

1 Assessing the spatial-temporal risks of SARS-CoV-2 infection for healthcare-
2 workers in the hospital using behavioural indices from routine data

3 Jared Wilson-Aggarwal¹, Nick Gotts¹, Kellyn Arnold¹, Moira J Spyer^{2,3}, Catherine F Houlihan^{2,4}, Eleni
4 Nastouli^{2,3,†}, Ed Manley^{1*}

5 *Corresponding author

6 †Eleni Nastouli on behalf of the SAFER investigators

7 ¹School of Geography, University of Leeds, Woodhouse, Leeds LS2 9JT, United Kingdom

8 ²Department of Clinical Virology, University College London Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust, London,
9 UK

10 ³Department of Infection, Immunity and Inflammation, UCL GOS Institute of Child Health University
11 College London, London, UK

12 ⁴Department of Infection and Immunity, University College London, London, United Kingdom

13

14 *Key words: Infection risk, nosocomial infections, Healthcare-workers, COVID-19, Mobility, Patient*
15 *contacts, Infection control*

16

17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29

Abstract

The COVID-19 pandemic has emphasised the need to rapidly assess infection risks for healthcare workers within the hospital environment. Using data from the first year of the pandemic, we investigated whether an individual’s COVID-19 test result was associated with behavioural markers derived from routinely collected hospital data two weeks prior to a test. The temporal and spatial context of behaviours were important, with the highest risks of infection during the first wave, for staff in contact with a greater number of patients and those with greater levels of activity on floors handling the majority of COVID-19 patients. Infection risks were higher for BAME staff and individuals working more shifts. Night shifts presented higher risks of infection between waves of COVID-19 patients. Our results demonstrate the epidemiological relevance of deriving markers of staff behaviour from electronic records, which extend beyond COVID-19 with applications for other communicable diseases and in supporting pandemic preparedness.

30 *Introduction*

31 The rapid spread of the severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2), that caused
32 the COVID-19 pandemic, has challenged the resilience of healthcare systems. The need to protect
33 front-line medical staff was quickly acknowledged, whereby healthcare workers (HCWs) were
34 identified as three times more likely to test positive for COVID-19 than the general public (Nguyen et
35 al., 2020). While the global prevalence of infection in HCWs has been estimated at 11% (Gómez-
36 Ochoa et al., 2021), there was considerable variation in the early stages of the pandemic with one
37 London hospital reporting infection in 44% of staff (Houlihan et al., 2020). SARS-CoV-2 infection can
38 be acquired by HCWs from their family and from the community, but they are also at risk of infection
39 within the healthcare environment, where the modes of transmission are no different; aerosols,
40 droplets and direct contact (Rahman et al., 2020). Protecting our front-line HCWs and patients by
41 preventing SARS-CoV-2 infection is a priority for hospitals, and requires an understanding of the risks
42 associated with transmission.

43 In the community, the transmission dynamics of SARS-CoV-2 depend on the frequency and duration
44 of contacts between infectious and susceptible individuals, which are somewhat determined by their
45 mobility (Buckee et al., 2021). Community level interventions that focus on reducing the movements
46 and contact rates of individuals have been successful in reducing transmission (Nouvellet et al.,
47 2021), as these social forces underpin transmission dynamics (Arthur et al., 2017). However, in the
48 healthcare environment, similar interventions are less appropriate or practical as HCWs are required
49 to have contact with patients. Nosocomial transmission of communicable diseases, such as SARS-
50 CoV-2, is prevented through infection prevention and control (IPC) measures; that allow HCWs to
51 safely conduct their work without the need to significantly reduce their within hospital mobility or
52 patient contacts (Ahmad & Osei, 2021). Examples of IPC measures in hospitals include the use of
53 personal protective equipment (PPE), administrative controls (e.g. staff cohorting) and
54 environmental controls (e.g. controlling air flow).

55 Surges in hospital admissions of COVID-19 patients resulted in stretched resources (Hoernke et al.,
56 2021; Mantelakis et al., 2021; Sen-Crowe et al., 2021) made worse by staff shortages (Appleby, 2021;
57 Edge et al., 2022), both of which can compromise IPC activities. In these circumstances, the risk of
58 infection for HCWs will depend not only on variations in the capacity to adhere to IPC policies, but
59 also on the contact rates and mobility of individuals (Arthur et al., 2017). When events such as
60 outbreaks and pandemics perturb the healthcare system in a way that negates IPC, there is a need
61 to rapidly assess and monitor the risk of infection for staff.

62 During the early stages of the pandemic, risk factors for HCWs testing positive for COVID-19 included
63 the lack of appropriate PPE (Kua et al., 2021; Paris et al., 2022), being of Black, Asian or minority
64 ethnicity (BAME; Otu et al., 2020), working in doctor, nursing or healthcare assistant roles (Akinbami
65 et al., 2021; Calcagno et al., 2021; Galanis et al., 2021; Gómez-Ochoa et al., 2021; Kua et al., 2021;
66 Piccoli et al., 2021; Rudberg et al., 2020; Zheng et al., 2020) and working night shifts (Rizza et al.,
67 2021). There is also evidence for spatial variation in the risk of infection, whereby staff working on
68 COVID-19 wards were more likely to test positive (Akinbami et al., 2021; Galanis et al., 2021; Gómez-
69 Ochoa et al., 2021; Piccoli et al., 2021; Zheng et al., 2020), but there have been relatively few
70 investigations into how HCW mobility and patient contacts within the healthcare environment
71 influences the risk of infection; likely owing to the scarcity of data on HCW behaviour. To our
72 knowledge, no studies have been conducted on HCW mobility, while studies on variations in patient
73 engagement have contrasting results, with some finding higher risks for HCWs with more frequent
74 contact with COVID-19 patients (Akinbami et al., 2021; Kua et al., 2021), and others finding either no
75 difference or lower risks for those interacting with COVID-19 patients (Korth et al., 2020; Paris et al.,
76 2022). Intuitively, the current evidence suggests HCW behaviour in the workplace can determine
77 their risk of infection, however, routinely collected data sources of HCW activity are underutilised,
78 yet their inclusion in risk models could facilitate rapid risk assessments during disease outbreaks.

