

1 **Title:** An outbreak of SARS-CoV-2 in a public-facing office in England, 2021.

2 **Authors:** Barry Atkinson^{1a*}, Karin van Veldhoven^{2a}, Ian Nicholls¹, Matthew
3 Coldwell³, Adam Clarke³, Gillian Frost³, Christina J. Atchison⁴, Amber I. Raja⁵, Allan
4 M Bennett¹, Derek Morgan³, Neil Pearce⁶, Tony Fletcher⁷, Elizabeth B Brickley^{5b} and
5 Yiqun Chen^{5b}.

6 **Affiliated addresses:** ¹Research and Evaluation, UK Health Security Agency,
7 Porton Down, Salisbury, United Kingdom; ²Department of Non-communicable
8 Disease Epidemiology, London School of Hygiene & Tropical Medicine, London,
9 United Kingdom; ³Health and Safety Executive, Science Division, Buxton, United
10 Kingdom; ⁴Rapid Investigation Team, Field Services, UK Health Security Agency,
11 Wellington House, London, United Kingdom; ⁵Department of Infectious Disease
12 Epidemiology, London School of Hygiene & Tropical Medicine, London, United
13 Kingdom; ⁶Department of Medical Statistics, London School of Hygiene & Tropical
14 Medicine, London, United Kingdom; ⁷Chemical and Environmental Effects
15 Department, UK Health Security Agency, Chilton, UK. ^aThese first authors
16 contributed equally; ^bthese senior authors contributed equally.

17 ***Corresponding author:** Barry Atkinson (barry.atkinson@phe.gov.uk)

18 +44 (0)1980 616739

19 **Word Count:** Abstract - 79; Main text – 1516.

20 **Key words:** COVID-19; SARS-CoV-2; workplace outbreak; environmental sampling,
21 environmental assessment.

22

23 **Abstract**

24 Between August-September 2021, an outbreak of SARS-CoV-2, with an attack rate
25 of 55% (22/40 workers), occurred in a public-facing office in England. To identify
26 workplace and worker-related risk factors, a comprehensive investigation involving
27 surface sampling, environmental assessment, molecular and serological testing, and
28 worker questionnaires was performed in September – October 2021. The results
29 affirm the utility of surface sampling to identify SARS-CoV-2 control deficiencies and
30 the importance of evolving, site-specific risk assessments with layered COVID-19
31 mitigation strategies.

32 **Outbreak Setting and Attack Rates**

33 The outbreak site was a three-storey public sector facility comprising three large
34 open-plan offices, low-occupancy offices, meeting rooms, a canteen/lunchroom, and
35 a small security office. Within the lower tier local authority area, the 7-day average
36 SARS-CoV-2 incidence rate increased from 34/100,000 in mid-June to around
37 300/100,000 from late July onwards, and ranged between 268 and 331 weekly cases
38 per 100,000 population during the outbreak period (Figure 1). Seventy-eight percent
39 of local residents (aged ≥ 12 years) had received two doses of COVID-19 vaccines
40 prior to the outbreak.

41 The workplace had a site specific COVID-19 prevention strategy in place based on a
42 generic template provided by the parent organisation. Control measures included
43 COVID-19 training for workers, single occupancy desks with 2m spacing, plastic
44 dividers between workers and the public, commercial hand sanitizers, and a cleaning
45 regimen including in between appointments with members of the public. Ventilation
46 on site was predominately natural (i.e. manually opened windows) with some locally
47 controlled air conditioning units and limited forced mechanical general ventilation.

48 The 40 workers included four (10.0%) cleaners, 30 (75.0%) office-based staff who
49 had up to 15 face-to-face meetings with visitors per day, and six (15.0%) security
50 staff who patrolled the facility on 30-minute rotating shifts, booked-in visitors, and
51 operated shared equipment in a 7.8m² office. The overall attack rate of SARS-CoV-2
52 was 55%, with 75% of cleaners (3/4), 47% of office staff (14/30), and 67% of security
53 staff (4/6) testing positive. Between end of August and mid-September 2021, a
54 'circuit break' closure was implemented to stop transmission within the workplace.

