

1 **Modelling the risk of SARS-CoV-2 infection through PPE**
2 **doffing in a hospital environment**

3

4 Short title: Healthcare worker PPE exposure risk to SARS CoV-2

5

6 Marco-Felipe King¹, Amanda M Wilson^{2*}, Mark H. Weir³, Martín López-García⁴, Jessica
7 Proctor¹, Waseem Hiwar¹, Amirul Khan¹, Louise A. Fletcher¹, P. Andrew Sleight¹, Ian
8 Clifton⁵, Stephanie J. Dancer^{6,7}, Mark Wilcox⁸, Kelly A. Reynolds² and Catherine J.
9 Noakes¹

10

11 ¹School of Civil Engineering, University of Leeds, Woodhouse Lane, Leeds, LS2 9JT, UK.

12 ²Department of Community, Environment, and Policy, Mel and Enid Zuckerman

13 College of Public Health, University of Arizona, Tucson, AZ, USA

14 ³Division of Environmental Health Sciences, The Ohio State University, Columbus, OH,

15 United States of America

16 ⁴School of Mathematics, University of Leeds, Woodhouse Lane, Leeds, LS2 9JT, UK.

17 ⁵Department of Respiratory Medicine, St. James's Hospital, University of Leeds, Leeds,

18 UK

19 ⁶School of Applied Sciences, Edinburgh Napier University, Edinburgh, UK.

20 ⁷Department of Microbiology, Hairmyres Hospital, NHS Lanarkshire, G758RG, UK.

21 ⁸Healthcare Associated Infections Research Group, Leeds Teaching Hospitals NHS

22 Trust and University of Leeds, Leeds, UK

23 * Corresponding author

24

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

- 25 **Keywords:** SARS CoV-2; COVID-19; PPE; surface contact transmission; quantitative
- 26 microbial risk assessment (QMRA); hospital infection model

27 **Abstract**

28 Self-contamination during doffing of personal protective equipment (PPE) is a
29 concern for healthcare workers (HCW) following SARS-CoV-2 positive patient care.
30 Staff may subconsciously become contaminated through improper glove removal,
31 so quantifying this risk is critical for safe working procedures. HCW surface contact
32 sequences on a respiratory ward were modelled using a discrete-time Markov chain
33 for: IV-drip care, blood pressure monitoring and doctors' rounds. Accretion of viral
34 RNA on gloves during care was modelled using a stochastic recurrence relation. The
35 HCW then doffed PPE and contaminated themselves in a fraction of cases based on
36 increasing case load. The risk of infection from this exposure was quantified using a
37 dose-response methodology. A parametric study was conducted to analyse the
38 effect of: 1a) increasing patient numbers on the ward, 1b) the proportion of COVID-
39 19 cases, 2) the length of a shift and 3) the probability of touching contaminated
40 PPE. The driving factors for infection risk were surface contamination and number of
41 surface contacts. HCWs on a 100% COVID-19 ward were less than 2-fold more at risk
42 than on a 50% COVID ward (1.6% vs 1%), whilst on a 5% COVID-19 ward, the risk
43 dropped to 0.1% per shift (sd=0.6%). IV-drip care resulted in higher risk than blood
44 pressure monitoring (1.1% vs 1% p<0.0001), whilst doctors' rounds produced a 0.6%
45 risk (sd=0.8%). Recommendations include supervised PPE doffing procedures such
46 as the "doffing buddy" scheme, maximising hand hygiene compliance post-doffing
47 and targeted surface cleaning for surfaces away from the patient vicinity.

48

49 **Importance**

50 Infection risk from self-contamination during doffing PPE is an important concern in
51 healthcare settings, especially on a COVID-19 ward. Fatigue during high workload

52 shifts may result in increased frequency of mistakes and hence risk of exposure.
53 Length of staff shift and number of COVID-19 patients on a ward correlate positively
54 with the risk to staff through self-contamination after doffing. Cleaning of far-patient
55 surfaces is equally important as cleaning traditional "high-touch surfaces", given
56 that there is an additional risk from bioaerosol deposition outside the patient zone(1).
57

58 **Introduction**

59 Severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) is an enveloped
60 virus which has infected in excess of 10 million people to date and caused more
61 than 700,000 deaths worldwide according to Johns Hopkins University's COVID-19
62 Dashboard (2). Inanimate objects known as fomites may host pathogens and have
63 the potential to contribute to infection transmission in healthcare environments. This
64 occurs in viral infection spread (3–5) including COVID-19 (6, 7). There appears to be
65 similarity between persistence of SARS-CoV-1 and 2 on surfaces, with viable virus
66 shown to be present for up to 72 hours (8). This allows an opportunity for exposure
67 through hand-to-fomite contacts, especially if surfaces are heavily contaminated.
68 Although personal protective equipment (PPE) such as gloves, gowns, and masks
69 are worn to protect both patient and healthcare worker (HCW) from exposure, self-
70 contamination during PPE doffing processes (9, 10) poses risks to HCW and enables
71 spread from one patient to another during multiple care episodes. SARS-CoV-2 has
72 been detected on healthcare worker PPE (11) and in the environment of rooms
73 where doffing occurs, providing evidence that errors in doffing could facilitate
74 COVID-19 exposure and transmission.

75 While SARS-CoV-2 has been detected on PPE and patient surfaces, the
76 relationship between viral RNA concentrations and risk of infection is still
77 unknown(12). Quantitative microbial risk assessments (QMRA) involve the use of
78 mathematical models to estimate doses of a pathogen and subsequent infection
79 risk probabilities. Quantifying infection risk for any given dose can be used to guide
80 intervention decision-making and have been used in other public health contexts,
81 such as in setting water quality standards (13). These typically rely on experimental
82 doses of a microorganism inoculated into healthy participants or mice models in a
83 known quantity. Whether they develop the infection can then be recorded(13).

84 QMRA modelling and surface contact models have been used to evaluate multiple
85 transmission pathways. The role of care-specific behaviours in environmental
86 microbial spread (14) includes the effect of glove use in bacterial spread from one
87 surface to another (15) and evaluating risk reductions through hand hygiene or
88 surface disinfection interventions (16–18). While a strength of QMRA is relating
89 environmental monitoring data to health outcomes, a common limitation has been
90 a lack of specific human behaviour data such as hand-to-face or hand-to-surface
91 contact sequences that result in dose exposures (18, 19). The use of the QMRA
92 modelling framework incorporating care type surface contact patterns before
93 potential self-contamination via PPE doffing will offer insight into infection risks per
94 shift, the importance of a doffing buddy and patient room surface cleaning
95 protocols.