79 We have previously outlined how routinely collected hospital data, in the form of security door logs
80 and electronic medical records, readily provide indicators for HCW behaviour within the hospital
81 (Wilson-Aggarwal et al., 2022). In this manuscript we investigate whether or not behavioural
82 markers for HCW mobility and patient contacts are associated with the risk of individuals testing
83 positive for COVID-19 in a London hospital during the first year of the pandemic. Distinct from
84 previous studies, this investigation demonstrates a means to rapidly assess and monitor the risk of
85 infection for all staff with evidence of activity in the hospital, while also providing insights into how
86 risk varies between discrete spatial areas and in time.

87 *Methodology*

88 *Study site and context*

89 University College London Hospital (UCLH) is a tertiary teaching hospital located in central London.

90 The main building is a 16 story structure known as the Tower, which is linked to two other buildings;
91 the Podium and the Elizabeth Garrett Anderson Wing.


92 During the COVID-19 pandemic the UCLH Tower became a key COVID-19 hospital in London. We
93 identified three stages during the first year of the pandemic between March 2020 and March 2021,
94 using the daily number of COVID-19 patients in the hospital: (1) March 1st– June 30th 2020 (i.e. the
95 ‘first wave’) when the first peak in COVID-19 admissions at the hospital was experienced and during
96 which the WHO declared a pandemic (March 11th 2020); (2) July 1st– September 30th 2020 (i.e. the
97 ‘summer lull’) when the number of COVID-19 patients in the hospital remained at a low level; and (3)
98 November 1st 2020 - March 31st 2021 (i.e. the ‘second wave’) when a subsequent peak of COVID-19
99 hospital admissions occurred and the mass-vaccination programme began (December 8th 2020).

100 Data for the month of October 2020 were discarded, as records either could not be extracted or had
101 an unusually low number of events (indicating an issue with extraction).

102 *Causal inference*

103 Using observational data to infer causal relationships is notoriously challenging, and requires
104 researchers to be explicit in their assumptions when conducting analyses (Arnold et al., 2021;
105 Laubach et al., 2021; Rohrer, 2018). To estimate the causal effect of a particular ‘exposure’ variable
106 on an outcome of interest, it is necessary to remove (or adjust for) all hypothesised associations that
107 confound the causal relationship. Directed acyclic graphs (DAGs) provide a formalised and rigorous
108 framework for estimating causal effects, since they help to identify the covariates that must be
109 adjusted for in statistical analyses and provide a transparent means for conveying a researcher’s
110 assumptions about the underlying data-generating process.

111 In this study, we aim to estimate the degree to which different factors affect the probability
112 (likelihood) of HCWs testing positive for COVID-19 during each of the three identified stages of the
113 pandemic. We adopt the formal framework provided by DAGs in order to estimate the total causal
114 effect on the outcome probability for the following observed covariates (i.e. exposures) that were
115 identified from the literature as influencing the risk of COVID-19 infection (Figure 1): age (Hu et al.,
116 2021; Li et al., 2021), ethnicity (Otu et al., 2020), job role (Akinbami et al., 2021; Calcagno et al.,
117 2021; Galanis et al., 2021; Gómez-Ochoa et al., 2021; Kua et al., 2021; Piccoli et al., 2021; Rudberg et
118 al., 2020; Zheng et al., 2020), shift patterns (Maidstone et al., 2021; Rizza et al., 2021), mobility and
119 space use in the hospital (Akinbami et al., 2021; Galanis et al., 2021; Gómez-Ochoa et al., 2021;
120 Piccoli et al., 2021; Zheng et al., 2020), and patient contacts (Akinbami et al., 2021; Kua et al., 2021).
121 Crucially, two assumptions are made: (a) that a HCWs level of patient engagement is determined by
122 their role and shifts, and (b) that their mobility and space use is a product of the patients they are
123 required to see. In the supplementary methods we provide the adopted DAG with notations (Figure
124 S1), detailing assumptions and justifications for hypothesised relationships between variables, and a
125 note on potential unobserved confounders.



126 **Figure 1. Directed acyclic graph (DAG).** The DAG depicts the hypothesised relationships between variables considered to influence the probability of
 127 **healthcare workers testing positive for COVID-19 (C19+).** The blue nodes represent the observed variables and the grey nodes represent unobserved
 128 variables. Arrows connecting nodes show the (directional) relationship between variables.

129 *Data sources & processing*

130 For the duration of the study UCLH staff had access to a staff testing programme that included
131 testing of combined nose/throat swabs for SARS-CoV-2 RNA by rtPCR: in the first wave this was for
132 symptomatic staff and after May 2020 it included weekly testing of asymptomatic staff. Positive and
133 negative SARS-CoV-2 PCR test results were extracted from the hospital's electronic health record
134 system. Data fields included the test result, a pseudonymous identifier for the individual and the
135 datetime for the test. The age, ethnicity and role of staff were extracted from electronic staff
136 records. Ethnicities were categorised into either BAME or white. Staff roles were categorised into
137 admin, allied health professionals, 'doctor: consultants', 'doctor: trainee', 'doctor: other' (e.g.
138 general medical practitioner), porters, cleaners, healthcare assistants, nurses, physiotherapists and
139 other clinical (e.g. pharmacist, phlebotomist and ambulance care assistant).

140 The date of each COVID-19 test was used to extract the individual's security door logs and patient
141 contacts two weeks prior to the test. The two week time period was determined based on the
142 incubation of COVID-19, which can be up to 14 days (McAloon et al., 2020), and with the assumption
143 that an individual's behaviour (within hospital mobility and patient contacts) during this time period
144 will best reflect their risk of testing positive. While we acknowledge that the actual exposure of
145 HCWs to the virus is not known (e.g. due to contact with the virus and infectious individuals in the
146 community/household, and other unrecorded contacts within the hospital), these metrics can
147 provide a proxy for within-hospital exposure. Models using metrics derived from data 7 days and 2
148 days prior to a test were also performed to test the robustness of the model we adopted; the results
149 of which are provided in the supplementary results (Table S6). While the results are similar between
150 models, we argue the model using 14 days of data is more appropriate due to the variation in
151 incubation times of the virus, and the ability to include data on individuals with less frequent shifts.
152 Data sources and data processing for metrics of HCW behaviour are described elsewhere (Wilson-
153 Aggarwal et al., 2022). Briefly, using the hospital's electronic medical record system, we extracted

154 the face to face patient contact events for all HCWs and calculated the total number of patients and
155 the total number of patient contact events. Door events were taken from the security door access
156 logs and used to calculate an individual's mobility as inferred from the total number of door events.
157 Both the door access logs and patient contacts were used to determine the total number of floors
158 HCWs were active on. The aforementioned metrics were also calculated separately for a subset of
159 the data involving only events relating to COVID-19 i.e. contacts with COVID-19 positive patients or
160 activity on COVID-19 floors. COVID-19 floors were identified as those that handled a large share
161 (>15%) of COVID-19 patients during the entire observation period; floors 1, 3, 7, 8, 9 and 10. Lastly,
162 we determined whether or not HCWs had evidence of activity on specific floors, treating each floor
163 as a binomial variable (1/0).

