Original article

SARS-CoV-2 Exposures of Healthcare Workers from Primary Care, Long-Term

Care Facilities and Hospitals: A Nationwide Matched Case-Control Study

Martin Belan,¹ Tiffany Charmet,² Laura Schaeffer,² Sarah Tubiana,^{1,3} Xavier Duval,^{1,3} Jean-

Christophe Lucet,^{1,4} Arnaud Fontanet,^{2,5} Gabriel Birgand,^{6,7*} and Solen Kernéis^{1,4*}

¹Université de Paris, INSERM, IAME, Paris, France

²Institut Pasteur, Université de Paris, Emerging Diseases Epidemiology Unit, Paris, France

³Centre d'Investigation Clinique, Inserm CIC 1425, Paris, France

⁴Equipe de Prévention du Risque Infectieux (EPRI), AP-HP, Hôpital Bichat, Paris, France

⁵Conservatoire National des Arts et Métiers, Unité PACRI, Paris, France

⁶Centre d'Appui à la Prévention des Infections Associées aux Soins (CPias) des Pays de la Loire,

Nantes, France

⁷NIHR Health Protection Research Unit in Healthcare-Associated Infection and Antimicrobial

Resistance, Imperial College London, Hammersmith Campus, London, UK

*Gabriel Birgand and Solen Kernéis contributed equally to this manuscript.

Corresponding author: Martin Belan, Equipe Mobile d'Infectiologie, Hôpital Cochin, AP-HP, 27

rue du Faubourg Saint Jacques, 75679 Paris CEDEX 14, France. Tel: +33(0)1 58 41 41 83, Fax:

+33(0)1 58 41 17 61, email: martin.belan@aphp.fr

Keyword: COVID-19; healthcare workers; infection control and prevention; risk factors.

Word count: 2327; 29 References, 2 Figures, 1 Table

Supplementary Data: 3 Tables.

ABSTRACT

Objectives. Healthcare workers (HCWs) are at higher risk of contracting coronavirus disease-19 (COVID-19) than the general population. This study assessed the roles of various exposures and personal protective equipment (PPE) use on that risk for HCWs working in primary care, long-term-care facilities (LTCFs) or hospitals.

Methods. We conducted a matched case-control (1:1) study (10 April–9 July 2021). Cases (HCWs with confirmed COVID-19) and controls (HCWs without any COVID-19-positive test or symptoms) recruited by email were invited to complete an online questionnaire on their exposures and PPE use. Questions covered the 10 days preceding symptom onset for cases (or testing if asymptomatic) or inclusion for controls.

Results. A total of 4152 matched cases and controls were included. The multivariable conditional logistic regression analysis retained exposure to an infected person outside work (adjusted odds ratio, 19.9 [95% confidence interval, 12.4–31.9]), an infected colleague (2.26 [1.53–3.33]) or COVID-19 patients (2.37 [1.66–3.40]), as independent predictors of COVID-19 in HCWs, while partial or complete immunization was protective. Eye protection (0.57 [0.37–0.87]) and wearing a gown (0.58 [0.34–0.97]) during COVID-19 patient care were protective, while wearing an apron slightly increased the risk of infection (1.47 [1.00–2.18]). N95-respirator protection was comparable to that of surgical masks. Results were consistent across healthcare-facility categories.

Conclusions. HCWs were more likely to get COVID-19 in their personal sphere than during occupational activities. Our results suggest that eye protection for HCWs during patient care should be actively promoted.

INTRODUCTION

Protecting healthcare workers (HCWs) from coronavirus disease-19 (COVID-19) is critical to ensure their own safety, and maintain continuity and quality of care. HCWs are estimated to have a 1.6- to 3.4-fold higher risk of infection compared to the general population [1, 2]. High on-site involvement during the acute phases of the pandemic and lockdown periods, direct interactions with patients and lack of access to personal protective equipment (PPE) likely contributed to higher exposure. The World Health Organization estimated that between 80 000 and 180 000 HCWs could have died from COVID-19 between January 2020 and May 2021 [3]. In France, from March 2020 to September 2021, 87 647 (9%) laboratory-confirmed infections and 19 attributable deaths were reported among 935 732 HCWs from healthcare facilities [4]. The more recent emergence of highly transmissible variants further affected the healthcare-workforce capacity.

