

1 **Reconstructing transmission chains of SARS-CoV-2 amid multiple outbreaks in a geriatric acute-**
2 **care hospital**

3 Mohamed Abbas^{1,2,3}, Anne Cori^{2,4}, Samuel Cordey^{3,5}, Florian Laubscher⁵, Tomás Robalo Nunes^{1,6},
4 Ashleigh Myall^{7,8}, Julien Salamun⁹, Philippe Huber¹⁰, Dina Zekry¹⁰, Virginie Prendki^{10,11}, Anne Iten¹,
5 Laure Vieux¹², Valérie Sauvan¹, Christophe E. Graf¹⁰, Stephan Harbarth^{1,3,7}

6 ¹ Infection Control Programme, Geneva University Hospitals, Geneva, Switzerland

7 ² MRC Centre for Global Infectious Disease Analysis, Imperial College London, London, United
8 Kingdom

9 ³ Faculty of Medicine, University of Geneva, Geneva, Switzerland

10 ⁴ Abdul Latif Jameel Institute for Disease and Emergency Analytics (J-IDEA), School of Public Health,
11 Imperial College London, London, United Kingdom

12 ⁵ Laboratory of Virology, Department of Diagnostics, Geneva University Hospitals, Geneva,
13 Switzerland

14 ⁶ Serviço de Infecçciologia, Hospital Garcia de Orta, EPE, Almada, Portugal

15 ⁷ Department of Infectious Diseases, Imperial College London, London, United Kingdom

16 ⁸ Department of Mathematics, Imperial College London, London, United Kingdom

17 ⁹ Department of Primary Care, Geneva University Hospitals, Geneva, Switzerland

18 ¹⁰ Department of Rehabilitation and Geriatrics, Geneva University Hospitals, Geneva, Switzerland

19 ¹¹ Division of Infectious Diseases, Geneva University Hospitals, Geneva, Switzerland

20 ¹² Occupational Health Service, Geneva University Hospitals, Geneva, Switzerland

21

22

23 **Corresponding author:**

24 Dr Mohamed Abbas, MD, MS

25 Infection Control Programme

26 Geneva University Hospitals and Faculty of Medicine, Geneva, Switzerland

27 Tel: +41 22 372 8828

28 Email: mohamed.abbas@hcuge.ch

29 Twitter: @mo_abbas_ipc

30

31 **Word count:** 3108

32

33 This paper has been submitted as an abstract at the 32nd European Congress of Clinical Microbiology
34 and Infectious Diseases (ECCMID, Lisbon, Portugal, 23-26 April 2022).

35

36 **Abstract (word count 378)**

37 **Background**

38 There is ongoing uncertainty regarding transmission chains and the respective roles of healthcare
39 workers (HCWs) and elderly patients in nosocomial outbreaks of severe acute respiratory syndrome
40 coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) in geriatric settings.

41 **Methods**

42 We performed a retrospective cohort study including patients with nosocomial coronavirus disease
43 2019 (COVID-19) in four outbreak-affected wards, and all SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR positive HCWs from a
44 Swiss university-affiliated geriatric acute-care hospital that admitted both Covid-19 and non-Covid-
45 19 patients during the first pandemic wave in Spring 2020. We combined epidemiological and
46 genetic sequencing data using a Bayesian modelling framework, and reconstructed transmission
47 dynamics of SARS-CoV-2 involving patients and HCWs, in order to determine who infected whom.
48 We evaluated general transmission patterns according to type of case (HCWs working in dedicated
49 Covid-19 cohorting wards: HCW_{covid} ; HCWs working in non-Covid-19 wards where outbreaks
50 occurred: HCW_{outbreak} ; patients with nosocomial Covid-19: $\text{patient}_{\text{nosocomial}}$) by deriving the proportion of
51 infections attributed to each type of case across all posterior trees and comparing them to random
52 expectations.

53 **Results**

54 During the study period (March 1 to May 7, 2020) we included 180 SARS-CoV-2 positive cases: 127
55 HCWs (91 HCW_{covid} , 36 HCW_{outbreak}) and 53 patients. The attack rates ranged from 10-19% for
56 patients, and 21% for HCWs. We estimated that there were 16 importation events (3 patients, 13
57 HCWs) that jointly led to 16 secondary cases. Most patient-to-patient transmission events involved
58 patients having shared a ward (97.6%, 95% credible interval [CrI] 90.4-100%), in contrast to those
59 having shared a room (44.4%, 95%CrI 27.8-62.5%). Transmission events tended to cluster by type of

60 case: patient_{nos0} were almost twice as likely to be infected by other patient_{nos0} than expected
61 (observed:expected ratio 1.91, 95%CrI 1.08 – 4.00, $p = 0.02$); similarly, HCW_{outbreak} were more than
62 twice as likely to be infected by other HCW_{outbreak} than expected (2.25, 95%CrI 1.00-8.00, $p = 0.04$).
63 The proportion of infectors of HCW_{covid} were as expected as random. The proportions of high
64 transmitters (≥ 2 secondary cases) were significantly higher among HCW_{outbreak} than patient_{nos0} in the
65 late phases (26.2% vs. 13.4%, $p < 2.2e-16$) of the outbreak.

66 **Conclusions**

67 Most importation events were linked to HCW. Unexpectedly, transmission between HCW_{covid} was
68 more limited than transmission between patients and HCW_{outbreak}. This highlights gaps in infection
69 control and suggests possible areas of improvements to limit the extent of nosocomial transmission.

70

71

72 **Key words:** COVID-19, SARS-CoV-2, infection prevention and control, healthcare-associated
73 infection, nosocomial outbreaks, geriatric hospitals

74

75

76 **Introduction**

77 Nosocomial acquisition of severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) in geriatric
78 institutions and long-term care facilities (LTCFs) may account for large proportions of all declared
79 coronavirus disease 2019 (Covid-19) cases in many countries, and contribute to a large extent to
80 morbidity and mortality [1-4]. The reservoir of SARS-CoV-2 in healthcare environments may
81 contribute to amplifying the pandemic [5], and as such, it is important to understand transmission
82 dynamics in these settings.

83 The terms healthcare-associated, hospital-onset, and nosocomial Covid-19 reflect the
84 uncertainty around defining and distinguishing community- versus healthcare-acquired Covid-19
85 cases [6]. Nevertheless, in some settings such as LTCFs and nursing homes these definitions are
86 relatively straightforward. In other settings, such as those with a high turnover of patients, or where
87 patients are admitted from the community and both Covid-19 and non-Covid-19 cases are
88 hospitalised in the same institution, defining, and more importantly detecting cases is crucial to
89 avoid cross-contamination. Determining sources and transmission pathways of infection may thus
90 help improve infection prevention and control (IPC) strategies.

