

1 **Title**
2 **Role of non-aerosols activities in the transmission of SARS-Cov-2 infection**
3 **among health care workers.**

4
5 **Running title**
6 **Risk factors for SARS-Cov-2 infection among HCWs**

7 **Authors**

8 **Christophe Paris¹, Emilie Tadié², Christopher Heslan², Pierre Gary-Bobo², Sitty Oumary², Anaïs**
9 **Sitruk¹, Pascal Wild³, Pierre Tattevin⁴, Vincent Thibault¹, and Ronan Garlantezec¹**

10 **Affiliations**

11 ¹CHU de Rennes, Univ Rennes, Inserm, EHESP, Irset (Institut de recherche en santé, environnement
12 et travail) - UMR_S 1085, F-35000 Rennes, France

13 ² CHU de Rennes, F-35000 Rennes, France

14 ³INRS, F-54500 Vandoeuvre Lès Nancy, France

15 ⁴CHU de Rennes, Univ Rennes, INSERM U1230, IFR140, F-35033, Rennes, France.

16
17 **Corresponding author**

18 **Corresponding author: Christophe Paris, MD, PhD**

19 **christophe.paris@inserm.fr**

20 University Hospital Rennes

21 Occupational Diseases Department – Le Chartier

22 2 Rue Henri Le Guilloux

23 F-35033 Rennes Cedex 09

24 France

25 Tel: +33 299 282 444

26 **Abstract**

27 Background. Since the emergence of SARS-CoV-2, health care workers (HCWs) have been on the front
28 line in caring for COVID-19 patients. Better knowledge of risk factors for SARS-CoV-2 infection is crucial
29 for the prevention of disease among this population.

30 Methods. We conducted a seroprevalence survey among HCWs in a French university hospital after
31 the first wave (May-June 2020), based on a validated lateral flow immuno-assay test (LFIAT) for SARS-
32 CoV-2. Demographic characteristics as well as data on the working characteristics of COVID-19 and
33 non-COVID-19 wards and 23 care activities were systematically recorded. The effectiveness of
34 protective equipment was also estimated, based on self-declaration of mask use. SARS-CoV-2 IgG
35 status was modelled by multiple imputations approach, accounting for the performance of the test
36 and data on serum validation ELISA immunoassay.

37 Findings. Among the 3,234 enrolled HCWs, the prevalence of SARS-CoV-2 IgG was 3.8%. Contact with
38 relatives or HCWs who developed COVID-19 were risk factors for SARS-CoV-2 infection, but not contact
39 with COVID-19 patients. In multivariate analyses, suboptimal use of protective equipment during naso-
40 pharyngeal sampling, patient mobilisation, clinical and eye examination was associated with SARS-
41 CoV-2 infection. In addition, patients washing and dressing and aerosol-generating procedures were
42 risk factors for SARS-CoV-2 infection with or without self-declared appropriate use of protective
43 equipment.

44 Interpretation. Main routes of transmission of SARS-CoV-2 IgG among HCWs were i) contact with
45 relatives or HCWs with COVID-19, ii) close or prolonged contact with patients, iii) aerosol-generating
46 procedures.

47

48

49 INTRODUCTION

50 Since the emergence of SARS-CoV-2 at the end of 2019 in Wuhan, China, healthcare workers (HCWs)
51 have been on the front lines of the pandemic. Previous publications have reported high percentages
52 of HCWs among patients with coronavirus disease 19 (COVID-19). Initial reports from China found that
53 HCWs represented 3.8% of all cases (1,716 HCWs/44,674) but this proportion was 29% of HCWs in
54 patients admitted for severe pneumonia¹. In the USA, HCWs represented 16% of the 315,531 cases of
55 COVID-19 among individuals with a known occupational status². According to the European CDC, the
56 proportion of HCWs among COVID-19 cases varied from 9% to 26% in several EU countries with
57 available data³. Finally, a recent meta-analysis reported an overall seroprevalence of SARS-CoV-2
58 antibodies among HCWs of 8.7% 95CI 6.7-10.9%⁴. In France, 67,811 HCWs were infected by SARS-CoV-
59 2 between March 2020 and February, 2021⁵. In this context, understanding the main routes of
60 transmission of SARS-CoV-2 in HCWs is an important public health question. Several care activities are
61 known or suspected to be associated with increased risk of transmission of several coronaviruses
62 (SARS, MERS and SARS-CoV-2), in particular aerosol-generating activities such as intubation, high-flow
63 oxygen and mechanical ventilation^{6,7}. In France, a recent study including 2,329 infected HCWs reported
64 that masks were not worn during eye examinations in 47.6% of cases, or during high-risk activities in
65 19.4% of cases⁸. Other circumstances of possible contamination among these HCWs were the initial
66 absence of recommendations to wear masks in care settings or the use of protective equipment only
67 with suspected or confirmed COVID-19 patients^{9,10}. Current knowledge on the pathways of SARS-CoV-
68 2 transmission among HCWs remains limited, and requires further analysis. We aimed to precisely
69 assess main care activities associated with the risk of SARS-CoV-2 infection in HCWs by performing a
70 large sero-prevalence study associated with questionnaires on contacts, and practices in a French
71 university hospital, after the first wave.

