

1 **Health-care workers in gastrointestinal endoscopy are at higher risk for SARS-**
2 **CoV-2 infection compared to other aerosol-generating disciplines**

3 Christoph Römmele^{1*}, Alanna Ebigbo¹, Maria Kahn¹, Stephan Zellmer¹, Anna Muzalyova¹, Gertrud
4 Hammel², Christina Bartenschlager³, Albert Beyer⁴, Jonas Rosendahl⁵, Tilo Schlittenbauer⁶, Johannes
5 Zenk⁷, Bilal Al-Nawas⁸, Roland Frankenberger⁹, Jürgen Hoffmann¹⁰, Christoph Arens¹¹, Frank
6 Lammert^{12,13}, Claudia Traidl-Hoffmann¹⁴, Helmut Messmann¹

7 ¹: Clinic for Internal Medicine III - Gastroenterology and Infectious Diseases, University Hospital
8 Augsburg, Stenglinstraße 2, 86156 Augsburg, Germany

9 ²: Institute of Environmental Medicine, Helmholtz Zentrum München, Ingolstädter Landstraße 1,
10 85764 Neuherberg, Germany

11 ³: Chair of Health Care Operations/Health Information Management, University Augsburg, Neusäßer
12 Straße 47, 86156 Augsburg, Germany

13 ⁴: Medical Practice for Gastroenterology and Gastrointestinal Oncology, Altötting, Germany

14 ⁵: Clinic for Internal Medicine I – Gastroenterology and Pneumology, University Hospital Halle,
15 Ernst-Grube-Straße 40, 06120 Halle (Saale), Germany

16 ⁶: Department of Oral and Maxillofacial Surgery, University Hospital Augsburg, Stenglinstraße 2,
17 86156 Augsburg, Germany

18 ⁷: Department of Otorhinolaryngology, Head and Neck Surgery, University Hospital Augsburg,
19 Stenglinstraße 2, 86156 Augsburg, Germany

20 ⁸: Clinic and Polyclinic for Oral and Maxillofacial Surgery, Plastic Surgery, University Hospital
21 Mainz, Augustusplatz 2, 55131 Mainz, Germany

22 ⁹: Department for Operative Dentistry, Endodontics, and Pediatric Dentistry, Philipps University
23 Marburg and University Hospital Giessen and Marburg, Campus Marburg, Georg Voigt Str. 3, D-
24 35039 Marburg, Germany

25 ¹⁰: Department of Oral and Maxillofacial Surgery, University Hospital Heidelberg, Im Neuenheimer
26 Feld 400, 69120 Heidelberg, Germany

27 ¹¹: Department of Otorhinolaryngology, Head and Neck Surgery, University Hospital Magdeburg,
28 Leipziger Str. 44, 39120 Magdeburg, Germany

29 ¹²: Department of Medicine II, Saarland University Medical Center, Saarland University, Kirrberger
30 Str. 100, 66421 Homburg, Germany

31 ¹³: Hannover Medical School (MHH), Hannover, Carl-Neuberg-Str. 1, 30625 Hannover, Germany

32 ¹⁴: Department of Environmental Medicine, Faculty of Medicine, University of Augsburg, Neusäßer
33 Straße 47, 86156 Augsburg, Germany

34

35 ***Corresponding author:**

36 Dr. Christoph Römmele
37 III. Medizinische Klinik
38 Universitätsklinikum Augsburg
39 Stenglinstraße 2, 86156 Augsburg
40 christoph.roemmele@uk-augsburg.de
41 0821/400 2351

42

43 **Word count:** 3501

44

45 **ABSTRACT**

46 **Objective:** Healthcare workers (HCW) are at high risk of SARS-CoV-2 infection due to exposure to
47 potentially infectious material, especially during aerosol-generating procedures (AGP). We aimed to
48 investigate the prevalence of infection among HCW in medical disciplines with AGP.