91 The role of healthcare workers (HCWs) in nosocomial Covid-19 is complex, as they can be
92 victims and/or vectors of SARS-CoV-2 infection, and can acquire from or transmit to their peers and
93 patients as well as the community [7, 8]. There is ongoing controversy and uncertainty surrounding
94 the role of HCWs in infecting patients in nosocomial outbreaks, and in particular findings from acute-
95 care hospitals cannot be applied directly to LTCFs and geriatric hospitals [9-12].

96 The aim of this study was to reconstruct transmission dynamics in several nosocomial
97 outbreaks of SARS-CoV-2 involving patients and HCWs in a Swiss university-affiliated geriatric
98 hospital that admitted both Covid-19 and non-Covid-19 patients during the first pandemic wave in
99 Spring 2020.

100

101 **Methods**

102 We performed a retrospective cohort study including patients with nosocomial COVID-19 in four
103 outbreak-affected wards, as well as all SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR positive HCWs from March 1 to May 7,
104 2020.

105 *Setting*

106 The Hospital of Geriatrics, part of the Geneva University Hospitals (HUG) consortium, is a facility with
107 196 acute-care and 100 rehabilitation beds. During the first pandemic wave, a maximum of 176
108 acute-care beds were dedicated to admitting geriatric patients with Covid-19 who were not eligible
109 for escalation of therapy (e.g. intensive care unit admission) [13]. During the same period, patients
110 were also admitted for non-Covid-19 hospitalisations, and the rehabilitation beds were also open to
111 convalescent Covid-19 patients. The implemented IPC measures are detailed in the Supplement. RT-
112 PCR screening of SARS-CoV-2 on admission for all patients, even if asymptomatic or without clinical
113 suspicion of Covid-19, started on April 01, 2020. From April 07, 2020, weekly screening surveys were
114 performed in non-Covid wards, until May 30, 2020. HCWs from outbreak wards were encouraged to
115 undergo PCR testing on nasopharyngeal swabs, even if asymptomatic between April 09 and April 16,
116 2020.

117 *Definitions*

118 Healthcare-associated (HA) Covid-19 was defined by an onset of symptoms ≥ 5 days after admission
119 in conjunction with a strong suspicion of healthcare transmission, in accordance with Swissnoso
120 guidelines [14]. Patients with HA-Covid-19 were classified as “patient_{nosocomial}”, the others were assumed
121 community-acquired or “patient_{community}”. An outbreak was declared when there were ≥ 3 cases of
122 HA-Covid-19 cases (HCWs and patients) with a possible temporal-spatial link [14]. HCWs were
123 included in the outbreak investigation if they presented a positive RT-PCR for SARS-CoV-2. HCWs

124 were classified as “HCW_{covid}” if they worked in a Covid-19 cohorting ward admitting community-
125 acquired cases, or “HCW_{outbreak}” if they worked in a “non-Covid” ward (i.e. not admitting community-
126 acquired Covid-19 cases) in which nosocomial outbreaks occurred.

127 *Data sources*

128 The data used for this study were from the same sources as described previously [9]. First, we used
129 prospectively collected data from the Swiss Federal Office of Public Health-mandated surveillance of
130 hospitalised Covid-19 patients [1]. We also used prospectively collected data from HUG’s
131 Department of Occupational Health for symptom-onset data as well as the Department of Human
132 Resources (HR) for HCW shifts.

133 *Descriptive epidemiology*

134 We produced an epidemic curve using dates of symptom onset; where these were unavailable (e.g.
135 lack of symptoms), we imputed them with the median difference between date of symptom onset
136 and date of nasopharyngeal swab.

137 *Microbiological methods*

138 All COVID-19 cases in the outbreak were confirmed by RT-PCR on nasopharyngeal swabs. We
139 performed SARS-CoV-2 whole genome sequencing (WGS) using an amplicon-based sequencing
140 method in order to produce RNA sequences, as previously described [9] and summarised in the
141 Supplement.

142 *Phylogenetic analysis*

143 Sequence alignment was performed with MUSCLE (v3.8.31). The evolutionary analyses were
144 conducted in MEGA X [15] using the Maximum Likelihood method and Tamura 3-parameter model
145 [16]. All SARS-CoV-2 complete genomes sequenced by the Laboratory of Virology (HUG) in the
146 context of city-wide epidemiological surveillance were integrated to the phylogenetic analysis in
147 addition to the case samples of this outbreak analysis.

148 *Statistical analysis*

149 We performed descriptive statistics with medians and interquartile ranges (IQR), and counts and
150 proportions, as appropriate.

151 *Reconstruction of transmission trees*

152 We combined epidemiological and genomic data to reconstruct who infected whom using the R
153 package `outbreaker2` [17, 18], as described elsewhere [9] and in the Supplement. Briefly, the
154 model uses a Bayesian framework, combining information on the generation time (time between
155 infections in an infector/infectee pair), contact patterns, with a model of sequence evolution to
156 probabilistically reconstruct the transmission tree (see Supplement).

157 Because formal contact tracing was limited during the study period, we constructed contact
158 networks based on ward or room presence for patients based on their trajectories, and on HCW
159 shifts obtained from HR. A contact was defined as simultaneous presence on the same ward on a
160 given day (see Supplement). The manner by which `outbreaker2` handles these contacts is
161 conservative in that it allows for A) non-infectious contacts to occur, and B) incomplete reporting of
162 infectious contacts; the proportions of these are estimated in the model output.

163 Using the reconstructed transmission trees, we calculated the number of secondary (i.e.
164 onwards) infections for each case, i.e. the individual reproductive number (R), which we stratified by
165 epidemic phase (early or late with a cut off on April 09, 2020) and type of case (HCW_{covid} , $HCW_{outbreak}$,
166 $patient_{nos0}$, $patient_{community}$, see Supplement).

167 We assessed the role of each type of case in transmission by estimating the proportion of
168 infections attributed to the type of case (f_{case}), which we compared to the random expectation
169 considering the prevalence of each type among cases (see Supplement). To better understand the
170 transmission pathways between and within wards, we also estimated (for outbreak and non-
171 outbreak wards), the proportion of infections attributed to infectors in the same ward. We also

172 constructed a matrix representing ward-to-ward transmission. Patient movements between wards
173 were constructed using the implementation of the `vistime` package (visualisation tool) as in the
174 publication by Meredith et al. [19]. Statistical analyses were performed in R software version 4.0.3
175 (<https://www.R-project.org/>).

