

# 1 **A large outbreak of COVID-19 in a UK prison, October 2020** 2 **to April 2021**

3  
4 James P. Adamson<sup>1,2\*</sup>, Christopher Smith<sup>3</sup>, Nicole Pacchiarini<sup>4</sup>, Thomas Richard Connor<sup>4,5</sup>,  
5 Janet Wallsgrove<sup>6</sup>, Ian Coles<sup>6</sup>, Clare Frost<sup>6</sup>, Angharad Edwards<sup>6</sup>, Jaisi Sinha<sup>7</sup>, Catherine  
6 Moore<sup>7</sup>, Steph Perrett<sup>8</sup>, Christie Craddock<sup>8</sup>, Clare Sawyer<sup>1,2</sup>, Alison Waldram<sup>2,9</sup>, Alicia  
7 Barrasa<sup>2,9</sup>, Daniel Rh. Thomas<sup>1</sup>, Philip Daniels<sup>9</sup>, Heather Lewis<sup>9</sup>

8  
9  
10 <sup>1</sup> Centre for Disease Surveillance and Control, Public Health Wales, Cardiff, Wales, UK

11 <sup>2</sup> UK Field Epidemiology Training Programme

12 <sup>3</sup> Improvement Cymru, Public Health Wales, Cardiff, Wales, UK

13 <sup>4</sup> Pathogen Genomics Unit, Public Health Wales, Cardiff, Wales, UK

14 <sup>5</sup> Cardiff University School of Biosciences, Cardiff University, Wales, UK

15 <sup>6</sup> "Prison A", Wales, UK

16 <sup>7</sup> Microbiology, Public Health Wales, Cardiff, Wales, UK

17 <sup>8</sup> Health Protection Division, Public Health Wales, Cardiff, Wales, UK

18 <sup>9</sup> UK Health Security Agency, London, UK

19

## 20 **\*Corresponding author**

21 James Adamson

22 CDSC Public Health Wales, Cardiff, Wales, UK

23 [james.adamson2@wales.nhs.uk](mailto:james.adamson2@wales.nhs.uk)

24 [0044] (0)29 2022 7744

25

26

27 **Word count:** 3480

28

29

30 **Abstract**

31 **Introduction**

32 Prisons are susceptible to outbreaks. Control measures focusing on isolation and cohorting  
33 negatively affect wellbeing. We present an outbreak of COVID-19 in a large male prison in  
34 Wales, UK, October 2020 to April 2021, and discuss control measures.

35 **Methods**

36 We gathered case-information, including demographics, staff-residence postcode, resident  
37 cell number, work areas/dates, test results, staff interview dates/notes and resident prison-  
38 transfer dates. Epidemiological curves were mapped by prison location. Control measures  
39 included isolation (exclusion from work or cell-isolation), cohorting (new admissions and  
40 work-area groups), asymptomatic testing (case-finding), removal of communal dining and  
41 movement restrictions. Facemask use and enhanced hygiene were already in place. Whole  
42 genome sequencing (WGS) and interviews determined genetic relationship between cases  
43 plausibility of transmission.

44 **Results**

45 Of 453 cases, 53% (n=242) were staff, most aged 25-34 years (11.5% females, 27.15%  
46 males) and symptomatic (64%). Crude attack-rate was higher in staff (29%, 95%CI: 26-64%)  
47 than in residents (12%, 95%CI: 9-15%).

48 **Conclusions**

49 Whole genome sequencing can help differentiate multiple introductions from person-to-  
50 person transmission in prisons. It should be introduced alongside asymptomatic testing as  
51 soon as possible to control prison outbreaks. Timely epidemiological investigation, including  
52 data visualisation, allowed dynamic risk assessment and proportionate control measures,  
53 minimising reduction in resident welfare.

54

## 55 **Introduction**

56 Prisons are crowded communal settings. During the COVID-19 pandemic, prisons have  
57 been highly susceptible to outbreaks, resulting in high levels of morbidity and mortality in  
58 residents and staff [1–3]. During the first wave, 7.6 confirmed COVID-19 cases were  
59 reported per 1000 prison residents in England and Wales compared with 4.9 in the general  
60 population [4]. In the second wave, this rose to 75 cases per 1000 population in prisons,  
61 compared to 46 cases per 1000 overall, by the end of December 2020 [5]. Control measures  
62 focusing on isolation and cohorting were initiated in prisons in Wales [6], reducing mixing  
63 and visits. These restrictive regimes can negatively affect physical and mental wellbeing  
64 through loss of control [7–9], consequently reducing cooperation: COVID-19 caused prison  
65 unrest and rioting in Europe early in the pandemic [10]. This is concerning given prisoners  
66 have worse physical and mental health than the general population and are regularly  
67 exposed to many health risks including smoking, poor hygiene and weakened immunity [3].  
68 Measures to limit the spread and impact of COVID-19 in Welsh prisons began several weeks  
69 before the first prison-cases were seen. On 11 February 2020, Public Health England  
70 circulated their first interim guidance for COVID-19 in prisons, which was adopted in Wales.  
71 Infection control processes were established in all Welsh prisons, continuing throughout the  
72 pandemic in line with further guidance.

