

Hospital-level work organization drives the spread of SARS-CoV-2 within hospitals: insights from a multi-ward model

Ajmal Oodally^{a,b,c,1}, Pachka Hammami^{a,b,c,f}, Astrid Reilhac^d, Guillaume Guérineau de Lamérie^d, Lulla Opatowski^{a,b,1,2}, and Laura Temime^{c,e,1,2}

^aUniversité Paris-Saclay, UVSQ, Inserm, CESP, Anti-infective evasion and pharmacoepidemiology team, Montigny-Le-Bretonneux, France; ^bInstitut Pasteur, Epidemiology and Modelling of Antibiotic Evasion (EMAE), Paris, France; ^cModélisation, épidémiologie et surveillance des risques sanitaires (MESuRS), Conservatoire national des arts et métiers, Paris, France; ^dDépartement d'information médicale, Centre hospitalier Guillaume Rénier, Rennes, France; ^ePACRI unit, Institut Pasteur, Conservatoire national des arts et métiers, Paris, France; ^fANSES, French Agency for Food, Environmental and Occupational Health and Safety Epidemiology, Health and Welfare Research Unit, Ploufragan-Plouzané-Niort Laboratory, Ploufragan, France

This manuscript was compiled on September 9, 2021

1 **Despite extensive protective measures, SARS-CoV-2 widely circulates within healthcare facilities, posing a significant risk to both**
2 **patients and healthcare workers. Several control strategies have**
3 **been proposed; however, the global efficacy of local measures imple-**
4 **mented at the ward level may depend on hospital-level organizational**
5 **factors. We aimed at better understanding the role of between-ward**
6 **interactions on nosocomial outbreaks and their control in a multi-**
7 **ward psychiatric hospital in Western France. We built a stochastic**
8 **compartmental transmission model of SARS-CoV-2 in the 24-wards**
9 **hospital, accounting for the various infection states among patients**
10 **and staff, and between-ward connections resulting from staff shar-**
11 **ing. We first evaluated the potential of hospital-wide diffusion of local**
12 **outbreaks, depending on the ward they started in. We then assessed**
13 **control strategies, including a screening area upon patient admis-**
14 **sion, an isolation ward for COVID-19 positive patients and changes**
15 **in staff schedules to limit between-ward mixing. Much larger and**
16 **more frequent outbreaks occurred when the index case originated in**
17 **one of the most connected wards with up to four times more trans-**
18 **missions when compared to the more isolated ones. The number**
19 **of wards where infection spreads was brought down by up to 53 %**
20 **after reducing staff sharing. Finally, we found that setting up an isola-**
21 **tion ward reduced the number of transmissions by up to 70 %, while**
22 **adding a screening area before admission seemed ineffective.**
23

stochastic model | multi-ward | SARS-CoV-2 | nosocomial transmission
| hospital

1. Introduction

2 The COVID-19 pandemic, caused by severe acute respiratory
3 syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2), has placed an unprece-
4 dented burden on healthcare services worldwide (1),(2),(3).
5 The crisis that followed incited most countries to go into partial
6 or full lockdowns in an effort to curb the spread of the virus.
7 Hospitals and Long Term Care Facilities (LTCFs) have been
8 hit hard, with the former being on the front line to deal with
9 the epidemic and the latter having to deal with repercussions
10 on often vulnerable patients while not always being sufficiently
11 prepared (4), (5), (6). Despite most countries doing their best
12 to ramp up vaccination efforts in these healthcare institutions
13 and among the healthcare worker (HCW) population, the
14 spread of variants of concern which could evade vaccination is
15 an ongoing issue (7), (8). In this context, within-hospital trans-
16 mission, henceforth referred to as nosocomial transmission,
17 can drastically impact day-to-day operations while putting
18 both HCWs and vulnerable patients at risk. There has been

a staggering number of SARS-CoV-2 outbreaks in LTCFs
and hospitals with often devastating consequences for elderly
patients and especially those with comorbidities (9). On 31
March 2021, LTCF residents in France and Belgium accounted
for 42 % and 57 % of total COVID-19 related deaths respec-
tively according to surveillance data from the European Centre
for Disease Prevention and Control. As of 31 August 2020,
residents of LTCFs accounted for 40 % of US COVID-19 re-
lated fatalities (10). Patients in LTCFs require constant care
putting them in close and frequent contact with HCWs who
might unknowingly act as vectors of transmission. On the
flip side, Taiwan's impressive response to COVID-19 includes
an efficient and crucial role played by hospitals in mitigating
the spread of the infection (11). Similarly, in the US where a
massive vaccination campaign significantly reduced the death
toll in most states, the implementation of rigorous control
measures has also proven effective in a large medical center
(12). Hence, better comprehension of transmission pathways
and prevention strategies can greatly reduce the extent of
nosocomial COVID-19.

Significance Statement

Hospital acquired COVID-19 poses a major problem to many countries. Despite extensive protective measures, transmission within hospitals still occurs regularly and threatens those essential to the fight against the pandemic while putting patients at risk. Using a stochastic compartmental model, we simulate the spread of SARS-CoV-2 in a multi-ward hospital, assessing the effect of different scenarios and infection control strategies. The novelty of our method resides in the consideration of staff sharing data to better reflect the field reality. Our results highlight the poor efficiency of implementing a screening area before hospital admission, while the setting up of an isolation ward dedicated to COVID-19 patients and the restriction of healthcare workers movements between wards significantly reduce epidemic spread.

Author contributions: A.O, L.O and L.T designed research. A.O, P.H, L.O and L.T performed research. A.R and G.G collected data. A.O, P.H, L.O and L.T analyzed data. A.O, P.H, A.R, G.G, L.O and L.T reviewed results. A.O wrote the manuscript. All authors edited and revised the manuscript.

L.O reports grants from Pfizer, outside the submitted work. All other authors report no competing interests.

²L.T and L.O contributed equally to this work

¹To whom correspondence should be addressed. Email: ajmal-iqbal.oodally@pasteur.fr or lulla.opatowski@pasteur.fr or laura.temime@lecnam.net

It is made available under a [CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/).




Fig. 1. Structure of stochastic multi-ward model. The intra-ward compartmental models for patients and HCWs are represented on the top and middle figure respectively. Red compartments correspond to contagious states while green ones correspond to non-contagious states. Grey compartments represent an intensive care unit (ICU), isolation ward (IsoW) for patients and sick leave (SL) for HCWs. Refer to the material and methods section for a detailed description of each model state. On the bottom figure, the multi-ward model includes all connections resulting from the sharing of HCWs. Wards located in the same building are colored similarly.

39 Mathematical modeling of the aforementioned phenom-
 40 ena serves as a powerful tool to evaluate the relevance of
 41 infection control strategies. Despite the work of many studies
 42 on the epidemic risk at the national or regional levels
 43 (13),(14),(15),(16),(17), (18), (19), studies focusing on model-
 44 ing SARS-CoV-2 transmission in the healthcare setting are
 45 still limited (20), (21), (22), (23) (24), (25), (26), (27), (28),
 46 (29). Most of the latter focus on testing strategies as control
 47 measures, and more importantly, none account for the
 48 organizational structure of the healthcare facility under study.
 49 Better understanding of nosocomial COVID-19 transmission
 50 and other possible infection control strategies should there-
 51 fore be thoroughly investigated with the aim to alleviate the
 52 burden on our healthcare institutions.