As in the general population, younger male HCWs with comorbidities, in contact with an infected household member or who participated in gathering events are at higher risk for contracting COVID-19 [5–8]. Specific occupational exposures were identified: regular patient-facing activities and contacts with infected colleagues [2, 5, 6, 9, 10]. PPE-conferred protection was mainly studied for Influenza, Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome (SARS) and Middle East Respiratory Syndrome (MERS), but evidence is controversial for COVID-19 [11–13]. Moreover, very few data have been published on HCWs in long-term care facilities (LTCFs) and primary care [14, 15], despite their intense involvement in the pandemic response. Most studies focused on the hospital setting, although exposures, organization of care and access to infection prevention and control (IPC) expertise vary greatly across facilities.

This study aimed to identify occupational and non-occupational exposures, and PPE practices

associated with COVID-19 risk for HCWs working in primary care, LTCFs or hospitals.

METHODS

Study Design and Participants

We conducted a matched case-control study from an ongoing national survey (ComCor) led by Institut Pasteur (Paris, France) since October 2020 [16–18]. The ComCor survey aims to identify COVID-19 risk factors in the general population through a case-control study on community and occupational exposures to SARS-CoV-2.

Participants were included between 10 April and 9 July 2021. All laboratory-confirmed cases of COVID-19 (either nasopharyngeal reverse transcriptase–polymerase chain reaction (RT-PCR) or antigenic test) compiled by the French National Health Insurance were invited by email to complete a questionnaire following their positive test result. Respondents who selected the “healthcare worker or working within health field” criterion in the questionnaire were included as cases in this study. Controls were recruited during the same period through two different sources: 1) IPSOS, a French marketing research and public opinion specialist, selected controls from a panel representative of the French population using frequency-matching with cases for age, sex, region, population density and week of inclusion for the Comcor survey; and 2) 24 professional corporations, scientific associations and medical platforms were asked to forward the questionnaire to their members. Participants declaring to be HCWs using the above-described criterion and reporting no previous symptoms or positive test were enrolled as controls. The final study population was obtained by randomly selecting cases and controls with a 1:1 ratio by exact case-control matching for 10-year age-category distribution, sex and residential region.

92

93 ***Data Collection***

94 Participants received online information about the study and gave consent for participation by
 95 completing the self-administered questionnaire. They opted-in without any incentives or
 96 reminders. Questionnaires covered the 10 days preceding symptom onset for cases (or testing if
 97 asymptomatic) and the 10 days preceding inclusion for controls. As previously described, the
 98 questionnaire covered sociodemographic characteristics (age, sex, residential region, household
 99 composition), health condition (prior medical history, COVID-19-immunization status) [16].
 100 Occupational activities were assessed for cases and controls: professional category, size and
 101 type of healthcare setting, frequency of contacts with general patients and COVID-19 patients,
 102 contacts with colleagues at work, and PPE use for COVID-19 patient care during the previous 10
 103 days. HCW professions were grouped in 4 categories: medical staff (physicians, residents,
 104 dentists, pharmacists, biologists), nurses, nurse's assistants and other professions (including,
 105 among others, laboratory or imaging technicians, administrative staff, speech or physical
 106 therapists, social workers and opticians). To account for previous immunization against SARS-
 107 CoV-2, we classified participants as either "not immunized", "partially immunized" or "fully
 108 immunized" [17, 19]. Participants without any documented previous COVID-19, and either not
 109 vaccinated or first-dose vaccinated within the 21 days preceding inclusion were considered "not
 110 immunized". Participants included 14 days to 6 months after laboratory-confirmed COVID-19
 111 infection or >7 days after a second vaccine dose (28 days for 1-dose regimen) were classified as
 112 fully immunized. Other participants were considered partially immunized.

