

1 **Non-patient related SARS-CoV-2 exposure to colleagues and household members**
2 **impose the highest infection risk for hospital employees with and without patient**
3 **contact in a German university hospital: follow-up of the prospective Co-HCW**
4 **Seroprevalence study**

5
6 Christina Bahrs,^{1,2*} Sebastian Weis,^{1,3} Miriam Kesselmeier,⁴ Juliane Ankert,¹ Stefan
7 Hagel,¹ Stephanie Beier,¹ Jens Maschmann,⁵ Andreas Stallmach,⁶ Andrea Steiner,⁷
8 Michael Bauer,⁸ Wilhelm Behringer,⁹ Michael Baier,¹⁰ Cora Richert,¹¹ Florian Zepf,¹²
9 Martin Walter,¹³ André Scherag,⁴ Michael Kiehntopf,¹¹ Bettina Löffler,¹⁰ Mathias W.
10 Pletz¹

11

12 ¹ Institute for Infectious Diseases and Infection Control, Jena University
13 Hospital/Friedrich-Schiller-University, Jena, Germany

14 ² Department of Medicine I, Division of Infectious Diseases and Tropical Medicine,
15 Medical University of Vienna, Vienna, Austria

16 ³ Leibniz Institute for Natural Product Research and Infection Biology - Hans Knöll
17 Institute (HKI), Jena, Germany.

18 ⁴ Institute of Medical Statistics, Computer and Data Sciences, Jena University
19 Hospital/Friedrich-Schiller-University, Jena, Germany

20 ⁵ Medical Executive Board, Würzburg University Hospital, Würzburg, Germany

21 ⁶ Department of Internal Medicine IV (Gastroenterology, Hepatology and Infectious
22 Diseases), Jena University Hospital/Friedrich-Schiller-University, Jena, Germany

23 ⁷ Department for Occupational Health, Jena University Hospital/Friedrich-Schiller-
24 University, Jena, Germany

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

25 ⁸ Department of Anesthesiology and Intensive Care Therapy, Jena University
26 Hospital/Friedrich-Schiller-University, Jena, Germany

27 ⁹Department of Emergency Medicine, Medical University of Vienna, Vienna, Austria

28 ¹⁰ Institute of Medical Microbiology, Jena University Hospital/Friedrich-Schiller-
29 University, Jena, Germany

30 ¹¹ Department of Clinical Chemistry and Laboratory Medicine, Jena University
31 Hospital/Friedrich-Schiller-University, Jena, Germany

32 ¹² Department of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry, Psychosomatic Medicine and
33 Psychotherapy, Jena University Hospital/Friedrich-Schiller-University, Jena, Germany

34 ¹³ Department of Psychiatry and Psychotherapy, Jena University Hospital/Friedrich-
35 Schiller-University, Jena, Germany

36

37 Corresponding author:

38 Christina Bahrs, MD, Institute of Infectious Diseases and Infection Control, Jena

39 University Hospital/Friedrich-Schiller-University, Am Klinikum 1, 07747 Jena,

40 Germany. E-mail: christina.bahrs@med.uni-jena.de Phone: +49-3641-932-4769, Fax:

41 +49-3641-932-4652.

42

43

44 **Abstract**

45 Background: The Co-HCW study is a prospective, longitudinal single center
46 observational study on the SARS-CoV-2 seroprevalence and infection status in staff
47 members of Jena University Hospital (JUH) in Jena, Germany.

48 Material and Methods: This follow-up study covers the observation period from 19th
49 May 2020 to 22nd June 2021. At each out of three voluntary study visits, participants
50 filled out a questionnaire on individual SARS-CoV-2 exposure. In addition, serum
51 samples to assess specific SARS-CoV-2 antibodies were collected. Participants with
52 antibodies against nucleocapsid and/or spike protein without previous vaccination
53 and/or a reported positive SARS-CoV-2 PCR test were regarded as participants with
54 detected SARS-CoV-2 infection. Multivariable logistic regression modeling was
55 applied to identify potential risk factors for infected compared to non-infected
56 participants.

57 Results: Out of 660 participants that were included during the first study visit, 406
58 participants (61.5%) were eligible for final analysis as they did not change the COVID-
59 19 risk area (high-risk n=76; intermediate-risk n=198; low-risk n=132) during the
60 study. Forty-four participants (10.8%, 95% confidence interval (95%CI) 8.0%-14.3%)
61 had evidence of a current or past SARS-CoV-2 infection detected by serology (n=40)
62 and/or PCR (n=28). No association of any SARS-CoV-2 infection with the COVID-19
63 risk group according to working place could be detected. But exposure to a SARS-
64 CoV-2 positive household member (adjusted OR (AOR) 4.46, 95%CI 2.06-9.65) or
65 colleague (AOR 2.30, 95%CI 1.10-4.79) significantly increased the risk of a SARS-
66 CoV-2 infection.

67 Conclusion. Our results demonstrate that non-patient-related SARS-CoV-2 exposure
68 imposed the highest infection risk in hospital staff members of JUH.