53 With this goal in mind, we propose a new SARS-CoV-2
 54 hospital transmission model that accounts for multiple inter-
 55 connected wards. After feeding this model with data from the
 56 main hospital site of a French psychiatric hospital, henceforth
 57 simply referred to as the hospital, we simulate different scenar-
 58 ios to assess the effectiveness of control measures on the spread
 59 of the epidemic within the hospital, notably underlining the
 60 importance of the ward connectivity.

2. Results

61
 62 The model describes the healthcare community as a meta-
 63 population divided into $W = 24$ wards located in 8 different
 64 buildings. HCWs are composed of doctors, nurses, medical
 65 interns, caregivers, maintenance staff and administrative staff.
 66 Each ward holds patients and HCWs distributed into several
 67 epidemiological compartments representing the natural history
 68 of SARS-CoV-2 infection in a discrete manner (Fig. 1a, Fig.
 69 1b). HCWs may be shared between different wards; staff shar-
 70 ing data allows to reconstruct a network of wards connected
 71 by HCWs' care activities (Fig. 1c). In simulation results that
 72 follow, patients who were symptomatic on admission and those
 73 who became symptomatic during their hospital stay, systemat-
 74 ically underwent SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR testing (sensitivity and
 75 specificity as indicated in Table S1 of SI) and were transferred
 76 to an isolation ward upon a positive test. Symptomatic HCWs
 77 were also underwent RT-PCR testing and took sick leave if
 78 their test results were positive. The model was parameterised
 79 (see Table S1 of SI) based on data collected in the hospital
 80 during the study period and on an outbreak that occurred in
 81 ward A2 (Fig. 2).




Fig. 2. Epidemic curve for ward A2

Oppositely, increasing staff sharing increased up to 44 % the mean number of affected wards. We then assessed the epidemic potential of each ward as point of origin of infection in the three staff organization scenarios. We computed the number of wards where infection spreads and summarized the results based on the degree of the index ward (Fig. 4b). The limited sharing scenario limited the degree of any ward to at most 4, leading to the lowest probability of spread (see Fig. S4, S5 of SI) and outbreaks that never exceed 5 secondary wards, which is not surprising given that most wards were isolated following the reduction in staff sharing (9 out of 24 wards). On the other hand, oversharing of staff frequently led to widespread contamination as illustrated by spates of red in the upper y-values of Fig. 4b.

C. An isolation ward can help reduce outbreak size. We evaluated the efficacy of implementing a COVID-19 isolation ward on preventing the dissemination of SARS-CoV-2 within the hospital. A COVID-19 isolation ward serves as a separate designated space to host detected SARS-CoV-2 positive patients. Symptomatic patients are systematically tested and transferred in case of a positive test. We ran 500 simulations over a 40-day period. Several levels of importation risk were evaluated, assuming different levels of community prevalence (from 0.1% up to 3%, corresponding to a situation close to the epidemic peak during the first pandemic wave). Fig. 5a shows that the presence of a COVID-19 isolation ward consistently led to a lower median number of nosocomial transmissions compared to the reference scenario, absence of a COVID-19 isolation ward. Isolating infected patients substantially brings down the number of transmissions, ranging from a 59 % decrease up to 70 % decrease on average depending on community prevalence. The maximum outbreak potential is also much worse in non-isolation scenarios especially in cases of high community prevalence. Setting up a COVID-19 isolation ward therefore strongly contributes to limiting the dissemination risk in the hospital.

D. Screening areas have limited impact on virus transmission. A screening area allows for temporary isolation of newly admitted patients before clinical examination, with RT-PCR tests administered to those presenting symptoms, thereby limiting the admission of positive patients. We assessed the impact of such screening areas and compared them with the reference scenario where symptomatic patients on admission were tested but no screening area was in place. Three types of screening areas were investigated: a global common screening area for the entire hospital, with dedicated staff; a local one for each ward where admitted patients were isolated from other patients from their admission ward; and a local one with isolation from both patients and HCWs of the admission ward. In all these scenarios, a COVID-19 isolation ward was set up and patients who tested positive were assumed to be systematically transferred to the isolation ward within 24 hours. Fig. 5b shows that, for a given community prevalence, the predicted median numbers of nosocomial transmissions after 40 days are quite similar. Insofar as all symptomatic patients were tested and systematically transferred to the isolation ward within 24 hours if they tested positive, screening areas, irrespective of the level of isolation implemented within, showed no impact on the epidemic risk.

A. Ward of origin of index case determines the global risk of outbreak at the hospital level. The connectivity and topology of the ward network may impact the risk and size of an outbreak at the hospital level. Wards were here characterized according to their size and connections to other wards. To better understand and quantify how importations in the different wards can lead to global dissemination risk, we simulated and analyzed the resulting epidemic size following the introduction of a non-contagious incubating patient in one ward at a time. 40 days after the introduction, the median number of nosocomial acquisitions in the entire hospital ranged from two, for an index case introduced in the least connected wards, to sixteen, for an introduction in the most connected one (Fig. 3a). As expected, the number of secondary wards affected was higher when the index ward was more connected (higher degree) (Fig. 3b). In this particular case, three additional interconnections led to one more infected ward on average. Starting from the introduction ward, other wards became infected with probabilities related to their proximity to this initial ward over the network, as illustrated in Fig. 3c-3e.

B. Reorganizing HCW sharing can impact the epidemic risk. We then explored different work organization scenarios at the hospital level, i.e. different networks, to assess their impact on the epidemic risk. We considered as a baseline scenario (Fig. 1c, 1d) the observed HCW staffing provided by the hospital during the period under investigation. We investigated two hypothetical scenarios: one where between-ward staff sharing was limited by 52.9 % and one where staff sharing was exacerbated by 57.6 %, serving as best-case scenario and worst-case scenario respectively. Limited sharing was modeled by re-assigning HCWs working in multiple wards to fewer wards isolating wards as much as possible; exacerbated sharing was modeled by re-assigning HCWs between wards located in the same building. Both those scenarios implied a different sharing structure of HCWs albeit keeping the same working hours by profession in all wards as in the baseline scenario. Fig. 4a shows the impact of these sharing structures on the propagation of SARS-CoV-2. Particularly useful in cases of low community prevalences, limited staff sharing resulted in up to a 53 % decrease in mean number of wards infected.

It is made available under a [CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/).





Fig. 3. How the index ward determines the global risk at the hospital level. (a) Global number of transmissions in the hospital after 40 days following the introduction of a non-contagious incubating patient in each ward is assessed. The figure shows violin plots based on 500 simulations. Red dots represent the median number of transmissions. (b) Mean number of wards affected by the virus following the introduction of a single case in an index ward, depending on the degree of index ward. (c)-(e) Illustrations of virus spread following introduction in three distinct wards (A2(c), F2(d) and B3(e)).

It is made available under a [CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/).




Fig. 4. How staff sharing impacts epidemic spread. The figure on the left corresponds to the percentage difference between staff sharing with the observed sharing structure acting as baseline scenario. Y-axis values represent community prevalence values. Results are based on 500 simulations ran over 40 days for each scenario. The figure on the right resumes the results obtained with each ward as index ward and no contamination from the community. Wards with similar degrees and same staff organization level are grouped together. Bold colored shapes represent mean values.