176 *Ethical considerations*

177 The Ethics Committee of the Canton of Geneva (CCER), Switzerland, approved this study (CCER no.
178 2020-01330 and CCER no. 2020-00827).

179

180 **Results**

181 During the study period, we included a total of 180 SARS-CoV-2 positive cases: 127 HCWs of whom
182 91 HCW_{covid}, and 36 HCW_{outbreak}, and 53 patients from the 4 outbreak wards. Of the 53 included
183 patients, *post-hoc* epidemiological analysis showed that 4 of these were highly likely community-
184 acquired Covid-19 (CA-Covid-19).

185 The remaining 49 nosocomial cases represented 20.2% (49/242) of all hospitalised COVID-19
186 patients, and 81.7% (49/60) of nosocomial Covid-19 cases of the Geriatric Hospital. The ward-level
187 attack rates ranged from 10 to 19% among patients. Moreover, 21% of all HCWs in the geriatric
188 hospital had a PCR-positive test. The epidemic curve is shown in Figure 1, and ward-level epidemic
189 curves in Supplementary Figure S1. Characteristics of patients and HCWs are summarised in Tables 1
190 and 2, respectively.

191 *Phylogenetic tree*

192 We obtained SARS-CoV-2 sequences for 148 of the 180 cases (82.2%), including 105 HCWs (82.7%)
193 and 43 patients (81.1%). A rooted phylogenetic tree suggests a large amount of genetic diversity,
194 with at least 9 clusters and sub-clusters (Figure 2). One cluster (with moderate bootstrap support
195 [BS] 26%) comprises sequences from 17 HCWs, 3 patients, and 6 community isolates in multiple

196 subclusters (e.g. BS 72% with signature mutation C5239T). Another cluster (BS 78% with signature
197 mutations C28854T & A20268G) shows a HCW sequence (H1048) with high similarity with
198 community isolates. A large cluster (BS 68% with signature mutations C8293T, T18488C, and
199 T24739C) with several subclusters includes 19 HCWs, 9 patients, and 3 community cases; ward
200 movements for the patients are shown in Supplementary Figure S3A. A well-defined cluster (BS
201 100%) shows isolates from patients and HCWs from the same ward.

202 *Imported cases*

203 In our reconstruction of who infected whom, we identified 16 imported cases of whom 13 were
204 HCWs and three were patients (C107, C115, and C123, Table 3), two of which (C107 and C115) were
205 initially classified as nosocomial. These 16 imported cases were found to have generated a total of
206 16 secondary cases, with 1 patient being involved in 5 onward transmissions. Together, imported
207 cases and their direct secondary cases account for 21.6% of all cases.

208 *Reconstructing who infected whom*

209 The output from our ancestry reconstruction is shown in Figure 3 (see Supplement for more results
210 and sensitivity analyses). In addition to the 16 cases identified as imported, we were able to
211 reconstruct with high confidence (>50% posterior probability) the ancestry of 36/132 (27.2%) of the
212 remaining cases. The model estimated that the reporting probability was 91.5% (95% credible
213 interval [CrI] 91.2%-91.9%), suggesting that only 8.5% of cases involved in transmission were
214 unidentified. For most (92.0%) cases, the model identified the direct infector, without intermediate
215 unobserved cases.

216 *Ward attribution*

217 There was 95% agreement between the epidemiological attribution of the presumptive ward of
218 infection (for patients) and that suggested by the model output (see Supplement). For 3 patients, the
219 ward attribution was modified by the modelling analysis.

220 *Transmission patterns*

221 Among patient-to-patient transmission events, and across all posterior trees, 97.6% (95%CrI 90.4-
222 100%) involved patients who had shared a ward during their hospital stay. In contrast, only 44.4%
223 (95%CrI 27.8-62.5%) of patient-to-patient transmissions involved patients who had shared a room.
224 The model predicted that C107 infected C131 with a 70.5% probability although they did not share a
225 ward (Supplementary Figure S3B); the probabilities that this was a direct infection and indirect
226 infection with an unreported intermediate infector were 36.2% and 34.3%, respectively
227 (Supplementary Figure S3B).

228 *Secondary infections*

229 The number of secondary infections caused by each infected case (individual reproductive number,
230 estimated from the transmission tree reconstruction), ranged from zero to nine (Figure 4). We
231 compared the proportion of cases with no secondary transmissions ("non-transmitters") and of
232 cases with ≥ 2 secondary transmissions ("high transmitters") across types of cases and phase of the
233 outbreak. We found that the proportion of non-transmitters among both $HCW_{outbreak}$ and $patient_{nos0}$
234 was smaller in the early than in the late stage (approximately 30% in early and 50% in late phase for
235 both groups), suggesting that the contribution of these groups to ongoing transmission decreased
236 over the study period. Conversely, the proportion of non-transmitters among HCW_{covid} was stable at
237 about 55% across the early and the late phase. The proportions of high transmitters were
238 significantly higher among $HCW_{outbreak}$ than either $patient_{nos0}$ or HCW_{covid} in the late phases (26.2% vs.
239 13.4% and 11.4%, $p < 2.2e-16$) of the outbreak. These trends were similar in the sensitivity analyses
240 (Supplementary Table S2).

241 *Role of HCWs and patients in transmission events*

242 We found that cases were significantly less likely than expected at random to be infected by HCWs
243 from COVID wards (proportion infected by HCW_{covid} , $f_{HCW} = (43\%; 95\%CrI 36-49\%$ versus 53%

244 expected at random; 95%CrI 44-62%; $p = 0.043$). This was true across all cases, but particularly
245 among HCWs in outbreak wards ($f_{\text{HCW}} = 31\%$, 95% CrI 16-46%; $p = 0.07$) and patients, ($f_{\text{HCW}} = 26\%$,
246 95%CrI 14-37%, $p = 0.005$). Conversely HCW_{outbreak} were significantly more likely than expected at
247 random to become infected by other HCW_{outbreak} (proportion infected by HCW_{outbreak}, $f_{\text{outbreak}} = 38\%$,
248 95%CrI 24-54% versus 18%; 95%CrI 4-35%, $p = 0.03$). Patients with nosocomial Covid-19 (patient_{nosocomial})
249 were significantly more likely than expected at random to be infected by other patient_{nosocomial}
250 (proportion infected by patient_{nosocomial}, $f_{\text{pat}} = 54\%$, 95%CrI 40-69% versus 28%; 95%CrI 14-45%, $p = 0.01$).
251 Full results are shown in Figure 5.