69 Keywords: SARS-CoV-2 infection, seroepidemiologic studies, healthcare workers,

70 universal masking, non-patient-related COVID-19 contact

71

72 **Introduction**

73 Healthcare workers (HCW) across the world are at high risk to acquire coronavirus
74 disease 2019 (COVID-19) caused by severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2
75 (SARS-CoV-2) ¹⁻³, as they are directly or indirectly exposed to infectious material ³
76 while caring for patients suffering from the coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) ⁴.
77 Transmission of SARS-CoV-2 occurs primarily via inhalation of, or inoculation with
78 infectious small liquid particles ranging from larger respiratory droplets to smaller
79 aerosols in case of close personal contact ⁵. Aerosol transmission in health-care settings
80 may occur in specific situations in which HCW perform medical, aerosol generating
81 procedures but do not use adequate personal protection equipment (PPE) ⁵. With the
82 ongoing COVID-19 pandemic ^{6,7}, ensuring the safety of HCW is of utmost relevance
83 ^{1,3,5}. Infection control measures, including the use of adequate PPE, hand hygiene, and
84 physical separation are considered essential in reducing nosocomial transmissions ^{5,8}.
85 Additionally, vaccination of patients and HCW reduces the risk of acquiring COVID-
86 19 in health care settings.

87 The city of Jena, with a population of approximately 111,000 inhabitants, hosts the only
88 university hospital of the entire federal state Thuringia (Jena University Hospital, JUH),
89 which is located in central Germany. Besides there is no other hospital in the city of
90 Jena. In March 2020, mandatory masking was implemented for all staff members of
91 JUH, including HCW and administration staff ⁹ aiming to reduce nosocomial SARS-
92 CoV-2 transmissions. Additionally, business trips and participation in presence on
93 conferences or trainings activities outside JUH were prohibited for all employees by
94 the local Medical Executive board. In December 2020, SARS-CoV-2 vaccination was
95 first available and was initially offered to HCW with high risk. Since February 2021,
96 SARS-CoV-2 vaccination was offered to all hospital staff members. The vaccination

97 rate documented by the department of occupational health of JUH in December 2021
98 was 85% (94% for physicians, 88% for nurses, and 85% for administration staff). We
99 have previously reported a low SARS-CoV-2 point seroprevalence rate of 2.7% among
100 hospital staff (inclusion of first participant: 19th May 2020, inclusion of last participant:
101 19th June 2020) ⁹, and identified COVID-19 exposure at home as the main risk factor
102 associated with SARS-CoV-2 point seroprevalence. This was prior to availability of
103 SARS-CoV-2 vaccination.

104 The primary objective of this follow-up study was to assess the SARS-CoV-2
105 seroprevalence and prevalence of SARS-CoV-2 infection among employees with
106 (HCW) and without patient contact (administration staff) of JUH over a period of 13
107 months (May 2020 to June 2021). Secondary objectives were to determine individual
108 exposure risk factors, and to compare SARS-CoV-2 infection rates between hospital
109 staff working at different COVID-19 risk areas according to working place.

110 **Methods**

111 *Study design and setting*

112 The Co-HCW study (SARS-CoV-2 seroprevalence and infection status in hospital staff
113 members at JUH) is a prospective, longitudinal single centre observational cohort study
114 conducted at JUH, a 1,400-bed academic hospital in Germany. The first of three visits
115 (05/2020) has already been published ⁹. This current analysis covers the complete
116 observation period of 11-13 months and includes data from 19th May 2020 to 22nd June
117 2021. At our hospital, intensive SARS-CoV-2 screening was carried out. Details of the
118 routine PCR screening are described below.

119 Research was conducted in accordance with the Declaration of Helsinki and national
120 and institutional standards. The study protocol was approved by the local ethics
121 committee of the Friedrich-Schiller-University Jena (approval no. 2020–1774),

122 and the study was registered at the German Clinical Trials Register (DRKS00022432).

123 *Enrolment and data management*

124 Participants including hospital staff and administration staff were recruited between
125 19th May 2020 and 19th June 2020. For inclusion and exclusion criteria as well as data
126 management, we refer to the previously published results of the first study visit ⁹. In
127 total, three study visits were offered to all participants. Participation in each study visit
128 was voluntary. The first study visit was performed at inclusion, the second study visit
129 was performed from 6th November 2020 to 26th November 2020, and the third study
130 visit was performed during 26th April 2021 and 22nd June 2021. For the present analysis,
131 only participants were considered who completed the last study visit in 2021 and did
132 not change the COVID-19 risk area according to their risk of a contact with COVID-
133 19 patients at work (low, intermediate and high risk) during the study.

134 At each study visit, participants had to fill out a questionnaire, and blood samples were
135 collected at the study center, which were then sent to the Department of Clinical
136 Chemistry and Laboratory Medicine of JUH and the Institute of Medical Microbiology
137 of JUH for testing of specific SARS-CoV-2 antibodies by two different immunoassays
138 (see below).