113

114 ***Statistical Analyses***

115 Categorical variables are described by number (percentage). All statistical analysis were

computed with R Studio v4.1.0 (R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria). Cases and controls were matched with the Matching package. Univariable and multivariable conditional logistic regression to account for the matching strategy, adjusted to the week of inclusion, assessed relationships between variables and the outcome (COVID-19). Missing data were managed with multiple imputations by chained equations using the MICE package. To evaluate imputation effects on our results, supplementary analysis was done on a sample of fully completed questionnaires only, excluding individuals with missing data. To compare risk factors within healthcare-setting categories (hospitals, LTCFs and primary care), subgroup analyses were conducted on three population samples using the same 1:1 matching strategy for age, sex and residential region. Strengthening of Reporting of Observational Studies in Epidemiology (STROBE) reporting guidelines were followed.

Ethical Considerations

The ComCor study was approved by the *Comité de Protection des Personnes* (CPP) *Sud Ouest et Outre Mer-1* on 21 September 2020. The data protection authority *Commission Nationale de l'Informatique et des Libertés* (CNIL) authorized data processing on 21 October 2020. CPP and CNIL accorded authorizations for substantial modification to recruit controls through professional societies and associations on 31 March 2021. Informed consent was obtained from all participants. The study is registered with ClinicalTrials.gov under the identifier NCT04607941.

RESULTS

Participants

Among 562 841 individuals with confirmed COVID-19 contacted by the French National Health

Insurance (10 April–9 July 2021), 6% completed the questionnaire, including 3510 HCWs, and 1:1 matching paired 2076 cases to 2076 controls for analysis. Overall, data were missing for 126 (6%) cases and 25 (1%) controls. The weekly number of inclusions and confirmed COVID-19 cases reported in France throughout the study period are reported in Figure 2.

Table 1 reports study population characteristics. Most participants were female, mostly working in primary care. Overall, 1770/4152 (43%) HCWs were classified as either partially or fully immunized against COVID-19; 678/4152 (16%) declared being posted in a COVID-19-dedicated unit or mostly caring for COVID-19 patients. In the subgroup of HCWs in contact with COVID-19 patients during the preceding 10 days (n = 2086), 1616 (77%) declared systematically wearing a gown, 1608 (77%) gloves, 1490 (71%) a N95 respirator, 1345 (64%) goggles/faceshield and 1146 (55%) an apron for patient care.

Association between Exposures and COVID-19 Status

According to the multivariable analysis, the strongest predictor of contracting COVID-19 was exposure to an infected person outside work, while complete or partial immunization was protective (Table 1). Occupational exposure to an infected colleague, to COVID-19 patients, or working in a unit harboring a cluster of nosocomial cases increased the risk of HCW infection. Compared to medical staff, being a nurse or a nurse's aide was significantly associated with the risk of contracting COVID-19. Eye protection (goggles or faceshield) and gowning for COVID-19-patient care were associated with lower risk, while wearing an apron posed a higher risk. N95-respirator-conferred protection was comparable to that of surgical facemasks. The supplementary analysis of cases with fully completed questionnaires (Supplementary Table 1) yielded similar results.

Subgroup and Sensitivity Analyses

The subgroup analyses by healthcare sector are reported in Supplementary Tables 2 and 3. After 1:1 matching, 1388 HCWs from hospitals, 558 from LTCFs and 1842 from primary care were included. When caring for COVID-19 patients, HCWs declared more frequently wearing N95 respirators in hospitals and primary care than in LTCFs. Adherence to eye protection was particularly poor in primary care (46% of cases and 53% of controls). According to the multivariable analysis, partial or complete immunization was protective in all three settings, while exposure to an infected person outside work was again the main risk factor for infection.