164 Staff rostering was not available electronically or on a centralised system for all HCW roles.
165 Therefore, to prevent the exclusion of key staff groups and to allow the inclusion of data on shift
166 patterns, we inferred the number of shifts worked in the Tower building from both logged door
167 events and patient contacts. A new shift was identified by a temporal gap between events that was
168 at least seven and a half hours. A night shift was determined by the time of the first event, whereby
169 an event between 5pm and 5am identified a night shift. We use the available roster data to conduct
170 an analysis to validate these methods and present the results in the supplementary methods (Table
171 S1). Specifically, we investigate the accuracy of using either a 4 hr, 7.5 hr or 11 hr temporal gap to
172 identify distinct working rostered shifts. We found that using a 7.5 hr gap was the most effective
173 method of correctly identifying shifts with the fewest errors.

174 We focused the analysis on HCWs who had activity in the Tower building as this was where the
175 majority of COVID-19 patients were handled. Therefore test results for individuals with no evidence
176 of activity (patient contacts and door events) in the Tower building were excluded from the analysis.
177 Test results for individuals with erroneous shift metrics were also excluded; day shifts with more
178 than one date associated with them or night shifts with more than two dates, and when the total

179 number of shifts was greater than 14. We also excluded all test results for individuals after they had
180 had a positive test.

181 *Statistical analysis*

182 Mixed-effect logistic regression models were used to investigate the probability of HCWs testing
183 positive for COVID-19. Statistical analyses were conducted in R (R Core Team, 2020) and the models
184 were built using the 'lme4' package (v1.1-18.1). All models included individual ID as a random effect;
185 the covariates included in the model as fixed effects were determined for each exposure individually
186 according to the hypothesised DAG (Figure 1; Table S2). When included in models, the number of
187 patients, number of patient contacts and the number of door events were all log transformed (base
188 2). We allowed for the effects to vary across time by including an interaction term with stage of the
189 pandemic. For post hoc comparisons the package 'emmeans' (v1.3.3) was used to estimate p-values,
190 adjusted odds ratios (OR) and 95% confidence intervals (CI). A Bonferroni correction was applied for
191 comparisons among and between groups.

192

Results

193 We analysed data for HCWs that had submitted the result of a COVID-19 test to the hospital testing
194 programme between March 2020 and March 2021, and that had logged door events and/or patient
195 contacts in the Tower building at UCLH. Data for test results from HCWs categorised as porters (n =
196 11), cleaners (n = 91) and ‘doctor: other’ (n = 98) were excluded from the analysis due to a low
197 sample size in either one or all stages of the pandemic. In total, we analysed 28,909 COVID-19 test
198 results submitted by 4,148 HCWs, of which 772 (3%) tested positive (Table 1).

199 **Table 1: Summary for the healthcare worker population studied during the first year of the COVID-**
200 **19 pandemic.** A count for the number of healthcare workers and COVID-19 test results are reported.
201 The number and percentage of positive test results are reported. A count and percentage
202 representation (of the observed population) by ethnicity and healthcare worker (HCW) role is also
203 provided.

	First wave <i>March - June 2020</i>	Summer lull <i>July - Aug 2020</i>	Second wave <i>Nov 2020 - March 2021</i>	Overall
<i>Tests</i>				
HCWs	1,890	1,850	3,118	4,148
COVID-19 tests	3,454	5,570	19,885	28,909
Positive results	383 (11%)	188 (3%)	201 (1%)	772 (3%)
<i>Ethnicity*</i>				
BAME	870 (46%)	905 (49%)	1,501 (48%)	2,024 (49%)
<i>HCW role</i>				
Admin	62 (3%)	59 (3%)	94 (3%)	134 (3%)
Allied health professional	159 (8%)	108 (6%)	190 (6%)	263 (6%)
Doctor: consultant	166 (9%)	151 (8%)	282 (9%)	364 (9%)
Doctor: trainee	155 (8%)	186 (10%)	457 (15%)	582 (14%)
Healthcare assistant	187 (10%)	231 (12%)	367 (12%)	507 (12%)
Nurse	994 (53%)	973 (53%)	1,502 (48%)	1,989 (48%)
Other: clinical	127 (7%)	102 (6%)	153 (5%)	216 (5%)
Physiotherapist	40 (2%)	40 (2%)	73 (2%)	93 (2%)

* The ethnicity of 66 HCWs was unknown

204

205 *Stage of the pandemic, Ethnicity and age*


206 The odds of HCWs testing positive for COVID-19 significantly reduced as the pandemic evolved (First
207 wave vs Summer lull: odds ratio (OR) = 2.86; 95% confidence intervals (CI) = 2.25-3.65; $p < 0.001$;
208 Summer lull Vs Second wave: OR = 3.27; CI = 2.53-4.23; $p < 0.001$). The HCWs ethnicity was
209 associated with their risk of testing positive, whereby those in the BAME group had higher odds of a
210 positive test result than those of white ethnicity (OR = 1.75; CI = 1.40-2.20; $p < 0.001$). The odds of
211 testing positive were not significantly associated with age (OR = 0.99; CI = 0.98-1.00; $p = 0.113$).

212 *Healthcare worker role*

213 The risk of testing positive for COVID-19 varied between HCW roles (Figure 2A, Table S3-5) however,
214 statistically significant differences were only observed for a few contrasts during the summer lull and
215 second wave. Compared to healthcare assistants, the odds of testing positive were lower for allied
216 health professionals (Summer lull: OR = 0.20; CI = 0.05-0.84; $p = 0.012$), consultants (Summer lull: OR
217 = 0.20; CI = 0.04-0.90; $p = 0.023$; Second wave: OR = 0.13; CI = 0.02-0.91; $p = 0.030$) and trainee
218 doctors (Summer lull: OR = 0.12; CI = 0.02-0.69; $p = 0.004$). The majority of HCW roles had higher
219 odds of a positive test result in earlier stages of the pandemic (Table S6), but a noteworthy
220 exception was healthcare assistants, which was the only role with no significant reduction in the
221 odds of testing positive between the first wave and summer lull (OR = 1.51; CI = 0.78-2.92; $p =$
222 0.398).