Fig. 5. How an isolation ward and screening areas impact epidemic spread. (a) Comparing reference scenarios and a scenario with an isolation ward where positive cases are systematically transferred after 24h on the number of transmissions (y-axis) for different prevalence levels on admission (x-axis) (i.e prevalence in the community) (b) Comparing various screening areas where symptomatic patients are tested, each with a different level of isolation, with a baseline scenario with no screening area on the number of transmissions (y-axis) for different prevalence levels on admission (x-axis). In all scenarios, an isolation ward is implemented.

3. Discussion

In view of the persisting nature of the pandemic and strain on healthcare institutions, all measures likely to limit nosocomial infections should be given serious consideration. In particular, hospital-level work organization plays a significant role in driving the spread of infection and should not be overlooked when designing surveillance and control strategies. The literature on multi-ward models of healthcare-associated infection spread (30) has been on the rise recently, as the necessary contact and transfer data become increasingly available. However, to date, very few studies (23) have taken into account the multi-ward structure of hospitals and LTCFs in their methodology to assess the impact of nosocomial COVID-19 infections. Our study aims at filling this gap and provides an insight in the role of HCW staffing as a major driver of SARS-CoV-2 spread. In this work, we assessed several infection control strategies aimed at curbing the spread of nosocomial COVID-19 transmissions. Our results indicate that the extent of an outbreak

at the hospital level largely depends on the location of the index case of infection. We also showed that the number of connections through HCW sharing was a significant risk factor for widespread contamination. Within 40 days following the introduction of an index case, one additional ward was infected on average following three extra connections. We demonstrated that limiting multi-assignment of HCWs could significantly reduce the risk of epidemic spread throughout the hospital. Finally, while the isolation of infected patients proved to be very effective in curbing the spread of the virus, this was not the case for screening areas.

We found here that HCW rescheduling was an efficient measure to limit nosocomial transmissions and prevent widespread contamination. However, the practical implementation of such a measure, especially if it implies major changes in staff planning, needs to be evaluated. Indeed, while disrupting the routine of already burdened HCWs could prove ill-advised, limiting their multi-assignments could substantially reduce

181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198

199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216

217 the risk of large scale infection thus contributing to a safer
218 work environment for them as well as patients. A previous
219 study done in the context of healthcare-acquired infections in
220 general came to a similar conclusion (31).

221 While isolation of identified cases in a dedicated COVID-19
222 ward was found to be effective, implementation of screening
223 areas focused on testing of symptomatic patients only were
224 found to be ineffective as long as newly symptomatic patients
225 were tested and isolated within 24 hours of admission. Previous
226 studies also point out the effectiveness of an isolation ward
227 and limited impact of measures analogous to a screening area
228 (23), (32).

229 In order to keep the model as generic and as simple as
230 possible in a context of limited data, we made several assump-
231 tions and limitations that should be highlighted. First, we
232 assumed homogeneous mixing within the HCW and patient
233 populations. Regarding HCWs, the risks of exposure are most
234 probably profession-dependent. Similarly, small clusters of
235 contacts may exist within the patient population. The homo-
236 geneous mixing assumption may have led us to overestimate the
237 risk of epidemic spread. Second, we estimated transmission
238 rates using data from an outbreak observed in a specific ward
239 and those estimates were then used to characterize all other
240 wards. In doing so, we assumed the same contact patterns
241 in all wards. Third, given that visits were strictly prohibited
242 during the first pandemic wave, we did not account for contam-
243 ination of patients and HCWs by visitors. In further analyses,
244 this assumption should be relaxed to avoid underestimating
245 the epidemic risk. Also, it would be of interest to account
246 for vaccination in both patient and HCW populations in the
247 model. Vaccine roll-out in LTCFs and hospitals surely plays
248 an important role in further mitigating the spread of infection.
249 Moreover, testing strategies based on network structure could
250 be designed so as to make better use of testing resources in the
251 hospital setting. Following the end of the first lockdown on 11
252 May 2020, the hospital has been implementing contact tracing
253 to break chains of transmission. Resulting contact data could
254 be used in the model as an infection control measure to limit
255 widespread contamination in case of outbreak. Lastly, a more
256 in-depth and dynamic analysis of the network and its drivers
257 could improve the predictive capacities of our model. Tools
258 such as exponential random graph models (33) or dynamic net-
259 work analysis taking into account the temporality of contact
260 data could serve such objectives.

261 We proposed a multi-ward stochastic model at the hospital
262 level to simulate virus transmission and to assess infection
263 control measures with the aim of mitigating the nosocomial
264 spread of SARS-CoV-2. The model serves as a very helpful
265 tool in anticipating the impact of measures to be implemented
266 and therefore contributes in informing decision-makers. While
267 we fed the model with data from a particular healthcare insti-
268 tution, the model remains generic and could be easily imple-
269 mented with data from other hospitals and LTCFs as input,
270 given that specific data on staff scheduling are available. For
271 instance, other healthcare institutions with different network
272 structures might see better or worse outcomes following reorga-
273 nization of HCW staffing as compared to the results presented
274 in this paper.

275 Materials and Methods

276

Epidemiological model description. We build a stochastic compart- 277
278 mental model of SARS-CoV-2 transmission within a multi-ward
279 hospital population under the assumption of homogeneous mixing
280 of populations. Individuals are distributed across compartments
281 according to their infectious status and ward localization. Patients
282 can be: susceptible (Sp), non-contagious incubating (Ep), conta-
283 gious incubating before asymptomatic condition (EAp), contagious
284 incubating before symptomatic condition (ESp), contagious with
285 asymptomatic condition (IAp), contagious with mild symptoms
286 (I1p), contagious with severe symptoms (I2p) and recovered (Rp).
287 When patients develop severe symptoms, they can be transferred in
288 an intensive care unit (ICU). A ward designated to isolate detected
289 sick patients (IsoW) is also implemented. Finally, to model screen-
290 ing areas aiming at clinical examination and/or virological testing
291 before admission in a ward, 7 other compartments (SASp, SAEp,
292 SAEAp, SAESp, SAIAp, SAI1p, SAI2p, SARp) were incorporated
293 to the model.

294 Similarly, HCWs can be: susceptible (Sh), non-contagious incu-
295 bating (Eh), contagious incubating before asymptomatic condition
296 (EAh), contagious incubating before symptomatic condition (ESH),
297 contagious with asymptomatic condition (IAh), contagious with
298 mild symptoms (I1h), contagious with severe symptoms (I2h) and
299 recovered (Rh). HCWs with mild symptoms have a probability p_{SL}
300 to take sick leave (SL) while HCWs with severe symptoms leave the
301 model and recover with probability $1 - p_D$. In case of death, they
302 are removed from the model.

303 Individuals move from one compartment to another following
304 stochastic transitions computed on the basis of a Gillespie algorithm
305 (34). Susceptible individuals are infected through at risk contacts
306 with contagious individuals (patients or HCWs) from the same ward
307 or connected wards via shared HCWs based on staffing schedules.
308 Each ward was independently modeled and wards were connected
309 through a meta-population system. We assumed that wards were
310 only connected by HCWs through multi-assignments or cover. Pa-
311 tient transfers were excluded in the present analysis. Patients are
312 therefore assumed to only be in contact with other patients and
313 HCWs working in the ward they belong to. The data was collected
314 during the first wave of the pandemic which occurred in March and
315 health practitioners at the hospital confirmed that patient transfers
316 and visits were stopped during that time.