139 *Questionnaire*

140 As previously described ⁹, the questionnaire included questions on demographics,
141 profession, working area, individual exposure to confirmed COVID-19 cases, return
142 from COVID-19 risk areas, results of previous polymerase chain reaction (PCR) or
143 serology test for COVID-19, clinical symptoms, accidents with biological material and
144 compliance concerning use of PPE in HCW with individual contact with a confirmed
145 COVID-19 patient. Due to the recommendation of the referees of the first peer-review
146 of this study, we additionally included the following parameters in the updated

147 questionnaire for the second and third visit: use of public transport on the way to work,
148 household size, travel to abroad and participation at events with at least five persons.
149 As SARS-CoV-2 vaccination has been available since 27th December 2020, the
150 questionnaire of the last visit was further extended with questions on number and type
151 of SARS-CoV-2 vaccinations.

152 ***PCR Screening***

153 All staff in high-risk areas (intensive care unit, intermediate care unit, emergency
154 department and COVID-19 regular ward) were tested twice a week by PCR. In addition,
155 all staff members were called upon to have a PCR test carried out in case of symptoms
156 of infection and/or after 1 and 5 days of contact with a SARS-CoV-2 infected person at
157 work or at home. Furthermore, in case of nosocomial transmission detected by patient
158 screening, the staff of the respective ward were screened on day 1 and 5.

159 ***SARS-CoV-2 antibody testing***

160 Specific SARS-CoV-2 antibodies in serum samples were detected at each time point
161 deploying the commercially available chemiluminescence-based immunoassay (CLIA)
162 Elecsys Anti-SARS-CoV-2 (Roche, Basel, Switzerland) that uses a recombinant
163 nucleocapsid protein as capture antigen. At the first and second visits the enzyme-
164 linked immunosorbent assay EDI Novel Coronavirus SARS-CoV-2 IgG ELISA
165 (Epitope Diagnostics Inc., San Diego, USA, antigen: recombinant nucleocapsid
166 protein) was performed as a second method. At visit three spike-protein specific IgG
167 antibodies were identified using the CLIA system LIAISON® SARS CoV-2 S1/S2 IgG
168 (DiaSorin, Saluggia, Italy). All serological tests were carried out according to the
169 manufacturers' instructions. Sensitivities and specificities as provided by the
170 manufacturers are high for all tests ($\geq 97\%$).

171 Participants with at least one positive test result for antibodies against nucleocapsid
172 and/or spike protein without previous vaccination and/or a reported positive SARS-
173 CoV-2 PCR test were regarded as participants with detected SARS-CoV-2 infection.

174 *Outcomes and further definitions*

175 The primary outcome of this follow-up study was to assess the SARS-CoV-2 infection
176 rates using SARS-CoV-2 antibody detecting immunoassays and reported positive
177 SARS-CoV-2 PCR test results. Secondary outcomes were (i) prevalence of SARS-
178 CoV-2 infection in participants stratified by their risk of COVID-19 exposure during
179 work (low, medium and high risk), and (ii) potential risk factors for detected SARS-
180 CoV-2 infection including compliance of HCW in case of an individual reported
181 contact with a confirmed COVID-19 positive patient.

182 *Statistical analysis*

183 Characteristics of participants are summarized (overall, stratified by test result) as
184 absolute and relative frequencies or as median together with first and third quartile (Q1,
185 Q3). Evidence of any SARS-CoV-2 infection in hospital staff within the observation
186 period is described with absolute and relative frequencies together with 95% Clopper-
187 Pearson confidence intervals (CIs). To compare SARS-CoV-2 infection rates between
188 participants working at different COVID-19 risk areas, and to identify potential risk
189 factors for infected compared to non-infected participants, we apply uni- and
190 multivariable logistic regression modelling with the SARS-CoV-2 infection as
191 dependent variable and the investigated factor as independent variable. In the
192 multivariable models, we adjusted for age and gender. For place of exposure, we
193 considered two additional multivariable models. In the first additional model, we
194 included all places, that were assessed, as independent variables to adjust each
195 investigated place for the respective other places. In the second additional model, we

196 adjusted this model for age and gender. We provide (adjusted) odds ratios (OR) together
197 with 95% CI and p-value.

198 We applied a two-sided significance level of 0.05 and did not correct for multiple
199 testing as all analyses were considered exploratory. The main analyses were done with
200 R (version 4.0.3), and parts were complemented by SPSS Statistics version 28.0 for
201 Windows (IBM Corp., Armonk, NY, USA).

