

1 **Staff to staff transmission as a driver of healthcare worker infections with COVID-19**

2

3 Claire L Gordon<sup>1,2</sup>, Jason A Trubiano<sup>1,3</sup>, Natasha E Holmes<sup>1,4</sup>, Kyra YL Chua<sup>1</sup>, Jeff

4 Feldman<sup>5</sup>, Greg Young<sup>6</sup>, Norelle L Sherry<sup>1,7</sup>, M Lindsay Grayson<sup>1,3</sup>, Jason C Kwong<sup>1,2</sup>

5

6 **Affiliations:**

7 1. Department of Infectious Diseases, Austin Health, Heidelberg, Australia

8 2. Department of Microbiology and Immunology, the University of Melbourne at The  
9 Peter Doherty Institute for Infection and Immunity, Melbourne, Australia

10 3. Department of Medicine, the University of Melbourne at Austin Health, Heidelberg,  
11 Australia

12 4. Department of Medicine and Radiology, the University of Melbourne, Melbourne,  
13 Australia

14 5. Arden Street Labs, Melbourne, Australia

15 6. Business Intelligence Unit, Austin Health, Melbourne Australia

16 7. Microbiological Diagnostic Unit Public Health Laboratory, Department of  
17 Microbiology and Immunology, the University of Melbourne at The Peter Doherty  
18 Institute for Infection and Immunity, Melbourne, Australia

19

20 **Corresponding author:**

21 Dr Jason Kwong – [jason.kwong@austin.org.au](mailto:jason.kwong@austin.org.au)

22 **Keywords:**

23 SARS-CoV-2; Healthcare worker infections; Outbreak; Staff break room; Staff tearoom

24 **Word count:**

25 Abstract: 209; Main article: 2486

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

26 **ABSTRACT**

27

28 **Objectives:** To investigate the COVID-19 infections among staff at our institution and  
29 determine the interventions required to prevent subsequent staff infections.

30 **Design:** Retrospective cohort study

31 **Participants and setting:** Staff working at a single tertiary referral hospital who returned a  
32 positive test result for SARS-CoV-2 between 25 January 2020 and 25 November 2020.

33 **Main outcome measures:** Source of COVID-19 infection.

34 **Results:** Of 45 staff who returned a positive test result for SARS-CoV-2, 19 were determined  
35 to be acquired at Austin Health. Fifteen (15/19; 79% [95% CI: 54–94%]) of these were  
36 identified through contact tracing and testing following exposures to other infected staff and  
37 were presumed to be staff-staff transmission, including 10 healthcare workers (HCWs) linked  
38 to a single ward that cared for COVID-19 patients. Investigation of the outbreak identified  
39 the staff tearoom as the likely location for transmission, with subsequent reduction in HCW  
40 infections and resolution of the outbreak following implementation of enhanced control  
41 measures in tearoom facilities. No HCW contacts (0/204; 0% [95% CI: 0–2%]) developed  
42 COVID-19 infection following exposure to unrecognised patients with COVID-19.

43 **Conclusions:** Unrecognised infections among staff may be a significant driver of HCW  
44 infections in healthcare settings. Control measures should be implemented to prevent  
45 acquisition from other staff as well as patient-staff transmission.

## 46 INTRODUCTION

47

48 The coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) pandemic has introduced significant challenges to  
49 the safe provision of healthcare. Healthcare workers (HCWs) are essential for the care of  
50 patients infected with COVID-19 and thereby place themselves at risk of acquiring COVID-  
51 19.<sup>1</sup> In a recent report of HCW COVID-19 infections in Victoria, Australia, the state  
52 Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) reported that 72.9% of COVID-19  
53 infections in HCWs were acquired in a healthcare setting.<sup>2</sup> High rates of HCW infections  
54 have been attributed to several factors, including inadequate personal protective equipment  
55 (PPE), exposure to large numbers or a high density of COVID-19 infected patients, poor  
56 ventilation, worker fatigue and limited access to diagnostic tests.<sup>3-8</sup> At our hospital, we  
57 observed an increase in HCW COVID-19 infections over a two-week period in July and  
58 August 2020 which predominantly involved staff working on a single ward. Here, we  
59 describe the staff infections at our institution and the interventions introduced to prevent  
60 subsequent transmission.