96 The objective of this study is to relate SARS-CoV-2 concentrations on surfaces to
97 predicted risks of exposure and infection for a single healthcare worker over an 8-
98 hour shift and estimate the effects of doffing mistakes and number of care episodes
99 per shift on infection risk per shift.

100 **Methodology**

101 This approach combines human behaviour and fomite-mediated exposure
102 models for 19 hospital scenarios, for which concentrations of SARS-CoV-2 on hands
103 and infection risk for a single shift are estimated for a registered nurse, an auxiliary
104 nurse and a doctor. A control scenario was defined as a single episode of care with
105 a SARS-CoV-2 positive individual with an 80% probability of self-contamination during
106 doffing. Eighteen other scenarios covered 3 likelihoods of self-contamination: 5%,
107 50%, and 80%, x 2 case load conditions: 7 patients (low) vs. 14 patients (high) x 3
108 probabilities of any given patient being COVID-19 positive: low (5%), high (50%), and
109 a 100% COVID-19 positive ward. During low case load conditions, it was assumed

110 that the number of care episodes per shift would be less than for high load
 111 conditions. The assumed number of patient care episodes when PPE is worn per shift
 112 for low and high case load scenarios were 7 and 14, respectively, based on a
 113 respiratory ward in a university teaching hospital in the UK. The low case load
 114 estimate was based on communication with a UK NHS consultant, who tracked the
 115 number of gowns used by healthcare workers over a week on a mixed COVID-19 8-
 116 bed respiratory ward. All model parameters are described and reported in Table 1.
 117 Per scenario, three simulations were run where sequences of hand-surface contacts
 118 per care episode were care-specific (IV care, observational care, or doctors'
 119 rounds).

120 **Table 1.** Model parameters and their distributions/point values

Parameter	Distribution/Point Value	Reference
Surface contamination (C_{RNA}) (RNA/ swabbed surface area)	For infected patient scenarios Surfaces: Triangular (min= 3.3×10^3 , mid= 2.8×10^4 , max= 6.6×10^4) Patient: Point estimate: 3.3×10^3	(1)
Area of any given surface ($A_{surface}$) (cm^2)	Triangular (min=5, max=195, mid=100)	Assumed
Fraction of RNA (infective) assumed to be infectious	Uniform (min=0.001, max=0.1)	Assumed
Finger-to-surface transfer efficiency (β)	Normal (mean=0.118, sd=0.088) Left- and right-truncated at 0 and 1, respectively	(5)
Surface-to-finger transfer efficiency (λ)	Normal (mean=0.123, sd=0.068) Left- and right-truncated at 0 and 1, respectively	(5)
Finger-to-mouth transfer efficiency ($TE_{H \rightarrow M}$)	Normal (mean=0.339, sd=0.20) Left- and right-truncated at 0 and 1, respectively	(20, 21)
Glove doffing self-contamination transfer efficiency	Uniform (min= 3×10^{-7} , max=0.1)	(9)
T_{99} on Hands (hours)	Uniform (min=1, max=6)	(22, 23)
T_{99} on surfaces (hours)	Uniform (min=3, max=120)	(22)
Hand hygiene efficacy: alcohol gel (\log_{10} reduction)	Uniform (min=2, max=4)	(24)
Hand hygiene efficacy: soap and water (\log_{10} reduction)	Normal (mean=1.62, sd=0.12) Left- and right-truncated at 0 and 6, respectively	(25)

Fraction of grip (S_m and S_h)	<p>For in/out events: Uniform (min=0.10, max=0.17)</p> <p>For patient contacts: Uniform (min=0.04, max=0.25)</p> <p>For other surface contacts: Uniform (min=0.008, max=0.25)</p> <p>For hand-to-face contacts: Uniform (min=0.008, max=0.012)</p>	(26)
Total hand surface area (A_h) (cm ²)	Uniform (min=445, max=535)	(19, 27)
Dose response curve parameter* α	0.36 ± 0.25 0.12, 19.6	(28); This study
Dose response curve parameter* β	5.94 ± 11.4 0.27, 802.1	(28); This study

121
122 *Dose response curve parameters are to be used in bootstrapped pairs. Mean ± SD
123 and minimum and maximum are provided to offer context as to the magnitude of
124 these parameters. Bootstrapped pairs are available in supplemental data.
125

126 **Healthcare Worker Surface Contact Behaviour Sequences**

127 Fifty episodes of mock patient care were recorded overtly using videography in
128 a respiratory ward side room at St James' Hospital, Leeds. Mock care was
129 undertaken by doctors and nurses with a volunteer from the research team to
130 represent the patient. While these observations were carried out prior to COVID-19,
131 it is assumed that patient care would be similar for any infected patient, including a
132 COVID-19 patient. Ethical approval for the study was given by the NHS Health
133 Research Authority Research Ethics Committee (London - Queen Square Research
134 Ethics Committee), REF: 19/LO/0301. Sequences of surface contacts were recorded
135 for three specific care types: IV drip insertion and subsequent care (IV, n=17)
136 conducted by registered nurses (RN); blood pressure, temperature and oxygen
137 saturation measurement (Observations, n=20) conducted by auxiliary nurses; and
138 doctors' rounds (Rounds, n=13). Data from care were used to generate
139 representative contact patterns to model possible sequences of surface contacts
140 by HCWs in a single patient room. HCWs were found to touch surfaces in a non-

141 random manner, insofar that moving from one surface category to another has a
142 higher probability than a transition elsewhere. By assigning each surface category a
143 numerical value from 1 to 5, where *Equipment* = 1, *Patient* = 2, *Hygiene*
144 *areas* = 3, *Near-bed surfaces* = 4, and *Far-bed surfaces* = 5, HCW sequential contact
145 of surfaces can be modelled in terms of weighted probabilities(14).

146 The movement of a HCW between surfaces is modelled using a discrete-time
147 Markov chain approach (14). Using defined weighted probabilities based on
148 observation of patient care, surface contact by HCW can be simulated based on
149 the property that, given the present state, the future and past surfaces touched are
150 independent. This is termed the Markov property (eq 1):

$$151 \quad P(X_{n+1} = i | X_n = j) \quad (1)$$

152 Where X_n represents the surface contacted in the n^{th} event, i and j are two
153 surfaces, and P represents a conditional probability. This is then denoted $P_{j \rightarrow i}$ for
154 ease of notation. For example, the probability if the HCW is currently touching the
155 table that they will next touch the chair is $P_{table \rightarrow chair}$ and can be worked out by
156 counting the number of times this happens during care divided by the number of
157 times any surface is touched after the table(29).

