

1 *Original article*

2 **SARS-CoV-2 Exposures of Healthcare Workers from Primary Care, Long-Term**

3 **Care Facilities and Hospitals: A Nationwide Matched Case-Control Study**

4 Martin Belan,¹ Tiffany Charmet,² Laura Schaeffer,² Sarah Tubiana,^{1,3} Xavier Duval,^{1,3} Jean-

5 Christophe Lucet,^{1,4} Arnaud Fontanet,^{2,5} Gabriel Birgand,^{6,7*} and Solen Kernéis^{1,4*}

6 ¹Université de Paris, INSERM, IAME, Paris, France

7 ²Institut Pasteur, Université de Paris, Emerging Diseases Epidemiology Unit, Paris, France

8 ³Centre d'Investigation Clinique, Inserm CIC 1425, Paris, France

9 ⁴Equipe de Prévention du Risque Infectieux (EPRI), AP-HP, Hôpital Bichat, Paris, France

10 ⁵Conservatoire National des Arts et Métiers, Unité PACRI, Paris, France

11 ⁶Centre d'Appui à la Prévention des Infections Associées aux Soins (CPIas) des Pays de la Loire,

12 Nantes, France

13 ⁷NIHR Health Protection Research Unit in Healthcare-Associated Infection and Antimicrobial

14 Resistance, Imperial College London, Hammersmith Campus, London, UK

15 *Gabriel Birgand and Solen Kernéis contributed equally to this manuscript.

16 Corresponding author: Martin Belan, Equipe Mobile d'Infectiologie, Hôpital Cochin, AP-HP, 27

17 rue du Faubourg Saint Jacques, 75679 Paris CEDEX 14, France. Tel: +33(0)1 58 41 41 83, Fax:

18 +33(0)1 58 41 17 61, email: martin.belan@aphp.fr

19 Keyword: COVID-19; healthcare workers; infection control and prevention; risk factors.

20 Word count: 2327; 29 References, 2 Figures, 1 Table

21 Supplementary Data: 3 Tables.

22 **ABSTRACT**

23 **Objectives.** Healthcare workers (HCWs) are at higher risk of contracting coronavirus disease-19
24 (COVID-19) than the general population. This study assessed the roles of various exposures and
25 personal protective equipment (PPE) use on that risk for HCWs working in primary care, long-
26 term-care facilities (LTCFs) or hospitals.

27 **Methods.** We conducted a matched case-control (1:1) study (10 April–9 July 2021). Cases (HCWs
28 with confirmed COVID-19) and controls (HCWs without any COVID-19-positive test or
29 symptoms) recruited by email were invited to complete an online questionnaire on their
30 exposures and PPE use. Questions covered the 10 days preceding symptom onset for cases (or
31 testing if asymptomatic) or inclusion for controls.

32 **Results.** A total of 4152 matched cases and controls were included. The multivariable
33 conditional logistic regression analysis retained exposure to an infected person outside work
34 (adjusted odds ratio, 19.9 [95% confidence interval, 12.4–31.9]), an infected colleague (2.26
35 [1.53–3.33]) or COVID-19 patients (2.37 [1.66–3.40]), as independent predictors of COVID-19 in
36 HCWs, while partial or complete immunization was protective. Eye protection (0.57 [0.37–0.87])
37 and wearing a gown (0.58 [0.34–0.97]) during COVID-19 patient care were protective, while
38 wearing an apron slightly increased the risk of infection (1.47 [1.00–2.18]). N95-respirator
39 protection was comparable to that of surgical masks. Results were consistent across healthcare-
40 facility categories.

41 **Conclusions.** HCWs were more likely to get COVID-19 in their personal sphere than during
42 occupational activities. Our results suggest that eye protection for HCWs during patient care
43 should be actively promoted.

44 INTRODUCTION

45

46 Protecting healthcare workers (HCWs) from coronavirus disease-19 (COVID-19) is critical to
47 ensure their own safety, and maintain continuity and quality of care. HCWs are estimated to
48 have a 1.6- to 3.4-fold higher risk of infection compared to the general population [1, 2]. High
49 on-site involvement during the acute phases of the pandemic and lockdown periods, direct
50 interactions with patients and lack of access to personal protective equipment (PPE) likely
51 contributed to higher exposure. The World Health Organization estimated that between 80 000
52 and 180 000 HCWs could have died from COVID-19 between January 2020 and May 2021 [3]. In
53 France, from March 2020 to September 2021, 87 647 (9%) laboratory-confirmed infections and
54 19 attributable deaths were reported among 935 732 HCWs from healthcare facilities [4]. The
55 more recent emergence of highly transmissible variants further affected the healthcare-
56 workforce capacity.