61

## 62 METHODS

### 63 *Setting*

64 Austin Health is a tertiary hospital in Victoria, Australia that operates >900 beds and includes  
65 state-wide transplantation and clinical specialty services. During the pandemic, several wards  
66 were repurposed as dedicated areas to cohort patients with COVID-19 and were designated  
67 “COVID wards”. Maximum patient occupancy for COVID wards was reduced from standard  
68 capacity to minimise density quotients for shared rooms, while maintaining sufficient staffing  
69 to accommodate the increased time requirements for changes of PPE and additional cleaning.  
70 Use of PPE was in accordance with state (DHHS) guidelines<sup>9, 10</sup> and included a “PPE spotter”

71 on COVID wards. Routine cleaning of COVID wards was performed in line with national  
72 guidance<sup>11</sup> and included daily cleaning and disinfection using Chloradet™ (Agar Cleaning  
73 Systems, Preston, Australia) with additional cleaning of frequently touched surfaces. All  
74 staff, visitors and patients were screened for symptoms of COVID-19 upon entry. Staff who  
75 returned a positive test to SARS-CoV-2 were required to immediately notify the Infection  
76 Prevention and Control team, the Occupational Health and Safety team, and their local  
77 manager. Samples were taken according to state and national guidelines<sup>12, 13</sup> using a  
78 combined throat and deep nasal swab. Positive test samples or an aliquot of extracted nucleic  
79 acid from positive samples were sent to the public health laboratory for genomic testing and  
80 analysis using methods previously reported.<sup>14</sup>

81

## 82 ***Data Collection***

83 All Austin Health staff who were notified to the organisation after returning a positive test by  
84 polymerase chain reaction (PCR) testing for SARS-CoV-2, irrespective of symptoms, were  
85 included in the analysis. Data from contact tracing interviews conducted at the time were  
86 included in the study with additional details sought retrospectively.

87

## 88 ***Definitions***

89 HCWs were defined as staff who had a clinical role in directly caring for patients i.e. those  
90 who had physical contact or were in close proximity (<1.5 metres) to patients. Cases were  
91 attributed to a particular source based on the criteria outlined in Supplementary Table 1.  
92 Contact definitions were taken from DHHS guidelines available at the time<sup>12</sup> and adapted for  
93 local implementation to account for the routine use of PPE by staff (Supplementary Figure 1).  
94 All staff who had unprotected exposure to confirmed cases of COVID-19 were required to be

95 tested for SARS-CoV-2 at baseline and day 11 after last exposure to an infected individual,  
96 with additional testing performed if they became symptomatic.

97

### 98 ***Statistics***

99 Statistical analysis was conducted in RStudio (R version 4.0.3). Confidence intervals for  
100 sample proportions were calculated by exact binomial distribution. Incidence rates of HCW  
101 infection for a specified group (e.g. ward or HCW type) were standardised to cases per 100  
102 patient exposure days, where the number of patient exposure days was calculated by:

103 
$$\text{Number of infected patients HCW group exposed to} \times \text{days of exposure}$$

104

### 105 ***Ethics***

106 This study was approved by Austin Health Office for Research (CD 20/011 and  
107 Audit/20/Austin/169).

108

109

## 110 **RESULTS**

111 Between 25 January 2020 and 25 November 2020, a total of 49 staff recorded a positive PCR  
112 result for SARS-CoV-2 among 8327 staff working at Austin Health (Figure 1). Of these, four  
113 staff were excluded from the analyses after an initial indeterminate result and negative results  
114 on subsequent testing. There were 45 staff infections included in the analysis, with 28/45  
115 (62% [95% CI 47–76%]) presumed to be healthcare acquired (19 Austin Health; 9 other) on  
116 the basis of the source attribution (Figure 1 and Supplementary Table 1). Of the 19 infections  
117 likely to have been acquired at Austin Health, 10/19 (53%) involved staff working on a  
118 dedicated COVID ward (“Ward A”), clustered in time around early August 2020 (Figure 2).