55 **COVID-OUT Outbreak Investigation**

56 Following notification, a comprehensive investigation by the COVID-19 Outbreak
57 Investigation to Understand Transmission (COVID-OUT) study team, part of the
58 PROTECT COVID-19 National Core Study on transmission and environment [1],
59 was conducted in September and October 2021, using the previously described
60 protocol [2].

61 Two rounds of surface sampling were performed using either Envirostik with
62 Neutralising Buffer (Technical Service Consultants Ltd) or UTM® Viral Transport
63 swabs (Copan) as appropriate. The first round of sampling was during the circuit
64 break; the second round approximately two weeks later the site reopened.
65 Quantitative reverse transcription polymerase chain reaction (qRT-PCR) for both
66 ORF1ab and nucleocapsid (N) gene targets was performed in duplicate using the
67 VIASURE SARS-CoV-2 Real Time PCR Detection Kit (CerTest) in accordance with
68 the manufacturer's instructions.

69 Out of 60 surfaces tested in the first round of sampling approximately 1-week after
70 the first identified case, 10 (16.7%) were confirmed positives, and one (1.7%) was a
71 suspected positive (Table 1). Five (8.3%) positive samples produced crossing
72 threshold (Ct) values between 32.0-34.9; whole genome sequencing was attempted
73 on these five samples, but only partial sequence was identified from a single sample
74 (window handle). The data generated implied delta variant sequence but as <50% of
75 the genome was recovered this could not be confirmed. The security office appeared
76 to be a site of enhanced contamination, with six of nine (66.7%) samples from this
77 location testing positive including three in the 32.0-34.9 Ct bracket. Based on these
78 findings, enhanced cleaning was performed prior to the site re-opening, and routine
79 cleaning procedures were updated to include window handle disinfection; maximum
80 occupancy and cleaning regimens in the confined security office were also

81 reassessed. Repeat surface sampling performed approximately 1-week after re-
82 opening identified only one positive (2.4%) and one suspected positive (2.4%)
83 sample, both near the assay's limit of detection.

84 Ventilation was assessed using CO₂ as a proxy; concentrations were determined by
85 spot measurements when the facility re-opened, with continuous measurements
86 logged over the subsequent two-week period in selected locations. These indicated
87 that, although largely by natural means, ventilation conformed with current guidance
88 [3], including in the security office where CO₂ levels did not exceed 1200ppm and
89 typically were <700ppm. At the time of the outbreak, the maximum occupancy of this
90 office was two with security staff rotating positions regularly between this location
91 and other areas within the building. Both occupancy levels for this office and security
92 staff rotation patterns were modified upon reopening based on the findings of this
93 study.

94 12 workers (100% office workers on regular day shift; 75% permanent contract)
95 consented to participate in the COVID-OUT study, which included completing online
96 questionnaires [4], two rounds of SARS-CoV-2 antibody testing, and three rounds of
97 self-administered nose and throat swabs for qRT-PCR testing [2]. Of the 12
98 participants, five (41.7%) self-reported positive SARS-CoV-2 tests during the
99 outbreak period; COVID-OUT serological testing confirmed all five were positive for
100 both N- and S-specific antibodies against SARS-CoV-2 and two were positive by
101 qRT-PCR. The non-cases were positive for S- but not N- antibodies, confirming that
102 they had been vaccinated but not previously infected (Table 2). Prior to the
103 outbreak, all participants, including the five cases, had received two doses of
104 COVID-19 vaccines (date range of second dose: early May to mid-July in test-
105 positives (cases) and mid-May to late July in non-cases; n=2 (18%) with

106 Pfizer/BioNTech and n=9 (82%) with Oxford/AstraZeneca). All five cases were
107 symptomatic for COVID-19 and presented with at least one of the following
108 symptoms: fever, dry cough, productive cough, shortness of breath, and/or loss of
109 taste or smell. Contact patterns were similar between cases and non-cases: roughly
110 half reported >6 close contacts (i.e., during work, social, and essential activities) per
111 day on average over the prior 14 days. Two-thirds of participants reported using face
112 masks both at work and outside of work with a higher proportion of non-cases using
113 face masks nearly all the time. Four participants (33%; two cases and two non-
114 cases) reported direct physical or close contact with co-workers and members of the
115 public. Of these, one worker (25%) reported a divider/screen between colleagues
116 and three (75%) reported a divider/screen between themselves and members of the
117 public. One participant reported no screen between themselves and colleagues or
118 the public and reported that they could 'sometimes' maintain social distance with
119 colleagues and 'rarely' with the public.

