

1 Using routinely collected hospital data to investigate healthcare worker
2 mobility and patient contacts within a UK hospital during the COVID-19
3 pandemic

4 Jared K Wilson-Aggarwal¹, Nick Gotts¹, Wai Keong Wong², Chris Liddington², Simon Knight², Moira J
5 Spyer^{3,4}, Catherine Houlihan^{3,4}, Eleni Nastouli^{3,4}†, Ed Manley^{1*}

6 *Corresponding author

7 †Eleni Nastouli on behalf of the SAFER investigators

8 ¹School of Geography, University of Leeds, Woodhouse, Leeds LS2 9JT, United Kingdom

9 ²Department of Digital Healthcare Technology, University College London Hospitals NHS Foundation
10 Trust, London, UK

11 ³Department of Infection, Immunity and Inflammation, UCL GOS Institute of Child Health University
12 College London, London, UK

13 ⁴ Department of Clinical Virology, University College London Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust,
14 London, UK

15 *Key words: nosocomial infections, healthcare-associated infections, healthcare workers, COVID-19,*
16 *mobility, patient contacts, infection control, behaviour change*

17

18

Abstract

19 Movement and contacts are central to the transmission of infectious diseases and, within the
20 hospital setting, healthcare worker (HCW) mobility and their contact with patients play an important
21 role in the spread of nosocomial disease. Yet data relating to HCW behaviours associated with
22 mobility and contacts in the healthcare environment are often limited. This paper proposes a
23 framework for integrating several electronic data sources routinely-collected by modern hospitals,
24 to enable the measurement of HCW behaviours relevant to the transmission of infections. Using
25 data from a London teaching hospital during the COVID-19 pandemic, we demonstrate how, at an
26 aggregate level, electronic medical records (EMRs) and door access logs can be used to establish
27 changes in HCW mobility and patient contacts. In addition, to show the utility of these data sources
28 in supporting infection prevention and control (IPC), we investigate changes in the indirect
29 connectivity of patients (resulting from shared contacts with HCWs) and spatial connectivity of floors
30 (owing to the movements of HCWs). Average daily rates of patient contacts are computed and found
31 to be higher throughout the pandemic compared to that pre-pandemic, while the average daily rates
32 of HCW mobility remained stable until the second wave, where they surpassed pre-pandemic levels.
33 The response of HCW behaviour to the pandemic was not equal between floors, whereby the
34 highest increases in patient contacts and mobility were on floors handling the majority of COVID-19
35 patients. The first wave of COVID-19 patients resulted in changes to the flow of HCWs between
36 floors, but the interconnectivity between COVID-19 and non COVID-19 wards was evident
37 throughout the pandemic. Daily rates of indirect contact between patients provided evidence for
38 reactive staff cohorting, whereby indirect contact rates between COVID-19 positive and negative
39 patients were lowest during peaks in COVID-19 hospital admissions. We propose that IPC
40 practitioners use these routinely collected data on HCW behaviour to support infection control
41 activities and to help better protect hospital staff and patients from nosocomial outbreaks of
42 communicable diseases.

43

Introduction

44 Human mobility and contact are significant drivers for the transmission of communicable diseases,
45 such as severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) that resulted in the COVID-19
46 pandemic (Buckee et al., 2021). While passively collected mobile phone and app-derived GPS
47 trajectory data provide an indication of populations' mobility and social mixing patterns (Ross et al.,
48 2021), only broad regional generalisations can be drawn. Transmission of SARS-CoV-2 occurs
49 through close proximity between infectious and susceptible individuals due to either direct contact
50 or respiratory aerosols in the shared space (Rahman et al., 2020). Therefore, insights into behaviours
51 at a fine scale, such as within indoor environments, are also required to deepen our understanding
52 of behaviours associated with the transmission of infections, and improve our ability to identify and
53 prevent transmission events. This is particularly relevant for healthcare settings, where infection
54 outbreaks present a significant risk to vulnerable patients through increased morbidity and
55 mortality.

56 The concern in relation to infection transmission within hospital environments extends more widely
57 than COVID-19, and includes other healthcare-associated infections (HAIs). The impact of HAIs on
58 healthcare systems is considerable, resulting in staff illness, complications in patient outcomes and
59 increasing healthcare costs. In England between 2016-2017, HAIs were estimated to have caused
60 >28,000 deaths, contributed to 21% of hospital bed days, resulted in >79,000 days of absence in
61 frontline HCWs and cost the NHS an estimated £2.7 billion (Guest et al., 2020). The surveillance
62 prevention and control of HAIs is a challenge as granular data are often limited and the transmission
63 pathways are highly variable; dependent on the epidemiology of the pathogen, be it bacterium, virus
64 or fungus (Khan et al., 2015, 2017).

65 Nosocomial infections in patients are well defined, as are frameworks for their prevention and
66 control (Loveday et al., 2014). To manage HAIs in patients, practitioners responsible for infection
67 prevention and control (IPC) frequently use passive data sources that are routinely collected, such as

68 medical records. These data sources provide information on the patient's location within the
69 hospital and their contacts with staff, which can be used to support surveillance, mapping patient
70 trajectories and contact tracing (Murray et al., 2017; Price et al., 2021; Rewley et al., 2020).
71 Historically these data sources have been handled manually, using time intensive frameworks that
72 prevent their use in real-time. Hospitals that have moved to digital systems have seen an increase in
73 the effectiveness and efficiency of patient focused IPC, through improved availability of data
74 resources and reduced burdens of manual data collection and processing (Chen et al., 2019; Russo et
75 al., 2018). However, while these data streams are well established for patient focused activities,
76 those for the management of HAIs in HCWs are relatively underdeveloped. This is surprising given
77 that, like patients, HCWs are at risk of both acquiring and facilitating the transmission of HAIs
78 (Huttunen & Syrjänen, 2014).

79 The rapid spread of SARS-CoV-2 has emphasized the need to protect front-line HCWs. Early in the
80 pandemic the prevalence of COVID-19 infection for HCWs was high, with one London hospital
81 reporting infection in 44% of HCWs (Houlihan et al., 2020) and a global estimation of 11% of HCWs
82 infected with the virus (Gómez-Ochoa et al., 2021). What's more, the risk of infection for HCWs
83 varied between roles and spatially, with a higher risk of infection for those working in non-
84 emergency wards and for nurses (Gómez-Ochoa et al., 2021). Nosocomial outbreaks of SARS-CoV-2
85 result from a small number of highly infectious individuals, and transmission chains may include
86 HCWs among the likely 'super-spreaders' (Lumley et al., 2021). Behavioural processes, such as
87 contact and mobility patterns, generate heterogeneity in the transmission of communicable diseases
88 (Arthur et al., 2017; Buckee et al., 2021) and, similar to the management of HAIs in patients,
89 passively collected data on the within-hospital behaviours of HCWs can contribute to a more
90 informed and rapid response to outbreaks.