119

120 ***Outbreak among staff working on a dedicated COVID ward***

121 Ward A is a 32-bed general hospital ward repurposed in March 2020 to provide care to  
122 patients with confirmed COVID-19, including eight single occupancy rooms, and capacity  
123 reduced from 4 to 1–2 patients per room in six shared patient rooms. The ward’s Heating,  
124 Ventilation and Air Conditioning (HVAC) system was modified to supply 100% fresh air  
125 intake and exhaust return air from the ward outside the building to avoid recirculation. Air  
126 flow was adjusted to achieve a net negative pressure differential of 3-4 Pa to establish inward  
127 air movement to the ward from adjoining corridors. At the time of the detection of the first  
128 staff case on Ward A, the PPE worn by staff entering Ward A included P2/N95 respirators (a  
129 change made prior to the formal updates in state and national guidelines in response to  
130 increasing HCW cases at other healthcare institutions and aligned with the decisions at those  
131 institutions at the time<sup>1, 9</sup>), face shield, isolation gown, and gloves. Most nursing and cleaning  
132 staff worked exclusively on Ward A and were experienced in caring for patients infected with  
133 COVID. Ward A shared the same PPE donning room and staff bathroom with another  
134 adjacent COVID ward (Ward B), but had separate doffing areas (located immediately prior to  
135 exiting each ward) and dedicated staff tearooms outside the clinical areas.

136

137 The first case identified on Ward A returned a positive PCR test to SARS-CoV-2 in late July  
138 2020 after developing mild respiratory symptoms (Figure 3 and Table 1). Testing of contacts  
139 identified Case 2, who had tested negative on two occasions in the previous week after  
140 exposure to a positive HCW on another ward in mid July. Case 2 acknowledged having  
141 respiratory symptoms when interviewed with an interpreter, and had worked six shifts during  
142 the infectious period. All staff who had worked on Ward A during the infectious period were  
143 tested upon detection of Case 2, and again at day 7 and 11 after last exposure on the ward.  
144 Additional upstream source contacts were also identified and tested. Due to the likelihood of

145 secondary and possibly tertiary transmissions, all staff that worked the same, preceding or  
146 following shifts on Ward A as either Case 1 or Case 2 during the infectious period were  
147 furloughed. The case load of Ward A was reduced to 8 patients to accommodate for  
148 decreased staffing.

149

150 In total, 179 HCW contacts exposed to Cases 1 and 2 were interviewed as part of the  
151 outbreak investigation, identifying 11 close contacts, 82 moderate contacts and 86 casual  
152 contacts. 95 HCW contacts had worked on Ward A during the infectious period and provided  
153 care to patients with COVID-19. Of these, close and moderate contacts predominantly  
154 comprised staff who recalled sharing the Ward A staff tearoom with Case 2. 45/95 (47%) of  
155 the Ward A HCW contacts did not use the staff tearoom at the same time as Case 2, and  
156 included medical and allied health staff who worked the same hours on Ward A but who used  
157 different break facilities, and night-shift nursing staff who did not work the same or  
158 overlapping shift hours. None of these staff returned a positive test. Of the other 50 Ward A  
159 HCW contacts, seven returned a positive test for SARS-CoV-2 (7/50; 14% [95% CI: 6–27%];  
160 vs 0/45,  $p = 0.01$ , Fisher's exact test). The incidence of positive HCWs on Ward A was 1.2  
161 per 100 patient days of exposure compared to 0.7 per 100 patient days of exposure among  
162 HCWs on other COVID wards (incidence rate ratio = 1.76; [95% CI 0.64–4.84]). Genomic  
163 analysis indicated all cases were derived from the same D.2 lineage (formerly B.1.1.25), as  
164 were the majority of cases in Victoria at the time.<sup>15</sup>

165

166 Case 8 returned a positive result during the same period, but worked on a different ward and  
167 was not initially linked through contact tracing. Although this HCW had cared for patients  
168 with suspected COVID-19, the HCW did not have any contact with patients with confirmed  
169 COVID-19. However, the HCW reported having meal breaks in the Ward A tearoom during

170 the exposure period with colleagues who worked on Ward A, and was subsequently linked to  
171 the Ward A outbreak.