72 **METHODS**

73

74 ***Population and data definitions***

75 Between May, 29th and July, 10th 2020, we conducted a sero-epidemiological study at the Rennes
76 University Hospital, a 1,500-bed tertiary care centre in western France, which served as a referral
77 centre for COVID-19 during the first epidemic wave (population catchment area, 1.5 million
78 inhabitants). All HCWs working in the hospital (n=8,540) were invited to be tested for COVID-19, with
79 a finger-prick rapid test (Figure 1). At inclusion and before the realization of the test, they respond to
80 a short questionnaire with data on socio-demographic characteristic (age, sex, occupation, ward) and
81 symptoms and potential risk factors (n=7,003, 82% participation rate). For 1,832 HCWs working in
82 COVID-19 wards and a random sample of HCWs working in non COVID-19 wards (n=1,421), a
83 supplemental questionnaire concerning occupational exposure was addressed. (Figure 1). In this
84 supplemental questionnaire, we collected data about the following activities during working hours: i)
85 patients care (consultation, vital sign measurement, insertion of central or peripheral venous
86 catheters, naso-gastric tubes, and/or urinary catheters, assistance during delivery, loco-regional
87 anaesthesia, clinical examination, naso-pharyngeal sampling, oral, eye, and ear, nose, throat (ENT)
88 examination, aerosol-generating procedures, patient mobilisation, bed making, feeding, surgery,
89 distribution of drugs, washing, dressing, mouth care, mobilisation and respiratory physiotherapy and
90 dental treatment), ii) shared activities with other staff during working hours (transmissions, mealtimes,
91 breaks, and meetings and changing-room habits). The use of protective equipment during these
92 activities was also investigated (masks, gloves, lab coats, etc.). Mask use was categorized as
93 appropriate if the HCWs kept the masks, whatever its type, throughout the activity, sub-optimal if
94 masks were irregularly use, and absent otherwise.

95 Serological status. After completion of the questionnaire, all HCWs underwent a SARS-CoV-2
96 Lateral Flow ImmunoAssay Test (LFIAT), namely the NG-Test[®] finger-prick test¹¹, with a reading 20 min
97 after the prick by trained nurses or doctors. This test allows the detection of anti-SARS-CoV-2 IgG with
98 a sensitivity of 82.5% and a specificity of 98% ¹². If the LFIAT was positive, a venous blood sample (7
99 mL) was drawn to confirm the serological status (Wantai SARS-CoV-2 Ab ELISA, Beijing, China). Indeed,
100 as the prevalence of SARS-CoV-2 IgG in the Western France during the study period was estimated to
101 be 2%, we expected a low positive predictive value but a good negative predictive value. All data were
102 stored in an on-line database using SPHINX[®]. The study obtained the agreement of the Lyon
103 Institutional Review Board (May, 28th 2020). All HCWs signed an informed consent form, and the study
104 was recorded on ClinicalTrials.gov (#35RC20_9716).

105

106 ***Statistical Analysis.***

107 The clinical COVID-19 status was defined as probable if patients presented with fever,
108 dyspnoea, and at least one of the following: cough, myalgia, headache or unusual fatigue, or if patients
109 presented with anosmia or ageusia. Patients with other symptoms were defined as possible COVID-19.

110 Our validation study ¹² demonstrated that SARS-CoV-2 serological test with LFIAT had a
111 predictive positive value of 49.7% and a negative predictive value of 99.7% in our population study for
112 IgG. We thus determined the SARS-CoV-2 serological status (negative / positive) using two distinct
113 approaches. First, only positive IgG LFIA tests were retained to define a positive status. However, as a
114 suitable proportion of HCWs also underwent a Wantai SARS-CoV-2 Ab ELISA as a control, we decided
115 to retain this last result when available, irrespective of the LFIA result. All negative IgG LFIA tests were
116 considered negative. This definition is thereafter referred to as ‘by combination’, and was used in all
117 descriptive and univariate analyses as well as multivariate analyses. Second, we proceeded to multiple
118 imputation (n = 50 databases) of the SARS-CoV-2 serological status using a logistic regression model
119 based on the clinical COVID-19 status (defined above) for subjects with a positive IgG LFIA test (except
120 for subjects with a Wantai SARS-CoV-2 Ab ELISA result). Conversely, negative IgG LFIA tests were
121 randomly imputed positive at a 0.3% frequency, corresponding to the false negative rate with this test
122 in our validation study. This definition is thereafter referred to as ‘by multiple imputation’ and only
123 used when multiple approaches were applied.

124
125 An analysis of risk factors associated with the serological status was performed using logistic
126 regression models. The descriptive and primary analyses used the ‘by combination’ definition of
127 serological SARS-CoV-2 status, whereas the analyses of overall and occupational risk factors used both
128 definitions.

129 Factor analysis was first performed for the analysis of activities, as preliminary analyses
130 demonstrated strong correlations among these data (not shown). Six factors were defined
131 corresponding to nurse, auxiliary-nurse, medical, surgical, physiotherapist and ENT activities.
132 Associations between a positive SARS-CoV-2 status and the use of protective equipment were then
133 analysed by separate backward logistic regression models according to each factor. All models were
134 adjusted for age, sex, and occupation and, depending on analyses, contact with COVID-19 patients or
135 relatives with COVID-19.

136 Statistical analyses were performed using the SAS® package, v9.4, with FACTOR, LOGISTIC and
137 MIANALYSE procedures. Results are presented as Odds ratio (OR) with their 95% confidence intervals.
138 A p value below 0.05 was considered as significant.