120 **Discussion**

121 In late August-September 2021, a public-facing office in England, with adherence to
122 governmental COVID-19 control guidance and high vaccination coverage,
123 experienced an outbreak of SARS-CoV-2 affecting 55% of the workforce. At the time
124 of this outbreak, governmental guidance for workplaces in England prioritized
125 policies for risk assessments, adequate ventilation, frequent cleaning, self-isolation,
126 and communication/training; however, social distancing and face covering usage
127 were no longer compulsory. Two weeks before the outbreak, government guidance
128 was amended so fully vaccinated people did not need to self-isolate if they were
129 identified as a close contact of someone with COVID-19.

130 Despite existing COVID-19 control measures, surface sampling identified potential
131 deficiencies in routine disinfection procedures that informed targeted strengthening
132 of infection control practices to support workplace re-opening. Similar to other
133 SARS-CoV-2 outbreak studies, relatively low-level contamination was identified even
134 in locations associated with recent occupancy of symptomatic people [5–10]. No
135 positive surface sample yielded complete genome sequence suggesting degradation
136 of the viral genome and a lack of transmission potential at the time of sampling.
137 Similar investigations imply Ct values of <30 correlate with presence of infectious
138 virus [11].

139 While vaccines remain highly effective for preventing severe COVID-19 illness and
140 death, SARS-CoV-2 infections among fully vaccinated individuals in this outbreak
141 are consistent with previous reports [12] and reinforce the importance of a layered
142 SARS-CoV-2 transmission mitigation strategy prioritising ventilation and risk
143 assessment-informed interventions, such as testing, social distancing, appropriate
144 occupancy levels and transmission control measures (e.g. face masks), in addition to
145 vaccination.

146 Overall, our findings highlight the need for evolving, site-specific risk assessments
147 that adapt for changes in local community infection rates and recognize
148 heterogeneity within a workplace in the risks associated with different workspaces
149 (e.g. rooms with high occupancy) and worker roles (e.g. desk-based versus
150 circulating staff). For public-facing workplaces, these assessments must inform
151 suitable control measures to minimize potential close interactions of staff members
152 with co-workers and visitors.

153 The limitations of this study warrant consideration. Surface sampling and participant
154 testing performed closer to the peak of cases could yield a more representative
155 indication of contamination within the facility and facilitate more informative genomic
156 sequencing and epidemiological assessment [13]. Although workplace transmission
157 appears likely, given the clustering of cases in some areas and positive
158 environmental sampling, we were unable to clarify chains of transmission and
159 determine whether cases may have been independently introduced from community
160 sources. Notably, the worker participation rate in COVID-OUT was 30%, with an
161 underrepresentation of male workers as well as cleaning and security staff. The
162 small sample size and potential for selection bias limit our ability to evaluate
163 individual risk factors within the workplace.

164 The ability to rapidly investigate SARS-CoV-2 outbreaks in workplaces and
165 implement data-informed SARS-CoV-2 transmission mitigation measures is of
166 importance for maintaining core societal functions during the COVID-19 pandemic.
167 This is particularly relevant to workplaces with public-facing elements that have a
168 dynamic population with an elevated risk of virus introduction and onward
169 transmission. Mechanisms to encourage workplaces to report potential outbreaks as
170 early as practicable and engage with research studies, like the one presented here,
171 should be prioritized to further our understanding of transmission and to provide
172 safer work environments.

173 **Copyright**

174 © Crown copyright (2021), Health and Safety Executive. This is an open access
175 article distributed under the terms of the Open Government Licence v3.0, which

176 permits re-use, distribution, reproduction and adaptation, provided the original work
177 is properly cited.

178 **Acknowledgments**

179 The authors wish to acknowledge Antony Spencer, Vince Sandys, Joan Cooke, Gary
180 Dobbin, Hannah Higgins, Chris Keen, Alice Graham and Helen Collins for their
181 efforts in recruitment and data collection supporting the COVID-OUT project, and for
182 assisting with this investigation. The authors further acknowledge the assistance of
183 the UKHSA Genomic Team for sequencing samples of interest from this study.