91 HCW behaviours have been investigated using surveys (English et al., 2018), observations (Weigl et
92 al., 2009; Westbrook et al., 2011) and tracking technologies (Butler et al., 2018; Hertzberg et al.,

93 2017; Oussaid et al., 2016; Vanhems et al., 2013), but these data collection methods are often
94 prohibitively time intensive, expensive, or only provide a snapshot view that is not hospital wide.
95 Electronic medical records (EMRs) have also been previously used to investigate HCW space use and
96 patient contacts (Curtis et al., 2013; Illingworth et al., 2022), but they are either optimised for
97 reconstructing patient trajectories or suffer from high spatial uncertainty. Additional databases, such
98 as door access logs could complement EMRs by supplementing spatiotemporal information on HCW
99 mobility. These data sources are analogous in nature to the passively-collected spatial data from
100 mobile phone records, which were used during the COVID-19 pandemic to demonstrate the
101 effectiveness of movement restrictions in reducing contact rates, and subsequently lowering levels
102 of community transmission (Nouvellet et al., 2021). Using the routinely collected hospital data as an
103 indicator for HCW behaviour provides opportunities to enhance evidence based IPC in a similar way;
104 supporting contact tracing efforts, validating transmission pathways and helping to monitor the
105 effectiveness of interventions in the hospital.

106 As with other communicable diseases, IPC interventions to prevent nosocomial outbreaks of COVID-
107 19 include hand washing, the use of personal protective equipment (PPE), limiting the traffic of
108 people in the hospital, and cohorting staff and patients (Ahmad & Osei, 2021). The routinely
109 collected data cannot identify or monitor all HCW behaviours that are epidemiologically relevant,
110 but can indicate their level of space use within the hospital, their frequency of movement, the
111 number of patients they contact and the frequency of patient contact. As behavioural markers these
112 metrics provide quantitative measures for IPC interventions aimed specifically at reducing the spatial
113 connectivity of spaces (e.g. by restricting staff access/flow to areas) and social connectivity of
114 individuals in the hospital (e.g. through patient and/or staff cohorting). The data can therefore be
115 used to assess the extent to which interventions targeted towards HCW mobility and patient
116 contacts have been successful in achieving their aim, or in determining opportunities for
117 improvement.

118 This paper outlines a framework for the use of routinely-collected hospital data in the measurement
119 of HCW behaviour. We describe (1) the integration of diverse digital data sources for the
120 quantification of HCW mobility and patient contact within the hospital setting, and (2) demonstrate
121 the use of these data sources in supporting IPC activities through a series of analyses. Specifically, we
122 use data from a London Hospital during the COVID-19 pandemic to measure at an aggregate level
123 how (i) the temporal and spatial patterns of HCW mobility and patient contacts, (ii) spatial
124 connectivity (flow between floors) and (iii) indirect contacts between patients (through shared HCW
125 contacts) changed during the COVID-19 pandemic.

126

Methodology

127 Study site and context

128 University College London Hospital NHS Trust (UCLH) is a large acute and tertiary referral academic
129 hospital located in central London. The Main UCLH building is comprised of a central Tower that has
130 19 floors (floors -2 to 16) and is linked to two other buildings; the Podium and the Elizabeth Garrett
131 Anderson (EGA) Wing.

132 In this analysis, we only considered data for the Tower building at UCLH. Here we describe floors
133 within the Tower by the ward/department that predominantly occupies it; the basement (floor-2),
134 imaging (floor -1), emergency department (ED on floor 0), acute medicine unit (AMU on floor 1), day
135 surgery (floor 2), critical care (floor 3), plant (floor 4), nuclear medicine (floor 5), short stay surgery
136 (floors 6), hyper-acute stroke unit (HASU on floor 7), respiratory & infectious diseases (floor 8),
137 general surgery (floor 9), care of the elderly (CoE on floor 10), paediatrics (floor 11), adolescents
138 (floor 12), oncology (floor 13), head and neck (floor 14), private wards (floor 15) and haematology
139 (floor 16).

140 During the pandemic the UCLH Tower became a key site for COVID-19 care in London, and the peaks
141 in the number of COVID-19 patients in the Tower (Figure 1C), closely followed that reported for all
142 London hospitals (as downloaded from gov.uk; $r = 0.97$). To investigate changes in the daily number
143 of events in different stages of the pandemic, we manually identified four distinct time periods
144 based on the number of COVID-19 patients in the Tower. The first time period identified was January
145 1st– February 28th 2020, which was considered pre-pandemic or the ‘baseline’, as this was prior to
146 the substantial rise in COVID-19 admissions in the hospital, so ‘normal’ patterns of movement and
147 patient contacts would be expected. The second time period was March 1st– June 30th 2020, when
148 the ‘first wave’ of COVID-19 hospital admissions was experienced, during which the WHO declared a
149 pandemic (March 11th 2020) and the first national lockdown in England was announced (23rd March
150 2020). The third time period was July 1st– August 31st 2020, which represented the ‘summer lull’,

151 where the number of COVID-19 patients in London hospitals remained at a low level and community
152 interventions were eased. The fourth time period was November 1st 2020 - March 31st 2021, when
153 the ‘second wave’ of COVID-19 hospital admissions occurred, the second national lockdown was
154 announced (5th November 2020) and the mass-vaccination programme began (December 8th 2020).

155 *Data sources*

156 The data sources used in this study were selected on the basis of providing spatial and temporal
157 indicators of staff movement and patient contacts within the hospital. For clarity, Table 1 provides
158 definitions of terms relating to behavioural processes that are investigated in this study.

159 Table 1 Definitions and data sources for behavioural processes relating to healthcare worker activity
160 in the healthcare environment.

Behavioural process	Definition	Data source
Mobility	The frequency of movement exhibited by individuals/populations between discrete locations.	Security door access logs
Direct patient contact	Face to face interactions between healthcare workers and patients.	Electronic medical records
Indirect contact	The secondary contact between individuals resulting from their direct contact with others.	Electronic medical records
Social connectivity	The relationship between individuals, as determined by their direct and/or indirect contacts.	Electronic medical records
Spatial connectivity	The relationship between discrete locations, as determined by the spatial activity of individuals.	Security door access logs & electronic medical records

161

162 *Electronic medical records (EMRs):* Patient contact events in EMRs were extracted from Epic, a
163 privately owned hospital system used by UCLH for managing medical records. While Epic contains a
164 large volume of data on patient diagnosis and treatment, we only use specific fields that provide

165 information on the spatial and temporal attributes of within-hospital contacts between staff and
166 patients. Data fields included the datetime of events, a description of the location (bed ID and floor),
167 an indicator of the event type, anonymous identifiers for the patient, pseudonymous identifiers for
168 the HCW and the COVID-19 status of the patient at the time of the event (0/1).

169 *Card access logs:* Door events were extracted from the database for security door access logs,
170 known in this context as CCure. Data fields included the datetime of events, a description of the
171 location (door ID and floor), direction of passage (in/out), status (accepted/rejected) and a
172 pseudonymous staff identifier.

173 *Data Processing*

174 *Data cleaning:* All data processing was conducted in R (R Core Team, 2020). Data for events outside
175 the UCLH Tower were discarded. Data for the month of October 2020, a weekend in July and
176 another in November were also discarded, as records either could not be extracted or had an
177 unusually low number of events (indicating an issue with extraction). Contact events in EMRs that
178 did not require face to face contacts (e.g. 'Telephone' or 'Letter') were excluded. Door events with a
179 rejected status were removed along with duplicate events in the same direction that were within 60
180 seconds of each other. Two types of lift (or elevator) events were present in the door access logs;
181 'Lift Calls' where a card is used to request a lift, and 'Lift commands' where a card is used before
182 selecting which floor to go to. All 'Lift Call' events were removed as they overinflate the number of
183 movement events for individuals using lifts (because some individuals may make multiple and
184 repeated lift calls while waiting for a lift).