57 As in the general population, younger male HCWs with comorbidities, in contact with an
58 infected household member or who participated in gathering events are at higher risk for
59 contracting COVID-19 [5–8]. Specific occupational exposures were identified: regular patient-
60 facing activities and contacts with infected colleagues [2, 5, 6, 9, 10]. PPE-conferred protection
61 was mainly studied for Influenza, Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome (SARS) and Middle East
62 Respiratory Syndrome (MERS), but evidence is controversial for COVID-19 [11–13]. Moreover,
63 very few data have been published on HCWs in long-term care facilities (LTCFs) and primary care
64 [14, 15], despite their intense involvement in the pandemic response. Most studies focused on
65 the hospital setting, although exposures, organization of care and access to infection prevention
66 and control (IPC) expertise vary greatly across facilities.

67 This study aimed to identify occupational and non-occupational exposures, and PPE practices

68 associated with COVID-19 risk for HCWs working in primary care, LTCFs or hospitals.

69

70 **METHODS**

71

72 ***Study Design and Participants***

73 We conducted a matched case-control study from an ongoing national survey (ComCor) led by
74 Institut Pasteur (Paris, France) since October 2020 [16–18]. The ComCor survey aims to identify
75 COVID-19 risk factors in the general population through a case-control study on community and
76 occupational exposures to SARS-CoV-2.

77 Participants were included between 10 April and 9 July 2021. All laboratory-confirmed cases
78 of COVID-19 (either nasopharyngeal reverse transcriptase–polymerase chain reaction (RT-PCR)
79 or antigenic test) compiled by the French National Health Insurance were invited by email to
80 complete a questionnaire following their positive test result. Respondents who selected the
81 “healthcare worker or working within health field” criterion in the questionnaire were included
82 as cases in this study. Controls were recruited during the same period through two different
83 sources: 1) IPSOS, a French marketing research and public opinion specialist, selected controls
84 from a panel representative of the French population using frequency-matching with cases for
85 age, sex, region, population density and week of inclusion for the Comcor survey; and 2) 24
86 professional corporations, scientific associations and medical platforms were asked to forward
87 the questionnaire to their members. Participants declaring to be HCWs using the above-
88 described criterion and reporting no previous symptoms or positive test were enrolled as
89 controls. The final study population was obtained by randomly selecting cases and controls with
90 a 1:1 ratio by exact case-control matching for 10-year age-category distribution, sex and
91 residential region.

92

93 ***Data Collection***

94 Participants received online information about the study and gave consent for participation by
95 completing the self-administered questionnaire. They opted-in without any incentives or
96 reminders. Questionnaires covered the 10 days preceding symptom onset for cases (or testing if
97 asymptomatic) and the 10 days preceding inclusion for controls. As previously described, the
98 questionnaire covered sociodemographic characteristics (age, sex, residential region, household
99 composition), health condition (prior medical history, COVID-19-immunization status) [16].
100 Occupational activities were assessed for cases and controls: professional category, size and
101 type of healthcare setting, frequency of contacts with general patients and COVID-19 patients,
102 contacts with colleagues at work, and PPE use for COVID-19 patient care during the previous 10
103 days. HCW professions were grouped in 4 categories: medical staff (physicians, residents,
104 dentists, pharmacists, biologists), nurses, nurse’s assistants and other professions (including,
105 among others, laboratory or imaging technicians, administrative staff, speech or physical
106 therapists, social workers and opticians). To account for previous immunization against SARS-
107 CoV-2, we classified participants as either “not immunized”, “partially immunized” or “fully
108 immunized” [17, 19]. Participants without any documented previous COVID-19, and either not
109 vaccinated or first-dose vaccinated within the 21 days preceding inclusion were considered “not
110 immunized”. Participants included 14 days to 6 months after laboratory-confirmed COVID-19
111 infection or >7 days after a second vaccine dose (28 days for 1-dose regimen) were classified as
112 fully immunized. Other participants were considered partially immunized.