184 **Declarations**

185 Financial support: This work was supported by funding from the PROTECT COVID-
186 19 National Core Study on Transmission and Environment, managed by the Health
187 and Safety Executive on behalf of HM Government.

188 Conflict of interest: None declared.

189 Ethical approval: The COVID-OUT study has been approved by the NHS North East
190 Research Ethics Committee (Reference 20/NE/0282).

191 Data availability statement: The data that support the findings of this study are
192 presented in this report. Additional data relating to the wider COVID-OUT project will
193 be published and catalogued within the NCS PROTECT repository available at
194 <https://sites.manchester.ac.uk/covid19-national-project/>.

195 **Authors' contributions:**

196 **Barry Atkinson:** Conceptualisation, methodology, validation, formal analysis,
197 investigation, data curation, writing – original draft, writing – review and editing, and
198 supervision.

199 **Karin van Veldhoven:** Conceptualisation, methodology, validation, formal analysis,
200 data curation, writing – original draft, writing – review and editing.

201 **Ian Nicholls:** Validation, formal analysis, investigation, data curation, writing –
202 review and editing.

203 **Matthew Coldwell:** Conceptualisation, methodology, validation, formal analysis,
204 investigation, data curation, writing – original draft, writing – review and editing,
205 supervision.

206 **Adam Clarke:** Validation, formal analysis, investigation, data curation, writing –
207 review and editing.

208 **Gillian Frost:** Validation, data curation, writing – original draft, writing – review and
209 editing.

210 **Christina J. Atchison:** Methodology, writing – review and editing.

211 **Amber I. Raja:** Methodology, writing – original draft, writing – review and editing.

212 **Allan M Bennett:** Conceptualisation, methodology, validation, writing – original draft,
213 writing – review and editing, supervision, project administration and funding
214 acquisition.

215 **Derek Morgan:** Conceptualisation, methodology, writing – review and editing,
216 supervision, project administration and funding acquisition.

217 **Neil Pearce:** Conceptualisation, methodology, writing – review and editing, project
218 administration and funding acquisition.

219 **Tony Fletcher:** Conceptualisation, methodology, writing – review and editing.

220 **Elizabeth B Brickley:** Conceptualisation, methodology, writing – original draft,
221 writing – review and editing, and supervision.

222 **Yiqun Chen:** Conceptualisation, methodology, validation, investigation, data
223 curation writing – original draft, writing – review and editing, supervision, and project
224 administration.

225 **Disclosure Statement**

226 The contents of this paper, including any opinions and/or conclusions expressed, are
227 those of the authors alone and do not necessarily reflect Health and Safety
228 Executive or UK Health Security Agency policy.

229 **References**

- 230 1. **PROTECT COVID-19 National Core Study.** *The PROTECT COVID-19 National*
231 *Core Study on transmission and environment.*
232 2021(<https://sites.manchester.ac.uk/covid19-national-project/>). Accessed 6
233 November 2021.
- 234 2. **Chen Y, et al.** *The COVID-OUT study protocol: COVID-19 outbreak investigation*
235 *to understand workplace SARS-CoV-2 transmission in the United Kingdom.*
236 Wellcome Open Research, 2021 Aug. Report No.: 6:201.
- 237 3. **Chartered Institution of Building Services Engineers.** *COVID-19: Ventilation.*
238 *COVID-19: Ventilation.* 2021([https://go.cibse.org/l/698403/2021-07-](https://go.cibse.org/l/698403/2021-07-16/58mxjt/698403/1626442809vU1W2onF/COVID_19___Ventilation_v5.pdf)
239 [16/58mxjt/698403/1626442809vU1W2onF/COVID_19___Ventilation_v5.pdf](https://go.cibse.org/l/698403/2021-07-16/58mxjt/698403/1626442809vU1W2onF/COVID_19___Ventilation_v5.pdf)).
240 Accessed 6 November 2021.
- 241 4. **Chen Y, et al.** COVID-19 risk questionnaire for workers - COVID-OUT study.
242 OSFOSF, 2021; Published online: 13 May 2021.doi:10.17605/OSF.IO/W8ZV5.
- 243 5. **Rooij MMT de, et al.** Potential environmental transmission routes of SARS-CoV-
244 2 inside a large meat processing plant experiencing COVID-19 clusters. *medRxiv*
245 Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory Press, 2021; : 2021.06.20.21259212.
- 246 6. **Gholipour S, et al.** Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 (SARS-
247 CoV-2) Contamination of High-touch Surfaces in Field Settings. *Biomedical and*
248 *environmental sciences: BES* 2020; **33**: 925–929.
- 249 7. **Marshall DL, et al.** Sentinel Coronavirus environmental monitoring can
250 contribute to detecting asymptomatic SARS-CoV-2 virus spreaders and can
251 verify effectiveness of workplace COVID-19 controls. *Microbial Risk Analysis*
252 2020; **16**: 100137.
- 253 8. **Mouchtouri VA, et al.** Environmental contamination of SARS-CoV-2 on
254 surfaces, air-conditioner and ventilation systems. *International Journal of*
255 *Hygiene and Environmental Health* 2020; **230**: 113599.