252 *Role of within-ward and between-ward transmission*

253 Infected staff or patients in outbreak wards were responsible for significantly more transmission in
254 general (54%; 95%CrI 48-61%) than expected (43.7%, 95%CrI 35-53%). This was driven in particular
255 by transmission from staff or patients to other staff or patients in outbreak wards (73%, 95%CrI 63-
256 82%) (Figure 5). Within-ward transmission was more pronounced in outbreak wards (mean 48%;
257 range: 20-70% of all infections within a ward) than in non-outbreak wards (mean 14%; range 0-63%)
258 as shown in Supplementary Figures S4 and S5.

259

260 **Discussion**

261 This in-depth investigation of SARS-CoV-2 transmission between patients and HCWs in a geriatric
262 hospital, including several nosocomial outbreaks, has provided many valuable insights on
263 transmission dynamics. First, we showed that the combination of epidemiological and genetic data
264 using sophisticated modelling was able to tease out overall transmission patterns. Second, we
265 showed that transmission dynamics among HCWs differed according to whether they worked in
266 Covid wards or in wards where outbreaks occurred: while there was no excess HCW-to-HCW
267 transmission in Covid wards, we observed a two-fold higher risk of transmission between HCWs in

268 non-Covid wards. Third, we identified excess patient-to-patient transmission events, most of which
269 occurred within the same ward, but not necessarily the same room. Fourth, we identified multiple
270 importation events mainly from HCWs, but also from one patient with community-acquired Covid-
271 19, that led to a substantial number of secondary cases and/or clusters.

272 These results are particularly important, as settings which care for elderly patients, such as
273 geriatrics and rehabilitation clinics or LTCFs have high attack rates of SARS-CoV-2 for both patients
274 and HCWs [7]. In an institution-wide seroprevalence study in our hospital consortium, the
275 Department of Rehabilitation and Geriatrics, of which the hospital in this study was part of, had the
276 highest proportion of HCWs with anti-SARS-CoV-2 antibodies [20].

277 The different transmission patterns between HCWs in Covid wards and outbreak wards (i.e.
278 meant to be “Covid-free”) is intriguing. One hypothesis may be behavioural; indeed, it has been
279 shown that HCWs caring for Covid-19 patients had significant concerns about being infected by their
280 patients, and therefore may apply IPC measures more rigorously than when not caring for Covid-19
281 patients [21]. It may be that HCWs working in non-Covid wards did not feel threatened by Covid-19
282 patients on other wards, and thus not in their direct care. Also, it may be that HCWs underestimated
283 the transmission risk from their peers to a greater extent in non-Covid wards than in Covid wards,
284 leading to less physical distancing. Another contributing factor, which gives credence to the
285 abovementioned hypotheses, is the higher mean duration of presenteeism despite symptoms
286 compatible with Covid-19 in HCWs in non-Covid wards (2.9 days) compared to HCWs in Covid wards
287 (1.6 days). There may be other factors (e.g. work culture, baseline IPC practices) that contribute to
288 explain this difference in transmission patterns.

289 Most patient-to-patient transmission events involved patients having shared a ward, and
290 were therefore in close proximity. Although we cannot exclude transmission from a “point-source”
291 or hand borne transmission (i.e. an unidentified HCW infecting multiple patients in the same ward),
292 there is little evidence to suggest that this is the case; indeed, these transmission patterns were

293 robust to changes in the model assumptions. Mathematical models suggest that single-room
294 isolation of suspected cases could potentially reduce the incidence of nosocomial SARS-CoV-2
295 transmission by up to 35% [22]. In the outbreaks we describe, symptomatic patients were identified
296 promptly, with a median delay of 0 days between symptom onset and first positive swab. This may,
297 however, not be sufficient as patients may be able to transmit pre-symptomatically to other patients
298 [23]; thus, forecasting patients at high risk of developing nosocomial Covid-19 [24] may be useful
299 should single-rooms not be available for all contacts of positive cases (e.g. in cases of overcrowding).
300 Indeed, it has been suggested that exposure to community-acquired cases (i.e. already identified
301 and therefore segregated/cohorted) was associated with half the risk of infection when compared to
302 exposure to hospital-acquired cases or HCWs (who may be asymptomatic) [25]. One possible
303 explanation is that by the time CA-Covid cases are hospitalised, they have passed the peak of
304 infectiousness, whereas HA-Covid cases are in frequently unprotected contact with HCWs and other
305 patients during their period of peak infectiousness.

306 It is our view that there is currently no strong evidence for the use of real-time genomics for
307 control of SARS-CoV-2 nosocomial outbreaks [26]. Nevertheless, in this investigation, as in many
308 others, we performed WGS to investigate transmission patterns [12]. Although we were able to gain
309 considerable insight from the powerful combination of genetic sequencing data and rich
310 epidemiological data, the outbreaks were successfully controlled without the availability of WGS, as
311 was the case in many published reports [27, 28]. Furthermore, WGS may be more useful for ruling
312 out transmission rather than for confirmatory purposes, due to the low number of mutations
313 accumulated in the SARS-CoV-2 genome between transmission pairs [29].

314 Our study has several strengths. To the best of our knowledge, it is the only extensive
315 outbreak investigation with WGS and sophisticated modelling in a geriatric acute-care hospital. Our
316 WGS coverage was very high with 80% of cases involved providing sequencing data, including
317 sequences from HCWs which has been previously shown to improve understanding of transmission

318 dynamics [8]. The data collected for the purposes of this study were prospectively collected,
319 minimising the risk of bias.

320 Despite these strengths, some limitations must be acknowledged. First, we did not include
321 sequences from CA-Covid cases, bar one. However the method we used to reconstruct who infected
322 whom is able to cope with and identify missing intermediate cases; here we estimated that the
323 overwhelming majority of cases (91.5%) was captured in our sample. Another limitation is that these
324 investigations were performed during the first pandemic wave in a susceptible population, and
325 therefore the results may no longer be applicable in settings with high vaccination coverage and/or
326 substantial natural immunity. Nevertheless, the lessons learned may be useful in a large number of
327 countries with slow vaccine roll-out due to vaccine hesitancy, particularly in HCWs where there is no
328 vaccine mandate, or unequal access to vaccine supplies [30]. Furthermore, nosocomial outbreaks of
329 SARS-CoV-2 still occur despite high vaccination coverage [31, 32]. Also, these valuable lessons may
330 be applicable for nosocomial outbreak control in the case of future pandemics due to respiratory
331 viruses with characteristics similar to SARS-CoV-2.