73

74 In October 2020, Public Health Wales (PHW) was notified of a case of COVID-19 in a  
75 resident of a large male prison in South Wales, UK (“Prison A”), which has approximately  
76 1700 residents and 850 staff. This index case had a history of respiratory illness and was in  
77 hospital at the time of notification. After a negative PCR result on hospital admission, they  
78 tested PCR positive during their stay, classifying them as a hospital-acquired case. Two  
79 weeks later, an incident management team (IMT) was convened to review 25 more cases  
80 (20 residents, 5 staff), epidemiologically linked to the index case. The IMT declared an

81 outbreak and established an outbreak control team (OCT) which managed this outbreak  
82 through collaborative decisions, as defined in the outbreak plan for Wales [11].

### 83 **Methods**

84 The OCT met weekly to discuss case numbers, epidemiology, control measures and  
85 operational issues related to the outbreak. The roles and organisations of OCT members are  
86 given in Table 1. We describe the epidemiology and control measures implemented for this  
87 outbreak.

88 A possible case was any staff or resident at Prison A on or after 14 Oct 2020 who had  
89 symptoms compatible with COVID-19 (cough and/or fever and/or loss of smell/taste), without  
90 a PCR test result. A probable case was a possible case with a positive PCR test result that  
91 had not been verified by PHW. A confirmed case was any probable case with a positive PCR  
92 test result, which had been verified by PHW. A discarded case was a possible case whose  
93 PCR test result was negative.

94 In accordance to then-current national guidance, symptomatic residents and staff were  
95 tested for the presence of SARS-CoV-2 RNA using PCR tests. Asymptomatic screening was  
96 introduced in the Admissions unit (A-Block) from December 2020 (see control measures).

97 We telephoned all staff cases to discuss their movements and contacts prior to testing  
98 positive; no resident interviewing was done due to concerns of breaking self-isolation to  
99 access a telephone. Instead, intelligence on resident cases was obtained from prison staff.

100 Given the restrictions of movement in place during this outbreak, this information was  
101 deemed accurate and reliable by the OCT.

102 Case data were managed using an Excel line list containing demographic information (age,  
103 sex), staff residence postcode, resident cell number, work areas/dates, laboratory results  
104 (test dates, result status, laboratory IDs, whole genome sequencing (WGS) links), interview  
105 dates/notes and resident prison-transfer dates. Line list management was performed by a

106 single member of staff, in frequent contact with prison, “Test, Trace, Protect” (TTP – contact  
107 tracing) and laboratory colleagues.

### 108 ***Epidemiological investigations***

109 Cases were plotted on an epidemiological curve, then mapped by accommodation block and  
110 work location to show frequency and distribution over time (total and last 28 days). Prison  
111 A’s accommodation is divided into 10 accommodation blocks (box 1) and other functional  
112 areas including Industries, where the residents of working age undertake assigned work-  
113 activities,

114 Laundry, Canteen, Gym and Healthcare.

115 Epidemiological curves and case location mapping were updated weekly, providing dynamic  
116 visual aids for risk assessment. Where cases were present in multiple locations, overlap was  
117 highlighted on the maps. Test date was used for asymptomatic cases and symptom onset  
118 date used for symptomatic cases. Crude attack rates were calculated by location using  
119 prison records for staff and residents (January 2021: 1693 staff and 832 staff). Variation in  
120 attack rates were measured using a two-proportion z-test. Finally, case hospitalisation ratios  
121 for staff and residents were calculated.

122 Whole genome sequencing was carried out by the PHW Pathogens Genomics Unit (PenGU)  
123 using the ARTIC protocol for “Illumina” (standard turnaround) or Oxford “Nanopore” (rapid  
124 turnaround) to assess the genetic relationship between cases, aid epidemiological  
125 investigation and determine control measures. Sequencing was performed only on samples  
126 meeting set quality criteria (including a diagnostic result with a cycle threshold value of less  
127 than 30). Samples were processed using the ncov2019 ARTIC Nextflow pipeline [12] and  
128 were analysed using the CLIMB COVID analysis platform [13] making use of the civet [14]  
129 and MircoReact [15] tools for analysis and visualisation of the outbreak.

130

131

132

## 133 **Results**

134 Between October 2020 and April 2021 (189 days), Prison A reported 453 cases (staff n=242,  
135 53%; residents n=211, 47%) (Table 2). Most were symptomatic (64%; staff n=163, 67%;  
136 residents n=126, 60%) (Table 3) with a mode of 25-34 years for both sexes (11.5% females,  
137 27.15% males) (Figure 1). Three staff were hospitalised due to their COVID-19 illness; case  
138 hospitalisation ratios were 0.36 for staff and 0.06 for residents. One death was linked to this  
139 outbreak; a resident with a positive PCR test result more than 28 days but fewer than 90  
140 days before death. Telephone interviews were completed with 99% of staff cases.