158
159 Discrete-time Markov chains were fitted to observed care contact sequences
160 using the "markovchainFit" function from the R package *markovchain* (version
161 0.7.0). Separate Markov chains were fitted to IV care, doctors' rounds and
162 observational care sequences. States included "in" (entrance to the patient room),
163 "out" (exit from the patient room), contact with a far-patient surface, contact with a
164 near-patient surface, contact with a hygiene surface (e.g. tap, sink, soap or alcohol
165 dispenser), and contact with equipment. For each episode of care, the first event
166 was entrance into the patient room. All HCWs wore a gown, gloves, mask and face

167 shield when entering the room. The episode of care ended when an “out” event
168 occurred.

169

170 **Exposure Model**

171 Accretion of microorganism on hands from surface contacts has been
172 demonstrated (14) to respond to a recurrence relationship which the concentration
173 on hands after the n^{th} contact, C_n^h , with the concentration on hands, C_{n-1}^h , and on
174 the surface involved, C_{n-1}^s , before the contact. See eq. 2.

$$175 \quad C_n^h = C_{n-1}^h e^{-k_h \Delta t} - S_h (\lambda C_{n-1}^h e^{-k_h \Delta t} - \beta C_{n-1}^s e^{-k_s \Delta t}) \quad (2)$$

176 This is an adaptation of the pathogen accretion model (PAM) from King et al.
177 (2015) (14) and a gradient transfer model by Julian et al. (2009) (30). Here, the
178 concentration on hands for contact n is equal to the previous concentration on the
179 hand (C_{n-1}^h) after adjusting for inactivation for the virus on the hand (k_h) and surface
180 k_s , minus the removal from the hand due to hand-to-surface transfer plus the gain to
181 the hand due to surface-to-hand transfer. Δt is the time taken for an episode of
182 patient care and sampled from a uniform distribution of range 2-20minutes(31).
183 Here, λ and β represent hand-to-surface and surface-to-hand transfer efficiencies
184 respectively. The fraction of the total hand surface area (S_h) is used to estimate how
185 much virus is available for transfer given a concentration of number of viral
186 particles/cm² on the gloved hand and surface.

187 **Estimating Inactivation on the Hand**

188 Sizun et al. (2000) evaluated the survival of human coronaviruses (HCoV) strains
189 OC43 and 229E on latex glove material after drying. Within six hours, there was a 99%
190 reduction in viral infectivity for HCoV-229E (22). For HCV-OC43, there was a 99% (T_{99})
191 reduction viral infectivity within an hour (22). Harbourt et al. measured SARS CoV-2
192 inactivation on pig skin with virus remaining viable for up to 8 hours at 37°C (32). We

193 therefore used a uniform distribution with a minimum of 1 hour and a maximum of 8
194 hours to estimate a distribution of k_h inactivation rates.

195 ***Estimating Inactivation on Surfaces***

196 The decay of the virus causing COVID-19 has been shown to vary under both
197 humidity and temperature but in contrast with previous findings(8), it appears that
198 surface material may not have a significant impact on decay rate(33). We therefore
199 take a conservative approach and use an averaged half-life τ estimate for stainless
200 steel and plastic-coated surfaces at 21-23°C(8) at 40% relative humidity; which are
201 5.63h (95%CI=4.59-6.86h), and 6.81h (95%CI=5.62-8.17h), respectively. We assume a
202 first order decay (eq 3) to estimate inactivation constant k which we use here for
203 brevity instead of k_s and k_h in equation 2.

204

$$205 \quad C(t) = C_0 e^{-k t} \quad (3)$$

206 Surface viral concentration C at any given time t then depends uniquely on initial
207 concentration C_0 . Where the half-life τ , is related to k by: $k_s = \log(2) / \tau$. Since hospital
208 rooms are made up of a combination of stainless steel and plastic surfaces, we have
209 taken the widest confidence interval as bounds when sampling from a uniform
210 distribution for inactivation rate k_s . Inactivation on gloves is assumed to be minimal
211 for the time-scale of a care episode (2-20minutes)(31).

212 ***Fractional Surface Area***

213 For contacts with the door handle during "in" or "out" behaviors, a fractional
214 surface area was randomly sampled from a uniform distribution with a minimum of
215 0.10 and a maximum of 0.17 for open hand grip hand-to-object contacts (26). For
216 contacts with the patient, a fractional surface area was randomly sampled from a
217 uniform distribution with a minimum of 0.04 and a maximum of 0.25, for front partial

218 finger or full front palm with finger contact configurations (26). For contacts with
219 other surfaces, fractional surface areas were randomly sampled from a uniform
220 distribution with a minimum of 0.008 and a maximum of 0.25, spanning multiple
221 contact and grip types from a single fingertip up to a full palm contact (26).

222

223 ***Transfer Efficiencies***

224 For contacts with surfaces other than the patient, a truncated normal distribution
225 with a mean of 0.123 and a standard deviation of 0.068 with maximum 1 and
226 minimum 0 was randomly sampled for surface-to-finger(λ) transfer efficiencies based
227 on aggregated averages of influenza, rhinovirus and norovirus(5). For patient
228 contacts, transfer efficiencies were randomly sampled from a normal distribution
229 with a mean of 0.056 and a standard deviation of 0.032, left- and right-truncated at
230 0 and 1, respectively. The mean and standard deviation were informed by transfer
231 efficiencies for rhinovirus measured for direct skin to skin contact (34). Transfer
232 efficiencies from fingers to surfaces (β) are assumed to be normally distributed with
233 mean 0.118 and standard deviation 0.088(5).

234 ***Surface Concentrations***

235 If the patient was assumed to be infected, surface contamination levels (RNA/
236 swab surface area) were sampled from a triangular distribution where the minimum
237 and maximum were informed by minimum and maximum contamination levels
238 reported for surfaces in an intensive care unit ward (1). The median of these was
239 used to inform the midpoint of the triangular distribution (1). For patient contacts, the
240 concentration of virus detected on a patient mask was used as a point value (3.3 x
241 10³RNA/swab surface area) (1). When a patient was not infected, it was assumed

242 contacts with surfaces and with the patient would not contribute to additional
243 accretion of virus on gloved hands.