185 *Aggregate measures:* Staffing levels, $|H|$, were determined by summing the number of distinct
186 HCWs, h , in the set of HCW IDs identifiable in the routinely collected data, H . Staffing levels were
187 calculated for each day, t , stage of the pandemic, $Stage$, and for each floor, f , and the entire
188 building. For each stage of the pandemic the mean daily staffing levels, \overline{H} , were calculated for the
189 entire building and each floor. Similarly, patient levels, $|P|$, were calculated by summing the number

190 of distinct patients, p , in the set of patient IDs identifiable in the data, P , for each day, and the mean
191 daily patient levels, \bar{P} , calculated for the entire building, and for each floor, during each stage of the
192 pandemic. The same metrics were also calculated using the subset of patients known to be positive
193 for COVID-19, $P^{Positive}$.

194 Door events, m , were used as an indicator of HCW behaviour in terms of their mobility, where M is
195 the full set of door events. The number of door events, $|M|$, was used as an absolute measure of
196 HCW mobility and was calculated for the entire building and each floor on each day. There was a
197 strong correlation between daily HCW mobility and daily staffing levels ($r = 0.94$) and therefore, to
198 control for changes in staffing levels, the rate of mobility, Mr , was calculated as a function of staffing
199 levels, where:

$$200 \quad Mr_{t,f} = \frac{|M_{t,f}|}{|H_{t,f}|}$$

201 To compare mobility levels between stages of the pandemic, the mean daily mobility, \bar{M} , and the
202 mean daily rate of mobility, \overline{Mr} , were calculated for the entire building and for each floor during the
203 different stages of the pandemic.

204 Patient contact events, c , were used as an indicator of HCW behaviour in terms of patient
205 engagement where C is the full set of patient contacts. The number of patient contacts, $|C|$, was
206 used as an absolute measure and was calculated for the entire building and each floor on each day.
207 There was a correlation between daily patient contacts and daily patient levels ($r = 0.65$), and
208 therefore we also calculated the daily rate of patient contacts, Cr , as a function of patient levels,
209 where:

$$210 \quad Cr_{t,f} = \frac{|C_{t,f}|}{|P_{t,f}|}$$

211 To compare levels of patient engagement between stages of the pandemic, the mean daily number
212 of patient contacts, \bar{C} , and the mean daily rate of patient contacts, $\bar{C}r$, were calculated for the entire
213 building and for each floor during the different stages of the pandemic.

214 To investigate the weekly and hourly patterns of mobility and patient engagement, a count for the
215 number of door events and patient contacts was made for each hour, hr , of each weekday, w , and
216 separately for the different stages of the pandemic. These counts were then weighted by dividing
217 them by the number of days each weekday appeared in the dataset.

218 *Changes in time and space:* To investigate how the measures of daily HCW behaviour, staffing levels
219 and patient levels differed from that pre-pandemic (baseline), on each floor and within the entire
220 building, the normalised difference to baseline, N , was calculated for each day e.g. normalised
221 difference to baseline for HCW mobility across the entire building, N_t^M , where:

$$222 \quad N_t^M = \frac{(|M_t| - \bar{M}_{Baseline})}{|M_t|}$$

223 The normalised difference to baseline was also calculated for the averaged values for HCW
224 behaviour during each stage of the pandemic. N can be interpreted as proportional change, but is
225 presented as percentage change in the results.

226 *Spatial connectivity:* To assess the relationship between floors, a dyadic analysis was conducted for
227 the different stages of the pandemic. For each spatial dyad (e.g. floors 1 & 2, floors 1 & 3 etc.) and
228 using both door events and patient contacts, the number of HCWs that were active on both floors in
229 any single day was extracted where:

$$230 \quad dyad_{t,f,i} = |H_{t,f} \cap H_{t,i}|$$

231 The index of the second floor in the dyad is denoted i . The resulting matrix was then treated as a
232 weighted network with the diagonal set to zero. The Louvain clustering algorithm was used to
233 identify floors that had stronger links. Louvain clustering is a hierarchical greedy modularity

234 maximization-based approach (Blondel et al., 2008) and was implemented using the R package
235 'igraph' v1.2.7 (Csardi & Nepusz, 2006). Lift events were excluded from this analysis as it was not
236 possible to identify the floor on which they occurred.

237 *Patient connectivity*: Patient connectivity, S , was determined by identifying the number of COVID-19
238 negative patients each patient was indirectly in contact with through shared contacts with the same
239 HCWs on the same day. This was achieved by first identifying the set of HCWs that had contact with
240 the j th patient on each day, where:

$$241 \quad H_{j,t} = \{h : C_t(p_j, h) = 1\}$$

242 Next the set of patients not known to be positive for COVID-19, $P^{Negative}$, and that had also been in
243 contact with any of the HCWs in $H_{j,t}$ were identified, where:

$$244 \quad P_{j,t}^{Negative} = \{p : p \in P_t^{Negative}, p \neq p_j, \exists h \in H_{j,t} | C_t(p, h) = 1\}$$

245 S was then calculated for each patient as a proportion of all patients not known to be positive for
246 COVID-19, and expressed as a percentage in the results where:

$$247 \quad S_{j,t} = \frac{|P_{j,t}^{Negative}|}{|P_t^{Negative}|}$$

248 For each day and stage of the pandemic, we made separate calculations for the average patient
249 connectivity of patients not known to be positive for COVID-19, $\bar{S}^{Negative}$, and COVID-19 positive
250 patients, $\bar{S}^{Positive}$.

251

252

Results

253 Data were analysed for 7,975 HCWs that had logged door events and/or patient contacts in the
254 UCLH Tower building between January 2020 and March 2021. In total, 5,510,359 door events and
255 6,574,590 patient contacts were recorded. During the entire observation period, 21,133 patients
256 were detected in the routinely collected data, of which 8% were positive for COVID-19. Table 2
257 provides a summary for the different stages of the pandemic.

258 In the following sections we describe the temporal and spatial patterns in the behaviour of HCWs,
259 and how these changed throughout the pandemic. We also describe epidemiologically relevant
260 changes in the patterns of spatial connectivity and indirect contacts between patients.

261

262 Table 2: Summary for indicators of healthcare worker staffing levels, mobility and patient contacts in the Tower building of University College London Hospital during the
 263 COVID-19 pandemic. For each stage of the pandemic, the duration in days is reported along with the total number and average daily count of healthcare workers, patients,
 264 patients positive for COVID-19 (COVID-19⁺), door events, patient contacts, and contacts with COVID-19⁺. The mean daily rate of door events (per healthcare worker) and
 265 mean daily rate of patient contacts (per patient) are also reported. For counts involving COVID-19⁺, the percentage of all patients/contacts are provided in brackets.