317 Model parameters.

Statistical inference. The model was parametrized, when available, 318
319 directly from data compiled from the hospital database. Parameter
320 values for which no information was available were fixed from the
321 literature. We refer to Table 1 of SI for an exhaustive list of param-
322 eter values and their sources. Transmission rates were estimated to
323 reproduce observed data of suspected or confirmed COVID-19 cases
324 collected during an outbreak that occurred in ward A2 (Fig. 2). The
325 outbreak occurred during the first wave of the pandemic, affecting
326 6 patients and 10 HCWs. At that time, testing policy only targeted
327 symptomatic patients, who were systematically tested, while testing
328 of HCW was much more complicated for administrative reasons
329 and was not generalized.

330 A single ward model was fitted to the outbreak data of ward A2
331 using the pomp package (35) and iterative filtering method (36).
332 The observation model was the cumulative symptomatic infections in
333 the patient and HCW populations, assuming a Poisson measurement
334 model. Parameters were estimated by maximum likelihood, using
335 particle filtering to compute a robust estimate of the likelihood
336 and iterated filtering to maximize it over unknown parameters.
337 Estimations computed from synthetic data generated by the model
338 defined with four transmission rates did not result in the recovery of
339 known parameter values. Those parameters were not identifiable in
340 the model. Consequently, a single transmission rate β was estimated
341 with proportionality constraints on transmission rates β_{HP} , β_{PP} ,
342 β_{PH} and β_{HH} . Multiple combinations of parameters were compared
343 and the set that maximized the likelihood was retained. Besides
344 the transmission rate β , we also estimated the number of initial
345 patients (E_{p0}) and HCWs (E_{h0}) in non-contagious incubation.

346 The date of first infection (t_{init}) was not estimated but fixed to
347 values ranging from 1 to 20 days prior to the first detected case.
348 For each aforementioned value of t_{init} , we estimated parameters
349 β , Ep_0 and Eh_0 . The parameter estimates that maximized the
350 likelihood were chosen as best estimates. The model was first
351 tested on simulated data, generated to resemble the outbreak data,
352 to evaluate the capacity to recover known parameter values. We
353 refer to SI for a detailed description of the simulation study and
354 estimation procedure.

355 **ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.** The work was supported directly by
356 internal resources from the French National Institute for Health and
357 Medical Research, the Institut Pasteur, the Conservatoire National
358 des Arts et Métiers, and the University of Versailles-Saint-Quentin-
359 en-Yvelines/University of Paris-Saclay. This study received funding
360 through the MODCOV project from the Fondation de France grant
361 106059 as part of the alliance framework “Tous unis contre le virus”,
362 the Université Paris-Saclay (AAP Covid-19 2020) and the French
363 government through its National Research Agency project SPHINX-
364 17-CE36-0008-01. The authors would like to acknowledge the help
365 of the EMEA-MESuRS working group on the nosocomial modeling
366 of SARS-CoV-2 (Audrey Duval, Kévin Jean, Sofia Jijón, Ajmal
367 Oodally, Lulla Opatowski, George Shirreff, David RM Smith, Laura
368 Temime).

369 1. Miller IF, Becker AD, Grenfell BT, Metcalf CJE (2020) Disease and healthcare burden of covid-
370 19 in the united states. *Nature Medicine* 26(8):1212–1217.
371 2. Felice C, Di Tanna GL, Zanus G, Grossi U (2020) Impact of covid-19 outbreak on healthcare
372 workers in italy: results from a national e-survey. *Journal of community health* 45(4):675–683.
373 3. Nguyen LH, et al. (2020) Risk of covid-19 among front-line health-care workers and the gener-
374 al community: a prospective cohort study. *The Lancet Public Health* 5(9):e475–e483.
375 4. Burton JK, et al. (2020) Evolution and effects of covid-19 outbreaks in care homes: a popu-
376 lation analysis in 189 care homes in one geographical region of the uk. *The Lancet Healthy*
377 *Longevity* 1(1):e21–e31.
378 5. Shallicross L, et al. (2021) Factors associated with sars-cov-2 infection and outbreaks in
379 long-term care facilities in england: a national cross-sectional survey. *The Lancet Healthy*
380 *Longevity*.
381 6. Hashan MR, et al. (2021) Epidemiology and clinical features of covid-19 outbreaks in aged
382 care facilities: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *EClinicalMedicine* p. 100771.
383 7. Sheikh A, McMenamin J, Taylor B, Robertson C (2021) Sars-cov-2 delta voc in scotland:
384 demographics, risk of hospital admission, and vaccine effectiveness. *The Lancet*.
385 8. Bernal JL, et al. (2021) Effectiveness of covid-19 vaccines against the b. 1.617. 2 variant.
386 *medRxiv*.
387 9. Abbas M, et al. (2021) Nosocomial transmission and outbreaks of coronavirus disease 2019:
388 the need to protect both patients and healthcare workers. *Antimicrobial Resistance & Infec-*
389 *tion Control* 10(1):1–13.
390 10. Chen MK, Chevalier JA, Long EF (2021) Nursing home staff networks and covid-19. *Pro-*
391 *ceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 118(1).
392 11. Chang YT, et al. (2020) Infection control measures of a taiwanese hospital to confront the
393 covid-19 pandemic. *The Kaohsiung Journal of Medical Sciences* 36(5):296–304.
394 12. Rhee C, et al. (2020) Incidence of nosocomial covid-19 in patients hospitalized at a large us
395 academic medical center. *JAMA network open* 3(9):e2020498–e2020498.
396 13. Salje H, et al. (2020) Estimating the burden of sars-cov-2 in france. *Science*.
397 14. Hoertel N, et al. (2020) A stochastic agent-based model of the sars-cov-2 epidemic in france.
398 *Nature medicine* 26(9):1417–1421.
399 15. Aguiar M, Ortuondo EM, Van-Dierdonck JB, Mar J, Stollenwerk N (2020) Modelling covid
400 19 in the basque country from introduction to control measure response. *Scientific reports*
401 10(1):1–16.
402 16. Kyrychko YN, Blyuss KB, Brovchenko I (2020) Mathematical modelling of the dynamics and
403 containment of covid-19 in ukraine. *Scientific reports* 10(1):1–11.
404 17. Covid I (2021) Modeling covid-19 scenarios for the united states. *Nature medicine* 27(1):94.
405 18. Oliveira JF, et al. (2021) Mathematical modeling of covid-19 in 14.8 million individuals in bahia,
406 brazil. *Nature communications* 12(1):1–13.
407 19. Giordano G, et al. (2020) Modelling the covid-19 epidemic and implementation of population-
408 wide interventions in italy. *Nature Medicine* pp. 1–6.
409 20. Evans S, Agnew E, Vynnycky E, Robotham JV (2020) The impact of testing and infection
410 prevention and control strategies on within-hospital transmission dynamics of covid-19 in
411 english hospitals. *medRxiv*.
412 21. Martos DM, Parcell B, Eftimie R (2020) Modelling the transmission of infectious diseases
413 inside hospital bays: implications for covid-19. *medRxiv*.
414 22. Zhang Y, Cheng SR (2020) Periodic covid-19 testing in emergency department staff.
415 *medRxiv*.
416 23. Baek YJ, et al. (2020) A mathematical model of covid-19 transmission in a tertiary hospital
417 and assessment of the effects of different intervention strategies. *Plos one* 15(10):e0241169.
418 24. Miller JC, Qiu X, MacFadden D, Hanage WP (2020) Evaluating the contributions of strategies
419 to prevent sars-cov-2 transmission in the healthcare setting: a modelling study. *medRxiv*.
420 25. Howick S, et al. (2020) Evaluating intervention strategies in controlling covid-19 spread in
421 care homes: An agent-based model. *Infection Control & Hospital Epidemiology* pp. 1–60.