244 Surface areas to relate RNA/swabbed surface area to RNA/cm² were not
245 provided by Guo et al. (2020). While a typical sampling size is 100 cm², it may be as
246 small as 10-25 cm² (35–38) and in real-world scenarios, sampling surface areas may
247 be larger or smaller than these depending upon available surface area, ease of
248 access and the contamination magnitude expected. Since the surface areas of
249 these surfaces were not provided, a triangular distribution (min=5, max=195,
250 mid=100) describing the surface area (cm²) of surfaces sampled was used to
251 estimate RNA/cm². Not all detected RNA was assumed to represent infectious viral
252 particles. This is a conservative risk approach when utilizing molecular concentration
253 data in QMRA (39). Therefore, concentrations on surfaces C^S (viable viral
254 particles/cm²) were estimated by eq 4,

$$255 \quad C^S = \frac{C_{RNA}}{A_{surface}} \cdot infective \quad (4)$$

256 where C_{RNA} is the RNA/swabbed surface area, $A_{surface}$ is the surface area (cm²) of
257 the surface, and *infective* is the fraction of RNA that relates to infective viral particles
258 (uniform(min=0.001, max=0.1)).

259 **Estimating Infection Risk**

260 For all scenarios, it was assumed the starting concentration on gloved hands for
261 the first episode of care was equal to 0 viral particles/cm². If gloves were doffed and
262 a new pair was donned in between care episodes, it was assumed the next episode
263 of care began with a concentration of 0 viral particles/cm² on the gloved hands.
264 After each care episode, a number was randomly sampled from a uniform
265 distribution with a minimum of 0 and a maximum of 1. If this value was less than or
266 equal to the set probability of self-contamination during doffing, self-contamination

267 occurred, where the fraction of total virus transferred from the outer glove surface to
268 the hands was assumed to be uniformly distributed between 3×10^{-5} % and 10% (9).
269 There was then a 50/50 chance that either hands were washed or sanitized using
270 alcohol gel. If they washed their hands, a \log_{10} reduction was randomly sampled
271 from a normal distribution with a mean of 1.62 and a standard deviation of 0.12,
272 (min=0 and max=6) (25). While these are not coronavirus-specific hand washing
273 efficacies they allow for a conservative estimate. If hand sanitizer was used, a \log_{10}
274 reduction was randomly sampled from a uniform distribution with a minimum of 2
275 and a maximum of 4 (24).

276 To estimate a dose, an expected concentration on the hands after doffing and
277 hand hygiene was estimated, followed by an expected transfer to a facial mucosal
278 membrane during a single hand-to-nose contact after each patient care episode
279 (eq. 5).

$$280 \quad D = C_h \cdot TE_{HM} \cdot S_m \cdot A_h \cdot e^{-k_h \Delta t} \quad (5)$$

281 There was a 50/50 chance that either the right or left hand was used for this
282 hand-to-face contact. Here, the transfer efficiency ($T_{H \rightarrow M}$) of the hand-to-nose
283 contact was randomly sampled from a normal distribution with a mean of 33.90%,
284 and a standard deviation of 20% based on a viral surrogate(21). The fractional
285 surface area of contact (S_m) was assumed to equal one fingertip. To estimate this
286 surface area, the minimum and maximum front partial fingertip fractional surface
287 areas were divided by 5 to inform the minimum and maximum values of a uniform
288 distribution (22). The surface area of a hand (A_h) was randomly sampled from a
289 uniform distribution with a minimum of 445 cm² and a maximum of 535 cm² (19) and
290 is informed by values from the Environmental Protection Agency, USA's Exposure
291 Factors Handbook (27). The expected inactivation of virus during this contact
292 assumed a single second contact, and the final k_h value used in the care episode


293 simulation was used. Δt represents the time between doffing and touching the
294 mucosa. 10,000 parameter combinations are obtained for each care type scenario
295 in a Monte Carlo framework.

296 **Dose-Response**

297 Due to lack of dose-response curve data for SARS-CoV-2, an exact beta-
298 Poisson dose-response curve (40) was fitted to pooled data for SARS-CoV-1 and
299 HCoV 229E, assuming the infectivity of SARS-CoV-2 lies between the infectivity for
300 these two organisms. In eq 6., ${}_1F_1(\alpha, \alpha + \beta, -d)$ is the "Kummer confluent
301 hypergeometric function" and $P(d)$ is the probability of infection risk given dose: d
302 (eq. 6) (40).

$$303 \quad P(d) = 1 - {}_1F_1(\alpha, \alpha + \beta, -d) \quad (6)$$

304 Ten-thousand bootstrapped pairs of α and β were produced based on a maximum
305 likelihood estimation fit. For each estimated dose, an α and β pair were randomly
306 sampled, and an infection risk was estimated with eq. 6. The infectious dose for 50%
307 of infections to occur was between 5 and 100 infectious viral particles with a mean
308 of 30; the dose-response curve can be seen in Figure 1.



309

310

Figure 1 Dose-response risk curve for averaged SARS CoV-1 and Coronavirus 229E response.

311

312 **Sensitivity Analysis**

313

Spearman correlation coefficients were used to quantify monotonic

314

relationships between input variables and infection risk. This method has been used

315

in other QMRA studies to evaluate the relationship between model inputs and

316

outputs (30, 41, 42). As not all relationships are monotonic, scatter plots of input

317

variables and associated infection risks were also investigated.

318 **Results**

319

Surface contact pattern predictions varied by care type. IV care resulted in the

320

highest number of surface contacts (mean=23, sd=10) per episode, whilst

321


observational care and doctors' rounds had on average 14 (sd=7) and 20 (sd=6)

322

contacts, respectively. A stair plot showing an example HCW surface contact

323

pattern derived from the Markov chain prediction can be seen in Figure 2.



324


325 **Figure 2 Stair plot of example HCW surface contacts during care**

326

327 ***Estimated Infection Risks***

328 After a care episode of any type, the risk of becoming infected from a single
329 facial contact ranged from 0 to 29% with a mean of 0.18%. On average, IV care
330 provided the highest risk (1% per shift, $p < 0.001$) due to the number of surface
331 contacts (IV-drip care: 23 ± 10 , Doctors' rounds: 14 ± 7 and Observational care: 20 ± 6).
332 At a 7-patient load, regardless of COVID-19 prevalence, risk was 0.6% whilst doubling
333 patient capacity more than doubled the risk to 1.3% per shift. Figure 3 shows a bar
334 chart with standard deviations for care type, COVID-19 prevalence on the ward
335 and chance of self-contamination following a mistake during doffing.

336



337

338 **Figure 3: Bar chart showing infection risk % per shift for IV, Observations and doctors' rounds for**
 339 **different COVID patient loads. Errorbars represent standard deviation of the mean.**

340 Risks relating to COVID prevalence on the ward does not appear to track
 341 linearly. HCWs on a 100% COVID ward were less than a 2x more at risk than on a 50%
 342 COVID ward (1.6% vs 1%), whilst on a 5% COVID, the risk dropped to 0.1% per shift on
 343 average (sd=0.6%).