	Baseline Jan – Feb 2020	First wave March – June 2020	Summer lull July – Aug 2020	Second wave Nov 2020 – March 2021	Overall
Days	61	123	91	147	422
No. of staff $ H $	4,763	5,526	5,089	6,107	7,975
Avg. daily staffing levels \bar{H}	1,373	1,235	1,213	1,302	-
No. of patients $ P $	6,522	5,695	5,814	7,926	21,133
No. of COVID patients $ P^{Positive} $ (% of all patients)	35 (1%)	565 (10%)	63 (1%)	1082 (14%)	1,688 (8%)
Avg. daily patient levels \bar{P}	587	330	403	434	-
No. of events $ M $	795,057	1,598,378	1,095,257	2,021,667	5,510,359
Avg. daily no. of events \bar{M}	13,034	12,995	12,036	13,753	-
Avg. daily rate of events \overline{Mr}	10	11	10	11	-
No. of contacts $ C $	1,025,271	1,572,340	1,305,838	2,671,141	6,574,590
Avg. daily no. of contacts \bar{C}	16,808	12,783	14,350	18,171	-
Avg. daily rate of contact \overline{Cr}	29	41	36	42	-
No. of contacts with COVID-19+ $ C^{Positive} $ (% of all contacts)	37,393 (4%)	527,986 (34%)	42,801 (3%)	996,440 (37%)	1,604,620 (24%)
Avg. daily no. of COVID-19+ contacts $\bar{C}^{Positive}$	613	4293	470	6779	-
Avg. daily rate of COVID-19+ contacts $\overline{Cr}^{Positive}$	51	69	50	73	-

267 *Temporal dynamics*

268 During the baseline period, the daily number of door events and patient contacts showed clear
269 temporal regularity, whereby the number of events was highest during weekdays (Figure 1A). These
270 peaks were in line with the daily pattern of staff and patient numbers in the hospital, both of which
271 also showed weekday highs (Figure 1B). The hourly number of door events were highest on
272 weekdays between 7am-5pm, but this peak was less prominent at weekends (Figure 2A). Regardless
273 of the day, the hourly number of patient contacts peaked once at 10am and again at 6pm (Figure
274 2E). These temporal patterns demonstrate the utility of the routinely collected data in depicting the
275 global activity levels of HCWs, which will underline the nature of staff working patterns within the
276 hospital.


277 During the first wave of COVID-19 patients (Figure 1C), the average daily number of staff with
278 evidence of activity in the hospital fell by 10% compared to pre-pandemic levels. The average daily
279 number of patients in the hospital dropped sharply, down by 44%. This coincided with a 24%
280 decrease in the average daily number of patient contacts logged by HCWs, which was associated
281 with a less prominent pattern in the weekly and hourly counts of contacts (Figure 2F). However, the
282 per patient rate of daily contact was 41% higher than at baseline (i.e. on average patients in the first
283 wave had more contact events with HCWs per day than that logged pre-pandemic). In contrast, the
284 average daily number, rate and hourly pattern of door events remained relatively consistent
285 ($N_{Firstwave}^M < 1\%$; $N_{Firstwave}^{Mr} = 1\%$; Figure 2B), which is surprising given the reduced staff levels.

286 In the summer lull, when there were fewer COVID-19 patients in the hospital, the average daily
287 staffing levels and patient numbers remained below baseline levels ($N_{Summertull}^H = -12\%$;
288 $N_{Summertull}^P = -31\%$). While the daily number and hourly pattern of patient contacts began to return
289 towards that seen pre-pandemic, the average daily count of events remained lower than baseline
290 levels ($N_{Summertull}^C = -15\%$), and the rate of contact was maintained above that seen at baseline
291 ($N_{Summertull}^{Cr} = 24\%$). The average daily number of door events was 8% lower than baseline levels,


292 and this was due to lower weekday peaks, while the rate of mobility remained similar to the pre-
293 pandemic rate ($N_{Summertull}^{Mr} < 1\%$).

294 During the second wave, both the average daily number of patients and staff in the hospital
295 remained lower than that at baseline ($N_{Secondwave}^P = -26\%$; $N_{Secondwave}^H = -5\%$). However, it is worth
296 noting how daily staffing levels, after an initial drop during the Christmas break, followed the rise
297 and fall of COVID-19 patients in the hospital, emphasising a different strategy by the hospital to that
298 in the first wave where staff numbers were reduced. The second wave of COVID-19 patients also
299 coincided with an increase in the daily number and rate of patient contacts and door events, all of
300 which exceeded baseline levels ($N_{Secondwave}^C = 8\%$; $N_{Secondwave}^{Cr} = 45\%$; $N_{Secondwave}^M = 6\%$;
301 $N_{Secondwave}^{Mr} = 1\%$).

302



303 Figure 1: Daily counts for indicators of healthcare worker behaviour, staffing levels and patient numbers in the Tower building of University College London hospital during
 304 the COVID-19 pandemic. Plot A shows the activity of healthcare workers in the hospital as characterised by the daily count of door events (green) and patient contacts
 305 (blue) logged in routinely collected electronic data sources. Plot B shows daily counts for the number of healthcare workers (black) and patients (grey) identified in the
 306 data. Plot C shows the number of COVID-19 patients in the hospital, which was used to determine the different stages of the pandemic; Baseline (pre-pandemic), first
 307 wave, summer lull and second wave. Data for October 2020 was not available.



308 Figure 2: Heat maps for the number of door events and patient contacts at different hours of the day and week for healthcare workers at the Tower building of University
 309 College London Hospital during the COVID-19 pandemic. Plots A-D are for the number of door events and plots E-H are for patient contacts. Yellow cells represent a higher
 310 density of events and blue cells represent a lower density; to allow comparison between each stage of the pandemic, the colour gradient is relative to the maximum weight
 311 across all time periods.

312 *Spatial-temporal dynamics*

313 The pattern in the rate of mobility (as measured by the daily number of door events corrected for
314 the number of HCWs) and rate of patient contacts (as measured by the daily number of logged
315 patient contact events corrected for the number of patients) for HCWs on each floor of the Tower,
316 differed in response to the pandemic (Table 3). Here we focus on the behaviour of HCWs on the six
317 floors identified as key COVID-19 wards and that handled the majority ($\geq 15\%$) of COVID-19 patients
318 (Figure 3, see Figure S1 for non COVID-19 wards); the AMU (floor 1), critical care (floor 3), HASU
319 (floor 7), respiratory diseases (floor 8), general surgery (floor 9) and CoE (floor 10).

320 The daily rate of mobility for HCWs during the first wave was, on average, higher on all COVID-19
321 floors compared to baseline levels. During the summer lull, the daily average rate of mobility on
322 AMU and General surgery fell below baseline levels, while HCW mobility on all other COVID-19 floors
323 increased, with the most notable increase on HASU ($N_{Floor7}^M = 101\%$). In response to the second
324 wave of COVID-19 patients, the rate of mobility increased further above baseline levels on floors
325 with HASU, Respiratory disease, General surgery and CoE, while HCW mobility was only marginally
326 below baseline levels on AMU and Critical care.

327 During the first wave and compared to pre-pandemic levels, the average daily rate of patient contact
328 increased on AMU, Critical care, HASU and Respiratory disease. In contrast, the rate of patient
329 contact was lower on average for General surgery and CoE, both of which had a period of days in
330 May with zero contacts logged, which may indicate that the floors were closed during this period. In
331 the summer lull and with the exception of HASU, the average daily rate of patient contact was higher
332 than baseline levels for all COVID-19 floors. The rise in COVID-19 patients in the second wave
333 coincided with a further increase in the rate of patient contact on all COVID-19 floors, with the most
334 notable increase on HASU ($N_{Floor7}^M = 155\%$).

335

336 Table 3: Changes in the rate of healthcare worker mobility and patient contacts in the Tower building at University College London Hospital during the COVID-19 pandemic.
 337 The rate of mobility (as measured by the average daily number of door events per healthcare worker), and the rate of patient contact (as measured by the average daily
 338 number of patient contacts per patient) during the pre-pandemic period (baseline) are presented for each floor of the Tower building. For each stage of the pandemic (First
 339 wave, Summer lull and Second wave) the normalized difference (*N*) to the average daily rates during the pre-pandemic stage are provided and expressed as percentage
 340 change. Rows in bold identify floors that handled the majority of COVID-19 patients ($\geq 15\%$) during the pandemic.