DISCUSSION

In this large case-control study, the strongest predictor of HCW COVID-19 infection was exposure to an infected person outside work. Contact with an infected colleague and regular COVID-19 patient-facing activities were also significantly, but to a lesser extent, associated with infection. Eye protection and gowning during patient care decreased the risk, while N95 respirators did not confer better protection than surgical masks. These results were consistent across healthcare settings (hospital, LTCFs and primary care).

As also shown by others, our results suggest that direct contact with infected household members, relatives or, to a lesser degree, colleagues were the main sources of HCW acquisition of COVID-19 [5, 6, 9]. Nevertheless, COVID-19 patient-facing activities seem to further enhance the risk, although previous results were heterogeneous [2, 5, 7, 9, 20, 21]. One explanation for this heterogeneity across settings and wards may be the various degrees of HCW education and training to follow IPC protocols and best practices. Correct PPE use by HCWs is essential to avoid contaminations during patient care. Since the start of the pandemic, French guidelines have

recommended universal masking with surgical facemasks for general patient care, and N95-respirator use for aerosol-generating procedures [22]. For confirmed COVID-19 patients, additional PPE, such as eye protection, and gowns or aprons must be worn. Gloves are restricted to activities carrying a risk of exposure to body fluids.

Our findings highlighted marked divergence of PPE use from French guidelines, since the large majority of HCWs declared systematically wearing a N95 respirator and gloves when caring for COVID-19 patients. However, our finding that N95 respirators were not superior to surgical facemasks for protecting HCWs during standard care is consistent with the results of a recent meta-analysis of 4 randomized controlled trials on other viral respiratory infections [11]. In a multicenter observational study in Switzerland, an institutional policy of systematic N95-respirator use was not associated with a lower HCWs' seroconversion rate for COVID-19 [23]. Although additional safety conferred by eye protection was also suggested in a recent meta-analysis [24], most clinical workers find faceshields and goggles uncomfortable, impair vision and interfere with work, probably contributing to poor adherence [25]. Unexpectedly, apron use was associated with a heightened risk of contamination, while gowns were protective. The pandemic led to a widespread use or reuse of homemade aprons during COVID-19-patient care, owed to gown shortage for which donning and doffing might be easier. These observed misuses of aprons and possible lack of personal protection suits may have led to an increased risk of cross contamination during care.

HCWs from different healthcare settings have participated in the COVID-19 response. In France, 72% of nursing homes had at least one COVID-19-infected resident in 2020 [26], and numerous devastating outbreaks were described worldwide [27]. Herein, HCWs from LTCFs and primary care tended to be at higher risk of infection, which probably reflects a lack of extensive training (associated with large-scale staff turnover), and limited access to PPE and diagnostic

tests, with a globally lower awareness on the infectious risk and prevention measures. Support from hospitals and regional health authorities should be encouraged to continue staff training and ensure PPE supply. The risk of contracting COVID-19 was also influenced by the professional category: being nurses and nurse's assistants was more closely associated with COVID-19 than medical staff. Although those associations might be biased by unbalanced case and control populations for professions, they might also reflect that nurses and nurse's assistants were engaged in more prolonged and closer patient care than other professions. This higher risk of infection was described for domestic cleaners and porters, but not for nurses and nurse's assistants to our knowledge [5, 10, 21]. The result associated with the "other profession" category must be interpreted with caution because of the heterogeneity of professions, but numbers were too small to fit a statistical model to each individual profession.