344 In terms of most important factor determining risk, Figure 4 shows two dimensional
 345 heatmaps of input parameters plotted against predicted infection risk to elucidate
 346 correlations. The stronger the correlation, the more influence that parameter has on
 347 the output. Surface cleanliness was found to be the single most important factor in
 348 determining future risk, with hand-to-mouth/eyes/nose transfer efficiency only half as
 349 important (correlation coefficient $\rho = 0.29$ vs $\rho = 0.12$, respectively) (see Table 2).
 350 Surface concentration relates to cleaning frequency and hence the control case

351 was run for half the surface bioburden. At double the cleaning frequency, the risk is
352 halved.

353 **Table 2.** Spearman correlation coefficients of input parameters with infection risk


Parameter	Spearman Correlation Coefficient
Concentration on surfaces (viral particles/cm ²)	0.29
Transfer efficiency to mouth, eyes, or nose**	0.12
Transfer efficiency surface to hand	0.08
Transfer efficiency Hand to surface	0.06
Inactivation constant for surfaces	0.05
Fraction of total hand surface area in contact	-0.03
Fraction of RNA relating to infectious particles*	0.03
Fraction of total hand surface area used in hand-to-face contact**	0.03
Total hand surface area**	0.02
Duration (seconds)	0.02
Inactivation constant for hands	0.01
Alpha dose response curve parameter	-0.01
Beta dose-response curve parameter	-0.002

354
355 *The spearman correlation coefficient represents instances where contacts with
356 surfaces that had non-zero concentrations were made

357 **The spearman correlation coefficient represents instances in which these
358 parameters were used in a simulation where a contaminated hand-to-face contact
359 was made after doffing

360

361



362

363

364

Figure 4 Heatmaps of input parameters plotted against estimated infection risks for scenarios in which doses were greater than zero. FSA= fractional surface area. Count represents the number of simulations resulting in a specified infection risk.

365 **Discussion**

366 **Key Findings and Generalizability**

367 The model developed in this study indicates that risk of infection from mistakes
368 after doffing PPE is likely to be less than 1% for a single shift, even for nurses on 100%
369 patient COVID-19 positive wards. Infection risks vary by care type as greater
370 frequencies of surface contacts directly impact on viral loading on gloves and
371 subsequent self-contamination exposures. The risk increases further if error rates in
372 doffing are high and a high proportion of patients are COVID-19 positive (Figure 1),
373 This highlights the importance of optimal hand hygiene, especially after PPE doffing.

374

375 Surface cleanliness was the most important factor in predicting risk regardless of
376 doffing mistake likelihood, highlighting the relevance of frequency of cleaning
377 regimes for managing risk. Halving the surface viral concentration decreased the
378 infection risk 2-fold. Studies have shown that microorganisms can be readily
379 transferred between touch sites in a healthcare environment by routine
380 activities(43). Dispersion of respiratory droplets and aerosols may contaminate less
381 frequently touched surfaces as well, particularly where the patient is undergoing
382 treatment that generates aerosols such as continuous positive airway (CPAP)
383 ventilation. Sampling in COVID wards suggests aerosol deposition is a contributor to
384 surface contamination, as one study has reported deposition at a distance of 3m
385 from the patient(12). Previous experimental work aerosolising a bacteria in an air-
386 conditioned hospital room test-chamber showed that surfaces well outside the
387 patient zone can become contaminated with infectious material (44, 45). Since the
388 observational study underlying the Markov chains reveals that at least 10% of staff
389 contacts impact on such surfaces (excluding door handles), then current lists of

390 high-touch surfaces(46) that had historically been prioritised for cleaning, may need
391 to be revised.

392 Regardless of the number of COVID-19 positive patients on a ward, notable
393 decreases in predicted infection risk were associated with less self-contamination
394 during doffing. For example, for scenarios involving all COVID-19 patients, the mean
395 infection risk for 10% probability of self-contamination while doffing was 0.4%, while
396 the mean infection risk for an 80% probability of self-contamination while doffing was
397 more than a 420% increase at 2.1% (Table 1). This emphasizes the importance of
398 adequate training for PPE use. Less risk of self-contamination will decrease
399 transmission risks, potentially through a doffing buddy. PPE can be an effective
400 strategy for mitigating exposure if proper doffing techniques are used. In addition to
401 training, improvements in PPE design that enhance safety and expediency of
402 doffing may lower self-contamination rates and therefore improve PPE as a
403 mitigation strategy (47). For example, fasteners or ties on gowns/masks were
404 identified as “doffing barriers,” because it was unclear whether these were to be
405 untied and there were difficulties in reaching these ties. Self-contamination due to
406 gowns and masks were not specifically addressed in this model. It is possible that
407 self-contamination during doffing of items other than gloves could increase
408 potential risks due to incorrect doffing. Shortages of PPE have changed normal
409 practice where PPE is worn on a sessional basis rather than renewed for each
410 patient. This means less doffing and potentially less auto-contamination but may
411 increase the risk of virus transfer within the unit.

412 In addition to the importance of safe and proper doffing, the results from this
413 computational study also emphasize the importance of surface decontamination
414 and environmental monitoring strategies. The concentration of virus on surfaces was
415 the most influential parameter on infection risk, which is consistent with other surface

416 transmission risk studies (30). Whilst SARS-CoV-2 RNA has been detected on surfaces,
417 one limitation to a molecular approach is the lack of information regarding
418 infectivity. In a recent study by Zhou et al. (2020), no surface samples demonstrated
419 infectivity. However, it was noted that the concentrations of SARS-CoV-2 on surfaces
420 were below the current detection limits for culture methodologies (38). While there
421 are known relationships between cycle threshold values and probabilities of
422 detecting viable virus in a sample (48, 49), it is necessary to know what fraction of
423 detected genome copies relate to viral particles for QMRAs. More data are needed
424 to better understand how molecular concentrations, even concentrations below
425 detection limits, relate to infectivity and subsequent infection risk.

426 **Limitations**

427 The model in this study only evaluates a surface transmission route while in
428 reality, risks posed to healthcare workers are due combined exposure pathways: air,
429 droplet, person-to-person, and surface transmission. As the model only evaluates
430 surface transmission, these infection risks are likely to be an underestimate of the
431 total risk incurred by healthcare workers over an entire shift. In a study of healthcare
432 workers in a facility in Wuhan, China, 1.1% (110/9684) were COVID-19 positive (50).
433 According to CDC, of 428,295 healthcare personnel for which data were available,
434 20% (84,035/428,295) were COVID-19 cases (51). However, it is not known how many
435 shifts were associated with these infection rates. Additionally, we assumed that
436 wards with non-COVID-19 patients did not have SARS-CoV-2 contamination on
437 surfaces, due to lack of data on SARS-CoV-2 surface contamination beyond COVID-
438 19 wards or patient rooms. There is potential for asymptotically infected
439 healthcare workers to contribute environmental contamination, especially when
440 considering the relatively long shedding durations for asymptomatic infections (52).