202

203 **Results**

204 *Characteristics of the study population*

205 Out of 660 participants that were analysed during the first study visit, 406 hospital staff
206 members (61.5%) also participated in the third and last study visit and did not change
207 the COVID-19 risk area during the reported 13 months. Of these 406 participants, 91
208 (22.4%) were males and 315 (77.6%) were females. The median age of the participants
209 was 41.0 (Q1-Q3: 34.0-49.8) years. The most common professions included
210 administration staff (n=132, 32.5%), followed by nurses (n=125, 30.8%), physicians
211 (n=66, 16.3%), reception staff (n=12, 3.0%), nursing assistants (n=10, 2.5%),
212 psychologists (n=10, 2.5%), ergo therapists (n=10, 2.5%), and medical assistants (n=9,
213 2.2%). Two-hundred twenty-four participants (55.2%) reported direct contact to a
214 confirmed COVID-19 case, whereas 182 participants (44.8%) were not aware of any
215 COVID-19 exposure. Among the 224 staff members with reported COVID-19
216 exposure, 151 participants (67.4%) had direct contact with a SARS-CoV-2 positive
217 patient, and 60 participants (26.8%) had exposure to a SARS-CoV-2 positive colleague.
218 Direct COVID-19 contact outside the JUH included close contact to a positive
219 household member (n=43, 19.2%), exposure to friends (n=20, 8.9%), exposure during
220 shopping (n=2, 0.9%) and exposure on holiday (n=1, 0.4%). Further details on the
221 participants are provided in Table 1. Any SARS-CoV-2 vaccination prior to the last
222 study visit was reported from 307 participants (75.6%); 177 participants (43.6%) had
223 received two vaccinations (homologous vaccination with a COVID-19 messenger RNA
224 (mRNA) vaccine: n=160; homologous vaccination with the vector-based vaccine
225 ChAdOx1-S: n=7; heterologous vaccination with the vector-based vaccine followed by
226 a mRNA vaccine: n=10) and 130 participants (32.0%) had received one vaccination

227 (COVID-19 mRNA vaccine: n=16; COVID-19 vector-based vaccine ChAdOx1-S:
228 n=114).

229 *Seroprevalence and prevalence of SARS-CoV-2 infection*

230 At the last study visit, 318 of 406 participants (78.3%) were tested seropositive by
231 Liaison test (295 vaccinated participants and 23 unvaccinated participants), and 88
232 patients (21.7%) remained seronegative (12 vaccinated participants and 76
233 unvaccinated participants). Within the 13 months observational period, 44 of 406
234 participants (10.8%, 95% CI 8.0%-14.3%) had any evidence for a SARS-CoV-2
235 infection detected by serology and/or PCR. As shown in Table 2, among those 44
236 participants, 40 participants (90.9%) had at least one positive SARS-CoV-2 IgG
237 antibody test compatible with current or past infection (positive Roche test n=30;
238 positive EDI ELISA n=13; positive Liaison test despite missing vaccination n=26), and
239 28 participants (63.3%) reported at least one positive PCR test result. According to the
240 self-reported symptoms, nine of the 44 infected participants (20.5%) had an
241 asymptomatic SARS-CoV-2 infection, whereas very mild disease of SARS-CoV-2
242 related clinical symptoms were reported from two (4.5%), mild disease from eight
243 (18.2%), moderate disease from 14 (31.8%) and severe disease from eleven staff
244 members (25%).

245 As shown in Figure 1, most positive PCR test results (25/28, 89.2%) were reported
246 during the last six month of the study. SARS-CoV-2 variants of concern (VOCs) alpha,
247 beta, gamma and delta did not emerge among Thuringian surveillance samples earlier
248 than 2021 (alpha variant since January 2021, beta variant since February 2021, gamma
249 and delta variants since April 2021). The molecular surveillance of VOCs and the
250 respected timeline for the State of Thuringia can be assessed at

251 [https://charts.mongodb.com/charts-routine-sequencing-sars-c-](https://charts.mongodb.com/charts-routine-sequencing-sars-c-amykg/public/dashboards/e9453286-1dce-4202-9423-a8459e3962f8)
252 [amykg/public/dashboards/e9453286-1dce-4202-9423-a8459e3962f8](https://charts.mongodb.com/charts-routine-sequencing-sars-c-amykg/public/dashboards/e9453286-1dce-4202-9423-a8459e3962f8).
253 Two PCR-positive unvaccinated participants did not show any seroconversion.
254 Breakthrough infections after vaccination confirmed by a positive PCR test result were
255 reported in one participant three months after two vaccinations with the COVID-19
256 mRNA vaccine BNT162b2, in one participant six weeks after one vaccination with the
257 vector based COVID-19 vaccine ChAdOx1-S, and in one participant four months after
258 only one vaccination with BNT162b2.