223 *Shifts*

224 During the first wave and summer lull, the risk of a positive test result increased with every
225 additional shift worked, but no significant effect was observed during the second wave (Figure 2B).
226 During the summer lull, a relative increase in the number of night shifts HCWs worked (increasing
227 ratio of night shifts to day shifts worked) resulted in higher risks of testing positive for COVID-19, but
228 no significant effect was identified in the first or second waves (Figure 2C).



229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238

Figure 2. The probability of a positive COVID-19 test result for different healthcare worker roles and working patterns during the first year of the COVID-19 pandemic. Estimates (and 95% confidence intervals) are plotted from a mixed effects logistic regression for the first wave (orange), summer lull (purple) and second wave (green). Panel A shows the probability of testing positive for different healthcare worker roles, panel B for the total number of shifts worked two weeks prior to taking a COVID-19 test, and panel C for the relative number of night shifts worked. For plots B & C, the estimated odds ratio, 95% confidence interval and statistical significance (as indicated by asterisks; *p < 0.05; **p < 0.01; ***p < 0.001) are reported.


239 *Number of patients*

240 Throughout the pandemic the risk of HCWs testing positive for COVID-19 increased with the number
241 of patients they had contact with (Figure 3A). During the first wave, a relative increase in the number
242 of COVID-19 positive patients contacted by HCWs (increasing ratio of the number of COVID-19
243 patients seen to the number of patients seen that were not known to have COVID-19) resulted in
244 lower risks of a positive test result (Figure 3B). In contrast, there was no significant effect in the
245 summer lull while, during the second wave, the risk of HCWs testing positive was positively
246 associated with a relative increase in the number of COVID-19 patients they had contact with.

247 *Number of patient interactions*

248 The total number of patient contact events was negatively associated with the risk of HCWs testing
249 positive for COVID-19 during the first wave, but no significant effect was identified in the summer
250 lull or second wave (Figure 3C). A relative increase in the number of contact events HCWs had with
251 COVID-19 positive patients (increasing ratio of contacts with COVID-19 patients to contacts with
252 patients not know to have COVID-19) was associated with a reduced risk of testing positive during
253 the first wave (Figure 3D). No significant effect was identified during the summer lull or second
254 wave.

255



256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266

Figure 3. The relationship between patient contact and the probability of healthcare workers testing positive for COVID-19 during the first year of the COVID-19 pandemic. Estimates (and 95% confidence intervals) from a mixed effects logistic regression are plotted for the first wave (orange), summer lull (purple) and second wave (green). Plots A & C show the effect of the total number of patients and total number of patient contact events on the probability of a positive test result. Plots B & D show the same effects, but metrics are derived from contact events with only patients identified as COVID-19 positive and is relative to the total number of patients/contacts. Odds ratios, statistical significance (as indicated by asterisks; *p < 0.05; **p < 0.01; ***p < 0.001) and 95% confidence intervals are also reported. For all plots the x-axis is on a logged scale (base 2).

267 *Evidence of activity on floors*

268 When considering whether or not HCWs had evidence of activity on specific floors (at least one
269 patient contact or door event) during the first wave, activity on the majority of COVID-19 floors was
270 associated with increased odds of testing positive compared to when HCWs had no evidence of
271 activity on the focal floor (Figure 4A). The exceptions were floor 8 (respiratory ward) that was not
272 associated with any change in the odds of a positive test result, and floor 3 (critical care) where
273 evidence of activity provided a protective effect. Of the non COVID-19 floors, activity on the ground
274 floor (ED) was associated with higher odds of a positive test result.

275 During the summer lull and of the COVID-19 floors, evidence of activity was only associated with
276 higher odds of a positive test result on floor 1 (AMU) and floor 10 (CoE). Activity on floor 3 continued
277 to provide a protective effect, as did evidence of activity on some non COVID-19 floors (11, 13, 14
278 and 16). Higher odds of testing positive persisted for HCWs with evidence of activity on the ground
279 floor. During the second wave, the odds of a positive test result were no longer significantly
280 associated with HCWs having evidence of activity on any floor.

281 *Number of floors*


282 The total number of floors HCWs were active on did not significantly influence the risk of a positive
283 test result in any stage of the pandemic (Figure 4B). However, the spatial context of activity was
284 important, whereby a relative increase in the number of COVID-19 floors HCWs were active on
285 (increasing ratio of the number of COVID-19 floors to the number of non COVID-19 floors) resulted in
286 higher risks of a positive test result during the first wave and summer lull (Figure 4C). No statistically
287 significant effect was found in the second wave.

288 *Number of door events*

289 The total number of door events logged by HCWs two weeks prior to a COVID-19 test had no
290 significant effect on the odds of HCWs testing positive in any stage of the pandemic (Figure 4D). A

291 relative increase in the number of door events on COVID-19 floors (increasing ratio of the number of
292 door events on COVID-19 floors to the number of events on non COVID-19 floors) resulted in greater
293 risks of HCWs testing positive during the first wave and summer lull (Figure 4E). No significant effect
294 was observed during the second wave.

295



296 **Figure 4. The relationship between healthcare worker mobility and the risk of testing positive for**
 297 **COVID-19 during the first year of the COVID-19 pandemic.** Odds ratios, statistical significance (*p <
 298 0.05; **p < 0.01; ***p < 0.001) and 95% confidence intervals are estimated from mixed effects
 299 logistic regression models, and plotted separately for the first wave (orange), summer lull (purple)
 300 and second wave (green). Panel A is a forest plot showing the odds of a positive test when
 301 healthcare workers had evidence of activity on a specific floor vs no activity on the floor. Floors that
 302 handled the majority of COVID-19 patients (>15%) are identified by darker circles, and floor 4 was
 303 excluded due to a lack of clinical spaces. Panel B & C show the estimated probability of testing
 304 positive for the total number of floors and COVID-19 floors that individuals were active on
 305 respectively. Panels D & E show the estimated probability of testing positive for the number of door
 306 events on all floors and on COVID-19 floors respectively. The x-axis of panels D & E are on a logged
 307 scale (base 2).