139 RESULTS

140 Among the 3,234 participants that completed the supplemental questionnaire and underwent
141 LFIAT (Figure 1), 120 (3.8%) HCWs presented with IgG SARS-CoV-2 according to the ‘by combination’
142 definition (Table I). We observed close-to-significant differences ($p = 0.06$) among occupations, with
143 cleaners, stretcher-bearers and residents having the highest rate of positive tests. There were no
144 significant differences according to sex, age, smoking status, or presence of comorbidities. The number
145 of symptoms highly correlated with the presence of SARS-CoV-2 IgG, as well as the clinical definition
146 of COVID-19 status (Table II). Overall, in univariate analyses (Table III), working in a COVID-19 ward
147 (relative to working in a non-COVID-19 ward, 3.8% vs 3.2%, $p = 0.50$) or taking care of COVID-19
148 patients (4.0% vs 3.2%, $p = 0.27$), were not significantly associated with a positive status for SARS-CoV-
149 2 IgG. Conversely, contact with a HCW who was diagnosed as COVID-19 was significantly associated
150 with seropositivity for SARS-CoV-2 IgG (2.4% vs 4.9%, $p=0.0004$) as was household contact with
151 someone diagnosed with COVID-19 (3.2% vs 6.9%, $p = 0.0006$). Activities associated with increased risk
152 of positive IgG SARS-CoV-2 test in univariate analyses (Table IV) were clinical examination ($p = 0.01$),
153 and the mobilisation of patients in bed ($p = 0.01$). Multivariate analyses (Table V), both using the ‘by
154 combination’ or ‘by multiple imputation’ definitions, confirmed the association between SARS-CoV-2
155 IgG seropositivity and contact with HCWs diagnosed with COVID-19 (OR = 1.51 95%CI [1.18-1.94], by
156 the ‘multiple imputation definition’) or relatives (OR = 1.42 95%CI [1.08-1.86]). On multivariate
157 analyses adjusted for age, sex, occupation, and contact with a relative or patient with COVID-19, sub-
158 optimal protective equipment during certain tasks was associated with positive test for SARS-CoV-2
159 IgG (‘by combination definition’): nasopharyngeal samplings (OR= 3.46 95%CI [1.15-10.40]),
160 mobilisation of patient in bed (OR = 3.30 95%CI [1.51-7.25]), clinical examination (OR = 2.51 95%CI
161 [1.16-5.43]) and eye examination (OR = 2.90 95%CI [1.01-8.35]). The same analyses using the ‘by
162 multiple imputation’ definition confirmed these associations only for mobilising patients and clinical
163 examination (Table VI). Washing and dressing patients were also associated with increased risk of
164 SARS-CoV-2 IgG seropositivity even with self-declared appropriate use of protective equipment, using
165 both the ‘by combination’ and ‘by multiple imputation’ definitions (OR = 2.13 [95%CI 1.05-4.30] and
166 OR= 1.51 95%CI [1.06-2.14], respectively). Finally, aerosol-generating procedures, whether with self-
167 declared appropriate, or sub-optimal use of protective equipment were also associated with positive
168 test for SARS-CoV-2 IgG using the ‘by multiple imputation’ method (OR=1.37 95%CI [1.04-1.81] and OR
169 = 1.74 95%CI [1.05-2.88], respectively).

170 DISCUSSION

171 This large sero-epidemiological study, which included more than 3,000 HCWs in a French
172 university hospital after the first epidemic wave, highlights several possible factors in the risk of
173 transmission of SARS-CoV-2. First, our results confirm that, during the first epidemic wave, contact
174 with both relatives or HCWs with COVID-19 were the two main risk factors for SARS-CoV-2 infection,
175 while working in COVID-19 wards or contact with COVID-19 patients was not associated with an
176 increased risk. Second, we confirmed that certain tasks performed by HCWs that increase the risk of
177 aerosolization also increase the risk of SARS-CoV-2 transmission, particularly when use of protective
178 equipment was sub-optimal, such as interventions on the upper respiratory tract or nasopharyngeal
179 sampling. Our results also suggest that certain tasks associated with daily care, such as patients
180 washing, dressing, mobilisation, and eye or clinical examinations also increased the risk of SARS-CoV-
181 2 infection among HCWs.