141 The index case was resident in A-block prior to hospital admission; 12 staff cases worked  
142 hospital bed watch shifts for the index case during their infectious period and subsequently  
143 worked in A-block, T-block, young persons' unit (YPU) and safer custody unit (SCU).  
144 However, there were already staff cases in SCU prior to these staff working back in Prison  
145 A.

146 Crude attack rate was higher in staff (29%, 95%CI: 26-64%) than in residents (12%, 95%CI:  
147 9-15%). Accommodation-units' specific attack rates ranged from 0% to 26% in residents and  
148 24% to 90% in staff (table 2). Admissions (A-block), D-block, SCU and YPU experienced the  
149 highest overall attack rates (table 2). An overview of staff cases in other work locations (table  
150 4) shows highest attack rates in the testing and mentor teams.

151 An epidemic curve (Figure 2), highlighting dates of key control measures, shows that the first  
152 half of the outbreak (87 days) comprised 346 (76%) of the cases reported. Of these, 75  
153 (22%) were asymptomatic. During the second half of the outbreak (86 days), 82 of the 106  
154 cases (77%) were asymptomatic. Mapping cases by area of work or residence showed  
155 variation in attack rates by area and which cases were associated to more than one location  
156 (Figure 3).

157 Sequencing of a sample from the index case and one prison staff member on bed watch for  
158 the index case revealed that the resident and staff member infections were of different  
159 lineages and not closely genetically related.

160 Subsequent WGS testing showed a third, different phylotype present in the prison; a cluster  
161 of seven X-block resident cases employed in the prison's print shop had identical  
162 phlotypes. One staff member's WGS result was this same phylotype; follow-up interviews  
163 revealed brief, informal contact between these cases whilst moving between locations. By  
164 the end of October 2020, 26 cases' test samples had been sequenced (15 residents, 11  
165 staff), identifying in 11 different phlotypes. Phlotypes are based upon the position of a  
166 sample on the global SARS-CoV-2 phylogenetic tree, and where two cases possess  
167 phlotypes that differ, it is possible to exclude those two cases from being a directly linked  
168 transmission. Where two cases possess the same phylotype, when combined with other  
169 epidemiological data, it is possible to conclude the cases are part of a transmission group.  
170 Taking these WGS results with the other epidemiological data, WGS demonstrated that  
171 there had been multiple introductions into the prison as well as subsequent person-to-person  
172 transmission.

173 WGS enabled a delineation of person-to-person spread, and helped demonstrate that this  
174 had occurred between residents and staff through identical phylotype results by time, place  
175 and person. Person-to-person spread was also found in the same way between staff working  
176 in the same location with no contact to residents (Figure 4). Clusters by team, such as in  
177 Estates and Facilities Management, were examples of where keeping two metres apart was  
178 often difficult when completing essential duties.

179

### 180 ***Outbreak control measures***

181 Certain COVID-19 control measures were in place before this outbreak, mandated across  
182 the Welsh Prison estate start of the pandemic:

183 All areas had enhanced cleaning protocols. Hand-washing stations and 70%-alcohol-gel  
184 dispensers were installed in all areas. Safety briefings to all staff and residents reiterated the  
185 importance of hand hygiene and social distancing. Facemasks were mandatory for  
186 everyone; signage was installed throughout the prison to reinforce these rules. All areas  
187 were risk-assessed; rooms stipulated maximum capacity and residents were allowed to  
188 move within their blocks in sub-groups to aid social distancing.

189 Residents were vaccinated by age-cohort by the prison healthcare team; the first vaccination  
190 was given in January 2021. Uptake of resident vaccination is affected by prison churn but  
191 has been given to 97% of those requesting it (July and November 2021, table 5). Prison staff  
192 were offered vaccination in the community by age-cohort, commensurate with the public,  
193 which Prison A's management encouraged.

194 The principal control measures instigated by the OCT are categorised as standard-unilateral  
195 measures and targeted-proportional measures. The latter expedited relaxation of other  
196 controls imposed based on evidence of reduced infection and transmission:

197 Staff with COVID-19 symptoms were excluded from work, asked to take a PCR test and  
198 remained in self-isolation until the result was known. Symptomatic residents took a PCR test  
199 and remained in cell-isolation pending results. Where cells were shared, this contact formed  
200 a "bubble"; they followed the same isolation period as their cellmate, dependent on results.

201 New resident-admissions into Prison A, from the courts system or inter-prison transfer, were  
202 reverse-cohorted by date to limit transmission in either direction between people living and  
203 working in A-block.

204 Asymptomatic testing (day one and day five PCR tests) was implemented for new resident-  
205 admissions from December 2020. Admissions were grouped by admission date until 14 days  
206 after their arrival before commencement of the induction-programme and relocation to  
207 another permanent residential-block.



208 To minimise new introductions and person-to-person transmission, staff worked in one area  
209 only, unless operational necessity otherwise. Staff overtime was restricted to the same area  
210 as normal hours. Staff dining became takeaway during March 2020. Staff were frequently  
211 advised not to car share, in-person and by email.

212 The highest level of restrictions (“level four”) were initiated in mid-December 2020 to control  
213 the number of cases at this outbreak’s peak. This included suspension of visits, non-  
214 essential work and staff-movement across the prison. Residents were limited to 30-minutes  
215 per day to shower and exercise outside cells. Meals and purchases were brought to their  
216 cells.