The strengths of this study are the large sample size, enabling exact matching of cases and controls for age, sex and residential region, adjustment to the week of inclusion, and the nationwide distribution of study participants. Notably, sources of infection according to healthcare-facility category has not previously been assessed. The main limitations of the study are the low response rate of cases and controls and the use of an online questionnaire, which may have resulted in selection biases towards younger participants, more comfortable with internet and French language. Second, the underrepresentation of some professional categories impaired subgroup analyses, despite specific occupational exposures, e.g., physiotherapists or speech therapists. Third, the data used were relied upon HCW declarations, potentially influenced by social desirability or memorization bias. Fourth, we did not rule out past or current asymptomatic infections among controls [28]. Nevertheless, our population was composed of HCWs, more likely to recognize COVID-19 symptoms and with 3–5-fold higher access to tests than the general population, then lowering the risk of classification bias [1].

Finally, the study took place between April and July 2021, during the third COVID-19 wave in France. HCWs might have been better prepared and protected than during the first wave, especially regarding PPE, and the Delta and Omicron variants emerged in France after the end of the study period. Omicron transmissibility is much higher than previous variants, which may affect the relative weights of transmission sources and appropriate PPE [29].

In conclusion, our study results indicated that, for HCWs, COVID-19 patient-facing activities increased the risk of getting infected, while colleague-related and mostly community exposures appear to represent higher risks. Moreover, they suggest that, when caring for COVID-19 patients, HCWs should wear a surgical facemask (apart from aerosols-generating procedures), eye protection and a gown. The protection conferred by gloving should be further explored.

Supplementary Data

Supplementary materials are available at *Clinical Microbiology and Infections* online.

Notes

Funding. The study was funded by Institut Pasteur and Research, Action Emerging Infectious Diseases (REACTing), and the French Agency ANRS- Maladies Infectieuses Emergentes (ComCor project). MB is funded by the ARS Grand Est. AF's laboratory receives support from the Labex IBEID (ANR-10-LABX-62-IBEID) and the INCEPTION project (PIA/ANR-16-CONV-0005) for studies on emerging viruses. TC is funded by the Fondation de France (Alliance "Tous unis contre le virus").

Conflicts of interest. All authors: no conflict of interest to declare.

References

- [1] Nguyen LH, Drew DA, Graham MS, Joshi AD, Guo C-G, Ma W, et al. Risk of COVID-19 among front-line health-care workers and the general community: a prospective cohort study. *The Lancet Public Health* 2020;5:e475–83. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S2468-2667\(20\)30164-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2468-2667(20)30164-X).
- [2] Iversen K, Bundgaard H, Hasselbalch RB, Kristensen JH, Nielsen PB, Pries-Heje M, et al. Risk of COVID-19 in health-care workers in Denmark: an observational cohort study. *Lancet Infect Dis* 2020;20:1401–8. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1473-3099\(20\)30589-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1473-3099(20)30589-2).
- [3] World Health Organization. The impact of COVID-19 on health and care workers: a closer look at deaths. World Health Organization; 2021.
- [4] Recensement national des cas de COVID-19 chez les professionnels en établissements de santé. <https://www.santepubliquefrance.fr/etudes-et-enquetes/recensement-national-des-cas-de-covid-19-chez-les-professionnels-en-etablissements-de-sante>.
- [5] Eyre DW, Lumley SF, O'Donnell D, Campbell M, Sims E, Lawson E, et al. Differential occupational risks to healthcare workers from SARS-CoV-2 observed during a prospective observational study. *Elife* 2020;9. <https://doi.org/10.7554/eLife.60675>.
- [6] Lentz RJ, Colt H, Chen H, Cordovilla R, Popevic S, Tahura S, et al. Assessing coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) transmission to healthcare personnel: The global ACT-HCP case-control study. *Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol* 2021;42:381–7. <https://doi.org/10.1017/ice.2020.455>.
- [7] Weinberger T, Steffen J, Osterman A, Mueller TT, Muenchhoff M, Wratil PR, et al. Prospective Longitudinal Serosurvey of Health Care Workers in the First Wave of the SARS-CoV-2 Pandemic in a Quaternary Care Hospital in Munich, Germany. *Clin Infect Dis* 2021;73:e3055–65. <https://doi.org/10.1093/cid/ciaa1935>.