113

114 ***Statistical Analyses***

115 Categorical variables are described by number (percentage). All statistical analysis were

116 computed with R Studio v4.1.0 (R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria). Cases
117 and controls were matched with the Matching package. Univariable and multivariable
118 conditional logistic regression to account for the matching strategy, adjusted to the week of
119 inclusion, assessed relationships between variables and the outcome (COVID-19). Missing data
120 were managed with multiple imputations by chained equations using the MICE package. To
121 evaluate imputation effects on our results, supplementary analysis was done on a sample of
122 fully completed questionnaires only, excluding individuals with missing data. To compare risk
123 factors within healthcare-setting categories (hospitals, LTCFs and primary care), subgroup
124 analyses were conducted on three population samples using the same 1:1 matching strategy for
125 age, sex and residential region. Strengthening of Reporting of Observational Studies in
126 Epidemiology (STROBE) reporting guidelines were followed.

127

128 ***Ethical Considerations***

129 The ComCor study was approved by the *Comité de Protection des Personnes (CPP) Sud Ouest et*
130 *Outre Mer-1* on 21 September 2020. The data protection authority *Commission Nationale de*
131 *l'Informatique et des Libertés (CNIL)* authorized data processing on 21 October 2020. CPP and
132 CNIL accorded authorizations for substantial modification to recruit controls through
133 professional societies and associations on 31 March 2021. Informed consent was obtained from
134 all participants. The study is registered with ClinicalTrials.gov under the identifier NCT04607941.

135

136 **RESULTS**

137

138 ***Participants***

139 Among 562 841 individuals with confirmed COVID-19 contacted by the French National Health

140 Insurance (10 April–9 July 2021), 6% completed the questionnaire, including 3510 HCWs, and
141 1:1 matching paired 2076 cases to 2076 controls for analysis. Overall, data were missing for 126
142 (6%) cases and 25 (1%) controls. The weekly number of inclusions and confirmed COVID-19
143 cases reported in France throughout the study period are reported in Figure 2.

144 Table 1 reports study population characteristics. Most participants were female, mostly
145 working in primary care. Overall, 1770/4152 (43%) HCWs were classified as either partially or
146 fully immunized against COVID-19; 678/4152 (16%) declared being posted in a COVID-19-
147 dedicated unit or mostly caring for COVID-19 patients. In the subgroup of HCWs in contact with
148 COVID-19 patients during the preceding 10 days (n = 2086), 1616 (77%) declared systematically
149 wearing a gown, 1608 (77%) gloves, 1490 (71%) a N95 respirator, 1345 (64%) goggles/faceshield
150 and 1146 (55%) an apron for patient care.

151

152 ***Association between Exposures and COVID-19 Status***

153 According to the multivariable analysis, the strongest predictor of contracting COVID-19 was
154 exposure to an infected person outside work, while complete or partial immunization was
155 protective (Table 1). Occupational exposure to an infected colleague, to COVID-19 patients, or
156 working in a unit harboring a cluster of nosocomial cases increased the risk of HCW infection.
157 Compared to medical staff, being a nurse or a nurse's aide was significantly associated with the
158 risk of contracting COVID-19. Eye protection (goggles or faceshield) and gowning for COVID-19-
159 patient care were associated with lower risk, while wearing an apron posed a higher risk. N95-
160 respirator-conferred protection was comparable to that of surgical facemasks. The
161 supplementary analysis of cases with fully completed questionnaires (Supplementary Table 1)
162 yielded similar results.

163

164 ***Subgroup and Sensitivity Analyses***

165 The subgroup analyses by healthcare sector are reported in Supplementary Tables 2 and 3.
166 After 1:1 matching, 1388 HCWs from hospitals, 558 from LTCFs and 1842 from primary care
167 were included. When caring for COVID-19 patients, HCWs declared more frequently wearing
168 N95 respirators in hospitals and primary care than in LTCFs. Adherence to eye protection was
169 particularly poor in primary care (46% of cases and 53% of controls). According to the
170 multivariable analysis, partial or complete immunization was protective in all three settings,
171 while exposure to an infected person outside work was again the main risk factor for infection.