Floor	Mobility				Patient contacts			
	Baseline	First wave	Summer lull	Second wave	Baseline	First wave	Summer lull	Second wave
Floor -1; Imaging	2.4	7%	-3%	10%	6.4	-29%	7%	-11%
Floor G; ED	9.4	18%	2%	8%	12.7	20%	30%	-68%
Floor 1; AMU	5.8	7%	-15%	-3%	19.6	45%	35%	58%
Floor 2; Day surgery	3.1	17%	-6%	1%	18.8	-4%	30%	44%
Floor 3; Critical care	4.2	25%	15%	-4%	98.6	28%	16%	20%
Floor 5; Nuclear medicine	13.4	-5%	-8%	-14%	3.8	-46%	-12%	4%
Floor 6; Short stay surgery	4.9	7%	56%	-4%	21.9	26%	42%	20%
Floor 7; HASU	2.5	72%	101%	78%	34.6	73%	-21%	155%
Floor 8; Respiratory disease	7.1	14%	12%	64%	23.5	13%	7%	46%
Floor 9; General surgery	3.4	21%	-5%	50%	24.3	-7%	13%	26%
Floor 10; CoE	3.1	59%	43%	66%	24.8	-2%	53%	44%
Floor 11; Paediatrics	7.6	17%	13%	25%	14.2	33%	26%	28%
Floor 12; Adolescents	4.5	52%	16%	-1%	19.7	-30%	34%	44%
Floor 13; Oncology	3.3	11%	22%	55%	22.1	24%	28%	28%
Floor 14; Head and neck	4.7	0%	8%	-8%	23.3	21%	31%	27%
Floor 15; Private wards	9.3	-14%	-27%	-22%	9.4	-41%	-31%	51%
Floor 16; Haematology	7	-7%	-1%	-2%	30.5	12%	16%	11%

341



342 Figure 3: Changes in the rate of HCW mobility and patient contact on COVID-19 wards in the Tower building at
343 University College London Hospital. The rate of healthcare worker mobility was measured in terms of the daily
344 number of door events per healthcare worker, and the rate of patient contact was measured in terms of the
345 daily number of logged patient contacts per patient. COVID-19 wards were identified as those that had $\geq 15\%$
346 of all COVID-19 patients (grey polygon) during the observation period. For each of the two measures, the
347 normalized difference (N) to the average daily rates during the pre-pandemic (red/yellow points, representing
348 percentage change) was calculated, and a smooth was applied using a seven day rolling average (red/yellow
349 line). The black dotted line represents 0% change compared to the average in the pre-pandemic period. Data
350 for October 2020 was not available.


351 *Spatial connectivity*

352 The connectivity between floors (based on the number of HCWs that had activity on any two floors
353 in the same day) revealed that some were more connected than others, and that the resulting
354 clustering of floors varied throughout the pandemic (Figure 4). During the baseline period, three
355 clusters were identified; one large cluster containing Imaging through to Plant (floors -1 to 4), Short
356 stay surgery, HASU and General surgery; a smaller cluster comprising the Basement, Nuclear
357 medicine, Paediatrics and Adolescents; and a third consisting of Respiratory disease, CoE and
358 Oncology through to Haematology (floors 13 to 16).

359 During the first wave, the connectivity between floors changed such that four clusters were
360 identifiable, and floors adjacent to each other were generally in the same cluster. The basement
361 through to Nuclear medicine (floors -2 to 5) formed a cluster, while Short stay surgery through to
362 CoE (floors 6 to 10) formed a second cluster, Paediatrics and adolescents (floors 11 and 12) made up
363 a third cluster and the fourth consisted of Oncology through to Haematology (floors 13 to 16). Floors
364 identified as COVID-19 wards were present in two of the four clusters, which also included non
365 COVID-19 wards.

366 Adjacent floors were again more likely to be connected during the summer lull, but only three
367 clusters were identified; Imaging through to CoE (floors -1 to 10) formed the largest cluster, while
368 the basement, Paediatrics and Adolescents (floors -2, 11 and 12) were in a second cluster, and the
369 third cluster consisted of Oncology through to Haematology (floors 13 to 16). During the second
370 wave the connectivity of floors and the clusters they formed were unchanged from that in the
371 summer lull, suggesting that the spatial activity of HCWs had stabilised. All COVID-19 floors were in
372 the larger cluster, which also included non COVID-19 wards.

373




374 Figure 4: The spatial connectivity of floors in the Tower building at University College London Hospital during the COVID-19 pandemic. The alluvial diagram
 375 depicts the connectivity of floors, as determined from the Louvain clustering algorithm and using dyadic weights derived from the number of healthcare
 376 workers with logged door events and/or patient contacts on the focal floors during the same day . The numbering in the left most column identifies the
 377 floors, and the numbers in the remaining four columns represent the cluster group the floors belong to in each stage of the pandemic; pre-pandemic
 378 (baseline), first wave, summer lull and second wave. An asterisk identifies floors that had the majority ($\geq 15\%$) of COVID-19 patients during the observation
 379 period.

380 *Indirect contacts between patients*

381 The average daily patient connectivity (due to shared contacts with HCWs on the same day), showed
382 daily fluctuations that were not consistent during the course of the pandemic (Figure 5). The average
383 daily connectivity of COVID-19 negative patients with other COVID-19 negative patients ($\bar{S}_t^{Negative}$)
384 remained stable throughout the pandemic ($\bar{S}_{Firstwave}^{Negative} = 5\%$; $\bar{S}_{Summerlull}^{Negative} = 5\%$; $\bar{S}_{Secondwave}^{Negative} = 5\%$)
385 however, during the first wave the pattern in $S_t^{Negative}$ followed the rise and fall of COVID-19
386 patients in hospital before settling around 5% in the summer lull where it remained until the end of
387 the observation period.

388 In contrast, during the first wave, the hospital reduced the daily connectivity between COVID-19
389 negative patients and COVID-19 positive patients ($S_t^{Positive}$) to a low of <1%. However, $\bar{S}_{Firstwave}^{Positive}$
390 was 2%, and there was a noteworthy spike in $S_t^{Positive}$ to 16% on the 5th May 2020, which was due
391 to one HCW who had 89 patient contacts; 33 of which were positive for COVID-19. During the
392 summer lull, much greater levels of indirect contact between patient groups was seen ($\bar{S}_{Summerlull}^{Positive} =$
393 4%), suggesting a relaxation in staff cohorting procedures. During the second wave, $S_t^{Positive}$
394 gradually dropped to a low of <1% and $\bar{S}_{Secondwave}^{Positive}$ returned to 2%, highlighting a reactive response
395 to the rise of COVID-19 patients.

396



397 Figure 5: The average daily percentage of COVID-19 negative patients that had indirect contacts with other patients in the Tower building at University
 398 College London Hospital during the COVID-19 pandemic. The daily averages are plotted separately for the percentage of COVID-19 negative patients to have
 399 indirect contacts with COVID-19 positive (orange) and other COVID-19 negative (blue) patients. An indirect contact was determined through evidence of a
 400 shared contact with HCWs on the same day. Data for October 2020 was not available.