332 In conclusion, strategies to prevent nosocomial SARS-CoV-2 transmission in geriatric settings
333 should take into account the complex interplay between HCWs in dedicated Covid-19 wards versus
334 non-Covid wards, and the potential for patient-to-patient transmission.

335

336

337 **Acknowledgements**

338 We would like to thank Frédéric Bouillot (Geneva University Hospitals) for providing us with HR data,
339 Aurore Britan (Geneva University Hospitals) for data management, Rachel Goldstein for data
340 collection (Geneva University Hospitals), Daniel Teixeira for data extraction (Geneva University
341 Hospitals). In addition, the authors would like to thank Stéphanie Baggio, Frédérique Jacqueroz
342 Bausch, Hervé Spechbach from the AMBUCoV study (Geneva University Hospitals), Amaury Thiabaud
343 (University of Geneva), as well as the IPC team members from Geneva University Hospitals involved
344 in SARS-CoV-2 outbreak management (Pascale Herault, Didier Pittet, Walter Zingg). Ashleigh Myall
345 (Imperial College London) provided code to help generate the edge list of contacts. Thibaut Jombart
346 (London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine) and Finlay Campbell (World Health Organization)
347 provided input on technical aspects of the `outbreaker2` model development. The study team also
348 wishes to thank the dedicated HCWs who looked after patients professionally, as well as the
349 Geriatric Hospital Covid-19 crisis management team (Gabriel Gold, Charline Couderc, Etienne Satin).

350

351 **Conflicts of interest**

352 All authors have no conflicts of interest to declare.

353

354 **Funding**

355 This work was supported by a grant from the Swiss National Science Foundation under the NRP78
356 funding scheme (Grant no. 4078PO_198363). Anne Cori is supported by the National Institute for
357 Health Research (NIHR) Health Protection Research Unit in Modelling and Health Economics, a
358 partnership between Public Health England, Imperial College London and LSHTM (grant code
359 NIHR200908); and acknowledges funding from the MRC Centre for Global Infectious Disease Analysis
360 (reference MR/R015600/1), jointly funded by the UK Medical Research Council (MRC) and the UK

361 Foreign, Commonwealth & Development Office (FCDO), under the MRC/FCDO Concordat agreement
362 and is also part of the EDCTP2 programme supported by the European Union. Ashleigh Myall was
363 supported by a scholarship from the Medical Research Foundation National PhD Training
364 Programme in Antimicrobial Resistance Research (MRF-145-0004-TPG-AVISO). Disclaimer: “The
365 views expressed are those of the author(s) and not necessarily those of the NIHR, Public Health
366 England or the Department of Health and Social Care.”

367

368 **Role of the funding source**

369 The funding source had no involvement in the writing of the manuscript or the decision to submit it
370 for publication. All authors had full access to the full data in the study and accept responsibility to
371 submit for publication.

372

373 **Data availability**

374 Due to small size of the various clusters, clinical data will not be shared in order to safeguard
375 anonymity of patients and HCWs.

376

377 **References**

- 378 1. Thiabaud A, Iten A, Balmelli C, Senn L, Troillet N, Widmer A, et al. Cohort profile: SARS-CoV-
379 2/COVID-19 hospitalised patients in Switzerland. *Swiss Med Wkly*. 2021;151:w20475.
- 380 2. Bhattacharya A, Collin SM, Stimson J, Thelwall S, Nsonwu O, Gerver S, et al. Healthcare-
381 associated COVID-19 in England: A national data linkage study. *J Infect*. 2021;83(5):565-72.
- 382 3. The Guardian. Up to 20% of hospital patients with Covid-19 caught it at hospital [Available
383 from: [https://www.theguardian.com/world/2020/may/17/hospital-patients-england-](https://www.theguardian.com/world/2020/may/17/hospital-patients-england-coronavirus-covid-19)
384 [coronavirus-covid-19](https://www.theguardian.com/world/2020/may/17/hospital-patients-england-coronavirus-covid-19)]. [Accessed 21.05.2020]
- 385 4. The Guardian. 40,600 people likely caught Covid while hospital inpatients in England [Available
386 from: [https://www.theguardian.com/society/2021/mar/26/40600-people-likely-caught-covid-](https://www.theguardian.com/society/2021/mar/26/40600-people-likely-caught-covid-while-hospital-inpatients-in-england)
387 [while-hospital-inpatients-in-england](https://www.theguardian.com/society/2021/mar/26/40600-people-likely-caught-covid-while-hospital-inpatients-in-england)]. [Accessed 02.09.2021]
- 388 5. Knight GM, Pham TM, Stimson J, Funk S, Jafari Y, Pople D, et al. The contribution of hospital-
389 acquired infections to the COVID-19 epidemic in England in the first half of 2020. *medRxiv*.
390 2021:2021.09.02.21262480.
- 391 6. Abbas M, Zhu NJ, Mookerjee S, Bolt F, Otter JA, Holmes AH, et al. Hospital-onset COVID-19
392 infection surveillance systems: a systematic review. *J Hosp Infect*. 2021;115:44-50.
- 393 7. Abbas M, Robalo Nunes T, Martischang R, Zingg W, Iten A, Pittet D, et al. Nosocomial
394 transmission and outbreaks of coronavirus disease 2019: the need to protect both patients and
395 healthcare workers. *Antimicrob Resist Infect Control*. 2021;10(1):7-.
- 396 8. Ellingford JM, George R, McDermott JH, Ahmad S, Edgerley JJ, Gokhale D, et al. Genomic and
397 healthcare dynamics of nosocomial SARS-CoV-2 transmission. *Elife*. 2021;10.
- 398 9. Abbas M, Robalo Nunes T, Cori A, Cordey S, Laubscher F, Baggio S, et al. Explosive nosocomial
399 outbreak of SARS-CoV-2 in a rehabilitation clinic: the limits of genomics for outbreak
400 reconstruction. *J Hosp Infect*. 2021;117:124-34.
- 401 10. Klompas M, Baker MA, Rhee C, Tucker R, Fiumara K, Griesbach D, et al. A SARS-CoV-2 Cluster in
402 an Acute Care Hospital. *Ann Intern Med*. 2021;174(6):794-802.