217 Residents performing essential work (kitchen, cleaning and laundry) were organised into  
218 shift-groups so men from the same accommodation unit worked together. Non-essential  
219 work was limited or stopped during.

220 Level four-regime control measures could be lifted when positivity rates were low; to confirm  
221 this, asymptomatic testing (PCR) was used on a weekly basis, piloted in staff in the  
222 vulnerable prisoners unit (VPU) from December 2020 due to the high attack-rate. Testing  
223 was extended to staff in the YPU from January 2021 and offered to all staff and residents  
224 later that month. Lateral flow device (LFD) testing began in February 2021, becoming  
225 available to all staff and residents by the end of March 2021.

### 226 ***Impact of the control measures***

227 Effective outbreak management required a collaborative, multi-agency OCT that acted at all  
228 policy and operational levels, gathered accurate information and implemented appropriate  
229 and timely control measures. Cohorting and testing new-admissions reduced their ability to  
230 infect others. Asymptomatic screening identified cases who would otherwise have remained  
231 an infection risk and highlighted additional efforts required to end level four regime measures  
232 safely in specific areas. The timeline of the outbreak and key dates and control measures is  
233 shown in detail in Figure 5.

234

## 235 **Discussion**

236 We describe a large, long-running outbreak of COVID-19 affecting 211 prison residents and  
237 242 staff. During the second peak in Wales in December 2020, there were 102 resident  
238 cases and 101 staff cases in this outbreak, representing a period-incidence of 60.4 cases  
239 per 1000 population (residents) and 118.8 cases per 1000 population (staff) respectively.  
240 This was higher for staff but lower for prisoners compared to the England and Wales prison  
241 average in the same period, highlighting the impact of community incidence on introductions  
242 to the prison. The proportion of cases hospitalised was six-times higher in staff than  
243 residents, highlighting potential differences in self-perception of disease severity or inequity  
244 of access to healthcare.

245 There were notable differences in infection patterns; YPU cases were mostly staff (38/40;  
246 95%) and both resident infections were asymptomatic, consistent to community infections  
247 whereby young people generally experienced milder or no symptoms of COVID-19.  
248 Conversely, D-block cases were mostly residents (24/32; 75%) which may highlight  
249 difficulties in social-distancing for those with disabilities. The accommodation with the  
250 highest attack rates (SCU=45.5%; YPU=38.5%; D=30.5%) were all self-contained units with  
251 fewer residents and staff; thus each new case contributed a higher weighting to attack rates  
252 than the larger units.

253 Where staff had greater exposure to others, attack rates were higher; exemplified by the  
254 Mentor and Testing Teams experiencing attack rates of 50%. These roles involved contact  
255 with a many of people and, for the Testing Team, an obvious and repeated risk of contact  
256 with infectious asymptomatic cases. Because some staff-teams were small and others  
257 worked in more than one area, attack rates should be interpreted with caution. What is clear  
258 is that the 242 staff cases in a stable population of 850 versus 211 resident cases in a  
259 fluctuating population of over 1690 during this outbreak, means the attack rate was far  
260 higher in staff than residents (Overall AR = 29% in staff versus 12% in residents). The skew

261 in male cases reflects the resident population and majority of staff being male. The higher  
262 proportion of staff cases in this outbreak reached statistical significance. One explanation for  
263 this could be the long periods of resident cell-isolation and greatly reduced contact  
264 opportunities during socialisation times. Furthermore, staff mixed with others outside work,  
265 which might not have been detected by this investigation, despite interviewing.

266 Controlling COVID-19 outbreaks in prisons requires preventative and reactive measures.  
267 This OCT benefitted from dedicated epidemiological support, line listing management and  
268 case distribution mapping. The importance placed on epidemiological investigation by the  
269 OCT chair improved its ability to determine and expedite control measures through  
270 combination of case-location mapping and WGS results. Mapping revealed where further  
271 investigation and control measures were required and allowed phased relaxation of  
272 restrictions such as cell-isolation. WGS showed this outbreak was seeded by multiple  
273 introductions to the prison but also involved person-to-person transmission. In terms of the  
274 initial X-block cluster identified by WGS, the same phylotype was widely distributed in  
275 communities in Wales at this time in the pandemic and many staff were resident in these  
276 areas, giving rise to a plausible introduction-pathway.

277 Early or temporary release of prisoners was discussed widely early in the pandemic [16],  
278 although little evidence suggests this happened at scale anywhere. Cohorting and reduced  
279 mixing worked well in this outbreak. However, residents undertake essential services  
280 (cooking, laundry, cleaning) resulting in mixing. Prisons have a continuous churn of  
281 residents; despite limiting transfers during the peak incidence of COVID-19 in the UK, they  
282 were not stopped, resulting in residual risk of infection. Mass screening is effective in  
283 identifying cases and limiting spread of disease [17] and was employed here to minimise  
284 transmission between groups and identify cases who would have otherwise have remained  
285 an infection risk. Scaling-up testing capacity to all staff and residents demonstrated the  
286 majority of cases were asymptomatic in the second-half of this outbreak (106 cases in 86  
287 days, 18 symptomatic). If other asymptomatic cases had been identified in this was at the

288 start of this outbreak, the length might have been reduced. It also highlights inequalities in  
289 testing practice. This suggests the epidemic curve is not a true reflection of case rates by  
290 location, especially in the first-half of this outbreak. The collaborative OCT approach allowed  
291 them to discuss, consider, adapt and react within the changing guidance-landscape of the  
292 COVID-19 pandemic [18].