401

Discussion

402 Mobility and contact rates are fundamental to the transmission of communicable diseases, and data
403 on these behaviours are extremely valuable for epidemiological investigations. It has long been
404 established that HCWs can be part of transmission clusters within healthcare settings (Huttunen &
405 Syrjänen, 2014; Lumley et al., 2021) however, data on the behaviour of HCWs are often scarce. In
406 this paper, we demonstrate how behavioural markers for HCW mobility and patient contacts within
407 the hospital, can be derived from EMRs and door access logs at an aggregate level. Using data from a
408 London teaching hospital and during the COVID-19 pandemic, we provide a framework to further
409 support IPC practitioners in assessing patterns of staff behaviour, identifying behavioural change and
410 in conducting evidence-based infection control.

411 The temporal trends in workforce and HCW behaviour are in line with those reported in other
412 studies (Champredon et al., 2018; Duval et al., 2018; Gallego et al., 2015; Vanhems et al., 2013), and
413 illustrate the utility of the featured data sources in representing the working patterns of HCWs. Staff
414 and patient levels determined daily patterns in HCW behaviour, and this was evident when the
415 hospital reduced staff and patient numbers during the first wave of COVID-19 patients, which
416 resulted in a notable drop in logged patient contacts. However, the rate of patient contact (number
417 of contact events per patient) was maintained above baseline levels throughout the pandemic, while
418 the rate of HCW mobility (number of door events per HCW) remained relatively stable, only
419 surpassing baseline levels in the second wave. Causes for the observed changes in HCW behaviour
420 are hard to ascertain, but are likely products of shifting working practices (e.g. through IPC
421 activities), perceptions of risk (e.g. before/after vaccination and changes in the availability of PPE)
422 and hospital pressures (e.g. needs of the patient population). Even without clear causal pathways, it
423 is evident that these data can be used to monitor the behaviour and activity patterns of the HCW
424 population, providing novel insights for IPC practitioners.

425 Patterns of HCW behaviour showed significant spatial variation in response to the pandemic.
426 Increases in the rate of mobility and rate of patient contact were most notable on COVID-19 floors
427 during the first and second waves. However, the degree of change in these behavioural markers was
428 not equal across floors and, despite few (or no) COVID-19 patients, non COVID-19 floors also
429 experienced changes in HCW behaviour. Trends in HCW behaviour on different floors will depend on
430 the functions of the wards occupying them, how these functions evolved during the course of the
431 pandemic and on IPC interventions. Combining observations of how HCW behaviour varied spatially
432 with data on the context in which they occurred, will be necessary to help explain spatial
433 heterogeneity in the infection risk for HCWs, as was seen during the pandemic (Gómez-Ochoa et al.,
434 2021).

435 One strategy to prevent nosocomial transmission is to cohort patients and staff, whereby patients
436 positive for the disease of concern and/or the staff responsible for their care, are kept separate to
437 the rest of the patient population (Ahmad & Osei, 2021). At UCLH this was achieved by establishing
438 COVID-19 wards that handled the majority of COVID-19 patients. Using the routinely-collected data
439 we were able to identify the main COVID-19 wards and monitor the daily indirect contacts between
440 patients (as determined through shared contacts with HCWs on the same day). Successful staff
441 cohorting would have resulted in no indirect contact between COVID-19 negative and positive
442 patients. However, this was not consistently achieved and, while the indirect contacts between
443 these groups of patients were substantially reduced during the first and second waves, the response
444 was not maintained during the summer lull, and appears reactive to increases in the number of
445 COVID-19 patients. Staff cohorting can be prevented by numerous practical limitations, and the
446 pandemic presented many challenges including staff shortages. That said, the routinely collected
447 data provides a tool for IPC practitioners to monitor the success of interventions such as cohorting,
448 and offers a means to quickly identify, investigate and react to undesirable spikes in indirect patient
449 contacts that could compromise patient and staff safety.

450 Another strategy available to IPC practitioners is to limit the traffic within the hospital (Ahmad &
451 Osei, 2021). At UCLH a number of interventions were adopted to accomplish this, including reduced
452 patient and staff numbers, and through the installation of ‘COVID doors’ that created barriers to
453 disrupt the flow of people between spaces. Our analyses identified the reduced staff and patient
454 numbers, but we were unable to assess the effect of COVID doors on the mobility of HCWs, as the
455 dates of their installation and use were not known. Instead, we assessed the flow of HCWs between
456 floors and found that, after some fluctuation in the early stages of the pandemic, the connectivity
457 between floors stabilised, suggesting a new ‘normal’ to the working practices of HCWs. Throughout
458 the pandemic, the flow of HCWs continued between COVID-19 and non COVID-19 wards, which may
459 highlight an opportunity to improve IPC activities. However, a higher resolution analysis that takes
460 into account the partitions within floors may reveal the true flow of staff between COVID-19 and
461 non-COVID-19 areas.

462 In this investigation we used a minimal number of data fields and metrics aggregated at the level of
463 the HCW population. However, further insights into the variations of HCW behaviour could be
464 uncovered if the data were paired with other data fields and aggregated by individual or HCW group.
465 For example, combining this data with specific details on where and when IPC interventions were
466 introduced, would allow investigations into the pre and post effects of interventions on HCW
467 mobility and patient contacts. Combining these data sources with data on the disease status of staff
468 could help identify HCW groups and/or individuals more at risk of acquiring HAIs, along with the
469 behaviours or working conditions associated with higher risk. As healthcare systems move towards
470 more digital systems, the accessibility and diversity of data available to practitioners grows,
471 providing new opportunities for research and support for evidence based infection control.

472 While the data sources featured here have potential to be used operationally by IPC practitioners,
473 there are several challenges that hospitals may have to overcome for this to be realised. Firstly, it is
474 worth noting that UCLH is a digital hospital, but many healthcare facilities in the UK and across the

475 world are not, and an absence of electronic records will reduce the scope and capacity of facilities to
476 utilise these data. Hospitals, particularly those within the NHS, often outsource services such as
477 systems for security door logs and EMRs, and in this study the various datasets from outsourced
478 companies had to be consolidated, which required the creation of a master staff index to establish
479 links between the databases. Mapping the data flows and creating a user friendly platform will be
480 challenging and requires the collaboration of researchers, IT professionals and IPC staff. There are
481 also challenges in relation to the generation of these data themselves, as we lack assurances on the
482 exact nature of the processes underlying their generation. For instance, the use of staff cards to
483 open security doors may be biased in time and space by HCWs following each other through doors
484 (e.g. during ward rounds), or by doors being left open. Likewise, there has been little systematic
485 analysis to date on the generation of EMR data, in relation to the accuracy of the spatial or temporal
486 markers, or the HCWs involved in events. These remain important validation challenges that are
487 being undertaken – but nevertheless, the principles underlying aggregate patterns produced using
488 these data appear sound.

489 Data on behaviours with epidemiological relevance are often scarce but, as hospitals embrace the
490 digital age, data is becoming more readily available. Deriving behavioural markers from routinely
491 collected data provides opportunities to enhance IPC activities aimed at better protecting HCWs and
492 patients, in addition to improving pandemic preparedness. IPC practitioners should consider what
493 new data sources are at their disposal and how they can be used operationally to empower decision
494 making.