- 403 11. Lucey M, Macori G, Mullane N, Sutton-Fitzpatrick U, Gonzalez G, Coughlan S, et al. Whole-
404 genome Sequencing to Track Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2)
405 Transmission in Nosocomial Outbreaks. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2021;72(11):e727-e35.
- 406 12. Aggarwal D, Myers R, Hamilton WL, Bharucha T, Tumelty NM, Brown CS, et al. The role of viral
407 genomics in understanding COVID-19 outbreaks in long-term care facilities. *Lancet Microbe*.
408 2021.
- 409 13. Mendes A, Serratrice C, Herrmann FR, Genton L, Perivier S, Scheffler M, et al. Predictors of In-
410 Hospital Mortality in Older Patients With COVID-19: The COVIDAge Study. *J Am Med Dir Assoc*.
411 2020;21(11):1546-54 e3.
- 412 14. Swissnoso. Prevention & control of healthcare-associated COVID-19 outbreaks [Available from:
413 [https://www.swissnoso.ch/fileadmin/swissnoso/Dokumente/5_Forschung_und_Entwicklung/6](https://www.swissnoso.ch/fileadmin/swissnoso/Dokumente/5_Forschung_und_Entwicklung/6_Aktuelle_Ereignisse/200515_Prevention_and_control_of_healthcare-associated_COVID-19_outbreaks_V1.0_ENG.pdf)
414 [Aktuelle Ereignisse/200515 Prevention and control of healthcare-associated COVID-](https://www.swissnoso.ch/fileadmin/swissnoso/Dokumente/5_Forschung_und_Entwicklung/6_Aktuelle_Ereignisse/200515_Prevention_and_control_of_healthcare-associated_COVID-19_outbreaks_V1.0_ENG.pdf)
415 [19 outbreaks V1.0 ENG.pdf](https://www.swissnoso.ch/fileadmin/swissnoso/Dokumente/5_Forschung_und_Entwicklung/6_Aktuelle_Ereignisse/200515_Prevention_and_control_of_healthcare-associated_COVID-19_outbreaks_V1.0_ENG.pdf)]. [Accessed 30.06.2020]
- 416 15. Kumar S, Stecher G, Li M, Knyaz C, Tamura K. MEGA X: Molecular Evolutionary Genetics Analysis
417 across Computing Platforms. *Mol Biol Evol*. 2018;35(6):1547-9.
- 418 16. Tamura K. Estimation of the number of nucleotide substitutions when there are strong
419 transition-transversion and G+C-content biases. *Mol Biol Evol*. 1992;9(4):678-87.
- 420 17. Jombart T, Cori A, Didelot X, Cauchemez S, Fraser C, Ferguson N. Bayesian reconstruction of
421 disease outbreaks by combining epidemiologic and genomic data. *PLoS Comput Biol*.
422 2014;10(1):e1003457.
- 423 18. Campbell F, Didelot X, Fitzjohn R, Ferguson N, Cori A, Jombart T. outbreaker2: a modular
424 platform for outbreak reconstruction. *BMC Bioinformatics*. 2018;19(Suppl 11):363.
- 425 19. Meredith LW, Hamilton WL, Warne B, Houldcroft CJ, Hosmillo M, Jahun AS, et al. Rapid
426 implementation of SARS-CoV-2 sequencing to investigate cases of health-care associated
427 COVID-19: a prospective genomic surveillance study. *Lancet Infect Dis*. 2020;20(11):1263-72.

- 428 20. Martischang R, Iten A, Arm I, Abbas M, Meyer B, Yerly S, et al. Severe acute respiratory
429 coronavirus virus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) seroconversion and occupational exposure of employees at a
430 Swiss university hospital: A large longitudinal cohort study. *Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol*.
431 2021;1-8.
- 432 21. Ottolenghi J, McLaren RA, Jr., Bahamon C, Dalloul M, McCalla S, Minkoff H. Health Care
433 Workers' Attitudes Toward Patients With COVID-19. *Open Forum Infect Dis*. 2021;8(8):ofab375.
- 434 22. Evans S, Agnew E, Vynnycky E, Stimson J, Bhattacharya A, Rooney C, et al. The impact of testing
435 and infection prevention and control strategies on within-hospital transmission dynamics of
436 COVID-19 in English hospitals. *Philos Trans R Soc Lond B Biol Sci*. 2021;376(1829):20200268.
- 437 23. Ferretti L, Wymant C, Kendall M, Zhao L, Nurtay A, Abeler-Dorner L, et al. Quantifying SARS-
438 CoV-2 transmission suggests epidemic control with digital contact tracing. *Science*.
439 2020;368(6491).
- 440 24. Myall A, Price JR, Peach RL, Abbas M, Mookerjee S, Zhu N, et al. Predicting hospital-onset
441 COVID-19 infections using dynamic networks of patient contacts: an observational study.
442 *medRxiv*. 2021:2021.09.28.21264240.
- 443 25. Mo Y, Eyre DW, Lumley SF, Walker TM, Shaw RH, O'Donnell D, et al. Transmission of
444 community- and hospital-acquired SARS-CoV-2 in hospital settings in the UK: A cohort study.
445 *PLoS Med*. 2021;18(10):e1003816.
- 446 26. Stirrup O, Hughes J, Parker M, Partridge DG, Shepherd JG, Blackstone J, et al. Rapid feedback on
447 hospital onset SARS-CoV-2 infections combining epidemiological and sequencing data. *Elife*.
448 2021;10.
- 449 27. Arons MM, Hatfield KM, Reddy SC, Kimball A, James A, Jacobs JR, et al. Presymptomatic SARS-
450 CoV-2 Infections and Transmission in a Skilled Nursing Facility. *N Engl J Med*.
451 2020;382(22):2081-90.
- 452 28. Taylor J, Carter RJ, Lehnertz N, Kazazian L, Sullivan M, Wang X, et al. Serial Testing for SARS-CoV-
453 2 and Virus Whole Genome Sequencing Inform Infection Risk at Two Skilled Nursing Facilities