308

Discussion

309 We have documented the spatial-temporal variation in the risk of SARS-CoV-2 infection for HCWs at
310 a London hospital during the first year of the pandemic. Using routinely collected data we generated
311 simple markers for the within hospital mobility and patient contacts of staff two weeks prior to a
312 COVID-19 test. The association between the infection status of HCWs and their level of patient
313 contact or movement around the hospital was context dependent, and demonstrated significant
314 variations in space and time. Our results show the highest risk of infection among staff was during
315 the first wave of COVID-19 hospital admissions; for HCWs that worked a greater number of shifts,
316 had contact with a greater number of patients and that had higher levels of mobility on and between
317 floors that handled the majority of COVID-19 patients. We also corroborate the findings of previous
318 studies whereby the ethnicity, occupational role and shifts of HCWs were identified as important
319 determinants of infection status.

320 The only temporally consistent behavioural predictor for a HCWs COVID-19 infection status was the
321 total number of patients they had contact with, which had a positive relationship with the likelihood
322 of testing positive. In contrast and during the first wave, HCWs whose work focused more on COVID-
323 19 patients (both in terms of the number of patients and number of patient contacts) were less likely
324 to test positive, but this protective effect was not observed in later stages of the pandemic, with the
325 risk of infection during the second wave increasing the more HCW contacts were focused on COVID-
326 19 patients. The inconsistency of this effect is also reflected in the literature (Akinbami et al., 2021;
327 Korth et al., 2020; Kua et al., 2021), and our results point towards the importance of considering
328 changing circumstances as the pandemic evolves in time. These circumstances may include factors
329 unobserved in this study, such as shifts in the perception of risk (Vindrola-Padros et al., 2020),
330 changes to IPC policy and/or challenges relating to IPC activities, such as the supply of PPE or staff
331 shortages (Edge et al., 2022; Sen-Crowe et al., 2021).

332 HCW mobility within the hospital was a strong indicator for their risk of infection and, inline with
333 previous studies, the context of HCW movements was important (Galanis et al., 2021; Gómez-Ochoa
334 et al., 2021; Piccoli et al., 2021). The risk of a positive COVID-19 test result increased with the
335 number of COVID-19 floors HCWs were active on and the number of door events they had on these
336 floors. The number of COVID-19 floors HCWs were active on provides a measure of their exposure to
337 viral hotspots in space, which is intuitively linked to the risk of infection. The relevance of the
338 number of door events is less obvious, but this metric is an indicator for the frequency of
339 movements in and out of COVID-19 hotspots, which may provide a proxy for other high-risk activities
340 such as the need to don and doff PPE or contact with high touch objects (Tian et al., 2020).

341 Evidence of activity (at least one patient contact or door event) on a COVID-19 floor was enough to
342 identify HCWs with increased risks of testing positive during the first wave. Contrary to this, activity
343 on two of the COVID-19 floors had no association with increased infection risks; activity on the
344 respiratory ward had no effect and, as reported in other studies, activity on the critical care ward
345 provided protection against infection (Shields et al., 2020; Zheng et al., 2020). Given the needs of the
346 patient population on these floors, the layout and facilities would have been better equipped for IPC
347 activities relating to COVID-19 e.g. side rooms to isolate infectious patients, systems for controlled
348 airflow, appropriate PPE and suitable supplies. The only non COVID-19 floor to be associated with
349 higher infection risks was the emergency department, likely owing to the need to triage patients not
350 yet identified as COVID-19 positive or that were asymptomatic. The spatial variation in the risk of
351 infection became less salient as the pandemic progressed, and was non-existent by the second
352 wave, presumably due to improved IPC policies and activities across the hospital.

353 Previous studies have found that doctors, nurses and healthcare assistants are more likely to
354 contract COVID-19 than other occupational roles (Akinbami et al., 2021; Calcagno et al., 2021;
355 Galanis et al., 2021; Gómez-Ochoa et al., 2021; Kua et al., 2021; Piccoli et al., 2021; Rudberg et al.,
356 2020; Zheng et al., 2020), and in this investigation healthcare assistants were more at risk than other

357 groups, but this was only after the first wave and in contrast to a few roles. A more conspicuous
358 result was that the number of shifts worked two weeks prior to a COVID-19 test (a proxy for the
359 general exposure of individuals to the hospital environment) had a positive relationship with the
360 likelihood of testing positive. What's more, individuals that primarily worked night shifts during the
361 summer lull were at higher risk of infection. While night shifts have been previously identified as a
362 risk factor (Rizza et al., 2021), the reason behind this is unclear. Possible explanations include higher
363 workloads due to lower staffing levels or fewer senior staff to support/supervise IPC activities. The
364 exposure of HCWs to infectious agents will depend on the characteristics of a shift, and shifts will
365 vary in their obligate tasks, therefore investigations into shift profiles for HCW behaviour and the risk
366 of infection would provide further insight into how to better protect staff.

367 This investigation is not without limitations, one of which is the use of retrospective observational
368 data that may contain sources of bias. Despite using a causal modelling framework and explicitly
369 stating our hypotheses and assumptions (Figure 1 & supplementary methods), the use of
370 observational data introduces unobserved confounding effects that limit causal claims. We utilised
371 data from the hospital's staff testing programme and the testing policy was not consistent
372 throughout the observation period. It is possible that the sample of HCWs taking tests is biased in
373 time and towards those with symptoms as, even when asymptomatic testing policies were
374 introduced in May 2020, tests were taken at the HCWs own discretion. We were also unable to
375 measure an individuals exposure to the community or confirm if infection was acquired through
376 nosocomial transmission (which would require sequencing data). That said, our results are inline
377 with that of previous studies, and we expect infections resulting from community transmission to
378 add noise to the data.

379 A second limitation is in the need to validate behavioural metrics derived from the routinely
380 collected data, as biases may exist due to variations in how HCWs log door events and patient
381 contacts. Studies into the processes underlying the generation of the routinely collected data will

382 help to identify occupational roles that are misrepresented and nuances important for the
383 interpretation of results. In addition, since no centralised electronic rostering database existed, we
384 used the routinely collected data to infer the number of shifts worked, an imperfect method (see
385 supplementary methods). However, the rostering database also showed evidence of errors, whereby
386 some shifts labelled as not working had evidence of staff activity in the hospital. Therefore it may be
387 best to integrate rostering records with data on staff behaviour within the hospital to provide a
388 more accurate measure of worked shifts.