182 A lower risk of transmission by working in COVID-19 wards during the first epidemic wave has
183 already been reported. In a British cross-sectional study that included 545 HCWs, working in an
184 intensive care unit with COVID-19 patients was associated with a lower risk of SARS-CoV-2 infection
185 than working in other wards (OR = 0.28 95%CI [0.09-0.78]¹³. Similarly, a large US cross-sectional study
186 found no risk associated with working in COVID-19 wards (OR = 1.00 95%CI [0.98-1.03]) or intensive
187 care units (OR = 0.98 95%CI [0.93-1.02]) among 49,329 HCWs tested for SARS-CoV-2 IgG antibodies¹⁴.
188 A study from China also reported a higher risk associated with working in non-COVID-19 wards (relative
189 to dedicated wards, IRR = 3.1 95%CI [1.8-5.2])¹⁵. These findings suggest that appropriate use of
190 protective equipment, better compliance and experience with COVID-19 in such dedicated wards
191 would, indeed, be protective^{1,16}. One study¹⁷ reported an excess risk in frontline HCWs working in
192 dedicated COVID-19 wards (RR= 1.65 95%CI [1.34-2.02]) among 28,792 subjects but that study
193 considered both IgG and IgM antibodies obtained by a self-interpreted LFIA test to be positive, which
194 may not be accurate. In a sero-prevalence study using a different LFIA test among 3,056 HCWs in a
195 Belgian hospital, contact with COVID-19 patients was not associated with a higher prevalence of IgG
196 antibodies against SARS-CoV-2 (OR = 1.08 95%CI [0.80-1.45]¹⁸. In addition, Moscola et al. also did not
197 observe a risk associated with direct patient care (RR = 95%CI [0.97-1.02])¹⁴. Conversely, Lentz et al.
198 reported increased risk associated in HCWs with exposure to COVID-19 patients (OR=1.4 95%CI [1.0-
199 1.9]), and that risk was associated with routine contact (1.4 95%CI [1.04-1.90]) rather than exposure
200 to aerosol-generating procedures (OR =0.9 95%CI [0.6-1.2])¹⁶. Similarly, Shat et al. reported a higher
201 risk of COVID-19 for HCWs facing patients (HR = 3.30 95%CI [2.13-5.13]) than those not facing patients,
202 after adjustment for sex, age, ethnicity, socioeconomic status and comorbidity¹⁹. Iversen et al.¹⁷ also
203 reported a mild excess risk for HCWs in contact with COVID-19 patients (RR = 1.22 95% CI [1.03-1.45]).

204 One explanation for such discrepancies may be the role of the appropriate use of protective
205 equipment. Several at risk exposures have been reported for SARS, MERS, and, to a lesser extent, SARS-
206 CoV-2. In a large literature review, Chou et al. highlighted that involvement in intubation, direct patient
207 contact, and contact with bodily secretions increased the risk of coronavirus infections, but they found
208 less convincing arguments for other types of exposure such as non-invasive positive-pressure
209 ventilation, nebulizers use, manipulation of oxygen masks, and high-flow oxygen. This review
210 confirmed the protective effect of using a mask, either surgical or N95¹, previously reported ²⁰. For
211 coronaviruses, N95 masks are not generally found to be more protective than surgical masks for most
212 at-risk exposures, albeit some authors reported better protection with N95 masks ^{21,22}. However, these
213 studies suffered from methodological flaws. Our study suggests an increased risk associated with
214 aerosol-generating procedures such as nasopharyngeal sampling in line with the recommendation to
215 use N95 masks for these procedures. Moreover, actions on the upper respiratory tract were associated
216 with a significant risk of SARS-CoV-2 infection, with or without protective equipment (OR = 1.37 95%CI
217 [1.04-1.81] and OR = 1.74 95%CI [1.05-2.88], respectively using the 'by multiple imputation' definition).
218 We also found a higher risk of SARS-CoV-2 IgG positivity associated with two auxiliary-nurses activities,
219 namely patients washing and dressing, and their mobilisation. The masks used while performing these
220 activities are surgical, and our results suggest that this level of protection may not be appropriate. One
221 explanation may be that these activities require close, and prolonged contact with patients, two risk
222 factors that may increase the risk of SARS-CoV-1 transmission ^{21, 23, 24}. For SARS-CoV-2, to the best of
223 our knowledge, only two studies suggested that duration of care may be a risk factor for infection.
224 Thus, Lentz et al. documented an increased risk associated with care longer than 45 minutes ¹⁶. Grant
225 et al. , in their short paper, found a significant higher prevalence of SARS-CoV-2 antibodies among
226 HCWs with exposure defined as prolonged direct contact with patients ²⁵. Another explanation may be
227 the generation of a small amount of SARS-CoV-2 aerosol ²⁶ during such care activities, in particular by
228 patients not wearing a mask, and contamination by inhalation, despite the use of a surgical mask.
229 These findings suggest that protective equipment must be reinforced when HCWs are exposed to
230 prolonged and close care of COVID-19 patients. Finally, we also observed a higher risk associated with
231 eye and clinical examinations. These results are consistent with those of the literature ⁷, as SARS-CoV-
232 2 can be detected in tears and conjunctival secretions ²⁷ and eye examination requires close contact.
233 Suboptimal use of protective equipment under these conditions may place HCWS at risk, as suggested
234 by our results. This is the first study to suggest that clinical examination may be associated with
235 increased risk even with self-declared appropriate use of protective equipment. This may also be
236 possibly explained by close contact and, to a lesser extent, the duration of contact.

237 We also report increased risk of SARS-CoV-2 infection in HCWs with household relatives who
238 were diagnosed with COVID-19 (OR = 1.42 95%CI [1.08-1.86]). Lentz et al. found a significant risk of

239 infection associated with exposure outside of work, including living with a household member
240 diagnosed with COVID-19 (OR = 3.8 CI95% [1.5-9.3]) or who presented COVID symptoms (OR = 3.1
241 CI95% [1.5-6.3]). Lai et al. also reported more frequent contact with confirmed cases of COVID-19
242 among family members than colleagues, albeit the difference was non-significant (12.7% vs 10.9%).
243 Treibel et al. ²⁸ compared the number and incidence of patients testing positive for SARS-CoV-2 in
244 Greater London, to that of HCWs in their cohort study, and suggested that these data more likely
245 reflect general community transmission than in-hospital exposure. Finally, Steensels et al. ¹⁸ found a
246 significant association between sero-prevalence of SARS-CoV-2 antibodies and contact with suspected
247 COVID-19 households (OR = 3.15 [95%CI 2.33-4.25]).

