out, my daughter will come and get me, because her house is in [the same village]. (...) I would like us to be able to go out again at some point, but we have to bring the staff back. And with the disease....This microbe is always there, we can't live normally. | 3, Resident, Mrs E. |
| | 32 | The room, we stayed in there for a few days straight, you see! Can you tell? From breakfast to supper, in a room! It is not in my nature. (...) It was not fun. Especially since these rooms are small; they can't be 40m2. | 6, Resident, Mrs. Q |
| | 33 | These activities we used to have, these games, twice a week. It was a nice break during a week. I miss that. Now, every day of the week looks the same. | 57, Resident, Mrs C. |
| | 34 | (Mme A.) When this illness happened, we were no longer allowed to do anything. We no longer have outings, we have nothing, nothing, nothing. (...) The COVID period, there, it hurts because you don't see anybody. You only see those who are inside [the nursing homes]. (Mme O.) We are isolated, left to ourselves. (...) Now I can only see my daughter behind a Plexiglas. So the mask, the glass... We don't understand a lot. (Mme A.) We have to speak a bit louder than normal. And we can't touch each other, we only kiss from far away. This is annoying, not being able to hug them! (Mme O.) We can't kiss hello or goodbye, nothing! We are separated by a Plexiglas. (Investigator) And you would prefer that people could come in the nursing homes? (Mme A.) Of course! We should see them a little more! | 36, Resident, Mrs A. 37, Resident, Mrs O. |

| | | | |
|--|----|---|----------------------------|
| | 35 | If I could go out on Sundays, I would be the happiest. (...) If we could go out, we would bear it better. (...) Things should go back to normal again. Just because there's a virus out there doesn't mean that everything should stop! | 6, Resident, Mrs. Q. |
| The courage to lift the containment measures | 36 | We followed the recommendations, to the letter. After that, there is the reality of the field. (...) If I applied the recommendations, I would put everyone in isolation, because there is still active virus circulation, and visits would not have resumed here. It is not acceptable to ban visits. But it is the director's responsibility. | 31, Director |
| | 37 | We decided to open the visits for families again, including for those suffering from failure-to-thrive syndrome, and not only for the "end of life" ones. Because our job is to be human. So at some point, people need to see their parents, their parents need to see their children. We have to be able to do all that, while respecting public health measures and so on. | 1, Director |
| | 38 | With this decision, to not confine them in their room, this year we really did what they wanted. And I think we'd never done it, actually, exactly what they wanted. (...) When you know that COVID is coming in, you accept that there will be deaths. The question is the conditions around the death. | 49, Director |
| | 39 | We're not here to generate failure-to-thrive syndromes or severe depressive states either. So I told the girls: "you wash his hands well when he comes out of the room, but we set him free!". Because that was really the point: the impression of locking people even more. They are 91 years old, 92 years old, so that's enough! | 10, Coordinating Physician |
| | 40 | When we reopened the dining room, we saw residents expressing a desire to eat with this or that other resident. Relationships, loving couples forming. All of that, it didn't exist anymore, they were isolated in their rooms, and there was no relationship between them anymore. | 1, Director |
| 1)Translated from French by investigators. | | | |