49 **Design:** A nationwide questionnaire-based study in in- and outpatient settings was conducted between
50 12/16/2020 and 01/24/2021. Data on SARS-CoV-2 infections among HCW and potential risk factors
51 were investigated.

52 **Results:** 2,070 healthcare facilities with 25,113 employees were included in the study. Despite a
53 higher rate of pre-interventional testing, clinics treated three times more confirmed SARS-CoV-2
54 cases than private practices (28.8% vs. 88.4%, $p<0.001$). Overall infection rate among HCW
55 accounted for 4.7%.—Multivariate analysis revealed that ZIP-regions having comparably higher
56 incidences were significantly associated with increased risk of infection. Furthermore, clinical setting
57 and the GIE specialty have more than double the risk of infection (OR 2.63; 95% CI 2.501-2.817,
58 $p<0.01$ and OR 2.35; 95% CI 2.245-2.498, $p<0.01$). The number of procedures performed per day was
59 also significantly associated with an increased risk of infection (OR 1.01; 95% CI 1.007-1.014),
60 $p<0.01$). No treatment of confirmed SARS-CoV-2 cases was tending to lower the risk of infection (OR
61 0.72; 95% CI 0.507-1.025, $p=0.068$).

62 **Conclusion:** HCW in GIE seem to be at higher risk of infection than those in other AGP, especially in
63 the clinical setting. Regions having comparably higher incidences as well as the number of procedures
64 performed per day were also significantly associated with increased risk of infection.

65 **Key words:** aerosol producing procedures; SARS-CoV-2 infection prevalence; pre-interventional
66 testing.

67 **Significance of this study**

68 **What is already known on this subject?**

69 Health care workers, especially those exposed to aerosol generating procedures, are assumed to have
70 an increased risk of SARS-CoV-2 infection. However, data confirming this are lacking, especially for
71 the outpatient care setting.

72 **What are the new findings?**

73 Health care workers in gastrointestinal endoscopy have a higher risk of SARS-CoV-2-infection than in
74 other AGPs. This risk is particularly higher

- 75 - in clinical settings compared to private practices
- 76 - in regions having comparably higher incidences
- 77 - the more procedures are performed per day

78 **How might it impact on clinical practice in the foreseeable future?**

79 Our study suggests making additional efforts to protect HCW in the gastrointestinal work field.

80 INTRODUCTION

81 For more than a year, the "coronavirus disease 2019" (COVID-19) has kept the world and especially
82 the health care sector on tenterhooks. A small outbreak of the virus "severe acute respiratory syndrome
83 coronavirus type 2" (SARS-CoV-2) has since developed into a worldwide pandemic with over 200
84 million cases (as of 08/30/2021),[1].

85 Health care workers (HCW) have been particularly exposed during the pandemic, and data shows an
86 increased infection rate among HCW compared to the general population,[2]. Data from different
87 countries emphasise the increased risk for HCW, especially for those with direct patient contact,[3, 4].
88 Based on these data and the risk of transmission between HCW, the Standing Committee on
89 Vaccination (STIKO) issued a prioritized vaccination recommendation for people working in medical
90 facilities. Transmission of SARS-CoV-2 mainly takes place via respiratory droplets as well as
91 aerosol,[5]. Numerous medical procedures typical for specific medical disciplines are widely
92 recognized to generate aerosols and therefore are supposed to increase the risk of infection. Therefore,
93 HCW who carry out aerosol-generating procedures (AGP) or activities close to patients' faces were
94 given higher priority for vaccination in Germany, even though real-world data demonstrating the
95 increased risk is limited,[5]. In particular, evidence for this within the outpatient care sector is lacking.