172

173 In response to the outbreak, staff break room policies were revised to apply stricter controls  
174 to mitigate the potential risk of transmission (Table 2). Following the return to work of  
175 HCWs after furlough, ward occupancy was increased again to capacity with patients with  
176 COVID-19. One additional HCW (Case 10) returned a positive test 14 days after the last  
177 positive case, but did not have any contact with any of the other Ward A staff cases during  
178 their respective infectious periods. Routine testing of HCWs working on COVID wards was  
179 introduced in early September in line with DHHS recommendations. The outbreak was  
180 considered resolved in late September, 28 days (two incubation periods) after the last staff  
181 member tested positive.

182

### 183 *Other staff cases*

184 Of the other nine staff cases presumed to be acquired at our institution, eight were HCWs.  
185 The non-clinical staff member likely acquired COVID-19 when using the same office as a  
186 HCW who had returned to work after completing a secondment assisting with the outbreak  
187 response at a residential aged care facility. This HCW, who presumably acquired COVID-19  
188 while on secondment, had used the office for non-clinical duties two days prior to developing  
189 symptoms, and had vacated the office immediately prior to handing over to the non-clinical  
190 staff member.

191

192 In addition to the last HCW case on Ward A, three other HCW cases did not have an  
193 identified link and were presumed to be independent acquisitions from infected patients  
194 (4/19; 21% [95% CI: 6–46%]), including one who reported a clear PPE breach. The



195 remaining five HCW cases outside of Ward A were identified from testing of contacts after  
196 investigation of staff cases, and were presumably linked to these other staff.

197

### 198 *Staff exposures to undiagnosed patients*

199 From 25 January 2020 (first case identified in Victoria) until 24 November 2020 (last active  
200 case in Victoria deemed non-infectious), 204 HCWs were identified as contacts of patients  
201 who were later diagnosed with COVID-19 due to exposure during the infectious period, prior  
202 to diagnosis and implementation of appropriate precautions (median exposure = 1 day; range  
203 1–6 days; total 223 patient exposure days). Of these 70 close, 25 moderate, and 109 casual  
204 contacts, none (0/204; 0% [95% CI 0–2%]) developed COVID-19 infection from their  
205 exposure.

206

## 207 **DISCUSSION**

208 HCW have been disproportionately affected in the number of detected cases in Australia,  
209 particularly in Victoria,<sup>2, 16</sup> though the exact mechanisms for acquisition of infection remain  
210 difficult to prove. While the majority of HCW infections are presumed to be acquired at work  
211 while undertaking clinical activities, several aspects of our data suggest that these are not  
212 necessarily all derived from exposure to infected patients, but may also be driven by exposure  
213 to other infected staff working in the healthcare setting. Firstly, the incidence of infected  
214 HCWs was clustered both in time and in geographic location. Of the 19 HCWs who possibly  
215 or probably acquired infection at our institution, half of these were linked to a single ward.  
216 Although this ward cared for patients with confirmed COVID-19 infection, the rate of HCW  
217 infections was greater than on other wards that also cared for patients with COVID-19, when  
218 standardised for exposure to patients with COVID-19. Nine of the 10 HCW infections linked  
219 to the ward occurred within a 2-week period (i.e. a 5% time window of the 9 months that

220 HCWs working on this ward had been caring for patients with COVID-19). Secondly, the  
221 involvement of Case 8 in the cluster, who had no contact with patients infected with COVID-  
222 19, but who used the Ward A staff tearoom, points towards transmission in this space. In  
223 contrast, staff working on Ward A who did not use the tearoom did not test positive in the  
224 outbreak investigation. Thirdly, the incidence of HCW infections significantly reduced after  
225 changes were made to the protocols around use of staff tearooms, without any change in PPE,  
226 ventilation or patient occupancy of the COVID ward.