172

173 **DISCUSSION**

174

175 In this large case-control study, the strongest predictor of HCW COVID-19 infection was
176 exposure to an infected person outside work. Contact with an infected colleague and regular
177 COVID-19 patient-facing activities were also significantly, but to a lesser extent, associated with
178 infection. Eye protection and gowning during patient care decreased the risk, while N95
179 respirators did not confer better protection than surgical masks. These results were consistent
180 across healthcare settings (hospital, LTCFs and primary care).

181 As also shown by others, our results suggest that direct contact with infected household
182 members, relatives or, to a lesser degree, colleagues were the main sources of HCW acquisition
183 of COVID-19 [5, 6, 9]. Nevertheless, COVID-19 patient-facing activities seem to further enhance
184 the risk, although previous results were heterogeneous [2, 5, 7, 9, 20, 21]. One explanation for
185 this heterogeneity across settings and wards may be the various degrees of HCW education and
186 training to follow IPC protocols and best practices. Correct PPE use by HCWs is essential to avoid
187 contaminations during patient care. Since the start of the pandemic, French guidelines have

188 recommended universal masking with surgical facemasks for general patient care, and N95-
189 respirator use for aerosol-generating procedures [22]. For confirmed COVID-19 patients,
190 additional PPE, such as eye protection, and gowns or aprons must be worn. Gloves are
191 restricted to activities carrying a risk of exposure to body fluids.

192 Our findings highlighted marked divergence of PPE use from French guidelines, since the
193 large majority of HCWs declared systematically wearing a N95 respirator and gloves when caring
194 for COVID-19 patients. However, our finding that N95 respirators were not superior to surgical
195 facemasks for protecting HCWs during standard care is consistent with the results of a recent
196 meta-analysis of 4 randomized controlled trials on other viral respiratory infections [11]. In a
197 multicenter observational study in Switzerland, an institutional policy of systematic N95-
198 respirator use was not associated with a lower HCWs' seroconversion rate for COVID-19 [23].
199 Although additional safety conferred by eye protection was also suggested in a recent meta-
200 analysis [24], most clinical workers find faceshields and goggles uncomfortable, impair vision
201 and interfere with work, probably contributing to poor adherence [25]. Unexpectedly, apron use
202 was associated with a heightened risk of contamination, while gowns were protective. The
203 pandemic led to a widespread use or reuse of homemade aprons during COVID-19-patient care,
204 owed to gown shortage for which donning and doffing might be easier. These observed misuses
205 of aprons and possible lack of personal protection suits may have led to an increased risk of
206 cross contamination during care.

207 HCWs from different healthcare settings have participated in the COVID-19 response. In
208 France, 72% of nursing homes had at least one COVID-19-infected resident in 2020 [26], and
209 numerous devastating outbreaks were described worldwide [27]. Herein, HCWs from LTCFs and
210 primary care tended to be at higher risk of infection, which probably reflects a lack of extensive
211 training (associated with large-scale staff turnover), and limited access to PPE and diagnostic

212 tests, with a globally lower awareness on the infectious risk and prevention measures. Support
213 from hospitals and regional health authorities should be encouraged to continue staff training
214 and ensure PPE supply. The risk of contracting COVID-19 was also influenced by the professional
215 category: being nurses and nurse's assistants was more closely associated with COVID-19 than
216 medical staff. Although those associations might be biased by unbalanced case and control
217 populations for professions, they might also reflect that nurses and nurse's assistants were
218 engaged in more prolonged and closer patient care than other professions. This higher risk of
219 infection was described for domestic cleaners and porters, but not for nurses and nurse's
220 assistants to our knowledge [5, 10, 21]. The result associated with the "other profession"
221 category must be interpreted with caution because of the heterogeneity of professions, but
222 numbers were too small to fit a statistical model to each individual profession.