26. Huang Q, et al. (2020) Sars-cov-2 transmission and control in a hospital setting: an individual-
422 based modelling study. *medRxiv*.
423 27. Vilches TN, et al. (2020) Multifaceted strategies for the control of covid-19 outbreaks in long-
424 term care facilities in ontario, canada. *medRxiv*.
425 28. Holmdahl I, Kahn R, Hay J, Buckee CO, Mina M (2020) Frequent testing and immunity-based
426 staffing will help mitigate outbreaks in nursing home settings. *medRxiv*.
427 29. Smith DR, et al. (2020) Optimizing covid-19 surveillance in long-term care facilities: a mod-
428 elling study. *BMC medicine* 18(1):1–16.
429 30. Assab R, et al. (2017) Mathematical models of infection transmission in healthcare settings:
430 recent advances from the use of network structured data. *Current Opinion in Infectious Dis-*
431 *eases* 30(4):410–418.
432 31. Valdano E, Poletto C, Boëlle PY, Colizza V (2021) Reorganization of nurse scheduling re-
433 duces the risk of healthcare associated infections. *Scientific reports* 11(1):1–12.
434 32. Zhang GQ, et al. (2020) The role of isolation rooms, facemasks and intensified hand hygiene
435 in the prevention of nosocomial covid-19 transmission in a pulmonary clinical setting. *Infec-*
436 *tious Diseases of Poverty* 9(1):1–6.
437 33. Ghafouri S, Khasteh SH (2020) A survey on exponential random graph models: an application
438 perspective. *PeerJ Computer Science* 6:e269.
439 34. Gillespie DT (1976) A general method for numerically simulating the stochastic time evolution
440 of coupled chemical reactions. *Journal of computational physics* 22(4):403–434.
441 35. King AA, Nguyen D, Ionides EL (2016) Statistical inference for partially observed markov
442 processes via the R package pomp. *Journal of Statistical Software* 69(12):1–43.
443 36. Ionides EL, Bhadra A, Atchadé Y, King A, et al. (2011) Iterated filtering. *The Annals of*
444 *Statistics* 39(3):1776–1802.
445

Supplementary Information

The deterministic version of the transmission model can be illustrated using differential equations which describe the dynamics of each compartment (see Table S3 for a description of each compartment) in each time step. Equations in the absence of a screening area are given below.

Equations for patients

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{dS_p}{dt} &= -(\beta_{HP} \times P_{inf}^{HCW,cw} + \beta_{PP} \times P_{inf}^{Pat}) \times S_p - \mu \times S_p \\ \frac{dE_p}{dt} &= (\beta_{HP} \times P_{inf}^{HCW,cw} + \beta_{PP} \times P_{inf}^{Pat}) \times S_p - \gamma_1 \times E_p \\ &\quad - \mu \times E_p \\ \frac{dEA_p}{dt} &= (1-p) \times \gamma_1 \times E_p - \gamma_2 EA_p - \mu \times EA_p \\ \frac{dES_p}{dt} &= p \times \gamma_1 \times E_p - \gamma_2 \times ES_p - \mu \times ES_p \\ \frac{dIA_p}{dt} &= \gamma_2 \times EA_p - \gamma_3 IA_p - \mu \times IA_p \\ \frac{dI1_p}{dt} &= (1-p_2p) \times \gamma_2 \times ES_p - \gamma_3 \times I1_p - \gamma_{PreIsoW} \times I1_p \\ &\quad - \mu \times I1_p \\ \frac{dI2_p}{dt} &= p_2p \times \gamma_2 \times ES_p - (1-pT) \times (\gamma_{PreIsoW} + \gamma_4) \times I2_p \\ &\quad - pT \times \gamma_T \times I2_p - \mu \times I2_p \\ \frac{dR_p}{dt} &= \gamma_3 \times IA_p + \gamma_3 \times I1_p + \gamma_{IsoW} \times IsoW \\ &\quad + (1-p_{Drea}) \times \gamma_5 \times ICU - \mu \times R_p \\ \frac{dIsoW}{dt} &= \gamma_{preIsoW} \times I1_p - \gamma_{IsoW} \times IsoW \\ \frac{dICU}{dt} &= pT \times \gamma_T \times I2_p - \gamma_5 \times ICU\end{aligned}$$

Equations for HCWs

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{dS_h}{dt} &= -(\beta_{PH} \times P_{inf}^{Pat,cw} + \beta_{HH} \times P_{inf}^{HCW,cw}) \times S_h \\ \frac{dE_h}{dt} &= (\beta_{PH} \times P_{inf}^{Pat,cw} + \beta_{HH} \times P_{inf}^{HCW,cw}) \times S_h \\ &\quad - \gamma_1 \times E_h \\ \frac{dEA_h}{dt} &= (1-p) \times \gamma_1 \times E_h - \gamma_2 EA_h \\ \frac{dES_h}{dt} &= p \times \gamma_1 \times E_h - \gamma_2 \times ES_h \\ \frac{dIA_h}{dt} &= \gamma_2 \times EA_h - \gamma_3 IA_h \\ \frac{dI1_h}{dt} &= (1-p_2) \times \gamma_2 \times ES_h - (1-p_{SL}) \times \gamma_3 \times I1_h \\ &\quad - p_{SL} \times \gamma_{BSL} \times I1_h \\ \frac{dI2_h}{dt} &= p_2 \times \gamma_2 \times ES_h - \gamma_4 \times I2_h \\ \frac{dR_h}{dt} &= \gamma_3 \times IA_h + \gamma_3 \times I1_h + (1-p_D) \times \gamma_4 \times I2_h \\ &\quad + \gamma_{SL} \times SL \\ \frac{dSL}{dt} &= p_{SL} \times \gamma_{BSL} \times I1_h - \gamma_{SL} \times SL\end{aligned}$$

where $P_{inf}^{HCW,cw}(w)$ denotes the proportion of infected HCWs in contact with patients belonging to a given ward w . We denote the total number of wards by $W \in \mathbb{N}$. We first compute the proportion of infected HCWs in each ward as follows for $w = 1, \dots, W$:

$$P_{inf}^{HCW}(w) = \frac{R_a \times EA_h(w) + ES_h(w) + R_a \times IA_h(w) + I1_h(w) + I2_h(w)}{S_h(w) + E_h(w) + EA_h(w) + ES_h(w) + IA_h(w) + I1_h(w) + I2_h(w) + R_h(w)}$$

where R_a is the relative risk of transmission of individuals in the asymptomatic pathway relative to individuals in the symptomatic pathway. For simplicity, we omit the ward notation for compartments going forward. The proportion of infected HCWs in contact with patients belonging to a given ward w is therefore computed as follows:

$$P_{inf}^{HCW,cw}(w) = \sum_{v=1}^W C_{w,v} P_{inf}^{HCW}(v)$$

where $C \in \mathcal{M}_{W \times W}(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0})$ is a contact matrix computed based on the connections between all W wards which are determined by the sharing of HCWs (Fig. S4d). Each entry corresponds to the proportion of total working hours spent by HCWs from the row ward in the column ward. For instance, HCWs of ward $H2$ typically spend 33% of their working time on average in ward $H1$.