- 283 [8] Li J, Huang DQ, Zou B, Yang H, Hui WZ, Rui F, et al. Epidemiology of COVID-19: A systematic
284 review and meta-analysis of clinical characteristics, risk factors, and outcomes. *J Med Virol*
285 2021;93:1449–58. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jmv.26424>.
- 286 [9] Contejean A, Leporrier J, Canouï E, Fourgeaud J, Mariaggi A-A, Alby-Laurent F, et al.
287 Transmission Routes of Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 Among
288 Healthcare Workers of a French University Hospital in Paris, France. *Open Forum Infect Dis*
289 2021;8:ofab054. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ofid/ofab054>.
- 290 [10] Howard-Anderson J, Adams C, Sherman AC, Dube WC, Smith TC, Edupuganti N, et al.
291 Occupational Risk Factors for SARS-CoV-2 Infection among Healthcare Personnel: A Cross-
292 Sectional Analysis of Subjects Enrolled in the COPE Study. *Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol*
293 2021;1–20. <https://doi.org/10.1017/ice.2021.54>.
- 294 [11] Bartoszko JJ, Farooqi MAM, Alhazzani W, Loeb M. Medical masks vs N95 respirators for
295 preventing COVID-19 in healthcare workers: A systematic review and meta-analysis of
296 randomized trials. *Influenza Other Respir Viruses* 2020;14:365–73.
297 <https://doi.org/10.1111/irv.12745>.
- 298 [12] Chu DK, Akl EA, Duda S, Solo K, Yaacoub S, Schünemann HJ, et al. Physical distancing, face
299 masks, and eye protection to prevent person-to-person transmission of SARS-CoV-2 and
300 COVID-19: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Lancet* 2020;395:1973–87.
301 [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(20\)31142-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(20)31142-9).
- 302 [13] Abbas M, Goto M, Tartari E, Perencevich E, Pittet D. Revisiting the evidence for physical
303 distancing, face masks, and eye protection. *The Lancet* 2021;398:661–3.
304 [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(21\)01739-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(21)01739-6).
- 305 [14] Al-Kuwari MG, AbdulMalik MA, Al-Nuaimi AA, Abdulmajeed J, Al-Romaihi HE, Semaan S, et
306 al. Epidemiology Characteristics of COVID-19 Infection Amongst Primary Health Care

307 Workers in Qatar: March-October 2020. *Front Public Health* 2021;9:679254.
308 <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpubh.2021.679254>.

309 [15] Ladhani SN, Chow JY, Janarthanan R, Fok J, Crawley-Boevey E, Vusirikala A, et al. Increased
310 risk of SARS-CoV-2 infection in staff working across different care homes: enhanced CoVID-
311 19 outbreak investigations in London care Homes. *J Infect* 2020;81:621–4.
312 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jinf.2020.07.027>.

313 [16] Galmiche S, Charmet T, Schaeffer L, Paireau J, Grant R, Chény O, et al. Exposures associated
314 with SARS-CoV-2 infection in France: A nationwide online case-control study. *Lancet Reg*
315 *Health Eur* 2021;7:100148. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lanepe.2021.100148>.

316 [17] Charmet T, Schaeffer L, Grant R, Galmiche S, Chény O, Von Platen C, et al. Impact of
317 original, B.1.1.7, and B.1.351/P.1 SARS-CoV-2 lineages on vaccine effectiveness of two
318 doses of COVID-19 mRNA vaccines: Results from a nationwide case-control study in France.
319 *Lancet Reg Health Eur* 2021;8:100171. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lanepe.2021.100171>.

320 [18] Grant R, Charmet T, Schaeffer L, Galmiche S, Madec Y, Von Platen C, et al. Impact of SARS-
321 CoV-2 Delta variant on incubation, transmission settings and vaccine effectiveness: Results
322 from a nationwide case-control study in France. *The Lancet Regional Health - Europe*
323 2021:100278. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lanepe.2021.100278>.