259 ***Potential risk factors for evidence of any SARS-CoV-2 infection of staff members***

260 As shown in Table 1, we did not find evidence for an association of any current or past
261 SARS-CoV-2 infection (detected by serology and/or PCR) with the demographics,
262 household size, use of public transport to get to work, returning from an inner-German
263 “COVID-19 risk area” as defined by national public health authorities according to the
264 respective incidence, travel to abroad or participation at events with equal to or more
265 than five persons, COVID-19 risk group according to working place, reported accident
266 with biological material or compliance to wear PPE. However, professions associated
267 with an increased risk of experiencing a SARS-CoV-2 infection compared to physicians
268 included nurses (adjusted OR 5.57, 95% CI 1.24-25.12; p=0.025) and administration
269 staff (adjusted OR 4.92, 95% CI 1.07-22.64; p=0.041). Additionally, any reported
270 (occupational and private) COVID-19 exposure (adjusted OR 7.19, 95% CI 2.86-18.11;
271 p<0.001) and particularly close contact to a SARS-CoV-2 positive household member
272 (adjusted OR 4.46, 95% CI 2.06-9.65; p<0.001) and exposure to a SARS-CoV-2
273 positive colleague (adjusted OR 2.30, 95% CI 1.10-4.79; p=0.026) significantly
274 increased the risk of a SARS-CoV-2 infection among hospital staff. These observations
275 are in line with the results from the additional models for place of exposure, where

276 contact with a household member and with a colleague were both independently
277 associated with a current or past SARS-CoV-2 infection (household member: adjusted
278 OR 5.97, 95% CI 2.07-17.19; p=0.001. Colleague: adjusted OR 3.33, 95% CI 1.36-
279 8.18; p=0.009. Table 3).

280 **Discussion**

281 The main results of our prospective cohort study among employees at the JUH were
282 the following: (1) The evidence of a past or current SARS-CoV-2 infection detected by
283 serology and/or PCR test results among hospital staff members of JUH tripled from
284 3.2% during the first corona wave (initial visit ⁹) of the pandemic to 10.8% during the
285 total study period covering the first three corona waves in Germany. This finding is
286 comparable to pooled incidence estimate of SARS-CoV-2 cases of about 12% (95% CI
287 4%-29%) among HCW reported in a recently published systematic review and meta-
288 analysis with no geographical limitation ¹⁰. The detected SARS-CoV-2 infection rate
289 in our study was numerically higher compared to the prevalence in the community of
290 the city of Jena. According to the official site of the Robert Koch Institute
291 ([https://experience.arcgis.com/experience/478220a4c454480e823b17327b2bf1d4/page](https://experience.arcgis.com/experience/478220a4c454480e823b17327b2bf1d4/page/Landkreise/)
292 [e/Landkreise/](https://experience.arcgis.com/experience/478220a4c454480e823b17327b2bf1d4/page/Landkreise/) last accessed at 19th June 2022), the cumulative number of confirmed
293 COVID-19 cases in the city of Jena was 3,902 at 26th April 2021 and 4,382 at 22nd June
294 2021, corresponding to an infection rate of below 5% of the overall population.
295 However, due to the assessment of seroprevalence and the intense PCR-based HCW
296 screening described, the detection rate at JUH may have been substantially higher
297 compared to the community. (2) We did not identify occupational contact with COVID-
298 19 patients as risk factor for infection. Although the majority of hospital staff members
299 reported direct COVID-19 exposure to a SARS-CoV-2 positive patient (67.4%), there
300 was no evidence for this variable to increase the risk of acquiring an infection, most

301 likely due to a high overall compliance of 92.4% among HCW to wear PPE. HCW
302 caring for COVID-19 patients had a numerically lower infection rate compared to
303 administration staff without any patient care (detected SARS-CoV-2 infection rate:
304 9.2% among high-risk HCW versus 12.9% among administration staff) and – in line
305 with this observation – patient-related contact to COVID-19 patients was not identified
306 as risk factor in the multivariable analyses. This finding is contradictory to other studies
307 that found a higher absolute risk of seropositivity for HCW with exposure to COVID-
308 19 patients ^{3,11,12}. (3) Similar to the first assessment of this study ⁹ and other studies ^{3,13},
309 close contact to a SARS-CoV-2 positive household member was identified as the main
310 private risk factor for a SARS-CoV-2 infection. Additionally, participants with a
311 detected SARS-CoV-2 infection reported more frequently direct exposure to a SARS-
312 CoV-2 positive colleague and were more frequently nurses or administration staff than
313 physicians. The increased infection rate in nurses and administration staff relative to
314 physicians may reflect the impact of medical education on infectious risk assessment
315 and respective risk behaviour including non-patient-related contacts. Even if not
316 addressed in our study, this observation warrants further investigation and may
317 underline the importance of educative measures. Similarly, a recent scoping review that
318 investigated seroprevalence and risk factors of COVID-19 in 9,223 HCW from eleven
319 countries across Africa found that SARS-CoV-2 seropositivity was associated with
320 lower education and working as a nurse/non-clinical HCW ¹⁴.

321 This study has the following limitations: Due to the limited number of study visits (two
322 to three per participant within one year) and no mandatory PCR testing among hospital
323 staff, the exact time of SARS-CoV-2 infection detected by serology only could not be
324 determined in 16 hospital staff members and is particularly uncertain in 9 asymptomatic

325 cases. Additionally, underestimation of infection rates could be possible due to waning
326 antibody titres in particular after oligo- or asymptomatic infections ^{15,16}.