495 *Acknowledgements*

496 This study was supported by the UCLH/UCL NIHR Biomedical Research Centre and funding from the
497 UKRI MRC (grant ref: MC_PC_19082) , and UCLH Charity. For their support we thank the UCLH
498 medical directors Charles House and Gill Gaskin, Pushpsen Joshi at the Joint Research Office, Nathan
499 Lea from the UCLH information governance department, Leila Hail from the UCLH infection control
500 department, Richard Clarke, David Ramlakhan, David Thompson and Gareth Adams at the UCLH
501 digital services department, and all involved with the SAFER research programme.

502

503 *Author contributions*

504 EN, MS, CH and EM supervised the project. EN and EM designed the research. WW, CL and SK
505 extracted the data. JWA, EM and NG analysed the data. JWA and EM wrote the manuscript and all
506 authors approved the final version.

507

508 *Competing interests*

509 The authors declare no competing interests.

510

511 *Data availability*

512 Data will be made available via a data repository service after confirmation of acceptance.

513

514 *Ethics statement*

515 The study protocol was approved by the NHS Health Research Authority (South Central – Berkshire
516 REC ref 20/SC/0147, protocol number 130861) and ethical oversight was provided by the UCLH
517 research ethics committee (IRAS project ID: ref. 281836). UCL GOS ICH R&D approval number
518 20PL06.

519

520

References

- 521 Ahmad, I. A., & Osei, E. (2021). Occupational Health and Safety Measures in Healthcare Settings
522 during COVID-19: Strategies for Protecting Staff, Patients and Visitors. *Disaster Medicine and*
523 *Public Health Preparedness*, 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.1017/DMP.2021.294>
- 524 Arthur, R.F., Gurley, E.S., Salje, H., Bloomfield, L.S. and Jones, J.H., (2017). Contact structure,
525 mobility, environmental impact and behaviour: the importance of social forces to infectious
526 disease dynamics and disease ecology. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B:*
527 *Biological Sciences*, 372(1719), p.20160454.
- 528 Blondel, V. D., Guillaume, J. L., Lambiotte, R., & Lefebvre, E. (2008). Fast unfolding of communities in
529 large networks. *Journal of Statistical Mechanics: Theory and Experiment*, 2008(10), P10008.
530 <https://doi.org/10.1088/1742-5468/2008/10/P10008>
- 531 Buckee, C., Noor, A., & Sattenspiel, L. (2021). Thinking clearly about social aspects of infectious
532 disease transmission. *Nature* 2021 595:7866, 595(7866), 205–213.
533 <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-021-03694-x>
- 534 Butler, R., Monsalve, M., Thomas, G. W., Herman, T., Segre, A. M., Polgreen, P. M., & Suneja, M.
535 (2018). Estimating Time Physicians and Other Health Care Workers Spend with Patients in an
536 Intensive Care Unit Using a Sensor Network. *The American Journal of Medicine*, 131(8), 972.e9-
537 972.e15. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.AMJMED.2018.03.015>
- 538 Champredon, D., Najafi, M., Laskowski, M., Chit, A., & Moghadas, S. M. (2018). Individual
539 movements and contact patterns in a Canadian long-term care facility. *AIMS Public Health*,
540 5(2), 111. <https://doi.org/10.3934/PUBLICHEALTH.2018.2.111>
- 541 Chen, W.-S., Zhang, W.-H., Li, Z.-J., Yang, Y., Chen, F., Ge, X.-S., Wang, T.-R., Fang, P., Feng, C.-Y., Liu,
542 J., Liu, S.-S., Pan, H.-X., Zhu, T.-L., Tian, Y.-Y., Wang, W.-Y., Xing, H., Yao, J., Yuan, Y.-M., Jiang, P.,
543 ... Liu, Y. (2019). Evaluation of manual and electronic healthcare-associated infections

- 544 surveillance: a multi-center study with 21 tertiary general hospitals in China. *Annals of*
545 *Translational Medicine*, 7(18), :444-):444. <https://doi.org/10.21037/ATM.2019.08.80>
- 546 Csardi, G., & Nepusz, T. (2006). The igraph software package for complex network research. *Inter*
547 *Journal, Complex Sy*, 1695. <https://igraph.org>
- 548 Curtis, D. E., Hlady, C. S., Kanade, G., Pemmaraju, S. V., Polgreen, P. M., & Segre, A. M. (2013).
549 Healthcare Worker Contact Networks and the Prevention of Hospital-Acquired Infections. *PLOS*
550 *ONE*, 8(12), e79906. <https://doi.org/10.1371/JOURNAL.PONE.0079906>
- 551 Duval, A., Obadia, T., Martinet, L., Boëlle, P. Y., Fleury, E., Guillemot, D., Opatowski, L., Temime, L.,
552 Alvarez, A. S., Baraffe, A., Beiró, M., Bertucci, I., Cyncynatus, C., Dannel, F., Delaby, M. L.,
553 Denys, P., De Cellès, M. D., Fraboulet, A., Gaillard, J. L., ... Villain, I. (2018). Measuring dynamic
554 social contacts in a rehabilitation hospital: effect of wards, patient and staff characteristics.
555 *Scientific Reports 2018 8:1*, 8(1), 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-018-20008-w>
- 556 English, K. M., Langley, J. M., McGeer, A., Hupert, N., Tellier, R., Henry, B., Halperin, S. A., Johnston,
557 L., & Pourbohloul, B. (2018). Contact among healthcare workers in the hospital setting:
558 Developing the evidence base for innovative approaches to infection control. *BMC Infectious*
559 *Diseases*, 18(1), 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.1186/S12879-018-3093-X/TABLES/7>
- 560 Gallego, B., Magrabi, F., Concha, O. P., Wang, Y., & Coiera, E. (2015). Insights into temporal patterns
561 of hospital patient safety from routinely collected electronic data. *Health Information Science*
562 *and Systems*, 3(Suppl 1), S2. <https://doi.org/10.1186/2047-2501-3-S1-S2>
- 563 Gómez-Ochoa, S. A., Franco, O. H., Rojas, L. Z., Raguindin, P. F., Roa-Díaz, Z. M., Wyssmann, B. M.,
564 Guevara, S. L. R., Echeverría, L. E., Glisic, M., & Muka, T. (2021). COVID-19 in Health-Care
565 Workers: A Living Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis of Prevalence, Risk Factors, Clinical
566 Characteristics, and Outcomes. *American Journal of Epidemiology*, 190(1), 161–175.
567 <https://doi.org/10.1093/AJE/KWAA191>