96 As a part of the collaborative project B-FAST of the Network of University Medicine (NUM),
97 initiated by the German Federal Ministry of Education and Research, Augsburg University Hospital
98 was commissioned to acquire data on facial, and AGP-associated medical subspecialties such as
99 gastrointestinal endoscopy (GIE), otorhinolaryngology (ORL), oral and maxillofacial surgery (OMS)
100 and dentistry. The study was supported by the Bavarian State Ministry of Science and Arts, as well as
101 the respective professional societies, including the German Society of Gastroenterology, Digestive and
102 Metabolic Diseases (DGVS), the German Society of Dentistry and Oral Medicine (DGZMK), the
103 German Society of Oral and Maxillofacial Surgery (DGMKG), The German Society of Oto-Rhino-
104 Laryngology, Head and Neck Surgery (DGHNO-KHC) and the Professional Association of
105 Gastroenterologists in Private Practice (bng).

106 The study's objective was to investigate the prevalence of SARS-CoV-2 infection among HCW
107 exposed to AGP in in- and outpatient settings, the suspected source of infection, and identify potential
108 risk or protective factors for infections in the specialties mentioned above.

109 **MATERIAL AND METHODS**

110 **Questionnaire**

111 The present study is a descriptive, explorative, cross-sectional, questionnaire-based study conducted in
112 Germany between the 16th of December and the 24th of January.

113 The questionnaire for the survey was designed based on detailed literature research and on expert
114 suggestions provided by the respective disciplines GIE, ORL, OMS, and dentistry (Supplement 1).
115 Besides descriptive data such as healthcare delivery setting and medical specialty, the questionnaire
116 focused on the prevalence of SARS-CoV-2 infection, presumed source of infection, treatment of
117 confirmed SARS-CoV-2 cases, and pre-interventional testing of patients. The first two digits of the
118 ZIP-code of each participating medical facility were inquired to assign medical facilities to one of ten
119 ZIP-code regions in order to correlate infection rate among HCW and incidence in the region.

120 The target group of the present questionnaire was inpatient and outpatient medical facilities of the four
121 specialties of research interest with a particular focus on GIE. Eligible participants were defined as
122 healthcare delivery facilities attributed to four medical disciplines such as GIE, ORL, OMS, or
123 dentistry. Study participants were recruited via e-mail distribution of the respective professional
124 societies (DGVS, DGZMK, DGMKG, DGHNO-KHC, bng). The heads of department or private
125 practice owners were contacted via e-mail and encouraged to fill in an online questionnaire
126 implemented in UniPark©. Participation in the survey was anonymous and completely voluntary, with
127 no direct contact to the study site.

128 **Statistical analysis**

129 The statistical analysis was performed using SPSS version 27.0. The categorical variables such as ZIP-
130 code region, medical specialty, type of medical facility, the presumed source of infection, pre-
131 interventional testing of patients, and treatment of confirmed SARS-CoV-2 cases are presented as
132 absolute frequencies and percentages. The interval-scaled variables such as the number of employees
133 and the number of procedures performed per day are presented as mean values and standard
134 deviations. HCW status was calculated as the proportion of the SARS-Cov-2 positive infections
135 among HCW to the underlying total population and expressed as percentages. Covid-19 incidences
136 were calculated using official county-granular data from the Robert Koch Institute (RKI), the leading
137 governmental institution in biomedicine in Germany, aggregated to 10 ZIP-code regions,[6].

138 In this scientific manuscript, the GIE data are compared with the aggregated data of the disciplines
139 ORL, OMS, and dentistry denoted as Non-GIE. When appropriate, the relationships between nominal-
140 scaled variables were tested inferentially using Chi-square independence tests or Fisher's exact test.
141 The comparison of GIE and Non-GIE facilities regarding the presumed source of infection was
142 adjusted with Cochran-Mantel-Haenszel-Test to control the confounding effect of the facility
143 healthcare delivery setting. Mean values were compared using Mann-Whitney-U test. The analysis of
144 the risk factors associated with infections among HCW was carried out using multivariate logistic
145 regression with the occurrence of a SARS-CoV-2 infection as a dependent variable and potential
146 influencing variables considered in the manuscript as independent variables. The significance level
147 was set as $p < 0.05$.