The proportion of infected patients in a given ward w is computed as follows:

$$P_{inf}^{Pat}(w) = \frac{R_a \times EA_p + ES_p + R_a \times IA_p + I1_p + I2_p}{S_p + E_p + EA_p + ES_p + IA_p + I1_p + I2_p + R_p}$$

We recall that susceptible HCWs can be infected upon contact with contagious patients and HCWs in all wards they work in. The proportion of infected patients with which HCWs from a given ward w are in contact with is therefore computed as follows:

$$P_{inf}^{Pat,cw}(w) = \sum_{v=1}^W C_{w,v} P_{inf}^{Pat}(w)$$

The differential equations which govern the deterministic version of the model with a screening area are given below.

20 Equations for patients

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{dSAS_p}{dt} &= -\left(\beta_{HP}^{SA} \times P_{inf}^{HCW,cw} \times \frac{N_{HCW}^{SA}}{N_h} + \beta_{PP}^{SA} \times P_{inf}^{Pat,SA}\right) \times SAS_p - \frac{1}{T_{ExCli}} \times SAS_p \\ \frac{dSAE_p}{dt} &= \left(\beta_{HP}^{SA} \times P_{inf}^{HCW,cw} \times \frac{N_{HCW}^{SA}}{N_h} + \beta_{PP}^{SA} \times P_{inf}^{Pat,SA}\right) \times SAE_p - \frac{1}{T_{ExCli}} \times SAE_p \\ \frac{dS_p}{dt} &= -(\beta_{HP} \times P_{inf}^{HCW} + \beta_{PP} \times P_{inf}^{Pat}) \times S_p - \mu \times S_p \\ \frac{dE_p}{dt} &= (\beta_{HP} \times P_{inf}^{HCW} + \beta_{PP} \times P_{inf}^{Pat}) \times S_p - \gamma_1 \times E_p - \mu \times E_p \\ \frac{dEA_p}{dt} &= \frac{1}{T_{ExCli}} \times SAE_p + (1-p) \times \gamma_1 \times E_p - \gamma_2 EA_p - \mu \times EA_p \\ \frac{dES_p}{dt} &= \frac{1}{T_{ExCli}} \times SAES_p + p \times \gamma_1 \times E_p - \gamma_2 \times ES_p - \mu \times ES_p \\ \frac{dIA_p}{dt} &= \frac{1}{T_{ExCli}} \times SAIA_p + \gamma_2 \times EA_p - \gamma_3 IA_p - \mu \times IA_p \\ \frac{dI1_p}{dt} &= \frac{1}{T_{ExCli}} \times SAI1_p + (1-p_2p) \times \gamma_2 \times ES_p - \gamma_3 \times I1_p - \gamma_{PreIsoW} \times I1_p - \mu \times I1_p \\ \frac{dI2_p}{dt} &= \frac{1}{T_{ExCli}} \times SAI2_p + p_2p \times \gamma_2 \times ES_p - (1-pT) \times \gamma_{PreIsoW} \times I2_p - pT \times \gamma_T \times I2_p - \mu \times I2_p \\ \frac{dR_p}{dt} &= \frac{1}{T_{ExCli}} \times SAR_p + \gamma_3 \times IA_p + \gamma_3 \times I1_p + \gamma_{IsoW} \times IsoW + (1-p_{Drea}) \times \gamma_5 \times ICU - \mu \times R_p \\ \frac{dIsoW}{dt} &= (1-pT) \times \gamma_{preIsoW} \times I2_p + \gamma_{preIsoW} \times I1_p - \gamma_{IsoW} \times IsoW \\ \frac{dICU}{dt} &= pT \times \gamma_T \times I2_p - \gamma_5 \times ICU \end{aligned}$$

21 where N_{HCW}^{SA} is the total number of HCWs taking care of patients in the screening area of a given ward and N_h is the total
22 number of HCWs working in the ward. $P_{inf}^{Pat,SA}(w)$ is the number of patients infected in the screening area of a given ward
23 and is calculated as follows:

$$P_{inf}^{Pat,SA}(w) = \frac{R_a \times SAE_p + SAES_p + R_a \times SAIA_p + SAI1_p + SAI2_p}{SAS_p + SAE_p + SAE_p + SAES_p + SAIA_p + SAI1_p + SAI2_p + SAR_p}$$

24 $P_{inf}^{Pat,SA,cw}(w) = \sum_{v=1}^W C_{w,v} P_{inf}^{Pat,SA}(v)$ is the proportion of infected patients in screening areas where HCWs of a given ward
25 w are working in. τ represents the proportion of patients in the screening area of a ward.

$$\tau = \frac{SAS_p + SAE_p + SAE_p + SAES_p + SAIA_p + SAI1_p + SAI2_p + SAR_p}{SAS_p + SAE_p + SAE_p + SAES_p + SAIA_p + SAI1_p + SAI2_p + SAR_p + S_p + E_p + EA_p + ES_p + IA_p + I1_p + I2_p + R_p}$$

26 Statistical inference

27 **Transmission rates.** Transmission rates β_{PP} , β_{HH} , β_{HP} and β_{PH} were estimated based on an outbreak that occurred in ward
28 A2. The model defined with four transmission rates was not identifiable in simulation settings, resulting in poor recovery
29 of known parameter values. Instead, we defined each transmission rate as a certain constant times β and then proceeded
30 with the estimation of the single rate β . Multiple combinations were tested and the set that subsequently maximized the
31 likelihood was defined as follows. Taking into account HCW working hours which we assumed to be on average 25 % of the
32 time, and assuming a similar contact rate in-between and between patients and HCWs, we came up with the following ratios:
33 $\beta_{PP} = \beta_{PH} = \beta$, $\beta_{HH} = 0.25 \times \beta$ and $\beta_{HP} = 0.7 \times \beta$.