- 568 Guest, J. F., Keating, T., Gould, D., & Wigglesworth, N. (2020). Modelling the annual NHS costs and
569 outcomes attributable to healthcare-associated infections in England. *BMJ Open*, *10*(1),
570 e033367. <https://doi.org/10.1136/BMJOPEN-2019-033367>
- 571 Hertzberg, V. S., Baumgardner, J., Mehta, C. C., Elon, L. K., Cotsonis, G., & Lowery-North, D. W.
572 (2017). Contact networks in the emergency department: Effects of time, environment, patient
573 characteristics, and staff role. *Social Networks*, *48*, 181–191.
574 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socnet.2016.08.005>
- 575 Houlihan, C. F., Vora, N., Byrne, T., Lewer, D., Kelly, G., Heaney, J., Gandhi, S., Spyer, M. J., Beale, R.,
576 Cherepanov, P., Moore, D., Gilson, R., Gamblin, S., Kassiotis, G., McCoy, L. E., Swanton, C.,
577 Hayward, A., Nastouli, E., Aitken, J., ... Hatipoglu, E. (2020). Pandemic peak SARS-CoV-2
578 infection and seroconversion rates in London frontline health-care workers. *The Lancet*,
579 *396*(10246), e6–e7. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(20\)31484-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(20)31484-7)
- 580 Huttunen, R., & Syrjänen, J. (2014). Healthcare workers as vectors of infectious diseases. *European*
581 *Journal of Clinical Microbiology and Infectious Diseases*, *33*(9), 1477–1488.
582 <https://doi.org/10.1007/S10096-014-2119-6/TABLES/3>
- 583 Illingworth, C.J., Hamilton, W.L., Jackson, C., Warne, B., Popay, A., Meredith, L., Hosmillo, M., Jahun,
584 A., Fieldman, T., Routledge, M. and Houldcroft, C.J., (2022). A2B-COVID: A tool for rapidly
585 evaluating potential SARS-CoV-2 transmission events. *Molecular biology and evolution*, *39*(3),
586 p.msac025.
- 587 Khan, H. A., Ahmad, A., & Mehboob, R. (2015). Nosocomial infections and their control strategies.
588 *Asian Pacific Journal of Tropical Biomedicine*, *5*(7), 509–514.
589 <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.APJTb.2015.05.001>
- 590 Khan, H. A., Baig, F. K., & Mehboob, R. (2017). Nosocomial infections: Epidemiology, prevention,
591 control and surveillance. *Asian Pacific Journal of Tropical Biomedicine*, *7*(5), 478–482.

592 <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.APJT.2017.01.019>

593 Loveday, H. P., Wilson, J. A., Pratt, R. J., Golsorkhi, M., Tingle, A., Bak, A., Browne, J., Prieto, J., &

594 Wilcox, M. (2014). epic3: National Evidence-Based Guidelines for Preventing Healthcare-

595 Associated Infections in NHS Hospitals in England. *Journal of Hospital Infection*, *86*(S1), S1–S70.

596 [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0195-6701\(13\)60012-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0195-6701(13)60012-2)

597 Lumley, S. F., Constantinides, B., Sanderson, N., Rodger, G., Street, T. L., Swann, J., Chau, K. K.,

598 O'Donnell, D., Warren, F., Hoosdally, S., O'Donnell, A. M., Walker, T. M., Stoesser, N. E.,

599 Butcher, L., Peto, T. E., Crook, D. W., Jeffery, K., Matthews, P. C., & Eyre, D. W. (2021).

600 Epidemiological data and genome sequencing reveals that nosocomial transmission of SARS-

601 CoV-2 is underestimated and mostly mediated by a small number of highly infectious

602 individuals. *Journal of Infection*, *83*(4), 473–482. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.JINF.2021.07.034>

603 Murray, S. G., Yim, J. W. L., Croci, R., Rajkomar, A., Schmajuk, G., Khanna, R., & Cucina, R. J. (2017).

604 Using Spatial and Temporal Mapping to Identify Nosocomial Disease Transmission of

605 *Clostridium difficile*. *JAMA Internal Medicine*, *177*(12), 1863–1865.

606 <https://doi.org/10.1001/JAMAINTERNMED.2017.5506>

607 Nouvellet, P., Bhatia, S., Cori, A., Ainslie, K. E. C., Baguelin, M., Bhatt, S., Boonyasiri, A., Brazeau, N. F.,

608 Cattarino, L., Cooper, L. V., Coupland, H., Cucunuba, Z. M., Cuomo-Dannenburg, G., Dighe, A.,

609 Djaafara, B. A., Dorigatti, I., Eales, O. D., van Elsland, S. L., Nascimento, F. F., ... Donnelly, C. A.

610 (2021). Reduction in mobility and COVID-19 transmission. *Nature Communications* *2021* *12*:1,

611 *12*(1), 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-021-21358-2>

612 Oussaid, N., Voirin, N., Régis, C., Khanafer, N., Martin-Gaujard, G., Vincent, A., Comte, B., Bénet, T., &

613 Vanhems, P. (2016). Contacts between health care workers and patients in a short-stay

614 geriatric unit during the peak of a seasonal influenza epidemic compared with a nonepidemic

615 period. *American Journal of Infection Control*, *44*(8), 905–909.

- 616 <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.AJIC.2016.02.002>
- 617 Price, J. R., Mookerjee, S., Dyakova, E., Myall, A., Leung, W., Weiße, A. Y., Shersing, Y., Brannigan, E.
618 T., Galletly, T., Muir, D., Randell, P., Davies, F., Bolt, F., Barahona, M., Otter, J. A., & Holmes, A.
619 H. (2021). Development and Delivery of a Real-time Hospital-onset COVID-19 Surveillance
620 System Using Network Analysis. *Clinical Infectious Diseases*, 72(1), 82–89.
621 <https://doi.org/10.1093/CID/CIAA892>
- 622 R Core Team. (2020). *R: A language and environment for statistical computing* (4.0.2).
623 <https://www.r-project.org/>
- 624 Rahman, H. S., Aziz, M. S., Hussein, R. H., Othman, H. H., Salih Omer, S. H., Khalid, E. S.,
625 Abdulrahman, N. A., Amin, K., & Abdullah, R. (2020). The transmission modes and sources of
626 COVID-19: A systematic review. *International Journal of Surgery Open*, 26, 125–136.
627 <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.IJSO.2020.08.017>
- 628 Rewley, J., Koehly, L., Marcum, C. S., & Reed-Tsochas, F. (2020). A passive monitoring tool using
629 hospital administrative data enables earlier specific detection of healthcare-acquired
630 infections. *Journal of Hospital Infection*, 106(3), 562–569.
631 <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.JHIN.2020.07.031>
- 632 Ross, S., Breckenridge, G., Zhuang, M., & Manley, E. (2021). Household visitation during the COVID-
633 19 pandemic. *Scientific Reports 2021 11:1*, 11(1), 1–11. [https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-021-](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-021-02092-7)
634 [02092-7](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-021-02092-7)
- 635 Russo, P. L., Shaban, R. Z., Macbeth, D., Carter, A., & Mitchell, B. G. (2018). Impact of electronic
636 healthcare-associated infection surveillance software on infection prevention resources: a
637 systematic review of the literature. *Journal of Hospital Infection*, 99(1), 1–7.
638 <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.JHIN.2017.09.002>
- 639 Vanhems, P., Barrat, A., Cattuto, C., Pinton, J. F., Khanafer, N., Régis, C., Kim, B. a., Comte, B., &

- 640 Voirin, N. (2013). Estimating Potential Infection Transmission Routes in Hospital Wards Using
641 Wearable Proximity Sensors. *PLOS ONE*, 8(9), e73970.
642 <https://doi.org/10.1371/JOURNAL.PONE.0073970>
- 643 Weigl, M., Müller, A., Zupanc, A., & Angerer, P. (2009). Participant observation of time allocation,
644 direct patient contact and simultaneous activities in hospital physicians. *BMC Health Services*
645 *Research*, 9, 110. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1472-6963-9-110>
- 646 Westbrook, J. I., Duffield, C., Li, L., & Creswick, N. J. (2011). How mUCLH time do nurses have for
647 patients? A longitudinal study quantifying hospital nurses' patterns of task time distribution
648 and interactions with health professionals. *BMC Health Services Research*, 11.
649 <https://doi.org/10.1186/1472-6963-11-319>