148 **Patient and public involvement**

149 As a part of the collaborative project B-FAST of the Network of University Medicine (NUM),
150 initiated by the German Federal Ministry of Education and Research, Augsburg University Hospital

151 was commissioned to acquire data on facial, and AGP-associated medical subspecialties. No patients
152 or the public were asked for advice on interpretation or writing up the results.

153 **RESULTS**

154 **Sample characteristics**

155 Two thousand ninety-six of the more than 20,000 contacted facilities participated in the survey.
 156 Twenty-six facilities were excluded from the data analysis based on prespecified eligibility criteria.
 157 Consequently, 2,070 remaining questionnaires were analysed, of which 113 (5.5%) had non-
 158 exclusionary missing data. Of the 2070 facilities, 1,828 (88.3%) were private practices and 242
 159 (11.7%) were clinics/hospitals. Among included facilities, GIE private practices accounted for 284
 160 (13.7%) facilities, whereas GIE clinics were represented by 145 (7.0%) hospitals (Table 1). The
 161 distribution of the Non-GIE facilities between the different disciplines can be found in the supplement
 162 (Supplement 1)

163 **Table 1:** Absolute and percentage distribution of cases by type of institution and specialty

Specialisation	Private Practice		Clinic		Total
	Number of facilities	% of all facilities	Number of facilities	% of all facilities	
GIE	284	13.7	145	7.0	429
Non-GIE	1544	74.6	97	4.7	1641
Total	1828	88.3	242	11.7	2070

164 *GIE: Gastrointestinal Endoscopy; Non-GIE: other AGP-associated specialties: otorhinolaryngology,*
 165 *oral and maxillofacial surgery, and dentistry.*

166 The most significant share of participating medical facilities belonged to the districts with the ZIP
 167 codes 80-89 (13.4%), and the most seldomly represented district were those of 01-09 (4.8%)
 168 (Supplemental 2). Regarding the rate of new infections, in the period from 40th calendar week 2020
 169 (beginning of the second COVID-19 wave) to third calendar week 2021 (the end of the survey) the
 170 highest mean incidence was observed in the ZIP-regions 01-09 with 195 (SD=143.0) followed by 90-
 171 99 with 147 (SD=90.3) and 80-89 with 143 (SD=71.7) located in the eastern part of the country. The
 172 lowest mean incidences were reported in ZIP-regions 20-29 with 72(SD=38.2) in the northern and 30-
 173 39 with 108(SD=60.6) central part of Germany (Figure 1).

174

175

176 **HCW status per facility type and specialty**

177 Two thousand seventy medical facilities included in the analysis comprised a total of 25,113 HCW in
 178 the respective fields of specialisation (see Table 2). GIE private practices reported performing on
 179 average 21.2 (SD=15.3) procedures per day. In contrast, Non-GIE practices stated to carry out
 180 significantly more procedures 34.6 (SD=27.7, $p<0.01$). Clinics performed overall significantly more
 181 procedures compared to private practices (41.5 (SD=23.4) vs. 32.9 (SD=26.8), $p<0.01$), with Non-GIE
 182 performing significantly more procedures as GIE (58.6(SD=35.6) vs. 24.9 (SD=12.9), $p <0.01$).