223 The strengths of this study are the large sample size, enabling exact matching of cases and
224 controls for age, sex and residential region, adjustment to the week of inclusion, and the
225 nationwide distribution of study participants. Notably, sources of infection according to
226 healthcare-facility category has not previously been assessed. The main limitations of the study
227 are the low response rate of cases and controls and the use of an online questionnaire, which
228 may have resulted in selection biases towards younger participants, more comfortable with
229 internet and French language. Second, the underrepresentation of some professional categories
230 impaired subgroup analyses, despite specific occupational exposures, e.g., physiotherapists or
231 speech therapists. Third, the data used were relied upon HCW declarations, potentially
232 influenced by social desirability or memorization bias. Fourth, we did not rule out past or
233 current asymptomatic infections among controls [28]. Nevertheless, our population was
234 composed of HCWs, more likely to recognize COVID-19 symptoms and with 3–5-fold higher
235 access to tests than the general population, then lowering the risk of classification bias [1].

236 Finally, the study took place between April and July 2021, during the third COVID-19 wave in
237 France. HCWs might have been better prepared and protected than during the first wave,
238 especially regarding PPE, and the Delta and Omicron variants emerged in France after the end of
239 the study period. Omicron transmissibility is much higher than previous variants, which may
240 affect the relative weights of transmission sources and appropriate PPE [29].

241 In conclusion, our study results indicated that, for HCWs, COVID-19 patient-facing activities
242 increased the risk of getting infected, while colleague-related and mostly community exposures
243 appear to represent higher risks. Moreover, they suggest that, when caring for COVID-19
244 patients, HCWs should wear a surgical facemask (apart from aerosols-generating procedures),
245 eye protection and a gown. The protection conferred by gloving should be further explored.

246

247 **Supplementary Data**

248 Supplementary materials are available at *Clinical Microbiology and Infections* online.

249

250 **Notes**

251 **Funding.** The study was funded by Institut Pasteur and Research, Action Emerging Infectious
252 Diseases (REACTing), and the French Agency ANRS- Maladies Infectieuses Emergentes (ComCor
253 project). MB is funded by the ARS Grand Est. AF's laboratory receives support from the Labex
254 IBEID (ANR-10-LABX-62-IBEID) and the INCEPTION project (PIA/ANR-16-CONV-0005) for studies
255 on emerging viruses. TC is funded by the Fondation de France (Alliance "Tous unis contre le
256 virus").

257 **Conflicts of interest.** All authors: no conflict of interest to declare.

258

259

260 **References**

- 261 [1] Nguyen LH, Drew DA, Graham MS, Joshi AD, Guo C-G, Ma W, et al. Risk of COVID-19 among
262 front-line health-care workers and the general community: a prospective cohort study. *The*
263 *Lancet Public Health* 2020;5:e475–83. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S2468-2667\(20\)30164-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2468-2667(20)30164-X).
- 264 [2] Iversen K, Bundgaard H, Hasselbalch RB, Kristensen JH, Nielsen PB, Pries-Heje M, et al. Risk
265 of COVID-19 in health-care workers in Denmark: an observational cohort study. *Lancet*
266 *Infect Dis* 2020;20:1401–8. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1473-3099\(20\)30589-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1473-3099(20)30589-2).
- 267 [3] World Health Organization. The impact of COVID-19 on health and care workers: a closer
268 look at deaths. World Health Organization; 2021.
- 269 [4] Recensement national des cas de COVID-19 chez les professionnels en établissements de
270 santé. [https://www.santepubliquefrance.fr/etudes-et-enquetes/recensement-national-](https://www.santepubliquefrance.fr/etudes-et-enquetes/recensement-national-des-cas-de-covid-19-chez-les-professionnels-en-etablissements-de-sante)
271 [des-cas-de-covid-19-chez-les-professionnels-en-etablissements-de-sante](https://www.santepubliquefrance.fr/etudes-et-enquetes/recensement-national-des-cas-de-covid-19-chez-les-professionnels-en-etablissements-de-sante).
- 272 [5] Eyre DW, Lumley SF, O’Donnell D, Campbell M, Sims E, Lawson E, et al. Differential
273 occupational risks to healthcare workers from SARS-CoV-2 observed during a prospective
274 observational study. *Elife* 2020;9. <https://doi.org/10.7554/eLife.60675>.
- 275 [6] Lentz RJ, Colt H, Chen H, Cordovilla R, Popevic S, Tahura S, et al. Assessing coronavirus
276 disease 2019 (COVID-19) transmission to healthcare personnel: The global ACT-HCP case-
277 control study. *Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol* 2021;42:381–7.
278 <https://doi.org/10.1017/ice.2020.455>.
- 279 [7] Weinberger T, Steffen J, Osterman A, Mueller TT, Muenchhoff M, Wratil PR, et al.
280 Prospective Longitudinal Serosurvey of Health Care Workers in the First Wave of the SARS-
281 CoV-2 Pandemic in a Quaternary Care Hospital in Munich, Germany. *Clin Infect Dis*
282 2021;73:e3055–65. <https://doi.org/10.1093/cid/ciaa1935>.