248

249 Our study has several limitations. First, data on the use of protective equipment, particularly
250 masks, were only declarative, and some HCWs may have over- or under-reported their use. We tried
251 to limit this effect by attributing the quality of protection independently of the tasks using the same
252 algorithm throughout the database. However, we observed associations for only a few activities, and
253 the observation of a coherent gradient of transmission risk with the quality of protection support the
254 validity of our findings. Another limitation was the low sero-prevalence, resulting in a low statistical
255 power. Nonetheless, we were able to highlight several activities associated with the risk of SARS-CoV-
256 2 infection, even in multivariable analyses. We also only considered SARS-CoV-2 IgG as the LFIA shows
257 low performances for the detection of SARS-CoV-2 IgM ¹¹. As we began our study at the end of May,
258 two months after the peak of the first epidemic wave in France, the effect on our prevalence estimate
259 was probably minimal. Finally, we only analysed the protective effect of masks, without considering
260 gloves, visors, and lab coats. Thus, our results primarily focus mostly on the risk of of SARS-CoV-2
261 transmission by inhalation.

262 Our study also has several strengths. The determination of SARS-CoV-2 status was based on a
263 LFIA test that we previously validated¹². Our knowledge of the quality of both the negative and positive
264 predictive values allowed us to include these data in our models, using multiple imputation after
265 stratification on the LFIA test response. This method, generally used to complete missing data, was a
266 good tool to correct our sero-prevalence results according to the validation measurement. Moreover,
267 several authors have recommended accounting for such errors ^{29, 30}. Thus, despite certain differences
268 between the 'in combination' and 'multiple imputation' definitions, these approaches provide more
269 confidence in our results.

270

271 Another strength was the selection of HCWs enrolled in the study. Our sample is
272 representative of HCWs of our hospital as it included all HCWs within COVID-19 wards and a random
273 selection of those working in non-COVID-19 wards. Moreover, the high rate of participation (80%)

274 ensure that our sample was representative. A comparison of demographic and occupational
275 characteristics between respondents and non-respondents did not find any difference (data not
276 shown).

277 As previously mentioned, our study allowed us to precisely study the role of several care-
278 associated activities, including nursing and auxiliary-nursing care. Our methodology, using factor
279 analyses coupled to multivariate logistic regression also allowed us to take into account statistical
280 correlations among the variables. However, residual correlations may explain some of the variation in
281 the observed associations between specific care activities and the presence of SARS-COV-2 antibodies.
282 As already mentioned and to the best of our knowledge, no previous study on this subject have used
283 these statistical approaches.

284 **Conclusions**

285 At a time during which second, and sometime third, wave of the SARS-CoV-2 pandemic is
286 sweeping across the world, and during which many HCWs must care for COVID-19 patients, our study
287 highlights several possible pathways of transmission associated with specific medical, nursing or
288 auxiliary-nursing activities. Although effective protective equipment was already being used by HCWs,
289 these findings support the possible role of less known situations in the transmission of SARS-CoV-2. In
290 particular, long-duration, non-aerosol generating activities close to patients such as mobilising patients
291 in their beds, washing and dressing them, and clinical or eye examinations may be at higher risk than
292 previously thought. Better use of adequate protective equipment during these activities must be
293 encouraged to better protect HCWs. Further studies are required to better understand the pathways
294 of SARS-CoV-2 transmission among HCWs.

295 **Table I. Overall characteristics of subjects enrolled in the HB AntiCov study (n=3,234)**

Characteristics	IgG serological status (by combination)		P-Value
	Negative	Positive	
Sex			0.28
men	627 (95.6)	29 (4.4)	
women	2,487 (96.5)	91 (3.5)	
Age (years)			0.18
<30	819 (95.2)	41 (4.8)	
30-39	867 (96.8)	29 (3.2)	
40-49	771 (96.1)	31 (3.9)	
50-+	657 (97.2)	19 (2.8)	
Occupation			0.06
Administrative staff	234 (97.5)	6 (2.5)	
Cleaners – Stretcher-bearers	173 (94.0)	11 (6.0)	
Auxiliary Nurses	657 (96.8)	22 (3.2)	
Nurses / Midwives	986 (94.5)	36 (3.5)	
Students	140 (97.9)	3 (2.1)	
Residents	132 (93.0)	10 (7.0)	
Medical staff	323 (97.3)	9 (2.7)	
HCW with patient contact	202 (97.1)	6 (2.9)	
HCW without patient contact	267 (94.0)	17 (6.0)	
<i>Total Medical Personnel</i>	456 (96.0)	19 (4.0)	
<i>Total Non-Medical Personnel</i>	1,821 (96.4)	69 (3.6)	
Household (DM=251)			0.02
Alone	398 (94.0)	25 (6.0)	
One child, at least	112 (95.7)	5 (4.3)	
One adult, at least	757 (96.1)	31 (3.9)	
One adult and one child, at least	1,608 (97.2)	47 (2.8)	
Smoking status (DM=102)			0.46
No	2,264 (96.1)	91 (3.9)	
Yes, not every day	277 (95.5)	13 (4.5)	
Yes, every day	473 (97.1)	14 (2.9)	
Immunodepression			0.81
No	2,997 (96.3)	116 (3.7)	

	Yes	117 (96.7)	4 (3.3)
296	DM : data missing		

297 **Table II. Clinical characteristics of subjects enrolled in the HB AntiCoV study (N = 3,234)**