183 32.7% of the GIE private practices reported having had at least one COVID-19 case among HCW,
 184 whereas this share was significantly lower in Non-GIE (21.2%, $p<0.01$). The proportion of SARS-
 185 CoV-2 infections was significantly higher in the clinical setting than private practices in both
 186 specialties (56.1% vs. 23.0%, $p<0.01$) and accounted in GIE for 58.6% and 48.5% in Non-GIE.
 187 However, this difference was not significant. Overall, the rate of HCW who were reported to have had
 188 a COVID-19 infection was 4.7%. The rate was significantly higher in the GIE compared to the Non-
 189 GIE (7.7% vs. 3.5%, $p>0.01$). The number of infected HCW was significantly higher in clinics than in
 190 private practices (6.3% vs. 4.0%, $p<0.01$). A significant difference between the examined specialties
 191 was reported for private practices, with 5.3% of GIE HCW and only 3.6% SARS-CoV-2-infected
 192 HCW in Non-GIE facilities. The same applies to the clinical setting: a significantly higher proportion
 193 of SARS-CoV-2-positive employees was also found for GIE in comparison to Non-GIE (9.9% vs.
 194 3.1%, $p<0.01$). Consequently, a higher risk of infection was reported for GIE than for the other AGP-
 195 associated disciplines for private practices and clinical settings.

196 **Table 2: SARS-CoV-2-positive HCW by facility type, specialty, and collective size in the questionnaire**

	Specialty	Facility		Employee Sum	Procedures per day Mean (SD)	Rate of SARS-CoV-2 positive	
		N ^a	Mean(SD)			Facility	HCW
Private Practice	GIE	283 ^b	11.8(10.6)	3324	21.2(15.3)**	32.7%**	5.3%**
	Non-GIE	1542 ^c	9.4(10.7)	14411	34.6(27.7)	21.2%	3.6%
Clinic	GIE	143 ^c	24.6(38.8)	3516	24.9(12.9)**	58.6% ^{n.s.}	9.9%**
	Non-GIE	96 ^b	40.2(44.8)	3862	58.6(35.6)	48.5%	3.1%
Total	GIE	426	16.0(24.8)	6840	22.3(14.7)**	41.5%**	7.7%**
	Non-GIE	1638	11.1(16.7)	18273	35.9(30.5)	22.9%	3.5%
	Private Practice	1825	9.7(10.7)	17735	32.9(26.8)**	23.0%**	4.0%**
	Clinic	239	30.9(41.9)	7378	41.5(23.4)	56.1%	6.3%
	Total	2064	12.2(18.7)	25113	33.7(28.9)	28.8%	4.7%

197 *a: Number of facilities in the respective category; b: One case each excluded from the calculation due*
 198 *to an unrealistic indication of the number of employees [600-1500 employees]; c: Two cases excluded*
 199 *from the calculation due to an unrealistic indication of the number of employees [800-1200*
 200 *employees]*

201 *The relation between specialty and proportion of SARS-CoV-2 positive HCW was statistically tested*
 202 *using chi-square independence test. A model was calculated for each type of facility and for the total*
 203 *sample.*

204 *** Significance level $p < 0.01$; * Significance level $p < 0.05$; n.s. not significant*

205 *GIE: Gastrointestinal Endoscopy; Non-GIE: other AGP-associated specialties: otorhinolaryngology,*
 206 *oral and maxillofacial surgery and dentistry; SD: Standard deviation.*

207 **Source of infection**

208 The implied source of infection identified by the heads of the facilities was predominantly the private
 209 environment (66%), followed by an unclear origin of infection (14%) (Figure 2). Only 14% of cases
 210 were attributed to patient contact or medical procedures. In GIE, the proportion of HCW with an
 211 implied source of infection during patient care ("During interventions" and "During other patient
 212 contacts") was significantly higher than in Non-GIE 10% vs. 5%, $p < 0.001$, and 13% vs. 4%, $p <$
 213 0.001 respectively). Accordingly, the proportion of employees who reported being infected in their
 214 private environment was substantially higher in Non-GIE specialty (73% vs. 56%, $p < 0.001$).