- 283 [8] Li J, Huang DQ, Zou B, Yang H, Hui WZ, Rui F, et al. Epidemiology of COVID-19: A systematic
284 review and meta-analysis of clinical characteristics, risk factors, and outcomes. *J Med Virol*
285 2021;93:1449–58. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jmv.26424>.
- 286 [9] Contejean A, Leporrier J, Canouï E, Fourgeaud J, Mariaggi A-A, Alby-Laurent F, et al.
287 Transmission Routes of Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 Among
288 Healthcare Workers of a French University Hospital in Paris, France. *Open Forum Infect Dis*
289 2021;8:ofab054. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ofid/ofab054>.
- 290 [10] Howard-Anderson J, Adams C, Sherman AC, Dube WC, Smith TC, Edupuganti N, et al.
291 Occupational Risk Factors for SARS-CoV-2 Infection among Healthcare Personnel: A Cross-
292 Sectional Analysis of Subjects Enrolled in the COPE Study. *Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol*
293 2021;1–20. <https://doi.org/10.1017/ice.2021.54>.
- 294 [11] Bartoszko JJ, Farooqi MAM, Alhazzani W, Loeb M. Medical masks vs N95 respirators for
295 preventing COVID-19 in healthcare workers: A systematic review and meta-analysis of
296 randomized trials. *Influenza Other Respir Viruses* 2020;14:365–73.
297 <https://doi.org/10.1111/irv.12745>.
- 298 [12] Chu DK, Akl EA, Duda S, Solo K, Yaacoub S, Schünemann HJ, et al. Physical distancing, face
299 masks, and eye protection to prevent person-to-person transmission of SARS-CoV-2 and
300 COVID-19: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Lancet* 2020;395:1973–87.
301 [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(20\)31142-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(20)31142-9).
- 302 [13] Abbas M, Goto M, Tartari E, Perencevich E, Pittet D. Revisiting the evidence for physical
303 distancing, face masks, and eye protection. *The Lancet* 2021;398:661–3.
304 [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(21\)01739-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(21)01739-6).
- 305 [14] Al-Kuwari MG, AbdulMalik MA, Al-Nuaimi AA, Abdulmajeed J, Al-Romaihi HE, Semaan S, et
306 al. Epidemiology Characteristics of COVID-19 Infection Amongst Primary Health Care

- 307 Workers in Qatar: March-October 2020. *Front Public Health* 2021;9:679254.
308 <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpubh.2021.679254>.
- 309 [15] Ladhani SN, Chow JY, Janarthanan R, Fok J, Crawley-Boevey E, Vusirikala A, et al. Increased
310 risk of SARS-CoV-2 infection in staff working across different care homes: enhanced CoVID-
311 19 outbreak investigations in London care Homes. *J Infect* 2020;81:621–4.
312 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jinf.2020.07.027>.
- 313 [16] Galmiche S, Charmet T, Schaeffer L, Paireau J, Grant R, Chény O, et al. Exposures associated
314 with SARS-CoV-2 infection in France: A nationwide online case-control study. *Lancet Reg
315 Health Eur* 2021;7:100148. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lanepe.2021.100148>.
- 316 [17] Charmet T, Schaeffer L, Grant R, Galmiche S, Chény O, Von Platen C, et al. Impact of
317 original, B.1.1.7, and B.1.351/P.1 SARS-CoV-2 lineages on vaccine effectiveness of two
318 doses of COVID-19 mRNA vaccines: Results from a nationwide case-control study in France.
319 *Lancet Reg Health Eur* 2021;8:100171. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lanepe.2021.100171>.
- 320 [18] Grant R, Charmet T, Schaeffer L, Galmiche S, Madec Y, Von Platen C, et al. Impact of SARS-
321 CoV-2 Delta variant on incubation, transmission settings and vaccine effectiveness: Results
322 from a nationwide case-control study in France. *The Lancet Regional Health - Europe*
323 2021:100278. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lanepe.2021.100278>.
- 324 [19] Hall VJ, Foulkes S, Saei A, Andrews N, Oguti B, Charlett A, et al. COVID-19 vaccine coverage
325 in health-care workers in England and effectiveness of BNT162b2 mRNA vaccine against
326 infection (SIREN): a prospective, multicentre, cohort study. *Lancet* 2021;397:1725–35.
327 [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(21\)00790-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(21)00790-X).
- 328 [20] Sims MD, Maine GN, Childers KL, Podolsky RH, Voss DR, Berkiw-Scenna N, et al. COVID-19
329 seropositivity and asymptomatic rates in healthcare workers are associated with job