327 Hospital staff members may serve as reservoirs, vectors or victims of SARS-CoV-2
328 cross transmission ⁴. They may not only infect patients they care for but also other
329 HCW, which would cause further reduction of already limited capacity of health
330 services ³.

331 To reduce nosocomial transmissions, the medical executive board of our hospital
332 implemented several specific measures affecting not only the patients but also the
333 hospital staff. For hospital staff, business trips, particularly to travel to abroad, and
334 personal participation on congresses were banned and repeated PCR testing was
335 mandatory when returning from risk areas after holidays. However, these parameters
336 were not associated with an increased risk of SARS-CoV-2 infection in our study. As
337 the own colleagues were identified as the most important source for nosocomial
338 transmissions within the hospital, it was recommended to perform coffee breaks or
339 lunch only with a small number of colleagues with adequate distance and always
340 together with the same colleagues. When mandatory masking was not feasible due to
341 eating, drinking or smoking, speaking should be kept to a minimum.

342 In conclusion, our results demonstrate that non-patient-related (most-likely non-
343 protected) contacts to SARS-CoV-2 infected household members and colleagues are
344 the main risk factors whereas patient-related contacts (direct contact to COVID-19
345 patients or body fluids) were not associated with an increased infection risk. Therefore,
346 infection prevention and control strategies should focus more on personal contact
347 between hospital staff members (e.g. using break rooms in small and non-mixed groups
348 only, strict universal masking in team meetings) and should improve risk awareness
349 outside the hospital. The lowest infection rate among physicians compared to nurses

350 and administration employees suggests that medical education may have an impact on
351 risk behaviour also in the non-occupational setting. This underlines the importance of
352 universal masking and educative strategies to decrease the infection risk for hospital
353 employees.

354

355 **Acknowledgements**

356 We thank Steffi Kolanos and Jana Schmidt for excellent technical support.

357

358 **Conflict of interest statement**

359 None to declare.

360

361 **Funding**

362 This study was partly supported by the local ethics committee of Friedrich-Schiller-
363 University Jena and by the BMBF, funding program Photonics Research Germany 590
364 (13N15745) and is associated into the Leibniz Center for Photonics in Infection
365 Research (LPI).

366

367 **Data availability statement**

368 The datasets used and/or analyzed during the current study are available from the
369 corresponding author on reasonable request.

References

1. Sabetian G, Moghadami M, Hashemizadeh Fard Haghighi L, et al. COVID-19 infection among healthcare workers: a cross-sectional study in southwest Iran. *Virology*. 2021;18(1):58. doi: 10.1186/s12985-021-01532-0.
2. Alshamrani MM, El-Saed A, Al Zunitan M, Almulhem R, Almohrij S. Risk of COVID-19 morbidity and mortality among healthcare workers working in a Large Tertiary Care Hospital. *Int J Infect Dis*. 2021;109: 238-243. doi: 10.1016/j.ijid.2021.07.009.
3. Piccoli L, Ferrari P, Piumatti G, et al. Risk assessment and seroprevalence of SARS-CoV-2 infection in healthcare workers of COVID-19 and non-COVID-19 hospitals in Southern Switzerland. *Lancet Reg Health Eur*. 2021;1:100013. doi: 10.1016/j.lanepe.2020.100013.
4. Abbas M, Robalo Nunes T, Martischang R, et al. Nosocomial transmission and outbreaks of coronavirus disease 2019: the need to protect both patients and healthcare workers. *Antimicrob Resist Infect Control*. 2021;10(1):7. doi: 10.1186/s13756-020-00875-7.
5. World Health Organization and International Labour Organization. COVID19: Occupational health and safety for health workers. Interim guidance 2 February 2021, Geneva 2021. Accessed September 22, 2022. https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/WHO-2019-nCoV-HCW_advice-2021-1
6. Whitworth J. COVID-19: a fast evolving pandemic. *Trans R Soc Trop Med Hyg*. 2020;114(4):241-248. doi: 10.1093/trstmh/traa025.

7. Abebe EC, Dejenie TA, Shiferaw MY, Malik T. The newly emerged COVID-19 disease: a systemic review. *Viol J.* 2020; 17(1):96. doi: 10.1186/s12985-020-01363-5.
8. Chou R, Dana T, Buckley DI, Selph S, Fu R, Totten AM. Epidemiology of and Risk Factors for Coronavirus Infection in Health Care Workers: A Living Rapid Review. *Ann Intern Med.* 2020; 173(2):120-136. doi: 10.7326/M20-1632.
9. Bahrs C, Kimmig A, Weis S, et al. Prospective surveillance study in a 1,400-bed university hospital: COVID-19 exposure at home was the main risk factor for SARS-CoV-2 point seroprevalence among hospital staff. *Transbound Emerg Dis.* 2022;69(2):720-730. doi: 10.1111/tbed.14041.
10. Dzinamarira T, Nkambule SJ, Hlongwa M, et al. Risk factors for COVID-19 infection among healthcare workers. A first report from a living systematic review and meta-analysis. *Saf Health Work.* 2022; 13(3):263-268. doi: 10.1016/j.shaw.2022.04.001.
11. Nguyen LH, Drew DA, Graham MS, et al. Risk of COVID-19 among front-line health-care workers and the general community: a prospective cohort study. *Lancet Public Health.* 2020;5(9):e475-e483. doi: 10.1016/S2468-2667(20)30164-X.
12. Galanis P, Vraika I, Fragkou D, Bilali A, Kaitelidou D. Seroprevalence of SARS-CoV-2 antibodies and associated factors in healthcare workers: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *J Hosp Infect.* 2021;108:120-134. doi: 10.1016/j.jhin.2020.11.008.
13. Steensels D, Oris E, Coninx L, et al. Hospital-Wide SARS-CoV-2 Antibody Screening in 3056 Staff in a Tertiary Center in Belgium. *JAMA.* 2020;324(2):195-197. doi: 10.1001/jama.2020.11160.