324 [19] Hall VJ, Foulkes S, Saei A, Andrews N, Oguti B, Charlett A, et al. COVID-19 vaccine coverage
325 in health-care workers in England and effectiveness of BNT162b2 mRNA vaccine against
326 infection (SIREN): a prospective, multicentre, cohort study. *Lancet* 2021;397:1725–35.
327 [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(21\)00790-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(21)00790-X).

328 [20] Sims MD, Maine GN, Childers KL, Podolsky RH, Voss DR, Berkiw-Scenna N, et al. COVID-19
329 seropositivity and asymptomatic rates in healthcare workers are associated with job

function and masking. Clin Infect Dis 2021;73:S154–62.

<https://doi.org/10.1093/cid/ciaa1684>.

[21] Tian C, Lovrics O, Vaisman A, Chin KJ, Tomlinson G, Lee Y, et al. Risk factors and protective measures for healthcare worker infection during highly infectious viral respiratory epidemics: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol 2021;1–102. <https://doi.org/10.1017/ice.2021.18>.

[22] Covid-19, infection par le SARS-CoV-2. <https://www.sf2h.net/publications/coronavirus-2019-ncov>.

[23] Szajek K, Fleisch F, Hutter S, Risch M, Bechmann T, Luyckx VA, et al. Healthcare institutions' recommendation regarding the use of FFP-2 masks and SARS-CoV-2 seropositivity among healthcare workers: a multicenter longitudinal cohort study. Antimicrobial Resistance & Infection Control 2022;11:6. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13756-021-01047-x>.

[24] Byambasuren O, Beller E, Clark J, Collignon P, Glasziou P. The effect of eye protection on SARS-CoV-2 transmission: a systematic review. Antimicrobial Resistance & Infection Control 2021;10:156. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13756-021-01025-3>.

[25] Alzunitan MA, Perencevich EN, Edmond MB. Assessing health care worker perceptions of face coverings during the COVID-19 pandemic. Am J Infect Control 2021;49:521–2. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ajic.2020.09.006>.

[26] En 2020, trois Ehpad sur quatre ont eu au moins un résident infecté par la Covid-19 | Direction de la recherche, des études, de l'évaluation et des statistiques. <https://drees.solidarites-sante.gouv.fr/publications/etudes-et-resultats/en-2020-trois-ehpad-sur-quatre-ont-eu-au-moins-un-resident-infecte>.

[27] Hashan MR, Smoll N, King C, Ockenden-Muldoon H, Walker J, Wattiaux A, et al. Epidemiology and clinical features of COVID-19 outbreaks in aged care facilities: A

354 systematic review and meta-analysis. *EClinicalMedicine* 2021;33:100771.
355 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eclinm.2021.100771>.
356 [28] He J, Guo Y, Mao R, Zhang J. Proportion of asymptomatic coronavirus disease 2019: A
357 systematic review and meta-analysis. *J Med Virol* 2021;93:820–30.
358 <https://doi.org/10.1002/jmv.26326>.
359 [29] Nishiura H, Ito K, Anzai A, Kobayashi T, Piantham C, Rodríguez-Morales AJ. Relative
360 Reproduction Number of SARS-CoV-2 Omicron (B.1.1.529) Compared with Delta Variant in
361 South Africa. *Journal of Clinical Medicine* 2022;11:30.
362 <https://doi.org/10.3390/jcm11010030>.
363

364 **Table 1.** Study population and infection determinants: description and results of the univariable and multivariable conditional logistic
365 regression analyses adjusted to the week of inclusion.