- 330 function and masking. *Clin Infect Dis* 2021;73:S154–62.
- 331 <https://doi.org/10.1093/cid/ciaa1684>.
- 332 [21] Tian C, Lovrics O, Vaisman A, Chin KJ, Tomlinson G, Lee Y, et al. Risk factors and protective
333 measures for healthcare worker infection during highly infectious viral respiratory
334 epidemics: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol* 2021;1–
335 102. <https://doi.org/10.1017/ice.2021.18>.
- 336 [22] Covid-19, infection par le SARS-CoV-2. [https://www.sf2h.net/publications/coronavirus-](https://www.sf2h.net/publications/coronavirus-2019-ncov)
337 2019-ncov.
- 338 [23] Szajek K, Fleisch F, Hutter S, Risch M, Bechmann T, Luyckx VA, et al. Healthcare institutions’
339 recommendation regarding the use of FFP-2 masks and SARS-CoV-2 seropositivity among
340 healthcare workers: a multicenter longitudinal cohort study. *Antimicrobial Resistance &*
341 *Infection Control* 2022;11:6. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13756-021-01047-x>.
- 342 [24] Byambasuren O, Beller E, Clark J, Collignon P, Glasziou P. The effect of eye protection on
343 SARS-CoV-2 transmission: a systematic review. *Antimicrobial Resistance & Infection*
344 *Control* 2021;10:156. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13756-021-01025-3>.
- 345 [25] Alzunitan MA, Perencevich EN, Edmond MB. Assessing health care worker perceptions of
346 face coverings during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Am J Infect Control* 2021;49:521–2.
347 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ajic.2020.09.006>.
- 348 [26] En 2020, trois Ehpad sur quatre ont eu au moins un résident infecté par la Covid-19 |
349 Direction de la recherche, des études, de l’évaluation et des statistiques.
350 [https://drees.solidarites-sante.gouv.fr/publications/etudes-et-resultats/en-2020-trois-](https://drees.solidarites-sante.gouv.fr/publications/etudes-et-resultats/en-2020-trois-ehpad-sur-quatre-ont-eu-au-moins-un-resident-infecte)
351 [ehpad-sur-quatre-ont-eu-au-moins-un-resident-infecte](https://drees.solidarites-sante.gouv.fr/publications/etudes-et-resultats/en-2020-trois-ehpad-sur-quatre-ont-eu-au-moins-un-resident-infecte).
- 352 [27] Hashan MR, Smoll N, King C, Ockenden-Muldoon H, Walker J, Wattiaux A, et al.
353 Epidemiology and clinical features of COVID-19 outbreaks in aged care facilities: A

354 systematic review and meta-analysis. *EClinicalMedicine* 2021;33:100771.

355 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eclinm.2021.100771>.

356 [28] He J, Guo Y, Mao R, Zhang J. Proportion of asymptomatic coronavirus disease 2019: A

357 systematic review and meta-analysis. *J Med Virol* 2021;93:820–30.

358 <https://doi.org/10.1002/jmv.26326>.

359 [29] Nishiura H, Ito K, Anzai A, Kobayashi T, Piantham C, Rodríguez-Morales AJ. Relative

360 Reproduction Number of SARS-CoV-2 Omicron (B.1.1.529) Compared with Delta Variant in

361 South Africa. *Journal of Clinical Medicine* 2022;11:30.

362 <https://doi.org/10.3390/jcm11010030>.

363

364 **Table 1.** Study population and infection determinants: description and results of the univariable and multivariable conditional logistic
 365 regression analyses adjusted to the week of inclusion.