14. Müller SA, Wood RR, Hanefeld J, El-Bcheraoui C. Seroprevalence and risk factors of COVID-19 in healthcare workers from 11 African countries: a scoping review and appraisal of existing evidence. *Health Policy Plan.* 2022;37(4):505-513. doi: 10.1093/heapol/czab133.
15. Weis S, Scherag A, Baier M, et al. Antibody response using six different serological assays in a completely PCR-tested community after a coronavirus disease 2019 outbreak-the CoNAN study. *Clin Microbiol Infect.* 2021;27(3):470.e1-470.e9. doi: 10.1016/j.cmi.2020.11.009.
16. Lau EHY, Tsang OTY, Hui DSC, et al. Neutralizing antibody titres in SARS-CoV-2 infections. *Nat Commun.* 2021;12(1):63. doi: 10.1038/s41467-020-20247-4.

Table 1. Potential risk factors for a current or past SARS-CoV-2 infection (detected by serology and/or PCR) among hospital staff members

Variable	Overall (N=406)	Detected infection		Univariable analysis		Multivariable analysis	
		Any (N=44)	None (N=362)	OR (95% CI)	p-value	Adjusted OR (95% CI)	p-value
Age, in years	41.0 (34.0, 49.8)	43.0 (32.0, 51.0)	41.0 (34.0, 49.0)	1.00 (0.97, 1.03)	0.969	1.00 (0.97, 1.03)	0.962
Male gender	91 (22.4%)	11 (25.0%)	80 (22.1%)	1.17 (0.57, 2.43)	0.663	1.18 (0.57, 2.43)	0.663
Profession							
Physician	66 (16.3%)	2 (4.5%)	64 (17.7%)	ref.	0.107	ref.	0.108
Nurse	125 (30%)	18 (40.9%)	107 (29.6%)	5.38 (1.21, 23.97)	0.027	5.57 (1.24, 25.12)	0.025
Reception staff	12 (3.0%)	1 (2.3%)	11 (3.0%)	2.91 (0.24, 34.89)	0.400	3.05 (0.25, 37.65)	0.348
Administration staff	132 (32.5%)	17 (38.6%)	115 (31.8%)	4.73 (1.06, 21.13)	0.042	4.92 (1.07, 22.64)	0.041
Other profession	71 (17.5%)	6 (13.6%)	65 (18.0%)	-	-	-	-
COVID-19 risk group according to working place							
High-risk	76 (18.7%)	7 (15.9%)	69 (19.1%)	ref.	0.643	ref.	0.644
Intermediate-risk	198 (48.8%)	20 (45.5%)	178 (49.2%)	1.11 (0.45, 2.74)	0.825	1.15 (0.46, 2.89)	0.763
Low-risk	132 (32.5%)	17 (38.6%)	115 (31.8%)	1.46 (0.58, 3.69)	0.427	1.52 (0.58, 3.98)	0.397
Reported COVID-19 exposure	224 (55.2%)	38 (86.4%)	186 (51.4%)	5.99 (2.47, 14.53)	<0.001	7.19 (2.86, 18.11)	<0.001
Among them: Place of reported exposure							
Household member	43 (19.2%)	16 (42.1%)	27 (14.5%)	4.28 (2.00, 9.18)	<0.001	4.46 (2.06, 9.65)	<0.001
Friend	20 (8.9%)	2 (5.3%)	18 (9.7%)	0.52 (0.12, 2.33)	0.392	0.52 (0.11, 2.35)	0.394
Colleague	60 (26.8%)	16 (42.1%)	44 (23.7%)	2.35 (1.13, 4.86)	0.022	2.30 (1.10, 4.79)	0.026
Patient	151 (67.4%)	18 (47.4%)	133 (71.5%)	0.36 (0.18, 0.73)	0.005	0.36 (0.18, 0.75)	0.007
Other	3 (1.3%)	1 (2.6%)	2 (1.1%)	2.49 (0.22, 28.14)	0.462	2.60 (0.22, 30.41)	0.446
Accident with biological material	8 (2.0%)	2 (4.5%)	6 (1.7%)	2.83 (0.55, 14.45)	0.212	2.77 (0.54, 14.23)	0.222
Compliance to wear	133 (92.4%)	15 (88.2%)	118 (92.9%)	0.57 (0.11, 2.90)	0.500	0.58 (0.11, 2.94)	0.507