227

228 In Australia, there has been considerable attention focussed on measures to prevent  
229 transmission of SARS-CoV-2 from infected patients to staff.<sup>17, 18</sup> However, as others have  
230 also identified internationally, transmission between staff in non-clinical areas can also be a  
231 significant driver of HCW infections.<sup>19, 20</sup> Measures to prevent transmission between staff are  
232 critical, given that infected individuals may be infectious despite being asymptomatic or pre-  
233 symptomatic,<sup>21</sup> and staff are generally less suspicious of other staff working regularly in  
234 close proximity to them than patients or members of the public. The presence of undetected  
235 COVID-19 infection in HCWs was highlighted in a large seroprevalence survey of HCWs  
236 who routinely cared for COVID-19 patients, where 6% had serological evidence of previous  
237 infection, of whom 29% were asymptomatic in the preceding months and 69% had not  
238 previously received a diagnosis.<sup>22</sup>

239

240 There are limitations to our retrospective observational data, with only a small number of  
241 HCW infections at a single healthcare institution to draw inferences from that may not be  
242 representative of the transmission occurring in other facilities. However, our experience  
243 provides important local data in recognising the potential for transmission between staff, as  
244 has occurred in other essential non-healthcare industries such as food production and

245 distribution. Staff tearooms or break rooms pose a particular challenge. In an environment  
246 where transmission is unable to be mitigated by PPE, staff are vulnerable to acquisition from  
247 other infected staff. In a study of 703 infected HCWs at a single institution, staying in the  
248 same break room as a HCW without a mask for >15 minutes and consuming food within 1 m  
249 of another HCW were identified as risk factors for infection.<sup>20</sup> However, tearoom and break  
250 facilities are essential to the wellbeing of HCWs, and provide an area to rest and replenish –  
251 critical resources to reducing staff fatigue that can also contribute to HCW infections through  
252 errors and breaches in otherwise routine practices such as hand hygiene and doffing of PPE.<sup>7</sup>  
253 <sup>8</sup> Space is often limited in HCW tearooms, with physical distancing requirements further  
254 restricting use of these facilities.

255

256 A greater understanding of HCW infections is essential to minimising the risk to frontline  
257 staff caring for patients with COVID-19. As our data indicate, healthcare institutions must  
258 consider risks to staff in both clinical and non-clinical settings, and ensure appropriate  
259 measures are in place to mitigate these risks.

260

## 261 **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

262 We wish to thank and acknowledge the contributions of the staff infected with COVID-19,  
263 the clinical ward staff, Infection Prevention & Control team, staff contact tracing and follow  
264 up team, and Health Safety & Wellness staff for their roles in assisting our efforts to  
265 understand the infections occurring in staff at Austin Health. We also wish to extend our  
266 acknowledgements and gratitude to the laboratory staff in Austin Pathology and the  
267 Microbiological Diagnostic Unit Public Health Laboratory.

268

269 All contributing authors had full access to the data in this study.

270

271 **FUNDING DECLARATION**

272 CLG (GNT 1160963), JAT (GNT 1139902) and JCK (GNT 1142613) are supported by Early

273 Career Fellowships from the National Health and Medical Research Council (NHMRC),

274 Australia. This study was undertaken independently of the NHMRC.

275 **REFERENCES**

276

277 1. Buising KL, Williamson D, Cowie BC, MacLachlan J, Orr E, MacIsaac C, et al. A  
278 hospital-wide response to multiple outbreaks of COVID-19 in health care workers: lessons  
279 learned from the field. *Med J Aust.* 2020.

280 2. Department of Health and Human Services (Victoria). Victorian healthcare worker  
281 (clinical and non-clinical) coronavirus (COVID-19) data 2020 [Available from:  
282 <https://www.dhhs.vic.gov.au/victorian-healthcare-worker-covid-19-data>.

283 3. Bielicki JA, Duval X, Gobat N, Goossens H, Koopmans M, Tacconelli E, et al.  
284 Monitoring approaches for health-care workers during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Lancet*  
285 *Infect Dis.* 2020;20(10):e261-e7.

286 4. Chou R, Dana T, Buckley DI, Selph S, Fu R, Totten AM. Epidemiology of and Risk  
287 Factors for Coronavirus Infection in Health Care Workers: A Living Rapid Review. *Ann*  
288 *Intern Med.* 2020;173(2):120-36.