Characteristic	Cases n = 2076	Controls n = 2076	aOR (95% CI)	
			Univariable analysis	Multivariable analysis
Characteristic				
Age category, years				
[18–28]	281 (14)	281 (14)		
[29–38]	639 (31)	639 (31)		
[39–48]	616 (30)	616 (30)		
[49+]	540 (26)	540 (26)		
Female sex	1762 (85)	1762 (85)		
At least one comorbidity ^a	305 (15)	235 (11)	1.38 (1.10–1.74)	1.28 (0.92–1.78)
Smoker	367 (18)	337 (16)	1.21 (0.98–1.49)	0.82 (0.60–1.11)
COVID-19 immunization				
None	1552 (75)	817 (39)	Reference	Reference
Partial	312 (15)	532 (26)	0.30 (0.24–0.38)	0.30 (0.22–0.40)
Complete	206 (10)	720 (35)	0.21 (0.16–0.27)	0.19 (0.14–0.27)
Healthcare sector				
Hospital	694 (33)	800 (39)	Reference	Reference
Long-term-care facility	372 (18)	291 (14)	1.58 (1.25–2.01)	1.11 (0.77–1.61)
Primary care	1010 (49)	985 (47)	1.14 (0.96–1.36)	1.70 (1.28–2.26)
HCWs Professional category				
Medical professions	174 (8)	552 (27)	Reference	Reference
Nurses	451 (22)	401 (19)	5.87 (4.30–8.02)	3.79 (2.50–5.76)
Nurse's assistants	357 (17)	126 (6)	14.2 (9.81–20.4)	9.08 (5.30–15.5)
Others	1094 (53)	997 (48)	4.22 (3.23–5.51)	2.16 (1.52–3.08)
Exposures during the 10 days preceding inclusion				
Regular COVID-19 patient-facing activities	393 (19)	285 (14)	1.63 (1.31–2.03)	2.37 (1.66–3.40)
Exposure to an infected colleague ^b	339 (17)	111 (5)	3.31 (2.48–4.43)	2.26 (1.53–3.33)
Exposure to an infected person outside of work ^b	434 (22)	47 (2)	11.3 (7.74–16.6)	19.9 (12.4–31.9)
Professional cluster (patients and/or HCWs) ^b	376 (19)	172 (8)	2.70 (2.09–3.49)	2.14 (1.50–3.06)

For COVID-19 patients care^c, systematic use of

Mask type				
Surgical facemask	331 (30)	253 (25)	—	—
Cloth mask	8 (<1)	4 (<1)	1.46 (0.35–6.14)	1.67 (0.18–15.8)
N95 respirator	749 (69)	741 (74)	0.64 (0.50–0.83)	0.85 (0.55–1.29)
Gloves	883 (81)	725 (73)	1.37 (1.06–1.78)	1.44 (0.87–2.39)
Eye protection (goggles or faceshield)	653 (60)	692 (69)	0.58 (0.46–0.73)	0.57 (0.37–0.87)
Gown	813 (75)	803 (81)	0.68 (0.52–0.89)	0.58 (0.34–0.97)
Apron	625 (57)	521 (52)	1.29 (1.03–1.62)	1.47 (1.00–2.18)
Did not care to COVID-19 patients	988 (48)	1078 (52)	—	—

Results are presented as number (%), and adjusted odds ratios [aOR] (95% confidence intervals [CI]).

^aComorbidity among: diabetes, arterial hypertension, myocardial infarction and/or chronic pulmonary disease.

^bAnalysis computed with multiple imputations for missing data.

^cFor personal protective equipment use, percentages were calculated based on the number of HCWs who cared to COVID-19 patients during the 10 past days (1088 cases and 998 controls).

Figure legends

Figure 1. Flow chart of study participants. HCWs, healthcare workers; IPSOS, French marketing-research and public-opinion specialist.

Figure 2. Weekly number of inclusions of cases (red bars) and controls (blue bars). The black line shows the weekly number of laboratory-confirmed cases reported in France throughout the study period (source: *Santé Publique France*).