- 256 9. **Marcenac P, et al.** Detection of SARS-CoV-2 on Surfaces in Households of
257 Persons with COVID-19. *International Journal of Environmental Research and*
258 *Public Health* 2021; **18**Published online: 2 August
259 2021.doi:10.3390/ijerph18158184.
- 260 10. **Cherrie JW, et al.** Contamination of Air and Surfaces in Workplaces with SARS-
261 CoV-2 Virus: A Systematic Review. *Annals of Work Exposures and Health*
262 Oxford Academic, 2021; **65**: 879–892.
- 263 11. **Zhou J, et al.** Investigating Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2
264 (SARS-CoV-2) Surface and Air Contamination in an Acute Healthcare Setting
265 During the Peak of the Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) Pandemic in
266 London. *Clinical Infectious Diseases: An Official Publication of the Infectious*
267 *Diseases Society of America* 2021; **73**: e1870–e1877.
- 268 12. **Brown CM.** Outbreak of SARS-CoV-2 Infections, Including COVID-19 Vaccine
269 Breakthrough Infections, Associated with Large Public Gatherings — Barnstable
270 County, Massachusetts, July 2021. *MMWR. Morbidity and Mortality Weekly*
271 *Report* 2021; **70**Published online: 2021.doi:10.15585/mmwr.mm7031e2.
- 272 13. **Bart SM, et al.** Multiple Transmission Chains within COVID-19 Cluster,
273 Connecticut, USA, 2020 - Volume 27, Number 10—October 2021 - Emerging
274 Infectious Diseases journal - CDC. Published online:
275 doi:10.3201/eid2710.211196.

276
277

278 Table 1: Data collected from two rounds of surface sampling in the COVID-OUT investigation of an
 279 outbreak of SARS-CoV-2 in an office-based workplace, England, August to September 2021.

Site sampling data							
		qRT-PCR result			qRT-PCR Mean Ct grouping		
Time of sampling	Samples collected	Positive n (%)	Suspected n (%)	Negative n (%)	Ct <32.0 n (%)	Ct 32.0-34.9 n (%)	Ct >35.0 ^a n (%)
Circuit-break	60	10 (16.7%)	1 (1.7%)	49 (81.7%)	0 (0.0%)	5 (8.3%)	55 (91.7%)
Reopening	42	1 (2.4%)	1 (2.4%)	40 (95.2%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	42 (100%)
Positive sample information							
Location Time of sampling	Description	Mean Ct Value ^b		Estimated copies per cm ^{2c}			
Open plan office (2 nd floor) Circuit-break	Window handle	33.6		4,589.9			
Meeting room Circuit-break	Air vent	37.6 (suspect ^d)		25.1			
Meeting room Circuit-break	Desk + chair	37.4		7.0			
Canteen Circuit-break	Table + chair	34.2		35.2			
Security office Circuit-break	Radio (two-way)	36.7		12.8			
Security office Circuit-break	Telephone	34.6		583.1			
Security office Circuit-break	Key press	34.5		148.1			
Security office Circuit-break	Control panel	34.2		229.4			
Security office Circuit-break	Telephone	35.1		214.2			
Security office Circuit-break	Desk + chair	37.7		19.5			
Open plan office (ground floor) Circuit-break	Air conditioning unit	37.6		13.1			
Canteen Reopening	Desk + chair	37.6 (suspect ^d)		1.1			
Canteen Reopening	Desk + chair	37.2		1.7			

280 ^aIncludes samples with no SARS-CoV-2 RNA detected. ^bMean Ct value for the N gene.
 281 ^cExtrapolation from copies per reaction to copies per sample collected based on the dilution factor,
 282 then divided by recorded sampling area. ^dA 'suspected positive' is one where only a single replicate is
 283 positive in at least one target.
 284

285

286 Table 2. Test results, clinical presentation, and characteristics of participants in the COVID-OUT
 287 investigation of an outbreak of SARS-CoV-2 in an office-based workplace, England, August to
 288 September 2021.