289 5. de Man P, Paltansing S, Ong DSY, Vaessen N, van Nielen G, Koeleman JGM.  
290 Outbreak of COVID-19 in a nursing home associated with aerosol transmission as a result of  
291 inadequate ventilation. *Clin Infect Dis.* 2020.

292 6. Nguyen LH, Drew DA, Graham MS, Joshi AD, Guo CG, Ma W, et al. Risk of  
293 COVID-19 among front-line health-care workers and the general community: a prospective  
294 cohort study. *Lancet Public Health.* 2020;5(9):e475-e83.

295 7. Zheng L, Wang X, Zhou C, Liu Q, Li S, Sun Q, et al. Analysis of the Infection Status  
296 of Healthcare Workers in Wuhan During the COVID-19 Outbreak: A Cross-sectional Study.  
297 *Clin Infect Dis.* 2020;71(16):2109-13.

- 298 8. Ran L, Chen X, Wang Y, Wu W, Zhang L, Tan X. Risk Factors of Healthcare  
299 Workers With Coronavirus Disease 2019: A Retrospective Cohort Study in a Designated  
300 Hospital of Wuhan in China. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2020;71(16):2218-21.
- 301 9. Department of Health and Human Services (Victoria). COVID-19 – A guide to the  
302 conventional use of PPE (31 July 2020). 2020.
- 303 10. Department of Health and Human Services (Victoria). Coronavirus disease 2019  
304 (COVID-19): Infection Prevention and Control guideline (version 2, 21 June 2020). 2020.
- 305 11. Infection Control Expert Group. Coronavirus (COVID-19): Environmental cleaning  
306 and disinfection principles for health and residential care facilities. Department of Health  
307 (Australia); 2020.
- 308 12. Department of Health and Human Services (Victoria). Coronavirus disease 2019  
309 (COVID-19): Case and contact management guidelines for health services and general  
310 practitioners (version 23, 10 July 2020). 2020.
- 311 13. Public Health Laboratory Network. PHLN guidance on laboratory testing for SARS-  
312 CoV-2 (the virus that causes COVID-19). Department of Health (Australia); 2020.
- 313 14. Seemann T, Lane CR, Sherry NL, Duchene S, Goncalves da Silva A, Caly L, et al.  
314 Tracking the COVID-19 pandemic in Australia using genomics. *Nat Commun*.  
315 2020;11(1):4376.
- 316 15. COVID-19 National Incident Room Surveillance Team. COVID-19, Australia:  
317 Epidemiology Report 21 (Fortnightly reporting period ending 19 July 2020). *Commun Dis*  
318 *Intell* (2018). 2020;44.
- 319 16. Smith P. Covid-19 in Australia: most infected health workers in Victoria's second  
320 wave acquired virus at work. *BMJ*. 2020;370:m3350.

- 321 17. MacIntyre CR, Ananda-Rajah M, Nicholls M, Quigley AL. Current COVID-19  
322 guidelines for respiratory protection of health care workers are inadequate. *Med J Aust.*  
323 2020;213(6):251-2 e1.
- 324 18. Regli A, von Ungern-Sternberg BS. Fit testing of N95 or P2 masks to protect health  
325 care workers. *Med J Aust.* 2020;213(7):293-5 e1.
- 326 19. Ariza-Heredia EJ, Frenzel E, Cantu S, Carlson M, Thomas G, Khawaja F, et al.  
327 Surveillance and identification of clusters of healthcare workers with coronavirus disease  
328 2019 (COVID-19): Multidimensional interventions at a comprehensive cancer center. *Infect*  
329 *Control Hosp Epidemiol.* 2020:1-6.
- 330 20. Celebi G, Piskin N, Celik Beklevic A, Altunay Y, Salci Keles A, Tuz MA, et al.  
331 Specific risk factors for SARS-CoV-2 transmission among health care workers in a university  
332 hospital. *Am J Infect Control.* 2020;48(10):1225-30.
- 333 21. Gandhi M, Yokoe DS, Havlir DV. Asymptomatic Transmission, the Achilles' Heel of  
334 Current Strategies to Control Covid-19. *N Engl J Med.* 2020;382(22):2158-60.
- 335 22. Self WH, Tenforde MW, Stubblefield WB, Feldstein LR, Steingrub JS, Shapiro NI, et  
336 al. Seroprevalence of SARS-CoV-2 Among Frontline Health Care Personnel in a Multistate  
337 Hospital Network - 13 Academic Medical Centers, April-June 2020. *MMWR Morb Mortal*  
338 *Wkly Rep.* 2020;69(35):1221-6.
- 339