441 Infected healthcare workers and environmental contamination could be
442 considered in future extensions of this model.

443 The fact that the proportions of healthcare workers with COVID-19 discussed
444 above are much larger than the infection risks estimated suggest that other
445 transmission routes could drive additional HCW cases. This would include more
446 transmission through airborne routes, or HCW to HCW transmission by asymptomatic
447 cases outside the COVID-19 care environment (53). However, while there continues
448 to be disagreement over the contribution of each route to overall risk, transmission
449 routes influence each other, making them all significant in healthcare environments.
450 For example, surfaces can become contaminated due to deposition of aerosolized
451 virus. Viruses can later be resuspended from surfaces, contributing to air
452 contamination. Future work should extend current models with a multi-exposure
453 pathway approach. This will advance not only our understanding of SARS-CoV-2
454 transmission but the transmission of pathogens in built environments as a whole.

455 Finally, a dose-response curve informed by SARS-CoV-1 and HCoV 229E data
456 was utilized, due to lack of SARS-CoV-2-specific dose-response data. We suggest
457 that this therefore is a conservative estimate. Despite limitations related to dose-
458 response, the conclusions from the estimated doses were consistent with insights
459 from infection risk estimates. Increases in probability of contamination between care
460 episodes related to increases in dose and most notably, for scenarios in which more
461 than 5% of patients had COVID-19 (Figure 3, Figure S1).

462 **Conclusion**

463 We propose a model for predicting risk of infection to healthcare workers from
464 self-contamination during doffing of personal protective equipment over a single
465 shift. The model estimates the quantity of SARS-CoV-2 virus accretion on gloved

466 hands for three types of non-aerosol-generating procedures: IV-care, observations
467 and doctors' rounds. Once doffing was in progress, staff self-contaminated a
468 fraction of the times based on patient-load fatigue. Three COVID-19 positive patient
469 scenarios (5%, 50% and 100% COVID-19 patients) were investigated amounting to a
470 total of 30,000 parameter combinations allowing us to conduct a "what-if"
471 parametric study and sensitivity analysis. Surface viral concentration was found to
472 be more than twice as important as any other factor whereby highlighting the
473 importance of time-appropriate cleaning. Transfer efficiency from finger to nose was
474 of secondary importance, although hand hygiene following doffing is highly
475 recommended. A doffing buddy could help reduce mistakes regardless of patient
476 numbers and hence is also recommended. Whilst risk from this type of self-
477 contamination sits at around 1% per healthcare worker shift, this highlights that the
478 procedures, if carried out correctly, are generally safe. It is accepted that other
479 routes of transmission will play a significant role in infection propagation.

480 ***Conflicts of Interest***

481 None to declare

482 ***Acknowledgements***

483 The authors thank Marc P. Verhoughstraete, PhD; Christina Liscynsky, MD for their
484 shared expertise and experience that contributed to the development of the
485 modelled scenarios in this study. This research is funded by the Engineering and
486 Physical Sciences Research Council, UK: Healthcare Environment Control,
487 Optimisation and Infection Risk Assessment (<https://HECOIRA.leeds.ac.uk>)
488 (EP/P023312/1). M. López-García was funded by the Medical Research Council, UK
489 (MR/N014855/1). J. Proctor was funded by EPSRC Centre for Doctoral Training in Fluid
490 Dynamics at Leeds (EP/L01615X/1). Under a Creative Commons Zero v1.0 Universal

491 license (CC-BY), code can be accessed at: <https://github.com/awilson12/surface->
492 [contam-model-COVID19](https://github.com/awilson12/surface-contam-model-COVID19)

493 **References**

- 494 1. Guo Z-D, Wang Z-Y, Zhang S-F, Li X, Li L, Li C, Cui Y, Fu R-B, Dong Y-Z, Chi X-Y,
495 Zhang M-Y, Liu K, Cao C, Liu B, Zhang K, Gao Y-W, Lu B, Chen W. 2020. Aerosol
496 and Surface Distribution of Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2
497 in Hospital Wards, Wuhan, China, 2020. *Emerg Infect Dis* 26.
- 498 2. Johns Hopkins University. COVID-19 Dashboard by the Center for Systems
499 Science and Engineering.
- 500 3. Boone SA, Gerba CP. 2007. Significance of fomites in the spread of respiratory
501 and enteric viral disease. *Appl Environ Microbiol* 73:1687–1696.
- 502 4. Otter JA, Donskey C, Yezli S, Douthwaite S, Goldenberg SD, Weber DJ. 2016.
503 Transmission of SARS and MERS coronaviruses and influenza virus in healthcare
504 settings: The possible role of dry surface contamination. *J Hosp Infect* 92:235–
505 250.
- 506 5. Kraay ANM, Hayashi MAL, Hernandez-Ceron N, Spicknall IH, Eisenberg MC,
507 Meza R, Eisenberg JNS. 2018. Fomite-mediated transmission as a sufficient
508 pathway: a comparative analysis across three viral pathogens. *BMC Infect Dis*
509 18:540.
- 510 6. Santarpia JL, Rivera DN, Herrera V, Morwitzer MJ, Creager H, Santarpia GW,
511 Crown KK, Brett-Major D, Schnaubelt E, Broadhurst MJ, Lawler J V, Reid SP,
512 Lowe JJ. 2020. Transmission Potential of SARS-CoV-2 in Viral Shedding
513 Observed at the University of Nebraska Medical Center. medRxiv
514 2020.03.23.20039446.
- 515 7. Ye G, Lin H, Chen L, Wang S, Zeng Z, Wang W, Zhang S, Rebmann T, Li Y, Pan Z,
516 Yang Z, Wang Y, Wang F, Qian Z, Wang X. 2020. Environmental contamination