Equations for HCWs

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{dS_h}{dt} &= -\left(\left(1 - \frac{N_{HCW}^{SA}}{N_h}\right) \times \beta_{PH} \times P_{inf}^{Pat,cw} + \frac{N_{HCW}^{SA}}{N_h} \times \left((1-\tau) \times \beta_{PH} \times P_{inf}^{Pat,cw} + \tau \times \beta_{PH}^{SA} \times P_{inf}^{Pat,SA,cw}\right) + \beta_{HH} \times P_{inf}^{HCW}\right) \times S_h \\ \frac{dE_h}{dt} &= \left(\left(1 - \frac{N_{HCW}^{SA}}{N_h}\right) \times \beta_{PH} \times P_{inf}^{Pat,cw} + \frac{N_{HCW}^{SA}}{N_h} \times \left((1-\tau) \times \beta_{PH} \times P_{inf}^{Pat,cw} + \tau \times \beta_{PH}^{SA} \times P_{inf}^{Pat,SA,cw}\right) + \beta_{HH} \times P_{inf}^{HCW}\right) \times S_h - \gamma_1 \times E_h \\ \frac{dEA_h}{dt} &= (1-p) \times \gamma_1 \times E_h - \gamma_2 EA_h \\ \frac{dES_h}{dt} &= p \times \gamma_1 \times E_h - \gamma_2 \times ES_h \\ \frac{dIA_h}{dt} &= \gamma_2 \times EA_h - \gamma_3 IA_h \\ \frac{dI1_h}{dt} &= (1-p_2) \times \gamma_2 \times ES_h - (1-p_{SL}) \times \gamma_3 \times I1_h - p_{SL} \times \gamma_{BSL} \times I1_h \\ \frac{dI2_h}{dt} &= p_2 \times \gamma_2 \times ES_h - \gamma_4 \times I2_h \\ \frac{dR_h}{dt} &= \gamma_3 \times IA_h + \gamma_3 \times I1_h + (1-p_D) \times \gamma_4 \times I2_h + \gamma_{SL} \times SL \\ \frac{dSL}{dt} &= p_{SL} \times \gamma_{BSL} \times I1_h - \gamma_{SL} \times SL \end{aligned}$$

34 **Likelihood based inference with *pomp*.** We implemented a within-ward model parametrized and initialized to match patient
35 and HCW populations' structure in ward A2 during that period. The likelihood-based inference framework for the stochastic
36 model was provided by iterated filtering methods (1) which were readily implemented in the R package *pomp* (2). The
37 *pomp* object was constructed by specifying the model observations as cumulative symptomatic infections in the patient and
38 HCW populations, the spread of infection based on a Gillespie algorithm using *rprocess* to define the observation process,
39 the measurement model defined as Poisson distributed with parameter equal to the cumulative infections for patients and
40 HCWs using *rmeasure*. Finally, *dmeasure* which is an evaluator of the measurement model was defined analogously to *rmeasure*.
41 Following each time step, the observation process provides a likelihood of observing the data given the internal state of the
42 system. The total likelihood was then computed as the product of likelihood values at each time step. Unknown parameters
43 were estimated by maximum likelihood, using particle filtering to compute a robust estimate of the likelihood and iterated
44 filtering to maximize it over unknown parameters. Particle filtering uses a set of particles to represent the posterior distribution
45 of the stochastic process given noisy observations. Each particle has a likelihood weight assigned to it that represents the
46 probability of that particle being sampled from the probability density function. Resampling is performed at each observation
47 to produce copies of the few particles with the highest weights. The method was implemented using the *pfilter* function
48 and outputs a stochastic estimate of the likelihood. The particle filter was applied a few times to obtain an estimate of the
49 variability, typically ten times with a high number of particles, 10^6 in our case. The idea behind the iterated particle filtering
50 algorithm is to apply a particle filter to the model in which the parameter vector for each particle is subjected to random
51 perturbations at each observation. In doing so, the parameter vector is made to follow a random walk. As the iterations
52 progress, the intensity of the perturbations is decreased according to a cooling schedule. For instance, we set the cooling
53 fraction such that after 50 iterations, the perturbations are reduced to half their original magnitudes. The iterated filtering
54 algorithm was implemented in the function *mif2* of *pomp*.

55 **Preliminary validation of the procedure using synthetic data.** The model and statistical inference framework were first validated
56 on synthetic data generated from a range of known parameter values which were then estimated. For each set of parameter
57 values, we generated 50 independent stochastic datasets using the *rmeasure* functionality of *pomp* with each one of them
58 consisting of at least one case in both patient and HCW populations over the observation period. Parameters were then
59 recovered using the iterated filtering algorithm in function *mif2* with the number of particles and number of iterations set at
60 values of 1500 and 500 respectively. We estimated parameter β in multiple scenarios with 1 or 2 non-contagious incubating
61 patients and HCWs as index cases and different times of introduction of the index cases (day 1, day 5 and day 10). In all
62 scenarios, estimates for β were adequately close to the true value on average as shown in Fig. S1.

63 **Parameter estimation on real outbreak data.** Following validation of our estimation framework on synthetic data, we analyzed
64 the real outbreak data of ward A2. We estimated the transmission rate β , initial number of non-contagious incubating patients
65 Ep_0 and initial number of non-contagious incubating HCWs Eh_0 by building likelihood profiles for each parameter. In doing so,
66 we constructed 95 % confidence intervals for each parameter using the chi-square approximation to the likelihood ratio statistic.
67 For instance, for a given parameter, say β , we computed the likelihood using the particle filtering algorithm for a range of
68 fix values of β while estimating Ep_0 and Eh_0 in every step. A 95 % confidence interval was then determined as all values
69 above the highest likelihood minus half of the 95 % quantile of the χ^2 -square distribution with two degrees of freedom. We
70 repeated this procedure for times of introduction of the index cases (t_{init}) ranging from 1 to 20 days before the first observed
71 symptomatic patient. The set of parameter values that maximized the likelihood was then retained as estimates. The profile
72 likelihoods coupled with 95 % confidence intervals for best set of parameter estimates are shown in Fig. S2. The best fit
73 suggested an index case 12 days prior to the detection of the first symptomatic patient. The set of parameter estimates that
74 maximized the likelihood were then fed to the transmission model to generate 1000 datasets. We then plotted the mean of
75 those simulations to compare with the observed data for patients in Fig. S3b and observed data for HCWs in Fig. S3b.

Table S1. Description of model parameters

	Symbol	Parameter	Value
Transmission rates	β_{PP}	effective transmission rate between patients	0.4 (Estimated)
	β_{HH}	effective transmission rate between HCWs	0.1 (Estimated)
	β_{HP}	effective transmission rate between contagious HCWs and susceptible patients	0.28 (Estimated)
	β_{PH}	effective transmission rate between contagious patients and susceptible HCWs	0.4 (Estimated)
	β_{PP}^{SA}	effective transmission rate between patients in screening area	0.4 (Estimated)
	β_{HH}^{SA}	effective transmission rates between HCWs in screening area	0.1 (Estimated)
	β_{HP}^{SA}	effective transmission rates between contagious HCWs and susceptible patients in screening area	0.28 (Estimated)
	β_{PH}^{SA}	effective transmission rates between contagious patients and susceptible HCWs in screening area	0.4 (Estimated)
	R_a	relative risk of secondary attack rate of people with asymptomatic infections	0.35 (3)
Durations (in days)	$1/\gamma_1$	duration of non-contagious incubation period	5 (4)
	$1/\gamma_2$	duration of contagious incubation period	2 (4)
	$1/\gamma_3$	duration of contagious period when asymptomatic and non-severe symptoms	7 (4)
	$1/\gamma_4$	duration of contagious period when severe symptoms	8 (Assumption)
	$1/\gamma_5$	duration of stay in intensive care before recovery or death	10 (Hospital data)
	$1/\gamma_T$	duration of contagious period before transfer in intensive care when severe symptoms	2 (Hospital data)
	$1/\gamma_{BSL}$	duration before sick leave when mild symptoms	1 (Hospital data)
	$1/\gamma_{SL}$	duration of sick leave	14 (Hospital data)
	$1/\gamma_{preIsoW}$	duration between first symptoms and transfer in a specific ward designated to isolate symptomatic patients	1 (Hospital data)
	$1/\gamma_{IsoW}$	duration of stay in a specific ward designated to isolate symptomatic patients	11 (Hospital data)
Probabilities	p	probability of symptoms	0.7 (3)
	p_2	probability of severity if symptoms for HCW	0.2 (Assumption)
	p_2p	probability of severity if symptoms for patient	0.5 (Assumption)
	p_{Drea}	probability of death in ICU following severe symptoms for patient	0.5 (Assumption)
	p_D	probability of death following severe symptoms for HCWs	0.1 (Assumption)
	p_T	probability of being transferred following severe symptoms	0.2 (Assumption)
	p_{SL}	probability that HCWS take sick leave following symptoms	0.8 (Hospital data)
	$Prev_{Com}$	prevalence in general population	0.1 % - 3 %
	Testing	$Sens_{Inf}$	sensitivity of RT-PCR test when testing contagious individuals
$Sens_{NInf}$		sensitivity of RT-PCR tests when testing non-contagious individuals	0.3 (5)
$Spec$		specificity of RT-PCR tests	1 (5)
	μ	probability of discharge or death	0.00749 - 0.0547 (Hospital data)