- 454 with COVID-19 Outbreaks - Minnesota, April-June 2020. MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep.
455 2020;69(37):1288-95.
- 456 29. Braun KM, Moreno GK, Buys A, Somsen ED, Bobholz M, Accola MA, et al. Viral Sequencing to
457 Investigate Sources of SARS-CoV-2 Infection in US Healthcare Personnel. Clin Infect Dis.
458 2021;73(6):e1329-e36.
- 459 30. The Lancet Infectious D. COVID-19 vaccine equity and booster doses. Lancet Infect Dis.
460 2021;21(9):1193.
- 461 31. Burugorri-Pierre C, Lafuente-Lafuente C, Oasi C, Lecorche E, Pariel S, Donadio C, et al.
462 Investigation of an Outbreak of COVID-19 in a French Nursing Home With Most Residents
463 Vaccinated. JAMA Netw Open. 2021;4(9):e2125294.
- 464 32. Shitrit P, Zuckerman NS, Mor O, Gottesman BS, Chowers M. Nosocomial outbreak caused by the
465 SARS-CoV-2 Delta variant in a highly vaccinated population, Israel, July 2021. Euro Surveill.
466 2021;26(39).
- 467
- 468

469 **Tables**

470 **Table 1.** Characteristics of CoVID-19 patients with nosocomial acquisition

Characteristics	All patients (N = 49)
Female, n (%)	28 (57.1)
Age, median (IQR)	85.4 (83.5 – 89.3)
Asymptomatic, n (%)	3 (6.1)
Onset of symptoms before swab date, n (%)	12 (24.5)
Days from onset of symptoms to swab, median (IQR)	0 (0-0)
Days from onset of symptoms to swab, mean (SD)	-0.29 (2.19)

471

472

473 **Table 2.** Characteristics of SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR positive HCWs

Characteristics	All HCWs (N = 127)
Female, n (%)	92 (72.4)
Age, median (IQR)	32.0 (43.3 – 54.8)
Profession, n (%)	
Nurse	57 (44.9)
Nurse assistant	39 (30.7)
Doctor	19 (15.0)
Care assistant	4 (3.2)
Transporter	4 (3.2)
Physical therapist	2 (1.6)
Logopedist	1 (0.8)
Medical student	1 (0.8)
Asymptomatic, n (%)	5 (3.9)
<i>missing data for 5</i>	
Days from onset of symptoms to swab, median (IQR)	1 (-2 to 21)
HCWs in Covid-19 wards	1 (1-2)
HCWs in non-Covid (outbreak) wards	1 (0-3)
Days from onset of symptoms to swab, mean (SD)	1.91 (2.86)
HCWs in Covid-19 wards	1.60 (1.78)
HCWs in non-Covid (outbreak) wards	2.88 (4.84)

474

475

476 **Table 3.** Imported cases and secondary infections

Imported case	Probability of importation	Secondary onward transmission	Posterior probability of onward transmission
C115	0.60	C114	0.60
C107	1.00	C131	0.70
		C124	0.39
		H1068	0.16
		H1005	0.33
		H1077	1.00
C123	0.97	H1058	0.89
H1025	0.87	H1085	0.94
H1082	0.83	H1052	0.83
H1110	0.86	H1064	0.32
		H1063	0.60
H1008	0.84	H1059	0.84
H1073	1.00		
H1015	1.00		
H1011	0.66	H1019	0.62
H1012	1.00		
H1013	1.00		
H1122	0.86	C113	0.57
H1057	0.50	C153	0.50
H1048	1.00		
H1021	1.00	H1017	1.00

477

478

479 **Figure legends**

480 **Figure 1.**

481 Epidemic curve of the nosocomial COVID-19 outbreak in a geriatric hospital involving HCWs and
482 patients.

483

484 **Figure 2.**

485 Phylogenetic tree of SARS-CoV-2 genome sequences. The tree includes 148 sequences related to the
486 outbreak (patient and employee sequences are named C1xx [blue] and H10xx [red], respectively),
487 alongside the community cases in the canton of Geneva, Switzerland, that were sequenced in
488 March-April 2020 by the Laboratory of Virology (Geneva University Hospitals) and submitted to
489 GISAID (virus names and accession ID (i.e. EPI_ISL_) are indicated) in the context of an
490 epidemiological surveillance. For each sequence the date of the sample collection is mentioned
491 (yyyy-mm-dd).

492

493 **Figure 3.**

494 Ancestry reconstruction (who infected whom) of the `outbreaker2` model. Infectors are on the
495 vertical axis and infectees are on the horizontal axis. Each bubble represents the posterior
496 probability of each infector-infectee transmission pair. The bottom row denotes the probability that
497 an infectee was in fact an imported case. Patients and employees are named C1xx and H10xx,
498 respectively.

499

500 **Figure 4.**

501 Histograms of distribution of secondary cases by each case type (“HCW_{covid}”, HCWs working in Covid-
502 19 wards; “HCW_{outbreak}”, HCWs working in outbreak wards; “patient_{noso}”, patients with hospital-

503 acquired Covid-19; “patient_{community}”, patients with community-acquired Covid-19) and stratified
504 according to early (up to April 09, 2020) and late phases (as of April 10, 2020). Number of cases in
505 early phase: HCW_{outbreak} 19, HCW_{covid} 43, patient_{noso} 25, patient_{community} 1. Number of cases in late
506 phase: HCW_{outbreak} 7, HCW_{covid} 36, patient_{noso} 17, patient_{community} 0.

507


508 **Figure 5.**

509 Proportions of transmissions (f_{case}) attributed to each case type (HCW_{covid}, HCW_{outbreak}, patient_{noso},
510 patient_{community}) proportion of infections attributed to the type of case for each of the 1000 posterior
511 trees retained. The blue histograms indicate the expected random distributions of f_{ward} , given the
512 prevalence of each type of case. The red histograms show the observed distribution of f_{ward} , across
513 1000 transmission trees reconstructed by `outbreaker2`. **A.** All cases. **B.** Transmission to HCWs in
514 Covid-19 wards only. **C.** Transmission to HCWs in non-Covid-19 wards (i.e. outbreak wards) only. **D.**
515 Transmission to patients with nosocomial Covid-19 only.