		Cases ^a		Non-cases ^b		Total		
		n	%	n	%	n	%	
SARS-CoV-2	Positive RT-PCR	5	100.0	0	0.0	5	41.7	
Testing	Self-reported positive test with N-specific antibodies	5	100.0	0	0.0	5	41.7	
Signs & symptoms of COVID-19	None reported	0	0.0	7	100.0	7	58.3	
	Fever	3	60.0	0	0.0	3	25.0	
	Dry cough	3	60.0	0	0.0	3	25.0	
	Productive cough	3	60.0	0	0.0	3	25.0	
	Shortness of breath	3	60.0	0	0.0	3	25.0	
	Loss of taste	4	80.0	0	0.0	4	33.3	
Vaccines	Pfizer/BioNTech, two doses	0	0.0	2	28.6	2	16.7	
	Oxford/AstraZeneca, two doses	4	80.0	5	71.4	9	75.0	
	Missing	1	20.0	0	0.0	1	8.3	
Direct physical or close contact with co-workers or public	No	3	60.0	5	71.4	8	66.7	
	Yes, with co-workers	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	
	Yes, with members of the public	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	
	Yes, with co-workers and members of the public	2	40.0	2	28.6	4	33.3	
	Missing	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	
COVID-19 control measures at work	Hand washing	Never	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
		1-10 times	1	20.0	1	14.3	2	16.7
		11+ times	4	80.0	5	71.4	9	75.0
		Missing	0	0.0	1	14.3	1	8.3
	Wear any type of face mask ^c	Never	2	40.0	0	0.0	2	16.7
		< half the time	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
		> half the time	0	0.0	2	28.6	2	16.7
		Nearly all the time	3	60.0	5	71.4	8	66.7
		Missing	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	Wear gloves	Never	5	100.0	4	57.1	9	75.0
		< half the time	0	0.0	2	28.6	2	16.7
		> half the time	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
		Nearly all the time	0	0.0	1	14.3	1	8.3
		Missing	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	Divider, colleagues	No	1	20.0	2	28.6	3	25.0
		Yes	1	20.0	0	0.0	1	8.3
		Not applicable ^d	3	60.0	5	71.4	8	66.7
		Missing	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	Divider, public	No	0	0.0	1	14.3	1	8.3
		Yes	2	40.0	1	14.3	3	25.0
		Not applicable ^d	3	60.0	5	71.4	8	66.7
		Missing	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	Social distancing, colleagues	Rarely able to maintain	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
		Sometimes able to maintain	0	0.0	1	14.3	1	8.3
		Mostly able to maintain	2	40.0	1	14.3	3	25.0
		Always able to maintain	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
		Missing	3	60.0	5	71.4	8	66.7
Missing		0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	
Social distancing, public	Rarely able to maintain	0	0.0	1	14.3	1	8.3	
	Sometimes able to maintain	1	20.0	0	0.0	1	8.3	
	Mostly able to maintain	4	80.0	6	85.7	10	83.3	
	Always able to maintain	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	
	Missing	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	
	Missing	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	
COVID-19 control measures not at work	Wear any type of face mask ^c	Never	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
		< half the time	1	20.0	0	0.0	1	8.3
		> half the time	1	20.0	1	14.3	2	16.7
		Nearly all the time	2	40.0	6	85.7	8	66.7
		Missing	1	20.0	0	0.0	1	8.3
Number of close contacts ^e	Household	None	1	20.0	0	0.0	1	8.3
		1-2	4	80.0	2	28.6	6	50.0