293 Prisons, by design, control activities and movement but provide little personal space.  
294 Compared to the wider community, this complicated the control of COVID-19 spreading in a  
295 naïve population. As such, stringent social distancing measures were deemed necessary to  
296 control COVID-19 in Prison A.

297 Integration of epidemiological techniques with WGS allowed the OCT to make balanced risk  
298 assessments with clarity about direction and intensity of transmission events. As case-rates  
299 were reduced in a particular location, relaxation of control measures followed. The social  
300 distancing and enhanced hygiene campaigns in place for eight months before this outbreak  
301 clarified the impact of the OCT's control measures.

302 Vaccination is a key control measure strategy for many infectious diseases. There was much  
303 debate about vaccination prioritisation for prison residents and staff given the high  
304 propensity for transmission. Modelling has shown that vaccinating everyone living and  
305 working in prisons is the most effective strategy for reducing COVID-19 cases, transmission  
306 and outbreaks, with an 89% reduction in cases over three years [2]. Combination of high  
307 vaccine coverage with other non-pharmaceutical interventions has been shown to reduce  
308 cumulative infections by up to 54% in another model [19].

309

310 Our methods had several limitations. Different testing pathways for staff and residents  
311 limited the number of samples available for WGS, particularly early in this outbreak.  
312 Additional, early WGS intelligence might have identified other transmission routes, especially  
313 in terms of community introduction via staff and inter-prison introduction via A-block.

314 However, there were huge pressure on WGS services due to the COVID-19 pandemic, and  
315 it wasn't until January 2021 that issues around accessing and sequencing Welsh Pillar 2  
316 samples tested by Lighthouse Laboratories were largely resolved. We only considered  
317 activities and movements of staff and residents inside Prison A; it is likely that staff  
318 socialised outside Prison A, potentially in contact with asymptomatic cases. Telephone  
319 interviews with staff cases investigated plausible vehicles of transmission, such as  
320 household contacts, but asymptomatic spread in their communities was not investigated and  
321 would have been difficult to measure. Despite agreement of the OCT members, not  
322 interviewing resident cases was an information bias and could have revealed additional  
323 information relevant to the investigation and control measures. Lack of ascertainment of  
324 resident denominators by accommodation area due to prison churn meant comparing staff  
325 and resident attack rates was not regularly possible.

326

327 We conclude that sufficient epidemiological capacity to investigate outbreaks thoroughly  
328 allows OCTs to assess changes and implement appropriate control measures. Traditional  
329 epidemiological investigations can be augmented with WGS to determine the phylogeny of  
330 infections and inform the epidemiological plausibility of community versus prison  
331 transmission. Analysis of epidemiological investigation findings revealed that admissions-  
332 block was a persistent source of infections; particular attention should be given to  
333 admissions screening. Case-distribution location mapping tracked infection progression,  
334 visualising data and allowing easy interpretation to make timely control measure responses.  
335 Mapping was equally informative for deciding when to relax control measures safely to  
336 improve resident welfare.

337 Limiting staff movements to one area negatively affected prison operational capacity as  
338 more staff became absent due to infection, but helped reduce further transmission. Frequent  
339 communication of COVID-19 infection control measures to all staff and residents built an  
340 inclusive culture of behaviour applicable to all staff and residents.

341 COVID-19 is likely to be in circulation for several years. Given the vulnerability of prison  
342 residents to infectious diseases, prioritisation of prisoners in COVID-19 vaccination  
343 campaigns should be considered.

344

#### 345 **Recommendations**

- 346 1. Sufficient capacity for thorough epidemiological investigations is important for providing  
347 timely information for the OCT to determine actions
- 348 2. Data visualisation through case-distribution location mapping improves speed of  
349 interpretation, aiding risk assessment to determine control measures
- 350 3. WGS is a powerful tool in assessing the plausibility of transmission chains and should be  
351 introduced as soon as possible in prison outbreak investigations
- 352 4. Cohorting, particularly in admissions blocks, is effective in limiting transmission of  
353 COVID-19 in prisons
- 354 5. Asymptomatic testing is highly effective in identifying cases and can limit transmission  
355 events by having them isolate

356

357

358

359

360

361

362

363

364

365 **Acknowledgements**

366 None

367 **Conflicts of interest**

368 None

369 **Ethics**

370 Ethical oversight of the project was provided by the PHW Research and Development  
371 Division. As this work was carried out as part of the health protection response to a public  
372 health emergency in Wales, using routinely collected surveillance data, PHW Research and  
373 Development Division advised that NHS research ethics approval was not required. The use  
374 of named patient data in the investigation of communicable disease outbreaks and  
375 surveillance of notifiable disease is permitted under PHW's Establishment Order. Data were  
376 held and processed under PHW's information governance arrangements, in compliance with  
377 the Data Protection Act, Caldicott Principles and PHW guidance on the release of small  
378 numbers. No data identifying protected characteristics of an individual were released outside  
379 of the OCT.