215

216 **Pre-interventional testing**

217 In private practices, Non-GIE specialties were testing their outpatients significantly more frequently
 218 than GIE (15.2% vs. 7.7%, $p < 0.01$). Regarding clinical settings, both out- and inpatients were
 219 significantly more often tested pre-interventionally compared to private practices. 58.9% of Non-GIE
 220 outpatients and 72.2% GIE outpatients were tested before procedures ($p < 0.05$), whereas among
 221 inpatients in all specialties, the testing rate was relatively high, accounting for 96.1% and 93.1% in
 222 Non-GIE and GIE, respectively. Furthermore, GIE clinics reported to test both their out-and in
 223 patients significantly more frequently using antigen than PCR (36.8% vs. 21.1%, $p < 0.01$ and 23.4%
 224 vs. 11.7% $p < 0.05$ respectively) (Table 3).

225 **Table 3: Pre-interventional testing by facility type and specialty**

		Non-GIE		GIE		p-value	
		Number of facilities	% ^a	Number of facilities	%		
Private Practice	No testing	1303	84.8	262	92.3	< 0.01	
	Testing	234	15.2	22	7.7		
	PCR	143	9.3	6	2.2	< 0.01	
	Antigen	91	5.9	16	5.7	0.89	
Clinic	outpatient	No testing	39	41.1	40	27.8	<0.05
		Testing	56	58.9	104	72.2	
		PCR	36	37.9	51	35.5	0.86
		Antigen	20	21.1	53	36.8	< 0.01
	inpatient	No testing	3	3.9	10	6.9	0.37
		Testing	74	96.1	135	93.1	
		PCR	65	84.4	101	69.7	< 0.05
		Antigen	9	11.7	34	23.4	< 0.05

226 *GIE: Gastrointestinal Endoscopy; Non-GIE: other AGP-associated specialties: otorhinolaryngology,*
 227 *oral and maxillofacial surgery, and dentistry. PCR: Polymerase chain reaction.*

228 *a Rates refer to the total of answers given by participating facilities*

229

230 **Treatment of confirmed SARS-CoV-2 cases**

231 In total, GIE medical facilities have treated more often confirmed SARS-CoV-2 cases (32.4% vs.
 232 24.7%, $p < 0.01$). GIE private practices stated to have treated confirmed SARS-CoV-2 patients in 7.7%
 233 of cases being significantly lower than Non-GIE 21.8% ($p < 0.01$). On the contrary, GIE clinics treated
 234 more SARS-CoV-2 confirmed cases than Non-GIE (80.7% vs. 72.2%, $p = 0.548$). Overall, clinics
 235 treated confirmed SARS-CoV-2 patients almost four times more often than private practices (77.3%
 236 vs. 19.5%, $p < 0.01$) (Table 4).

237 **Table 4: Treated confirmed SARS-CoV-2 cases by facility type and specialty**

	Non-GIE		GIE		Total		p-value
	Number of facilities	%	Number of facilities	%	Number of facilities	%	
Private practice	336	21.8	22	7.7	356	19.5	<0.01
Clinic	70	72.2	117	80.7	187	77.3	0.548
Total	406	24.7	139	32.4	545	26.3	<0.01

238 *GIE: Gastrointestinal Endoscopy; Non-GIE: other AGP-associated specialties: otorhinolaryngology,*
 239 *oral and maxillofacial surgery, and dentistry.*