- 517 of the SARS-CoV-2 in healthcare premises: An urgent call for protection for
518 healthcare workers. medRxiv 2020.03.11.20034546.
- 519 8. van Doremalen N, Bushmaker T, Morris DH, Holbrook MG, Gamble A,
520 Williamson BN, Tamin A, Harcourt JL, Thornburg NJ, Gerber SI, Lloyd-Smith JO,
521 de Wit E, Munster VJ. 2020. Aerosol and Surface Stability of SARS-CoV-2 as
522 Compared with SARS-CoV-1. *N Engl J Med*.
- 523 9. Casanova LM, Erukunuakpor K, Kraft CS, Mumma JM, Durso FT, Ferguson AN,
524 Gipson CL, Walsh VL, Zimring C, Dubose J, Jacob JT, Control D, Program PE.
525 2018. Assessing Viral Transfer During Doffing of Ebola-Level Personal Protective
526 Equipment in a Biocontainment Unit. *Clin Infect Dis* 66:945–949.
- 527 10. Tomas ME, Kundrapu S, Thota P, Sunkesula VCK, Cadnum JL, Mana TSC,
528 Jencson A, O'Donnell M, Zabarsky TF, Hecker MT, Ray AJ, Wilson BM, Donskey
529 CJ. 2015. Contamination of health care personnel during removal of personal
530 protective equipment. *JAMA Intern Med* 175:1904–1910.
- 531 11. Ong SWX, Tan YK, Chia PY, Lee TH, Ng OT, Wong MSY, Marimuthu K. 2020. Air,
532 Surface Environmental, and Personal Protective Equipment Contamination by
533 Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) from a
534 Symptomatic Patient. *JAMA - J Am Med Assoc* 3–5.
- 535 12. Liu Y, Ning Z, Chen Y, Guo M, Liu Y, Gali NK, Sun L, Duan Y, Cai J, Westerdahl D,
536 Liu X, Xu K, Ho K fai, Kan H, Fu Q, Lan K. 2020. Aerodynamic analysis of SARS-
537 CoV-2 in two Wuhan hospitals. *Nature* 582:557–560.
- 538 13. WHO. 2016. Quantitative Microbial Risk Assessment: Application for Water
539 Safety Management. WHO Press 187.
- 540 14. King M-FM-F, Noakes CJ, Sleight P a. 2015. Modelling environmental
541 contamination in hospital single and four-bed rooms. *Indoor Air* 25:694–707.
- 542 15. King MM-F, López-García M, Atedoghu KP, Zhang N, Wilson AM, Weterings M,

- 543 Hiwar W, Dancer SJS, Noakes CJC, Fletcher LA LA, López-García M, Atedoghu
544 KP, Zhang N, Wilson AM, Weterings M, Hiwar W, Dancer SJS, Noakes CJC,
545 Fletcher LA LA. 2020. Bacterial transfer to fingertips during sequential surface
546 contacts with and without gloves. *Indoor Air* Accepted.
- 547 16. Wilson AM, Reynolds KA, Sexton JD, Canales RA. 2018. Modeling surface
548 disinfection needs to meet microbial risk reduction targets. *Appl Environ*
549 *Microbiol* 84:1–9.
- 550 17. Wilson AM, Reynolds KA, Jaykus LA, Escudero-Abarca B, Gerba CP. 2020.
551 Comparison of estimated norovirus infection risk reductions for a single fomite
552 contact scenario with residual and nonresidual hand sanitizers. *Am J Infect*
553 *Control* 48:538-544..
- 554 18. Wilson AM, Reynolds KA, Canales RA. 2019. Estimating the effect of hand
555 hygiene compliance and surface cleaning timing on infection risk reductions
556 with a mathematical modeling approach. *Am J Infect Control Article* 47:1453-
557 1459.
- 558 19. Beamer PI, Plotkin KR, Gerba CP, Sifuentes LY, Koenig DW, Reynolds KA. 2015.
559 Modeling of human viruses on hands and risk of infection in an office
560 workplace using micro-activity data. *J Occup Environ Hyg* 12:266–75.
- 561 20. Rusin P, Maxwell S, Gerba C. 2002. Comparative surface-to-hand and
562 fingertip-to-mouth transfer efficiency of gram-positive bacteria, gram-
563 negative bacteria, and phage. *J Appl Microbiol* 93:585–92.
- 564 21. Lopez GU, Gerba CP, Tamimi AH, Kitajima M, Maxwell SL, Rose JB. 2013.
565 Transfer efficiency of bacteria and viruses from porous and nonporous fomites
566 to fingers under different relative humidity conditions. *Appl Environ Microbiol*.
- 567 22. Sizun J, Yu MWN, Talbot PJ. 2000. Survival of human coronaviruses 229E and
568 OC43 in suspension and after drying on surfaces : a possible source of hospital-

- 569 acquired infections. *J Hosp Infect* 46:55–60.
- 570 23. Warnes SL, Little ZR, Keevil CW. 2015. Human Coronavirus 229E Remains
571 Infectious on Common Touch Surface Materials. *MBio* 6:1–10.
- 572 24. Kampf G, Todt D, Pfaender S, Steinmann E. 2020. Persistence of coronaviruses
573 on inanimate surfaces and its inactivation with biocidal agents. *J Hosp Infect*
574 104:246–251.
- 575 25. Girou E, Loyeau S, Legrand P, Oppein F, Brun-Buisson C. 2002. Efficacy of
576 handrubbing with alcohol based solution versus standard handwashing with
577 antiseptic soap: randomised clinical trial. *BMJ* 325:362–362.
- 578 26. AuYeung W, Canales RA, Leckie JO. 2008. The fraction of total hand surface
579 area involved in young children's outdoor hand-to-object contacts. *Environ*
580 *Res* 108:294–299.
- 581 27. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. 2011. Exposure Factors Handbook 2011
582 Edition (EPA/600/R-09/052F). Washington, DC.
- 583 28. Watanabe T, Bartrand TA, Weir MH, Omura T, Haas CN. 2010. Development of
584 a dose-response model for SARS coronavirus. *Risk Anal* 30:1129–1138.
- 585 29. Jinadatha C, Villamaria FC, Coppin JD, Dale CR, Williams MD, Whitworth R,
586 Stibich M. 2017. Interaction of healthcare worker hands and portable medical
587 equipment: A sequence analysis to show potential transmission opportunities.
588 *BMC Infect Dis* 17:1–10.
- 589 30. Julian TR, Canales RA, Leckie JO, Boehm AB. 2009. A model of exposure to
590 rotavirus from nondietary ingestion iterated by simulated intermittent contacts.
591 *Risk Anal* 29:617–632.
- 592 31. King M-F, Noakes CJ, Sleigh PA, Bale S, Waters L. 2016. Relationship between
593 healthcare worker surface contacts, care type and hand hygiene: An
594 observational study in a single-bed hospital ward. *J Hosp Infect* 94:48–51.