380 **Funding**

381 No additional funding was received to undertake the outbreak investigation; outbreaks  
382 represent part of the core duties of the Public Health Wales Health Protection Division.  
383 The sequencing of samples was funded by Welsh Government and as part of the COVID-19  
384 Genomics UK Consortium (COG-UK). COG-UK is supported by funding from the Medical  
385 Research Council (MRC) part of UK Research & Innovation (UKRI), the National Institute of  
386 Health Research (NIHR) [grant code: MC\_PC\_19027], and Genome Research Limited,  
387 operating as the Wellcome Sanger Institute. Analysis of genome-sequenced samples was  
388 performed using the MRC CLIMB platform [grant reference MR/L015080/1].

389

390

## 391 **Data Availability Statement**

392 The data used in this investigation contain personal identifiable information of a vulnerable  
393 population. Anonymised information, including that contained in the supplementary  
394 information, required to reproduce these results is available from the corresponding author  
395 on reasonable request.

396

## 397 **References**

- 398 1. **World Health Organization COVID-19 Dashboard** (<https://covid19.who.int>).  
399 Accessed 16 May 2021.
- 400 2. **UK Government.** (2021) COVID-19 Transmission in Prison Settings:SAGE EMG  
401 Transmission Group. Published online: March 2021.  
402 [https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachm  
403 ent\\_data/file/979807/S1166\\_EMG\\_transmission\\_in\\_prisons.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/979807/S1166_EMG_transmission_in_prisons.pdf)
- 404 3. **World Health Organization.** (2021) Frequently asked questions about prevention  
405 and control of COVID-19 in prisons and other places of detention. Published online  
406 March 2021: [https://www.euro.who.int/en/health-topics/health-  
407 emergencies/coronavirus-covid-19/publications-and-technical-guidance/vulnerable-  
408 populations/prevention-and-control-of-covid-19-in-prisons-and-other-places-of-  
409 detention/frequently-asked-questions-about-prevention-and-control-of-covid-19-in-  
410 prisons-and-other-places-of-detention-produced-by-who/europe](https://www.euro.who.int/en/health-topics/health-emergencies/coronavirus-covid-19/publications-and-technical-guidance/vulnerable-populations/prevention-and-control-of-covid-19-in-prisons-and-other-places-of-detention/frequently-asked-questions-about-prevention-and-control-of-covid-19-in-prisons-and-other-places-of-detention-produced-by-who/europe)
- 411 4. **Braithwaite I, et al.** High COVID-19 death rates in prisons in England and Wales, and  
412 the need for early vaccination. *The Lancet Respiratory Medicine*. Published online 16  
413 March 2021. DOI: [https://doi.org/10.1016/S2213-2600\(21\)00137-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2213-2600(21)00137-5)
- 414 5. **Nuffield Trust.** (2021) The rising tide of Covid-19 infections in our overcrowded  
415 prisons Published online 19 January 2021:  
416 [https://www.nuffieldtrust.org.uk/resource/chart-of-the-week-the-rising-tide-of-covid-19-  
417 infections-in-england-and-wales-s-overcrowded-prisons](https://www.nuffieldtrust.org.uk/resource/chart-of-the-week-the-rising-tide-of-covid-19-infections-in-england-and-wales-s-overcrowded-prisons)
- 418 6. **UK Government.** (2021) Guidance Preventing and controlling outbreaks of COVID-  
419 19 in prisons and places of detention. Published online 13 September 2021:  
420 [https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/covid-19-prisons-and-other-prescribed-  
421 places-of-detention-guidance/covid-19-prisons-and-other-prescribed-places-of-  
422 detention-guidance](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/covid-19-prisons-and-other-prescribed-places-of-detention-guidance/covid-19-prisons-and-other-prescribed-places-of-detention-guidance)
- 423 7. **Weiss JM,** (1970) Somatic Effects of Predictable and Unpredictable Shock. *Journal of*  
424 *Psychosomatic Medicine.* **32:** 397-408. DOI: 10.1097/00006842-197007000-00008
- 425 8. **Liebrenz M, et al.** (2020) Caring for persons in detention suffering with mental illness  
426 during the Covid-19 outbreak. *Journal of Forensic Science International: Mind and*  
427 *Law.* Published online 26 February 2020: doi: 10.1016/j.fsimpl.2020.100013
- 428 9. **Dutheil F, Bouillon-Minois J-B, Clinchamps M,** (2020) COVID-19: a prison-  
429 breaker? *Canadian Journal of Public Health.* Published online 29 June 2020:  
430 <https://doi.org/10.17269/s41997-020-00359-6>