Characteristics	IgG serological status (by combination)		P-Value
	Negative	Positive	
Symptoms			<0.0001
No symptom	1,103 (98.4)	18 (1.8)	
1	459 (97.7)	11 (2.3)	
2-3	826 (97.5)	21 (2.5)	
4-6	553 (93.9)	36 (6.1)	
7+	173 (83.6)	34 (16.4)	
Median	1	4	<0.0001
COVID-19 (clinical status)			<0.0001
No	1,103 (98.4)	18 (1.6)	
Possible	1,862 (98.0)	39 (2.0)	
Probable	149 (70.3)	63 (29.7)	
RT-PCR			<0.0001
No test	1,988 (98.2)	36 (1.8)	
Negative	1,076 (97.6)	26 (2.4)	
Positive	50 (46.3)	58 (53.7)	
LFIAT (IgG) (DM=19)			<0.0001
Negative	3,026 (99.8)	7 (0.2)	
Positive	69 (37.9)	113 (62.1)	

298 DM : data missing, LFIAT: lateral flow immunoassay test

299 **Table III. Overall risk Factors associated with SARS-CoV-2 IgG serological status obtained by**
 300 **combination in the HB AntiCoV Study (univariate analyses, n= 3,083)**

Risk Factors	IgG Serological status (by combination)		P- Value
	Negative	Positive	
Overall work status during the lockdown			0.50
Not at work	143 (94.7)	8 (5.3)	
Worked in non-Covid-19 ward	1,795 (96.5)	65 (3.5)	
Worked in Covid-19 ward	1,176 (96.2)	47 (3.8)	
Care of Covid-19 patients (DM=51)			0.27
No	1,114 (96.8)	37 (3.2)	
Yes	1,806 (96.0)	75 (4.0)	
Contact with a Covid-19 patient family member			0.84
No	2,799 (96.4)	106 (3.6)	
Yes	172 (96.6)	6 (3.4)	
Sampling of SARS-CoV-2 (DM=36)			0.11
No	2,079 (96.7)	70 (3.3)	
Yes	858 (95.6)	40 (4.4)	
Contact with a HCW with Covid-19 (DM=42)			0.0004
No	1,441 (97.6)	36 (2.4)	
Yes	1,488 (95.1)	76 (4.9)	
Contact with a Covid-19 subject at home (DM=50)			0.0006
No	2,598 (96.8)	86 (3.2)	
Yes	325 (93.1)	24 (6.9)	

301 DM : data missing

302 **Table IV. Specific tasks associated with the SARS-CoV-2 IgG serological status obtained by**
 303 **combination in the HB Anti-CoV Study (univariate analyses, n=3,083, P <0 .20)**

	IgG Serological status (by combination)		P-Value
	Negative	Positive	
Non-care activities			
Transmissions (DM= 38)			0.13
No	379 (98.2)	7 (1.8)	
Yes, suboptimal protective equipment	1,084 (96.4)	40 (3.6)	
Yes, appropriate protective equipment	1,431 (96.0)	59 (4.0)	
Meals (DM=207)			
No	381 (96.2)	15 (3.8)	0.16
Yes, suboptimal protective equipment	955 (97.2)	27 (2.8)	
Yes, appropriate protective equipment	1,435 (95.8)	63 (4.2)	
Care activities			
Clinical examination (DM=5)			0.01
No	1,709 (96.9)	56 (3.1)	
Yes, suboptimal protective equipment	160 (92.5)	13 (7.5)	
Yes, appropriate protective equipment	1097 (96.2)	43 (3.8)	
Nasopharyngeal sampling (DM=11)			
No	2,356 (96.6)	82 (3.4)	0.09
Yes, suboptimal protective equipment	40 (90.9)	4 (9.1)	
Yes, appropriate protective equipment	565 (95.8)	25 (4.2)	
Oral and ENT examination (DM=20)			
No	2,397 (96.6)	85 (3.4)	0.18
Yes, suboptimal protective equipment	49 (92.5)	4 (7.5)	
Yes, appropriate protective equipment	505 (95.6)	23 (4.4)	
Eye examination (DM=10)			
No	2,761 (96.6)	98 (3.4)	0.06
Yes, suboptimal protective equipment	49 (92.5)	4 (7.5)	
Yes, appropriate protective equipment	151 (93.8)	10 (6.2)	
Actions on upper respiratory tract (DM=13)			
No	2,003 (96.7)	68 (3.3)	0.12
Yes, suboptimal protective equipment	79 (92.9)	6 (7.1)	

Yes, appropriate protective equipment	876 (95.8)	38 (4.2)	
Patient mobilisation (DM=7)			0.01
No	1,108 (96.6)	39 (3.4)	
Yes, suboptimal protective equipment	220 (92.8)	17 (7.2)	
Yes, appropriate protective equipment	1636 (96.7)	56 (3.3)	
Bed making (DM=7)			0.14
No	1,571 (96.4)	58 (3.6)	
Yes, suboptimal protective equipment	162 (93.6)	11 (6.4)	
Yes, appropriate protective equipment	1,231 (96.6)	43 (3.4)	
Feeding (DM=25)			0.08
No	2,038 (96.6)	71 (3.4)	
Yes, suboptimal protective equipment	99 (92.5)	8 (7.5)	
Yes, appropriate protective equipment	813 (96.6)	29 (3.4)	

304

Table V. Overall risk factors associated with the SARS-CoV-2 IgG serological status obtained by combination (n=2,866) or multiple imputation (n=50 data sets) in the HB Anti-CoV Study.