- 595 32. Harbourt DE, Haddow AD, Piper AE, Bloomfield H, Kearney BJ, Fetterer D,
596 Gibson K, Minogue T. 2020. Modeling the Stability of Severe Acute Respiratory
597 Syndrome Coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV- 2) on Skin, Currency, and Clothing.
598 medRxiv.
- 599 33. Biryukov J, Boydston JA, Dunning RA, Yeager JJ, Wood S, Reese AL, Ferris A,
600 Miller D, Weaver W, Zeitouni NE, Phillips A, Freeburger D, Hooper I, Ratnesar-
601 Shumate S, Yolitz J, Krause M, Williams G, Dawson DG, Herzog A, Dabisch P,
602 Wahl V, Hevey MC, Altamura LA. 2020. Increasing Temperature and Relative
603 Humidity Accelerates Inactivation of SARS-CoV-2 on Surfaces. *mSphere* 5:1–9.
- 604 34. Pancic F, Carpentier DC, Came PE. 1980. Role of infectious secretions in the
605 transmission of rhinovirus. *J Clin Microbiol* 12:567–571.
- 606 35. Whiteley GS, Glasbey TO, Fahey PP. 2016. A suggested sampling algorithm for
607 use with ATP testing in cleanliness measurement. *Infect Dis Heal* 21:169–175.
- 608 36. Public Health England. 2017. Detection and enumeration of bacteria in swabs
609 and other environmental samples. *Natl Infect Serv Food Water Environ*
610 *Microbiol Stand Method* 4.
- 611 37. Margas E, Maguire E, Berland CR, Welander F, Holah JT. 2013. Assessment of
612 the environmental microbiological cross contamination following hand drying
613 with paper hand towels or an air blade dryer. *J Appl Microbiol* 115:572–582.
- 614 38. Zhou AJ, Otter JA, Price JR, Cimpeanu C, Garcia M, Kinross J, Boshier PR,
615 Mason S, Bolt F, Alison H, Barclay WS. 2020. Investigating SARS-CoV-2 surface
616 and air contamination in an acute healthcare setting during the peak of the
617 COVID-19 pandemic in London. medRxiv 1–24.
- 618 39. Van Abel N, Schoen ME, Kissel JC, Meschke JS. 2016. Comparison of Risk
619 Predicted by Multiple Norovirus Dose–Response Models and Implications for
620 Quantitative Microbial Risk Assessment. *Risk Anal* 37:245–264.

- 621 40. Xie G, Roiko A, Stratton H, Lemckert C, Dunn PK, Mengersen K. 2017. Guidelines
622 for use of the approximate beta-Poisson dose–response model. *Risk Anal*
623 37:1388–1402.
- 624 41. Canales RA, Wilson AM, Sinclair RG, Soto-Beltran M, Pearce-Walker J, Molina
625 M, Penny M, Reynolds KA. 2019. Microbial study of household hygiene
626 conditions and associated *Listeria monocytogenes* infection risks for Peruvian
627 women. *Trop Med Int Heal* 24:899–921.
- 628 42. Canales RA, Reynolds KA, Wilson AM, Fankem SLM, Weir MH, Rose JB, Ad-
629 Elmaksoud S, Gerba CP. 2019. Modeling the role of fomites in a norovirus
630 outbreak. *J Occup Environ Hyg* 16:16–26.
- 631 43. Rawlinson S, Ciric L, Cloutman-Green E. 2020. COVID-19 pandemic – let's not
632 forget surfaces. *J Hosp Infect* 5–6.
- 633 44. King M-F, Noakes CJ, Sleigh PA, Camargo-Valero MA. 2013. Bioaerosol
634 deposition in single and two-bed hospital rooms: A numerical and
635 experimental study. *Build Environ* 59:436–447.
- 636 45. King MF, Camargo-Valero MA, Matamoros-Veloza A, Sleigh PA, Noakes CJ.
637 2017. An effective surrogate tracer technique for *S. aureus* bioaerosols in a
638 mechanically ventilated hospital room replica using dilute aqueous lithium
639 chloride. *Atmosphere (Basel)* 8.
- 640 46. Huslage K, Rutala WA, Gergen MF, Ascp MT, Sickbert-bennett EE, Weber DJ.
641 2013. Microbial Assessment of High- , Medium- , and Low-Touch Hospital Room
642 Surfaces and Low-Touch Hospital Room Surfaces 34:211–212.
- 643 47. Baloh J, Reisinger HS, Dukes K, Da Silva JP, Salehi HP, Ward M, Chasco EE,
644 Pennathur PR, Herwaldt L. 2019. Healthcare Workers' Strategies for Doffing
645 Personal Protective Equipment. *Clin Infect Dis* 69:S192–S198.
- 646 48. Bullard J, Dust K, Funk D, Strong JE, Alexander D, Garnett L, Boodman C, Bello

- 647 A, Hedley A, Schiffman Z, Doan K, Bastien N, Li Y, Van Caeselele PG, Poliquin G.
648 2020. Predicting infectious SARS-CoV-2 from diagnostic samples. *Clin Infect Dis*
649 1–18.
- 650 49. La Scola B, Le Bideau M, Andreani J, Hoang VT, Grimaldier C. 2020. Viral RNA
651 load as determined by cell culture as a management tool for discharge of
652 SARS-CoV-2 patients from infectious disease wards. *Eur J Clin Microbiol Infect*
653 *Dis* 39:1059–1061.
- 654 50. Lai X, Wang M, Qin C, Tan L, Ran L, Chen D, Zhang H, Shang K, Xia C, Wang S,
655 Xu S, Wang W. 2020. Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-2019) Infection Among
656 Health Care Workers and Implications for Prevention Measures in a Tertiary
657 Hospital in Wuhan, China. *JAMA Netw open* 3:e209666.
- 658 51. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. 2020. Coronavirus Disease 2019
659 (COVID-19): Cases in the U.S.
- 660 52. Long Q-X, Tang X-J, Shi Q-L, Li Q, Deng H-J, Yuan J, Hu J-L, Xu W, Zhang Y, Lv F-
661 J, Su K, Zhang F, Gong J, Wu B, Liu X-M, Li J-J, Qiu J-F, Chen J, Huang A-L. 2020.
662 Clinical and immunological assessment of asymptomatic SARS-CoV-2
663 infections. *Nat Med* 1–5.
- 664 53. Sikkema RS, Pas SD, Nieuwenhuijse DF, Toole ÁO, Verweij J, Linden A Van Der,
665 Chestakova I, Schapendonk C, Koopmans MPG. 2020. Articles COVID-19 in
666 health-care workers in three hospitals in the south of the Netherlands : a cross-
667 sectional study 3099:1–8.
- 668
669
670
671
672