- 431 10. **Cingolani M, et al.** (2021) The COVID-19 Epidemic and the Prison System in Italy.  
432 *Journal of Corrective Health Care.* **27:** 3-7 Published online March 2021: DOI:  
433 10.1089/jchc.20.04.0026
- 434 11. **The Communicable Disease Outbreak Plan for Wales** (2020)  
435 ([https://phw.nhs.wales/topics/latest-information-on-novel-coronavirus-covid-19/the-](https://phw.nhs.wales/topics/latest-information-on-novel-coronavirus-covid-19/the-communicable-disease-outbreak-plan-for-wales/)  
436 [communicable-disease-outbreak-plan-for-wales/](https://phw.nhs.wales/topics/latest-information-on-novel-coronavirus-covid-19/the-communicable-disease-outbreak-plan-for-wales/)). Accessed 13 September 2021.
- 437 12. **Anson M, et al.** ncov2019-artic-nf (<https://github.com/connor-lab/ncov2019-artic-nf>).  
438 Accessed on 13 September 2021.
- 439 13. **Nicholls SM, et al.** (2021) CLIMB-COVID: continuous integration supporting  
440 decentralised sequencing for SARS-CoV-2 genomic surveillance. *Journal of Genome*  
441 *Biology.* **22:** 1–21. Published online 01 July 2021: [https://doi.org/10.1186/s13059-](https://doi.org/10.1186/s13059-021-02395-y)  
442 [021-02395-y](https://doi.org/10.1186/s13059-021-02395-y)
- 443 14. **O’Toole AN, et al.** (2021) Genomics-informed outbreak investigations of SARS-CoV-  
444 2 using civet. Preprint published online 14 December 2021:  
445 <https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2021.12.13.21267267v1>
- 446 15. **Argimón S, et al. (2016)** Microreact: visualizing and sharing data for genomic  
447 epidemiology and phylogeography. *Journal of Microbial genomics.* Published online  
448 30 November 2016: <https://doi.org/10.1099/mgen.0.000093>
- 449 16. **Simpson PL, Butler TG.** (2020) Covid-19, prison crowding, and release policies.  
450 *British Medical Journal.* Published online 20 April 2020: doi: 10.1136/bmj.m1551.
- 451 17. **Wilburn J, et al.** (2020) COVID-19 within a large UK prison with a high number of  
452 vulnerable adults, March to June 2020: an outbreak investigation and screening  
453 event. *International Journal of Infectious Diseases.* Published online 16 January 2021:  
454 doi: 10.1016/j.ijid.2021.01.027
- 455 18. **Clarke M, et al.** (2020) Establishing prison-led contact tracing to prevent outbreaks of  
456 COVID-19 in prisons in Ireland. *Journal of Public Health.* **42:** 519-524. Published  
457 online 22 June 2020: doi: 10.1093/pubmed/fdaa092.
- 458 19. **Ryckman T, et al.** (2021) Outbreaks of COVID-19 variants in US prisons: a  
459 mathematical modelling analysis of vaccination and reopening policies. *The Lancet*  
460 *Public Health.* **6:** 760-770. Published online 01 October 2021:  
461 DOI:[https://doi.org/10.1016/S2468-2667\(21\)00162-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2468-2667(21)00162-6)
- 462

**Table 1. Overview of roles of the OCT membership, 14 October 2020 – 21 April 2021**

<b>Organization</b>	<b>Job Title</b>	<b>Role</b>
<b>Public Health Wales</b>	Consultant in Public Health	Chair
	UK FETP Fellow	Epidemiological investigation
	Improvements Manager	Line listing management & telephone interviews
	Health Protection Nurse	Liaison with prison about cases
	Lead Nurse for Health and Justice	Providing context at an all-Wales and UK level
	Bioinformatician	WGS methods and results interpretation
<b>Local Health Board</b>	Consultant in Public Health	Providing local health board delivery information
<b>Prison A</b>	Director	Strategic & tactical intelligence about Prison A
	Deputy Director	Strategic & tactical intelligence about Prison A
	Head of Health Care	Intelligence on operational aspects of Prison A
	Clinical Lead	Intelligence on operational aspects of Prison A
	Compliance Manager	Detailed case information & operational aspects
<b>Local Council</b>	Environmental Health Officer	Local Government context
<b>HMPPS Wales</b>	Director (Strategic Support & Assurance)	Providing intelligence at a UK prisons level

*UK FETP – UK Field epidemiology training programme*

*WGS – whole genome sequencing*

*HMPPS – Her Majesty's Prisons and Probation Service*

## **Box 1: Prison A accommodation description**

There are approximately 1,700 male residents, consisting of adult and young offenders aged 16 years and over. It has 850 staff, of whom approximately 375 are Prison Custody Officers with the balance made up of support, administration and teaching staff. Prisoners are made up of those on remand, short-term, long-term and life sentences. The residents' accommodation is as follows:

- **A Block (Admissions):** where the majority of new residents stay, known as "receptions". There are four units housing around 95 prisoners each
- **B Block:** four separate units housing around 95 prisoners each
- **C Block:** learning needs and disability unit housing approximately 75 self-contained prisoners
- **D Block:** (drug unit) housing around 95 self-contained prisoners
- **E & G Blocks:** The young persons' unit housing around 60 15-17 year olds, separated from other units with its own gym and education facilities. It has separate staff from other units. Prisoners from this unit do not mix with adult prison units
- **H Block:** The safer custody unit housing around 10-20 people in a self-contained unit
- **T Block:** comprises six separate units housing around 400 prisoners
- **X Block:** separate from main prison with three self-contained wings housing around 350 prisoners. It has its own industries, education and gym facilities. Each unit has its own meal tables, kitchen area and association area
- **\*The vulnerable prisoners Unit:** is comprised of X3 and T6, both separate from each other and other prison units

**Table 2. Overview of cases by accommodation units, Prison A, January 2021 (N=332<sup>1</sup>)**

Area	Staff cases				Resident cases				Total cases	
	Pop.	Symp.	Asymp.	AR* (%)	Pop.	Symp.	Asymp.	AR* (%)	n	AR* (%)
A	48	22	9	64.6	355	24	65	25.1	120	29.8
B	42	10	3	31	366	9	0	2.5	22	5.4
C	17	3	1	23.5	74	0	0	0	4	4.4
D	14	8	0	57.1	91	23	1	26.4	32	30.5
SCU	10	8	1	90	12	0	1	8.3	10	45.5
T	78	15	10	32.1	410	36	4	9.8	65	13.3
X	47	10	4	29.8	325	14	11	7.7	39	10.5
YPU	44	17	21	86.4	60	0	2	3.3	40	38.5
<b>Total</b>	<b>300</b>	<b>93</b>	<b>49</b>	-	<b>1693</b>	<b>106</b>	<b>84</b>	-	<b>332</b>	-


*1 - Note: some staff worked in more than one location during this outbreak, so total is greater than 242*

*Pop – population; Symp. – symptomatic; Asympt. – asymptomatic; AR – attack rate*

**Table 3. Overview of case types at Prison A, 14 October 2020 – 21 April 2021 (N=453)**

	<b>Symptomatic</b>	<b>Asymptomatic</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>AR%</b>
<b>Staff</b>	163	79	242	<b>29.1</b>
<b>Residents</b>	126	85	211	<b>12.5</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>289</b>	<b>164</b>	<b>453</b>	<b>-</b>

# Age-Sex pyramid of cases



**Table 4. Overview of staff cases by staff work location (L) or team (T), Prison A (N=103<sup>1</sup>), 14 October 2020 – 21 April 2021**

Location or Team	Cases	Pop.*	AR** %
Admin building and senior management team	8	45	17.8
Education and training teams	7	71	9.9
Gym	4	15	26.7
Healthcare	8	49	16.3
Interventions team	2	25	8.0
Mentor, families and pastoral support teams	6	30	20.0
Main industries	9	20	45.0
Main stores, facilities and waste management	20	56	35.7
Offender management unit	7	59	11.9
Security and nights teams	18	61	29.5
Testing team and pharmacy	4	11	36.4
Other***	10	-	-
<b>Total</b>	<b>103</b>	<b>442</b>	<b>23.4</b>



*1 - Note: some staff worked in more than one location during this outbreak.*

*(Some teams have been combined to maintain anonymity)*


\*Pop. – population of staff location of team

\*\*AR – attack rate


\*\*\*Other contractors or short-term staff








<b>AB</b>	Administration Building	<b>Ind</b>	Industries	<b>OMU</b>	Offender Management Unit	<b>WM</b>	Waste Management
<b>Ad</b>	Admissions	<b>Int</b>	Interventions	<b>PL</b>	Prisoner Liaison	<b>YPU</b>	Young Persons Unit
<b>ALL</b>	All Prison locations	<b>Kit</b>	Kitchen	<b>Pha</b>	Pharmacy	<b>YO</b>	Youth Offender
<b>CT</b>	COVID Testing	<b>L&amp;S</b>	Learning and Skills	<b>S&amp;E</b>	S&E Team		
<b>E</b>	Education	<b>Men</b>	Mentor Team	<b>SC</b>	Safer Custody		
<b>F</b>	Families	<b>M.Ind</b>	Main Industries	<b>Sec</b>	Security Office		
<b>FM</b>	Facilities Management	<b>Mre</b>	Main Reception	<b>SuC</b>	Subcontractor		
<b>Gym</b>	Gym	<b>MS</b>	Main Stores	<b>TT</b>	Testing Team (Coffee Shop)		
<b>HC</b>	Healthcare	<b>Ni</b>	Nights	<b>Vi</b>	Visits		
<b>Hos</b>	Hospital (index case)	<b>OG</b>	Oscar Group	<b>VPU</b>	Vulnerable Persons Unit		





**Table 5. Resident COVID-19 vaccination status overview, Prison A (July and November 2021)**

	<b>July 2021</b>	<b>November 2021</b>
<b>Total resident population</b>	<b>1639</b>	<b>1591</b>
Vaccines given	1555	2300
One vaccine dose	1052	1122
Two vaccine doses	518	1090
Refusals	368	464
Waiting to have first vaccine dose	219	21