(Logistic regression models, adjusted for age, sex, occupation)

Variables	IgG serological status	
	By combination	By multiple imputation
	OR [CI 95%]	OR [CI 95%]
Immunodepression (yes)	1.32 [0.47-3.74]	-
Life at home (DM=251)		ns
Alone	1.00	
One child, at least	0.54 [0.17-1.65]	-
One adult, at least	0.58 [0.33-1.03]	-
One adult and one child, at least	0.49 [0.28-0.85]	-
Care of Covid-19 patient (yes)	1.30 [0.78-2.17]	-
Contact with family of a Covid-19 patient (yes)	0.90 [0.38-2.10]	-
Covid-19 sampling (yes)	1.00 [0.63-1.60]	-
Contact with a Covid-19 HCW (yes)	2.08 [1.33-3.24]	1.51 [1.18-1.94]
Contact with a Covid-19 subject at home (yes)	2.00 [1.23-3.28]	1.42 [1.08-1.86]

Table VI. Specific care tasks associated with the SARS-CoV-2 IgG serological status obtained by combination (n=2,961) or multiple imputation (n=50 data sets) in the HB Anti-CoV Study.

(logistic regression, P-value <0.20, adjusted for age, sex, occupation, contact with a Covid-19 patient, contact with a Covid-19 subject at home)

Each group of specific tasks by occupation corresponded to an independent model according to the factorial analysis (see methods)

Variables	IgG Serological status	
	by combination	by multiple imputation
	OR [CI 95%]	OR [ICI 95%]
Nurse specific tasks		
Nasopharyngeal sampling		
No	1.00	1.00*
Yes, suboptimal protective equipment	3.46 [1.15-10.40]	0.88 [0.32-2.43]
Yes, appropriate protective equipment	1.33 [0.79-2.25]	1.13 [0.84-1.52]
Central lines insertion		
No	1.00	1.00
Yes, suboptimal protective equipment	2.66 [0.57-12.38]	1.75 [0.82-3.74]
Yes, appropriate protective equipment	0.72 [0.35-1.45]	0.74 [0.48-1.14]
Actions on upper respiratory tract		
No	1.00*	1.00
Yes, suboptimal protective equipment	1.85 [0.66-5.22]	1.74 [1.05-2.88]
Yes, appropriate protective equipment	1.53 [0.92-2.55]	1.37 [1.04-1.81]
Auxiliary Nurse specific tasks		
Washing and dressing patient		
No	1.00	1.00
Yes, suboptimal protective equipment	0.38 [0.10-1.46]	0.63 [0.29-1.36]
Yes, appropriate protective equipment	2.13 [1.05-4.30]	1.51 [1.06-2.14]
Patient mobilisation		
No	1.00	
Yes, suboptimal protective equipment	3.30 [1.51-7.25]	2.04 [1.33-3.11]
Yes, appropriate protective equipment	0.93 [0.49-1.79]	1.00 [0.70-1.44]
Feeding		
No	1.00	1.00*
Yes, suboptimal protective equipment	2.48 [0.92-6.72]	1.24 [0.65-2.36]

Yes, appropriate protective equipment	1.00 [0.54-1.89]	0.87 [0.62-1.24]
<hr/>		
Specific Medical tasks		
Clinical examination		
No	1.00	
Yes, suboptimal protective equipment	2.51 [1.16-5.43]	1.62 [1.06-2.48]
Yes, appropriate protective equipment	1.50 [0.85-2.64]	1.23 [0.90-1.68]
<hr/>		
Eye Examination		
No	1.00	1.00*
Yes, suboptimal protective equipment	2.90 [1.01-8.35]	1.39 [0.66-2.91]
Yes, appropriate protective equipment	1.86 [0.93-3.73]	1.02 [0.60-1.72]

* : variable not included in the final regression logistic model as $p > 0.20$

Contributors

CP and RG conceived the study. CP, RG, VT and PT contributed to the protocol and design of the study. ET, PGB, SO contributed to the implementation of the study or data collection. CH and VT conducted the ELISA serological assays. CP, AS, RG and PW conducted the statistical analysis. CP and RG contributed to the preparation of the report. All authors critically reviewed and approved the final version. All authors had full access to all the data in the study and had final responsibility for the decision to submit for publication.

Acknowledgements

We thank all participants and nurses (Anne-Marie Le Bonniec, Sabine Filande, Veronique Grigoli, and Gaëlle Oudard), and residents (Nadia Fatih, Alexandre Bichon, Jean Poinsignon, Annabelle Guilloux, Léah Rakotonirina and Ahmed Aiouaz) of the occupational medicine unit for inclusion of the participants. We thank Pr Boudjema, Pr Malledant, Nicolas Mevel, Sophie Huitorel, Agnes Gazzola, Anne-Sophie Jouault, and Valerie Turmel for their help in the organisation of this study.

Funding

This study was funded by a grant from the Nominoe Fund and the Rennes CHU.