It is made available under a [CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/) .

Table S2. Description of each hospital ward including number of HCWs shared between wards.

Ward	Number of patients	Number of assigned HCWs	Number of shared HCWs	Average stay of patients (in days)	Degree (number of connected wards)
A1	20	18		18.3	6
A2	20	16	89	133	6
A3	25	25		27.4	5
A4	20	19		50.8	5
A5	25	21	47	21.9	6
A6	20	18		21.6	5
B1	20	22		82.7	6
B2	23	20	31	40.9	2
E1	25	20		35.9	2
C1	20	16		53.5	2
D1	20	18	38	20.3	2
D2	20	16		19.1	2
C2	19	18		27.8	4
C3	20	18		18.8	4
E2	28	22	56	41.6	7
F1	24	22		64.6	7
F2	24	24		147	7
B3	22	18		18.5	6
B4	19	16	52	30.7	6
C4	19	13		19.8	6
G1	18	17	39	32.7	3
G2	19	17		25.7	1
H1	25	19	38	26.3	2
H2	24	21		24.5	2

It is made available under a [CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/).






Fig. S1. Mean estimates of β in multiple scenarios. Mean estimates of β in red with 95 % confidence intervals based on 50 simulations in each instance. The number of patients (Ep_0) and HCWs (Eh_0) in non-contagious incubation on the first day are fixed at values indicated in the column facet labels. Row facet labels indicate the date of introduction of the index cases.

It is made available under a [CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/).




(a) Likelihood profile for β computed using particle filtering at fixed values of β in steps of 0.01 from 0 to 1 while estimating E_{p_0} and E_{h_0} via iterated filtering. The point corresponding to the highest likelihood is taken as estimate and values of β above the dashed line lie in the 95 % confidence interval.

(b) Likelihood profile for E_{p_0} computed using particle filtering at fixed values of E_{p_0} in steps of 0.1 from 0 to 7 while estimating β and E_{h_0} via iterated filtering. The point corresponding to the highest likelihood is taken as estimate and values of E_{p_0} above the dashed line lie in the 95 % confidence interval.



(c) Likelihood profile for E_{h_0} computed using particle filtering at fixed values of E_{h_0} in steps of 0.1 from 0 to 7 while estimating β and E_{p_0} via iterated filtering. The point corresponding to the highest likelihood is taken as estimate and values of E_{h_0} above the dashed line lie in the 95 % confidence interval.


Fig. S2. Likelihood profile for parameters β , E_{p_0} and E_{h_0} computed on real outbreak data.




(a) 1000 simulations with 95 % confidence intervals in blue based on set of parameters that maximized the likelihood and best fit the data. The black line corresponds to the mean number of symptomatic cumulative cases in the patient population. Red points correspond to the true cumulative number of symptomatic patient cases. (b) 1000 simulations with 95 % confidence intervals in blue based on set of parameters that maximized the likelihood and best fit the data. The black line corresponds to the mean number of symptomatic cumulative cases in the HCW population. Red points correspond to the true cumulative number of symptomatic HCW cases.

Fig. S3. Simulating patient and HCW data using best set of parameter estimates. Cumulative incidence over time (a) in patients and (b) in HCWs


It is made available under a [CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/).




(a) Limited sharing of HCWs




(b) Contact matrix for limited sharing of HCWs




(c) Observed sharing of HCWs



(d) Contact matrix for observed sharing of HCWs



(e) Over sharing of HCWs



(f) Contact matrix for over sharing of HCWs

Fig. S4. Wards located in the same building are color coded similarly. From top to bottom, network representation of the sharing structure on the left with respective contact matrix on the right.

76 **Supplementary simulation results**

It is made available under a [CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/).




Fig. S5. Impact of altering HCWs sharing matrix on the number of wards affected after the introduction of an index case. Probability of spread (y-axis) in number of wards ranging from 1 to 24 (x-axis) for the three staff organization levels based on 500 simulations over a period of 40 days. Facet labels correspond to index wards. Context of simulation: No possible contamination from the community. Introduction of a non-contagious incubating patient in each ward.

It is made available under a [CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/).




Fig. S6. Risk of dissemination at the hospital level depending on the ward of introduction. Number of transmissions following the introduction of an index case in each ward for three staff organization levels based on 500 simulations over a period of 120 days. No contamination from the community considered.

Table S3. Description of model compartments

	Abbreviation	Description
	SA	screening area aiming at clinical examination and/or virological testing before admission in a ward
Epidemiological history of patients and HCWs	S E EA ES IA I1 I2 R	susceptible non-contagious incubating contagious incubating before asymptomatic condition contagious incubating before symptomatic condition contagious with asymptomatic condition contagious with mild symptoms contagious with severe symptoms recovered
Measures implemented following detection of a positive case in the patient or HCW population	ICU IsoW SL	intensive care unit for patients with severe symptoms isolation ward for detected positive patients sick leave of absence for HCWs

77 **References**

- 78 1. EL Ionides, A Bhadra, Y Atchadé, A King, , et al., Iterated filtering. *The Annals Stat.* **39**, 1776–1802 (2011).
- 79 2. AA King, D Nguyen, EL Ionides, Statistical inference for partially observed markov processes via the R package pomp. *J.*
80 *Stat. Softw.* **69**, 1–43 (2016).
- 81 3. D Buitrago-Garcia, et al., Occurrence and transmission potential of asymptomatic and presymptomatic sars-cov-2 infections:
82 A living systematic review and meta-analysis. *PLoS medicine* **17**, e1003346 (2020).
- 83 4. X He, et al., Temporal dynamics in viral shedding and transmissibility of covid-19. *Nat. medicine* **26**, 672–675 (2020).
- 84 5. LM Kucirka, SA Lauer, O Laeyendecker, D Boon, J Lessler, Variation in false-negative rate of reverse transcriptase
85 polymerase chain reaction–based sars-cov-2 tests by time since exposure. *Annals internal medicine* **173**, 262–267 (2020).