389 In conclusion, indicators for the within hospital mobility and patient contacts of HCWs can provide
390 insights into the spatial-temporal variations in the risks of infection for staff. These risks will be most
391 pertinent when healthcare systems are perturbed i.e. during outbreaks of disease and the early
392 stages of a pandemic. The relevance of the data sources and models presented in this investigation
393 extend beyond COVID-19, and can be applied to other communicable diseases (e.g. influenza and
394 norovirus), adapted to consider specific transmission pathways (e.g. particular procedures) and
395 expanded to include data on variables unobserved in this study (e.g. PPE supply). Provided staff
396 testing programmes are in place, digital hospitals have the capability to rapidly assess the infection
397 risk for all staff working on site, in addition to monitoring how risks change between spatially distinct
398 areas of the hospital and in time. Translating these analyses of risk into tools (apps, dashboards and
399 early warning systems) for routine IPC surveillance will not only help to better protect front-line
400 HCWs and patients, but also in supporting pandemic preparedness.

401

402 *Acknowledgements*

403 This study was supported by the UCLH/UCL NIHR Biomedical Research Centre and funding from the
404 UKRI MRC (grant ref: MC_PC_19082) , and UCLH Charity. For their support we thank the UCLH
405 medical directors Charles House and Gill Gaskin, Pushpsen Joshi at the Joint Research Office, Nathan
406 Lea from the UCLH information governance department, Leila Hail from the UCLH infection control
407 department, Wai Keong Wong, Chris Liddington, Simon Knight, Richard Clarke, David Ramlakhan,
408 David Thompson and Gareth Adams at the UCLH digital services department, Patricia Miralhes and
409 Emily Martyn and all involved with the SAFER research programme.

410

411 *Author contributions*

412 EN, MS, CH and EM supervised the project. EN and EM designed the research. JWA, EM, KA, and NG
413 analysed the data. JWA and EM wrote the manuscript and all authors approved the final version.

414

415 *Competing interests*

416 The authors declare no competing interests.

417

418 *Data availability*

419 The data are available from UCLH but restrictions apply to protect the privacy of individuals, and the
420 data are not publicly available. Data are however available from the authors upon reasonable
421 request and with permission from UCLH.

422

423 *Ethics statement*

424 The study protocol was approved by the NHS Health Research Authority (South Central – Berkshire
425 REC ref 20/SC/0147, protocol number 130861) and ethical oversight was provided by the UCLH
426 research ethics committee (IRAS project ID: ref. 281836). UCL GOS ICH R&D approval number
427 20PL06.

428

429

References

- 430 Ahmad, I. A., & Osei, E. (2021). Occupational Health and Safety Measures in Healthcare Settings
431 during COVID-19: Strategies for Protecting Staff, Patients and Visitors. *Disaster Medicine and*
432 *Public Health Preparedness*, 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.1017/DMP.2021.294>
- 433 Akinbami, L. J., Chan, P. A., Vuong, N., Sami, S., Lewis, D., Sheridan, P. E., Lukacs, S. L., Mackey, L.,
434 Grohskopf, L. A., Patel, A., & Petersen, L. R. (2021). Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome
435 Coronavirus 2 Seropositivity among Healthcare Personnel in Hospitals and Nursing Homes,
436 Rhode Island, USA, July–August 2020 - Volume 27, Number 3—March 2021 - Emerging
437 Infectious Diseases journal - CDC. *Emerging Infectious Diseases*, 27(3), 823–834.
438 <https://doi.org/10.3201/EID2703.204508>
- 439 Appleby, J. (2021). NHS sickness absence during the covid-19 pandemic. *BMJ*, 372.
440 <https://doi.org/10.1136/BMJ.N471>
- 441 Arnold, K. F., Davies, V., De Kamps, M., Tennant, P. W. G., Mbotwa, J., & Gilthorpe, M. S. (2021).
442 Reflection on modern methods: generalized linear models for prognosis and intervention—
443 theory, practice and implications for machine learning. *International Journal of Epidemiology*,
444 49(6), 2074–2082. <https://doi.org/10.1093/IJE/DYAA049>
- 445 Arthur, R. F., Gurley, E. S., Salje, H., Bloomfield, L. S. P., & Jones, J. H. (2017). Contact structure,
446 mobility, environmental impact and behaviour: the importance of social forces to infectious
447 disease dynamics and disease ecology. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B:*
448 *Biological Sciences*, 372(1719). <https://doi.org/10.1098/RSTB.2016.0454>
- 449 Buckee, C., Noor, A., & Sattenspiel, L. (2021). Thinking clearly about social aspects of infectious
450 disease transmission. *Nature* 2021 595:7866, 595(7866), 205–213.
451 <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-021-03694-x>
- 452 Calcagno, A., Ghisetti, V., Emanuele, T., Trunfio, M., Faraoni, S., Boggione, L., Burdino, E., Audagnotto,