## TABLES

**Table 1:**

**Characteristics of confirmed cases with COVID-19 infection who worked on Ward A**

Case	Primary Ward	PPE breach reported	Contact category	Recalled tearoom exposure <sup>a</sup>	Community prevalence <sup>b</sup>
1	A	No	Moderate	Yes	594
<b>2</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>Yes <sup>c</sup></b>	<b>NA</b>	<b>NA</b>	<b>202</b>
3	A	No	Casual	No	1,747
4	A	No	Moderate	Yes	693
5	A	No	Moderate	Yes	1,098
6	A	No	Close <sup>d</sup>	No	2,240
7	A	No	Moderate	Yes	2,050
8	C <sup>e</sup>	No	Moderate	Yes	2,069
9	A	No	Moderate <sup>f</sup>	Yes <sup>f</sup>	2,527
10	A	No	None	No	751

**Notes:**

The suspected primary case is shown in ***bold italics***.

<sup>a</sup> Based on whether staff recalled sharing the staff tearoom with another infected staff member. Required to have worked the same shift or have shift overlap as a confirmed case

<sup>b</sup> Rate expressed as number of active cases per million population for the Local Government Area where the staff member resides. “High community prevalence” was defined by DHHS at the time as an active case prevalence of >200 per million population.

<sup>c</sup> Mask breach reported

<sup>d</sup> Conversation with Case 2 in corridor for >15 minutes without masks

<sup>e</sup> Ward C admitted patients with suspected COVID-19

<sup>f</sup> Exposure to Case 4




**Table 2:**

**Additional measures implemented to control the spread of COVID-19 in staff break rooms**

<b><i>Elimination</i></b>	–
<b><i>Engineering</i></b>	–
<b><i>Administrative</i></b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Limited time in tearoom to 15 minutes for consumption of food/drink and encouraged remainder of break to be spent elsewhere while wearing a face mask</li> <li>• Reinforced designation of break rooms to specific wards, with mixing of staff working across different clinical areas discouraged</li> <li>• Removed excess furniture and placed markings/signs to reinforce physical distancing</li> <li>• Signs placed on break room doors to indicate maximum occupancy</li> <li>• Improved record keeping and auditing of break room use to monitor adherence to organisation policy</li> </ul>
<b><i>Personal Protective Equipment</i></b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Emphasised importance of donning face masks as soon as finished eating/drinking</li> </ul>

## FIGURES

**Figure 1: Attributed source of infection for health care workers infected with COVID-19**




**Figure 1:** Attributed source of infection for health care workers infected with COVID-19.

<sup>a</sup> 4 results were initially “indeterminate” but were negative on repeat testing of the same sample and subsequent samples

<sup>b</sup> Includes 9 cases due to exposure to a household contact, 1 case related to overseas travel, 4 cases unknown exposure but who were working from home and had not been on site

<sup>c</sup> No healthcare contact with confirmed or suspected cases; unknown community exposure or exposure in other healthcare facilities

<sup>d</sup> Includes 4 staff who did not work at Austin Health in the 2 weeks prior to their infectious period, 4 staff who cared for patients with COVID-19 at other healthcare facilities but not at Austin Health, and 1 staff member who cared for COVID-19 patients in precautions at Austin Health but was tested as part of an outbreak investigation involving multiple staff and patients at another healthcare facility.




**Figure 2:**

**A.** Community prevalence of active COVID-19 cases.

**B.** Incidence of Ward A and Austin Health staff cases in the context of the daily number of inpatients with active COVID-19 infection.