		3-5	0	0.0	5	71.4	5	41.7
		Missing	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Work		None	2	40.0	1	14.3	3	25.0
		1-2	0	0.0	2	28.6	2	16.7
		3-5	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
		6-20	2	40.0	2	28.6	4	33.3
		21-100	0	0.0	2	28.6	2	16.7
Commute		Missing	1	20.0	0	0.0	1	8.3
		None	4	80.0	6	85.7	10	83.3
		1-2	0	0.0	1	14.3	1	8.3
Social		Missing	1	20.0	0	0.0	1	8.3
		None	2	40.0	1	14.3	3	25.0
		1-2	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
		3-5	1	20.0	1	14.3	2	16.7
		6-20	2	40.0	3	42.9	5	41.7
Essential		21-100	0	0.0	1	14.3	1	8.3
		Missing	0	0.0	1	14.3	1	8.3
		None	1	20.0	1	14.3	2	16.7
		1-2	1	20.0	1	14.3	2	16.7
		3-5	1	20.0	0	0.0	1	8.3
		6-20	1	20.0	1	14.3	2	16.7
		21-100	0	0.0	4	57.1	4	33.3
Long close contacts (>1h in same space)	Non-household	Missing	1	20.0	0	0.0	1	8.3
		Never	3	60.0	2	28.6	5	41.7
		<1/day	0	0.0	3	42.9	3	25.0
		1/day	0	0.0	2	28.6	2	16.7
		>1/day	2	40.0	0	0.0	1	8.3
	Work	Missing	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
		Never	3	60.0	4	57.1	7	58.3
		<1/day	0	0.0	2	28.6	2	16.7
		1/day	1	20.0	0	0.0	1	8.3
		>1/day	1	20.0	1	14.3	2	16.7
	Commute	Missing	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
		Never	5	100.0	6	85.7	11	91.7
		<1/day	0	0.0	1	14.3	1	8.3
	Social	Missing	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
		Never	3	60.0	3	42.9	6	50.0
<1/day		1	20.0	3	42.9	4	33.3	
1/day		1	20.0	0	0.0	1	8.3	
Essential	Missing	0	0.0	1	14.3	1	8.3	
	Never	2	40.0	3	42.9	5	41.7	
	<1/day	2	40.0	2	28.6	4	33.3	
	1/day	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	
	>1/day	0	0.0	2	28.6	2	16.7	
		Missing	1	20.0	0	0.0	1	8.3

289 ^aConfirmed cases were defined as participants who presented during the outbreak period with: (i) RT-
290 PCR evidence of a SARS-CoV-2 infection, (ii) N-specific seroconversion, or (iii) self-reporting of a
291 positive test (i.e., by RT-PCR or LFD) with positive N antibody results. Suspected cases were defined
292 as participants who presented during the outbreak period with no positive RT-PCR or N
293 antibody results in COVID-OUT testing but with: (i) self-reporting of a positive test (i.e., by RT-PCR or
294 LFD) or (ii) symptoms consistent with COVID-19 defined as: (a) acute onset of fever (>37.8C) and
295 new continuous cough or (b) acute onset of any three or more of fever (>37.8C), cough, shortness of
296 breath, loss of taste or smell, runny nose, fatigue, sore throat, muscle or body
297 aches, headache, nausea or vomiting, and/or diarrhoea. Only confirmed cases were identified. ^bTwo
298 out of seven controls did not undertake any testing as part of COVID-OUT and so are not confirmed
299 negatives but classified as non-cases. ^cIncludes washable, surgical, disposable, FFP2 and FFP3.
300 ^dNot applicable: participants did not report direct physical or close contact with co-workers or
301 members of the public. ^e'Close Contact' defined as: typically spending more than 15 minutes within 2
302 metres of someone
303 Abbreviations: RT-PCR: real-time polymerase chain reaction.

304

305 Figure 1: Timeline of the COVID-OUT investigation in a public-facing office, England, June to
306 November 2021. Cases were identified between end of August and mid-September. Text/Arrows
307 indicates key dates of the COVID-OUT study activities. The circuit-break, which was implemented at
308 the moment of identification of the initial cluster of cases, lasted 2 weeks. The line chart represents
309 the 7-day average case rate for the lower tier local authority area at which the company is based
310 (publicly available from (<https://coronavirus.data.gov.uk/>); date of download 9 November 2021.
311



312