- 453 S., Lipani, F., Nigra, M., D'Avolio, A., Bonora, S., & Di Perri, G. (2021). Risk for SARS-CoV-2
454 Infection in Healthcare Workers, Turin, Italy - Volume 27, Number 1—January 2021 - Emerging
455 Infectious Diseases journal - CDC. *Emerging Infectious Diseases*, 27(1), 303–305.
456 <https://doi.org/10.3201/EID2701.203027>
- 457 Edge, R., Van Der Plaat, Di. A., Parsons, V., Coggon, D., Van Tongeren, M., Muiry, R., Madan, I., &
458 Cullinan, P. (2022). Changing patterns of sickness absence among healthcare workers in
459 England during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Journal of Public Health (Oxford, England)*, 44(1), E42–
460 E50. <https://doi.org/10.1093/PUBMED/FDAB341>
- 461 Galanis, P., Vraka, I., Fragkou, D., Bilali, A., & Kaitelidou, D. (2021). Seroprevalence of SARS-CoV-2
462 antibodies and associated factors in healthcare workers: a systematic review and meta-
463 analysis. *The Journal of Hospital Infection*, 108, 120–134.
464 <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.JHIN.2020.11.008>
- 465 Gómez-Ochoa, S. A., Franco, O. H., Rojas, L. Z., Raguindin, P. F., Roa-Díaz, Z. M., Wyssmann, B. M.,
466 Guevara, S. L. R., Echeverría, L. E., Glisic, M., & Muka, T. (2021). COVID-19 in Health-Care
467 Workers: A Living Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis of Prevalence, Risk Factors, Clinical
468 Characteristics, and Outcomes. *American Journal of Epidemiology*, 190(1), 161–175.
469 <https://doi.org/10.1093/AJE/KWAA191>
- 470 Hoernke, K., Djellouli, N., Andrews, L., Lewis-Jackson, S., Manby, L., Martin, S., Vanderslott, S., &
471 Vindrola-Padros, C. (2021). Frontline healthcare workers' experiences with personal protective
472 equipment during the COVID-19 pandemic in the UK: a rapid qualitative appraisal. *BMJ Open*,
473 11(1), e046199. <https://doi.org/10.1136/BMJOPEN-2020-046199>
- 474 Houlihan, C. F., Vora, N., Byrne, T., Lewer, D., Kelly, G., Heaney, J., Gandhi, S., Spyer, M. J., Beale, R.,
475 Cherepanov, P., Moore, D., Gilson, R., Gamblin, S., Kassiotis, G., McCoy, L. E., Swanton, C.,
476 Hayward, A., Nastouli, E., Aitken, J., ... Hatipoglu, E. (2020). Pandemic peak SARS-CoV-2

- 477 infection and seroconversion rates in London frontline health-care workers. *The Lancet*,
478 396(10246), e6–e7. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(20\)31484-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(20)31484-7)
- 479 Hu, P., Ma, M., Jing, Q., Ma, Y., Gan, L., Chen, Y., Liu, J., Wang, D., Zhang, Z., & Zhang, D. (2021).
480 Retrospective study identifies infection related risk factors in close contacts during COVID-19
481 epidemic. *International Journal of Infectious Diseases*, 103, 395–401.
482 <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.IJID.2020.12.011>
- 483 Korth, J., Wilde, B., Dolff, S., Anastasiou, O. E., Krawczyk, A., Jahn, M., Cordes, S., Ross, B., Esser, S.,
484 Lindemann, M., Kribben, A., Dittmer, U., Witzke, O., & Herrmann, A. (2020). SARS-CoV-2-
485 specific antibody detection in healthcare workers in Germany with direct contact to COVID-19
486 patients. *Journal of Clinical Virology*, 128, 104437. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.JCV.2020.104437>
- 487 Kua, J., Patel, R., Nurmi, E., Tian, S., Gill, H., Wong, D. J. N., Moorley, C., Nepogodiev, D., Ahmad, I., &
488 El-Boghdady, K. (2021). HealthcareCOVID: A national cross-sectional observational study
489 identifying risk factors for developing suspected or confirmed COVID-19 in UK healthcare
490 workers. *PeerJ*, 9, e10891. <https://doi.org/10.7717/PEERJ.10891/SUPP-4>
- 491 Laubach, Z. M., Murray, E. J., Hoke, K. L., Safran, R. J., & Perng, W. (2021). A biologist’s guide to
492 model selection and causal inference. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B*, 288(1943).
493 <https://doi.org/10.1098/RSPB.2020.2815>
- 494 Li, F., Li, Y. Y., Liu, M. J., Fang, L. Q., Dean, N. E., Wong, G. W. K., Yang, X. B., Longini, I., Halloran, M.
495 E., Wang, H. J., Liu, P. L., Pang, Y. H., Yan, Y. Q., Liu, S., Xia, W., Lu, X. X., Liu, Q., Yang, Y., & Xu, S.
496 Q. (2021). Household transmission of SARS-CoV-2 and risk factors for susceptibility and
497 infectivity in Wuhan: a retrospective observational study. *The Lancet Infectious Diseases*, 21(5),
498 617–628. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1473-3099\(20\)30981-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1473-3099(20)30981-6)
- 499 Maidstone, R., Anderson, S. G., Ray, D. W., Rutter, M. K., Durrington, H. J., & Blaikley, J. F. (2021).
500 Shift work is associated with positive COVID-19 status in hospitalised patients. *Thorax*, 76(6),

- 501 601–606. <https://doi.org/10.1136/THORAXJNL-2020-216651>
- 502 Mantelakis, A., Spiers, H. V. M., Lee, C. W., Chambers, A., & Joshi, A. (2021). Availability of Personal
503 Protective Equipment in NHS Hospitals During COVID-19: A National Survey. *Annals of Work
504 Exposures and Health*, 65(1), 136–140. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ANNWEH/WXAA087>
- 505 McAloon, C., Collins, Á., Hunt, K., Barber, A., Byrne, A. W., Butler, F., Casey, M., Griffin, J., Lane, E.,
506 McEvoy, D., Wall, P., Green, M., O’Grady, L., & More, S. J. (2020). Incubation period of COVID-
507 19: a rapid systematic review and meta-analysis of observational research. *BMJ Open*, 10(8),
508 e039652. <https://doi.org/10.1136/BMJOPEN-2020-039652>
- 509 Nguyen, L. H., Drew, D. A., Graham, M. S., Joshi, A. D., Guo, C. G., Ma, W., Mehta, R. S., Warner, E. T.,
510 Sikavi, D. R., Lo, C. H., Kwon, S., Song, M., Mucci, L. A., Stampfer, M. J., Willett, W. C., Eliassen,
511 A. H., Hart, J. E., Chavarro, J. E., Rich-Edwards, J. W., ... Zhang, F. (2020). Risk of COVID-19
512 among front-line health-care workers and the general community: a prospective cohort study.
513 *The Lancet Public Health*, 5(9), e475–e483. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S2468-2667\(20\)30164-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2468-2667(20)30164-X)
- 514 Nouvellet, P., Bhatia, S., Cori, A., Ainslie, K. E. C., Baguelin, M., Bhatt, S., Boonyasiri, A., Brazeau, N. F.,
515 Cattarino, L., Cooper, L. V., Coupland, H., Cucunuba, Z. M., Cuomo-Dannenburg, G., Dighe, A.,
516 Djaafara, B. A., Dorigatti, I., Eales, O. D., van Elsland, S. L., Nascimento, F. F., ... Donnelly, C. A.
517 (2021). Reduction in mobility and COVID-19 transmission. *Nature Communications* 2021 12:1,
518 12(1), 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-021-21358-2>
- 519 Otu, A., Ahinkorah, B. O., Ameyaw, E. K., Seidu, A. A., & Yaya, S. (2020). One country, two crises:
520 what Covid-19 reveals about health inequalities among BAME communities in the United
521 Kingdom and the sustainability of its health system? *International Journal for Equity in Health*,
522 19(1), 1–6. <https://doi.org/10.1186/S12939-020-01307-Z/METRICS>
- 523 Paris, C., Tadié, E., Heslan, C., Gary-Bobo, P., Oumari, S., Saade, A., Sitruk, A., Wild, P., Thibault, V.,
524 Tattevin, P., & Garlantezec, R. (2022). Risk factors for SARS-CoV-2 infection among health care