PPE*1							
Use of public transport	36 (8.9%)	6 (13.6%)	30 (8.3%)	1.75 (0.68, 4.47)	0.244	1.77 (0.69, 4.54)	0.235
Household size							
Number of members	2.0 (2.0, 4.0)	2.5 (2.0, 4.0)	2.0 (2.0, 4.0)	0.99 (0.77, 1.27)	0.924	0.99 (0.77, 1.27)	0.918
>1 member	319 (78.6%)	34 (77.3%)	285 (78.7%)	0.92 (0.43, 1.94)	0.824	0.92 (0.44, 1.95)	0.835
Returning from risk area	79 (19.5%)	10 (22.7%)	69 (19.1%)	1.25 (0.59, 2.65)	0.562	1.25 (0.59, 2.65)	0.562
Travel to abroad	99 (24.4%)	12 (27.3%)	87 (24.0%)	1.19 (0.59, 2.40)	0.637	1.20 (0.59, 2.44)	0.614
Participation at event with ≥5 persons	197 (48.5%)	24 (54.5%)	173 (47.8%)	1.31 (0.70, 2.46)	0.398	1.32 (0.70, 2.51)	0.389

Overall and by infection detection stratified distribution of potential risk factors as well as results from uni- and multivariable logistic regression modelling are provided. Distributions are summarized as absolute and relative frequencies or as median together with the first and third quartile. All multivariable models were adjusted for age and sex. The complete models are provided in Supplemental Table 1.

Abbreviations: -, excluded from model; CI, confidence interval; N, number of; OR, odds ratio; PCR, polymerase chain reaction; PPE, personal protective equipment; ref., reference.

*1 Information is missing for 262 participants who did not care for COVID-19 patients

Table 2. Evidence for a detected COVID-19 infection (PCR and/or antibody test result) among all hospital staff members and stratified for the COVID-19 risk group according to working place

Evidence	Overall	Risk group		
		High	Intermediate	Low
Any evidence for COVID-19 among them:	44 out of 406 participants (10.8%, 8.0% to 14.3%)	7 out of 76 participants (9.2%, 3.8% to 18.1%)	20 out of 198 participants (10.1%, 6.3% to 15.2%)	17 out of 132 participants (12.9%, 7.7% to 19.8%)
Evidence through PCR test				
Among all participants	28 (63.6%, 47.8% to 77.6%)	4 (57.1%, 18.4% to 90.1%)	16 (80.0%, 56.3% to 94.3%)	8 (47.1%, 23.0% to 72.2%)
Among participants with PCR test*	28 (71.8%, 55.1% to 85.0%)	4 (66.7%, 22.3% to 95.7%)	16 (80.0%, 56.3% to 94.3%)	8 (61.5%, 31.6% to 86.1%)
Evidence through antibody test	40 (90.9%, 78.3% to 97.5%)	5 (71.4%, 29.0% to 96.3%)	19 (95.0%, 75.1% to 99.9%)	16 (94.1%, 71.3% to 99.9%)

Values show number of participants (percentage, 95% confidence interval).

Abbreviation: PCR, polymerase chain reaction.

Table 3. Two additional multivariable logistic regression models for place of exposure

Variable	Additional model I		Additional model II	
	Adjusted OR (95% CI)	p-value	Adjusted OR (95% CI)	p-value
Place of reported exposure				
Household member	5.36 (1.95, 14.77)	0.001	5.97 (2.07, 17.19)	0.001
Friends	0.59 (0.09, 3.79)	0.576	0.61 (0.09, 4.15)	0.615
Colleague	3.24 (1.33, 7.90)	0.010	3.33 (1.36, 8.18)	0.009
Patient	0.91 (0.36, 2.28)	0.840	1.02 (0.38, 2.73)	0.971
Other	2.38 (0.10, 55.47)	0.590	2.44 (0.09, 65.87)	0.596
Age, in years	-	-	1.02 (0.98, 1.06)	0.281
Male gender	-	-	1.09 (0.43, 2.75)	0.855

Abbreviations: -, excluded from model; CI, confidence interval; OR, odds ratio.

Figure 1. Distribution of SARS-CoV-2 variants from the Thuringian surveillance samples (upper panel) and number and time of reported positive PCR test results among hospital staff members (lower panel) during the period 1st March 2020 to 30rd April 2021. Variants sequenced by the Institute for Infectious Diseases and Infection Control (JUH) are shown. Concerning the data of the SARS-CoV-2 variants, we refer to <https://charts.mongodb.com/charts-routine-sequencing-sars-c-amykg/public/dashboards/e9453286-1dce-4202-9423-a8459e3962f8>. Underlying data was assessed at 7th March 2022. Abbreviations: JUH, Jena University Hospital; PCR, polymerase chain reaction.