**Figure 3: COVID-19 infections acquired at Austin Health**



**Figure 3:**

**A.** Timeline of HCW COVID-19 infections in the Ward A outbreak. Numbers above each column indicate the corresponding case number of the HCW (see Table 1).

**B.** Staff-staff linkages among staff diagnosed with COVID-19. HCWs involved in the Ward A outbreak are shown in black and numbered, with Case 2 presumed to be the primary case. Linkages are coloured based on contact assignment through contact tracing following each exposure. Case 10 was identified while the Ward A outbreak was still considered “active”, but was not thought to be linked to the other staff. Two additional HCWs (shown in grey) who also worked in aged care facilities with active outbreaks have been included as the initial presumed source for subsequent staff infections.

## SUPPLEMENTARY APPENDIX

**Supplementary Table 1: Risk stratification and source attribution for HCWs with COVID-19**

<b><u>Risk stratification for healthcare acquisition</u></b>	
Probable	Close contact of a confirmed COVID-19 case while working in healthcare (with preceding or synchronous infection) In quarantine or furloughed due to exposure from active outbreak Reported breach in PPE while caring for a patient with COVID-19
Possible	Worked on COVID ward or cared for patients with confirmed COVID-19 Worked on a ward with an active outbreak but not quarantined/furloughed
Unknown	No known/minimal contact with confirmed COVID cases in the acquisition period
<b><u>Risk stratification for community acquisition</u></b>	
Probable	Close contact of a confirmed COVID-19 case in the community (with preceding or synchronous infection) In quarantine due to exposure from an active outbreak in a community setting
Possible	From a community local government area with high prevalence (defined as >200 active cases per million population = DHHS definition when initiating “hot spot” asymptomatic community testing in July 2020) Works in or visited a location with an active outbreak, but not in quarantine A household member in quarantine due to close contact or exposure in an active outbreak
Unknown	No known contacts or risk factors From a community local government area without high prevalence (defined above)

<b><u>Source attribution from risk stratification</u></b>		
<b><u>Healthcare acquisition risk</u></b>	<b><u>Community acquisition risk</u></b>	<b><u>Presumed source</u></b>
<b>Probable</b>	<b>Probable</b>	<b>Unknown</b>
<b>Probable</b>	Possible	Healthcare
<b>Probable</b>	Unknown	Healthcare
Possible	<b>Probable</b>	Community
<b>Possible</b>	<b>Possible</b>	<b>Healthcare</b>
<b>Possible</b>	Unknown	Healthcare
Unknown	<b>Probable</b>	Community
Unknown	<b>Possible</b>	Community
<b>Unknown</b>	<b>Unknown</b>	<b>Unknown</b>

*Presumed source was determined after considering the Healthcare acquisition risk and the Community acquisition risk*

## Supplementary Figure 1: Risk matrix for staff and patient exposures to COVID-19

Contact Category	Action
<b>Close</b>	Test and quarantine for 14 days, plus test day 11 post exposure
<b>Moderate</b>	Test and furlough for 14 days, plus test day 11 post exposure
<b>Casual</b>	Test at baseline and day 11 post exposure
<b>Very low</b>	No contact with source but worked in same area. No action required.
<b>No contact</b>	No contact with source and worked in a different area. No action required.

Face-to-Face Contact (<1.5m)		
Any direct contact*	<15 min	15 min-2 hr

Contact									
Mask, shield, gown & gloves	Mask & shield	Mask	Nil	Mask & shield	Mask	Nil	Mask & shield	Mask	Nil

Source	Asymptomatic	Mask on Mask off
	Symptomatic (cough)	Mask on
		Mask off


\* This means directly touching the source. If also meets criteria for close contact, classify as close contact

Shared Confined Space (>1.5m)			
<15 min	15 min-2 hr	2-6 hours	>6 hours

Contact										
Mask	Nil	Mask & shield	Mask	Nil	Mask & shield	Mask	Nil	Mask & shield	Mask	Nil

Source	Asymptomatic	Mask on Mask off
	Symptomatic (cough)	Mask on
		Mask off