- 525 workers. *American Journal of Infection Control*, 50(4), 375–382.
- 526 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ajic.2021.11.001>
- 527 Piccoli, L., Ferrari, P., Piumatti, G., Jovic, S., Rodriguez, B. F., Mele, F., Giacchetto-Sasselli, I., Terrot,
528 T., Silacci-Fregni, C., Cameroni, E., Jaconi, S., Sprugasci, N., Bartha, I., Corti, D., Uguccioni, M.,
529 Lanzavecchia, A., Garzoni, C., Giannini, O., Bernasconi, E., ... Ceschi, A. (2021). Risk assessment
530 and seroprevalence of SARS-CoV-2 infection in healthcare workers of COVID-19 and non-
531 COVID-19 hospitals in Southern Switzerland. *The Lancet Regional Health - Europe*, 1, 100013.
532 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lanepe.2020.100013>
- 533 R Core Team. (2020). *R: A language and environment for statistical computing* (4.0.2).
534 <https://www.r-project.org/>
- 535 Rahman, H. S., Aziz, M. S., Hussein, R. H., Othman, H. H., Salih Omer, S. H., Khalid, E. S.,
536 Abdulrahman, N. A., Amin, K., & Abdullah, R. (2020). The transmission modes and sources of
537 COVID-19: A systematic review. *International Journal of Surgery Open*, 26, 125–136.
538 <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.IJSO.2020.08.017>
- 539 Rizza, S., Coppeta, L., Grelli, S., Ferrazza, G., Chiocchi, M., Vanni, G., Bonomo, O. C., Bellia, A.,
540 Andreoni, M., Magrini, A., & Federici, M. (2021). High body mass index and night shift work are
541 associated with COVID-19 in health care workers. *Journal of Endocrinological Investigation*,
542 44(5), 1097–1101. <https://doi.org/10.1007/S40618-020-01397-0/TABLES/2>
- 543 Rohrer, J. M. (2018). Thinking Clearly About Correlations and Causation: Graphical Causal Models for
544 Observational Data. 27–42. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2515245917745629>
- 545 Rudberg, A. S., Havervall, S., Månberg, A., Jernbom Falk, A., Aguilera, K., Ng, H., Gabrielsson, L.,
546 Salomonsson, A. C., Hanke, L., Murrell, B., McInerney, G., Olofsson, J., Andersson, E., Hellström,
547 C., Bayati, S., Bergström, S., Pin, E., Sjöberg, R., Tegel, H., ... Thålin, C. (2020). SARS-CoV-2
548 exposure, symptoms and seroprevalence in healthcare workers in Sweden. *Nature*

- 549 *Communications 2020 11:1, 11(1), 1–8.* <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-020-18848-0>
- 550 Sen-Crowe, B., Sutherland, M., McKenney, M., & Elkbuli, A. (2021). A Closer Look Into Global Hospital
551 Beds Capacity and Resource Shortages During the COVID-19 Pandemic. *Journal of Surgical*
552 *Research, 260*, 56–63. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.JSS.2020.11.062>
- 553 Shields, A., Faustini, S. E., Perez-Toledo, M., Jossi, S., Aldera, E., Allen, J. D., Al-Taei, S., Backhouse, C.,
554 Bosworth, A., Dunbar, L. A., Ebanks, D., Emmanuel, B., Garvey, M., Gray, J., Kidd, I. M.,
555 McGinnell, G., McLoughlin, D. E., Morley, G., O’Neill, J., ... Richter, A. G. (2020). SARS-CoV-2
556 seroprevalence and asymptomatic viral carriage in healthcare workers: a cross-sectional study.
557 *Thorax, 75(12)*, 1089–1094. <https://doi.org/10.1136/THORAXJNL-2020-215414>
- 558 Tian, Z., Stedman, M., Whyte, M., Anderson, S. G., Thomson, G., & Heald, A. (2020). Personal
559 protective equipment (PPE) and infection among healthcare workers - What is the evidence?
560 *International Journal of Clinical Practice, 74(11)*. <https://doi.org/10.1111/IJCP.13617>
- 561 Vindrola-Padros, C., Andrews, L., Dowrick, A., Djellouli, N., Fillmore, H., Bautista Gonzalez, E., Javadi,
562 D., Lewis-Jackson, S., Manby, L., Mitchinson, L., Mulcahy Symmons, S., Martin, S., Regenold, N.,
563 Robinson, H., Sumray, K., Singleton, G., Syversen, A., Vanderslott, S., & Johnson, G. (2020).
564 Perceptions and experiences of healthcare workers during the COVID-19 pandemic in the UK.
565 *BMJ Open, 10(11)*, e040503. <https://doi.org/10.1136/BMJOPEN-2020-040503>
- 566 Wilson-Aggarwal, J. K., Gotts, N., Wong, W. K., Liddington, C., Knight, S., Spyer, M. J., Houlihan, C.,
567 Nastouli, E., & Manley, E. (2022). Using routinely collected hospital data to investigate
568 healthcare worker mobility and patient contacts within a UK hospital during the COVID-19
569 pandemic. *MedRxiv*, 2022.06.10.22276247. <https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.06.10.22276247>
- 570 Zheng, C., Hafezi-Bakhtiari, N., Cooper, V., Davidson, H., Habibi, M., Riley, P., & Breathnach, A.
571 (2020). Characteristics and transmission dynamics of COVID-19 in healthcare workers at a
572 London teaching hospital. *Journal of Hospital Infection, 106(2)*, 325–329.

573 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhin.2020.07.025>

574