516


517


518



C116|2020-04-06
H1100|2020-04-07
C127|2020-04-07
C108|2020-04-08
C129|2020-04-08
H1005|2020-04-08
H1106|2020-04-08
H1067|2020-04-09
C146|2020-04-10
H1026|2020-04-10
H1068|2020-04-10
C135|2020-04-11
H1069|2020-04-12
H1027|2020-04-13
C140|2020-04-14
C141|2020-04-14
C143|2020-04-14
H1086|2020-04-15
H1018|2020-04-16
H1029|2020-04-17
H1060|2020-04-17
H1070|2020-04-18
A9946G
54
H1089|2020-04-19
H1090|2020-04-19
H1080|2020-04-20
H1081|2020-04-22
H1108|2020-04-29
H1030|2020-05-01
H1039|2020-05-04
H1101|2020-04-06
C133|2020-04-06
C149|2020-04-13
C139|2020-04-14
H1072|2020-04-16
H1088|2020-04-19
H1046|2020-04-20
H1049|2020-04-20
H1062|2020-04-20
H1120|2020-04-27
H1099|2020-03-30
C138|2020-04-22
H1038|2020-05-02
G3955T
64
H1009|2020-05-03
H1040|2020-05-04
G22249T
H1010|2020-05-07
C107|2020-03-23
H1077|2020-04-03
hCoV-19/Switzerland/GE5737/2020|EPI ISL 429200|2020-03-19
hCoV-19/Switzerland/GE6099/2020|EPI ISL 429221|2020-04-06
hCoV-19/Switzerland/GE3655/2020|EPI ISL 429222|2020-04-07
C124|2020-03-26
C125|2020-03-26
C4780T
66
H1001|2020-03-30
H1092|2020-03-31
H1096|2020-04-12
C123|2020-03-26
H1058|2020-04-02
H1047|2020-04-10
H1036|2020-04-11
H1045|2020-04-12
100
C136|2020-04-15
H1037|2020-04-21
H1053|2020-04-10
H1061|2020-04-17
hCoV-19/Switzerland/GE8086/2020|EPI ISL 429213|2020-03-16
H1034|2020-04-07
H1013|2020-04-05
C131|2020-04-06
H1079|2020-04-13
H1073|2020-04-18
66
hCoV-19/Switzerland/GE1736/2020|EPI ISL 429203|2020-03-21
H1057|2020-04-10
100
C153|2020-04-16
H1024|2020-03-12
H1091|2020-03-13
C101|2020-03-16
H1043|2020-03-18
hCoV-19/Switzerland/GE2164/2020|EPI ISL 429208|2020-03-17
C109|2020-03-12
hCoV-19/Switzerland/GE0056/2020|EPI ISL 429212|2020-03-24
C106|2020-03-27
H1023|2020-03-11
hCoV-19/Switzerland/GE3144/2020|EPI ISL 429196|2020-03-18
hCoV-19/Switzerland/GE2759/2020|EPI ISL 429214|2020-03-23
hCoV-19/Switzerland/GE5708/2020|EPI ISL 429211|2020-03-24
26
H1002|2020-03-31
hCoV-19/Switzerland/GE7617/2020|EPI ISL 429204|2020-04-03
72
H1014|2020-04-08
H1084|2020-04-09
C5239T
H1078|2020-04-04
H1035|2020-04-10
64
H1074|2020-03-19
H1087|2020-04-17
46
H1011|2020-04-13
56
H1019|2020-04-17
H1012|2020-03-17
H1017|2020-04-15
H1020|2020-04-21
100
H1021|2020-04-24
H1054|2020-04-16
70
H1055|2020-04-05
H1076|2020-03-31
60
hCoV-19/Switzerland/GE0304/2020|EPI ISL 429218|2020-04-02
hCoV-19/Switzerland/GE2453/2020|EPI ISL 429219|2020-04-03
C28854T
A20268G
78
hCoV-19/Switzerland/GE8147/2020|EPI ISL 429210|2020-03-16
hCoV-19/Switzerland/GE0199-2/2020|EPI ISL 429197|2020-03-21
H1048|2020-04-11
100
C104|2020-03-23
C121|2020-03-27
H1003|2020-04-01
H1033|2020-04-03
H1044|2020-04-03
H1097|2020-04-05
C148|2020-04-12
C150|2020-04-13
H1113|2020-04-06
44
H1004|2020-04-07
42
88
H1006|2020-04-08
36
C401T
G25429T
94
H1025|2020-03-27
H1085|2020-04-10
H1031|2020-04-07
H1063|2020-03-11
H1064|2020-03-12
H1041|2020-03-15
hCoV-19/Switzerland/GE-HUG-30103224/2020|EPI ISL 6700198|2020-03-16
C102|2020-03-21
H1051|2020-04-03
H1110|2020-04-03
H1083|2020-04-06
H1095|2020-04-11
C147|2020-04-12
H1032|2020-04-12
H1065|2020-03-17
H1066|2020-03-21
hCoV-19/Switzerland/GE4807/2020|EPI ISL 429215|2020-03-23
hCoV-19/Switzerland/GE6065/2020|EPI ISL 429220|2020-04-06
H1094|2020-04-06
H1015|2020-04-10
62
H1028|2020-04-13
H1050|2020-04-05
H1042|2020-04-06
H1123|2020-04-07
C119|2020-04-07
C137|2020-04-11
H1016|2020-04-11
H1116|2020-04-15
H1075|2020-03-29
C122|2020-04-08
C118|2020-04-08
62
C144|2020-04
C145|2020-04
C18570T
C132|2020-04
98
C115|2020-03-25
C114|2020-03-26
42
hCoV-19/Switzerland/GE0636/2020|EPI ISL 429199|2020-03-22
88
hCoV-19/Switzerland/GE2297/2020|EPI ISL 429201|2020-03-29
C117|2020-03-27
C2416T
50
C111|2020-03-16
H1007|2020-03-28
H1022|2020-03-23
40
58
C105|2020-03-26
H1093|2020-04-06
H1056|2020-04-08
hCoV-19/Switzerland/GE5007/2020|EPI ISL 429206|2020-04-07
H1008|2020-04-06
94
H1059|2020-04-11
hCoV-19/Switzerland/GE-621901/2020|EPI ISL 738085|2020-03-17
hCoV-19/Switzerland/GE3650/2020|EPI ISL 429209|2020-03-16
hCoV-19/Switzerland/GE1184/2020|EPI ISL 429207|2020-04-03
H1082|2020-04-02
94
hCoV-19/Switzerland/GE-HUG-30248872/2020|EPI ISL 6700199|2020-04-03
H1052|2020-04-07
G4504T
C10156T
C14220T

medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.01.07.22268729>; this version posted January 10, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license.





Proportions of infections by different case types

HCW_{covid}

HCW_{outbreak}

patient_{noso}

medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.01.07.22268729>; this version posted January 10, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a [CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/).