Declaration of competing interests

The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

References

1. Wang X, Pan Z, Cheng Z Association between 2019-nCoV transmission and N95 respirator use. *J Hosp Infect* 2020; **105**: 104-5.
2. Team CC-R Characteristics of Health Care Personnel with COVID-19 - United States, February 12-April 9, 2020. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep* 2020; **69**: 477-81.
3. ECDC. Coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) in the EU/EEA and the UK. *Rapid Risk Assessment*, eighth update edn.: 2020.
4. Galanis P, Vraka 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**: 120-34.
5. SPF. Recensement national des cas de COVID-19 chez les professionnels en établissements de soins. <https://www.santepubliquefrance.fr/etudes-et-enquetes/recensement-national-des-cas-de-covid-19-chez-les-professionnels-en-etablissements-de-sante>: Santé Publique France.
6. 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**: 120-36.
7. Xiao J, Fang M, Chen Q, He B SARS, MERS and COVID-19 among healthcare workers: A narrative review. *J Infect Public Health* 2020; **13**: 843-8.
8. Cyril O, Jean-Baptiste B, Elisabeth B *et al.* Context of health care workers contamination during the first SARS-CoV-2 epidemic wave in France. *Bulletin Epidemiologique Hebdomadaire*: 2020; 690-5.
9. Richterman A, Meyerowitz EA, Cevik M Hospital-Acquired SARS-CoV-2 Infection: Lessons for Public Health. *JAMA* 2020.
10. Wang J, Zhou M, Liu F Reasons for healthcare workers becoming infected with novel coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) in China. *J Hosp Infect* 2020; **105**: 100-1.
11. Charpentier C, Ichou H, Damond F *et al.* Performance evaluation of two SARS-CoV-2 IgG/IgM rapid tests (Covid-Presto and NG-Test) and one IgG automated immunoassay (Abbott). *J Clin Virol* 2020; **132**: 104618.
12. Garlantezec R, Heslan C, Tadie E, Tattevin P, Thibault V, Paris C A lateral flow immunoassay test performance in SARS-CoV-2 seroprevalence surveys: a validation study among healthcare workers. *Emerg Microbes Infect* 2020; **9**: 2547-9.
13. Shields A, Faustini SE, Perez-Toledo M *et al.* SARS-CoV-2 seroprevalence and asymptomatic viral carriage in healthcare workers: a cross-sectional study. *Thorax* 2020; **75**: 1089-94.
14. Moscola J, Sembajwe G, Jarrett M *et al.* Prevalence of SARS-CoV-2 Antibodies in Health Care Personnel in the New York City Area. *JAMA* 2020; **324**: 893-5.
15. Lai X, Wang M, Qin C *et al.* Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-2019) Infection Among Health Care Workers and Implications for Prevention Measures in a Tertiary Hospital in Wuhan, China. *JAMA Netw Open* 2020; **3**: e209666.
16. Lentz RJ, Colt H, Chen H *et al.* Assessing coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) transmission to healthcare personnel: The global ACT-HCP case-control study. *Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol* 2020: 1-7.
17. Iversen K, Bundgaard H, Hasselbalch RB *et al.* Risk of COVID-19 in health-care workers in Denmark: an observational cohort study. *Lancet Infect Dis* 2020; **20**: 1401-8.
18. 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**: 195-7.

19. Shah ASV, Wood R, Gribben C *et al.* Risk of hospital admission with coronavirus disease 2019 in healthcare workers and their households: nationwide linkage cohort study. *BMJ* 2020; **371**: m3582.
20. Verbeek JH, Rajamaki B, Ijaz S *et al.* Personal protective equipment for preventing highly infectious diseases due to exposure to contaminated body fluids in healthcare staff. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2020; **4**: CD011621.
21. Raboud J, Shigayeva A, McGeer A *et al.* Risk factors for SARS transmission from patients requiring intubation: a multicentre investigation in Toronto, Canada. *PLoS One* 2010; **5**: e10717.
22. Chu DK, Akl EA, Duda S *et al.* Physical distancing, face masks, and eye protection to prevent person-to-person transmission of SARS-CoV-2 and COVID-19: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Lancet* 2020; **395**: 1973-87.
23. Scales DC, Green K, Chan AK *et al.* Illness in intensive care staff after brief exposure to severe acute respiratory syndrome. *Emerg Infect Dis* 2003; **9**: 1205-10.
24. Reynolds MG, Anh BH, Thu VH *et al.* Factors associated with nosocomial SARS-CoV transmission among healthcare workers in Hanoi, Vietnam, 2003. *BMC Public Health* 2006; **6**: 207.
25. Grant JJ, Wilmore SMS, McCann NS *et al.* Seroprevalence of SARS-CoV-2 antibodies in healthcare workers at a London NHS Trust. *Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol* 2021; **42**: 212-4.
26. Shiu EYC, Leung NHL, Cowling BJ Controversy around airborne versus droplet transmission of respiratory viruses: implication for infection prevention. *Curr Opin Infect Dis* 2019; **32**: 372-9.
27. Xia J, Tong J, Liu M, Shen Y, Guo D Evaluation of coronavirus in tears and conjunctival secretions of patients with SARS-CoV-2 infection. *J Med Virol* 2020; **92**: 589-94.
28. Treibel TA, Manisty C, Burton M *et al.* COVID-19: PCR screening of asymptomatic health-care workers at London hospital. *Lancet* 2020; **395**: 1608-10.
29. Sempos CT, Tian L Adjusting Coronavirus Prevalence Estimates for Laboratory Test Kit Error. *Am J Epidemiol* 2021; **190**: 109-15.
30. Kumleben N, Bhopal R, Czypionka T *et al.* Test, test, test for COVID-19 antibodies: the importance of sensitivity, specificity and predictive powers. *Public Health* 2020; **185**: 88-90.