Characteristic	Cases n = 2076	Controls n = 2076	aOR (95% CI)	
			Univariable analysis	Multivariable analysis
Characteristic				
Age category, years				
[18–28]	281 (14)	281 (14)		
[29–38]	639 (31)	639 (31)		
[39–48]	616 (30)	616 (30)		
[49+]	540 (26)	540 (26)		
Female sex	1762 (85)	1762 (85)		
At least one comorbidity ^a	305 (15)	235 (11)	1.38 (1.10–1.74)	1.28 (0.92–1.78)
Smoker	367 (18)	337 (16)	1.21 (0.98–1.49)	0.82 (0.60–1.11)
COVID-19 immunization				
None	1552 (75)	817 (39)	Reference	Reference
Partial	312 (15)	532 (26)	0.30 (0.24–0.38)	0.30 (0.22–0.40)
Complete	206 (10)	720 (35)	0.21 (0.16–0.27)	0.19 (0.14–0.27)
Healthcare sector				
Hospital	694 (33)	800 (39)	Reference	Reference
Long-term-care facility	372 (18)	291 (14)	1.58 (1.25–2.01)	1.11 (0.77–1.61)
Primary care	1010 (49)	985 (47)	1.14 (0.96–1.36)	1.70 (1.28–2.26)
HCWs Professional category				
Medical professions	174 (8)	552 (27)	Reference	Reference
Nurses	451 (22)	401 (19)	5.87 (4.30–8.02)	3.79 (2.50–5.76)
Nurse’s assistants	357 (17)	126 (6)	14.2 (9.81–20.4)	9.08 (5.30–15.5)
Others	1094 (53)	997 (48)	4.22 (3.23–5.51)	2.16 (1.52–3.08)
Exposures during the 10 days preceding inclusion				
Regular COVID-19 patient-facing activities	393 (19)	285 (14)	1.63 (1.31–2.03)	2.37 (1.66–3.40)
Exposure to an infected colleague ^b	339 (17)	111 (5)	3.31 (2.48–4.43)	2.26 (1.53–3.33)
Exposure to an infected person outside of work ^b	434 (22)	47 (2)	11.3 (7.74–16.6)	19.9 (12.4–31.9)
Professional cluster (patients and/or HCWs) ^b	376 (19)	172 (8)	2.70 (2.09–3.49)	2.14 (1.50–3.06)

For COVID-19 patients care^c, systematic use of

Mask type				
Surgical facemask	331 (30)	253 (25)	—	—
Cloth mask	8 (<1)	4 (<1)	1.46 (0.35–6.14)	1.67 (0.18–15.8)
N95 respirator	749 (69)	741 (74)	0.64 (0.50–0.83)	0.85 (0.55–1.29)
Gloves	883 (81)	725 (73)	1.37 (1.06–1.78)	1.44 (0.87–2.39)
Eye protection (goggles or faceshield)	653 (60)	692 (69)	0.58 (0.46–0.73)	0.57 (0.37–0.87)
Gown	813 (75)	803 (81)	0.68 (0.52–0.89)	0.58 (0.34–0.97)
Apron	625 (57)	521 (52)	1.29 (1.03–1.62)	1.47 (1.00–2.18)
Did not care to COVID-19 patients	988 (48)	1078 (52)	—	—

366 Results are presented as number (%), and adjusted odds ratios [aOR] (95% confidence intervals [CI]).

367 ^aComorbidity among: diabetes, arterial hypertension, myocardial infarction and/or chronic pulmonary disease.

368 ^bAnalysis computed with multiple imputations for missing data.

369 ^cFor personal protective equipment use, percentages were calculated based on the number of HCWs who cared to COVID-19 patients during
 370 the 10 past days (1088 cases and 998 controls).

371

372

373

374

375

376

377

378

379


380

381 **Figure legends**

382

383 **Figure 1.** Flow chart of study participants. HCWs, healthcare workers; IPSOS, French marketing-
384 research and public-opinion specialist.

385 **Figure 2.** Weekly number of inclusions of cases (red bars) and controls (blue bars). The black line
386 shows the weekly number of laboratory-confirmed cases reported in France throughout the
387 study period (source: *Santé Publique France*).



medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.02.26.22271545>; this version posted February 27, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