240

241 **Multivariate analysis of the risk factors**

242 Among examined factors, several ZIP-code regions were significantly associated with HCW infection
 243 in medical facilities. As ZIP-region 20-29 having the lowest incidence within examined period in time
 244 was chosen as a reference group, multivariate analysis revealed, consistently, odds ration
 245 corresponding to increased risk of SARS-Cov-2 infectio associated with nine other/remaining ZIP-
 246 regions. However, not all of this associations were significant. Particularly, regions 60 to 89, bordering
 247 Austria, Switzerland, and France, were significantly associated with an two- to three-fold increased
 248 risk of infection among HCW. And in the ZIP-code region 01-09, having the highest incidence in
 249 Germany, the risk of infection was 2.04 time higher compared to the reference group (95% CI 1.124-
 250 3.689, $p = 0.019$). Considering further influencing variables, in the clinical setting there was 2.63 times
 251 (95% CI 2.504 - 2.817, $p < 0.01$) increased risk of infection. GIE was also significantly associated with
 252 2.35 times (95% CI 2.245-2.498, $p < 0.01$) increased risk of SARS-CoV-2 infection among HCW. The
 253 number of procedures carried out per day in a medical facility increased the probability of infection,
 254 however, only marginally (OR 1.01, 95% CI 1.007-1.014), $p < 0.01$). Having not treated any confirmed
 255 SARS-CoV-2 patients was related to a lower risk of contagion (OR 0.72, 95% CI 0.507-1.025,
 256 $p = 0.068$); however, this association was marginally insignificant. Pre-interventional testing has not
 257 significantly influenced the occurrence of the SARS-CoV-2 infection among HCW (Table 5).

258 **Table 5:** Summary of the risk factors associated with SARS-CoV-2 infections among HCW

Category	Dimension	OR	CI 95%		p-value
			LB	UB	
ZIP-code region	01-09	2.04	1.124	3.689	0.019
	10-19	1.86	1.063	3.256	0.03
	30-39	1.18	0.700	1.987	0.535
	40-49	1.46	0.880	2.423	0.143
	50-59	1.41	0.859	2.324	0.174
	60-69	3.31	2.071	5.296	<0.01
	70-79	2.34	1.449	3.763	<0.01
	80-89	2.51	1.594	3.955	<0.01
	90-99	1.11	0.663	1.872	0.683
		20-29 [RG]			
Healthcare delivery setting	clinics	2.63	2.504	2.817	<0.01
	private practices [RG]				
Medical specialty	GIE	2.35	2.245	2.498	<0.01
	Non-GIE [RG]				
Procedures p. day		1.01	1.007	1.014	<0.01
Confirmed SARS-CoV-2 cases	no	0.72	0.507	1.025	0.068
	yes				
Pre-interventional testing	PCR	0.98	0.678	1.423	0.659
	Antigen	1.11	0.741	1.655	0.397
	No testing [RG]				

259

260 *HCW: healthcare worker; GIE: Gastrointestinal Endoscopy; Non-GIE: other AGP-associated*

261 *specialties: otorhinolaryngology, oral and maxillofacial surgery, and dentistry*

262 *OR: odds ratio, CI: confidence interval, LB: lower bound, UB: upper bound, RG reference group*

263 **DISCUSSION**

264 This study is the first to present cumulated data on the prevalence of SARS-CoV-2 infection in HCW
265 in different medical subspecialties and healthcare delivery settings. In particular, this manuscript
266 focuses on medical disciplines associated with AGP, including GIE, ORL, OMS, and dentistry. Data
267 from private practices and clinics were collected via a nationwide questionnaire-based survey
268 conducted in Germany (83.02 Mio inhabitants) between the 16th of December and the 24th of
269 January,[7].

270 Our study shows a nationwide total HCW-infection rate accounting for 4.7% in the four examined
271 specialties. Due to the current state of research, there is no consensus regarding the increased infection
272 rate of HCW compared to the normal population so far. For instance, Jungo et al. (2021) could not
273 confirm an increased rate of infections in dental offices as compared to the normal population,[8],
274 whereas, on the contrary, in a large Danish cohort, an increased risk for HCW could be shown based
275 on the seroprevalence compared to blood donors,[4]. RKI officially reported 2,134,936 confirmed
276 cases for Germany on 01/24/2021 by the end of the survey,[9]. According to this data, approximately
277 2.6% of the German population had been infected with SARS-CoV-2 by the time of the study. Based
278 on this insight, it could be inferred that HCW involved in AGP have an increased risk of infection
279 compared to the general population. However, it should be taken into account that not all infections
280 are recorded in official registries due to several reasons, such as a high rate of asymptomatic or mild
281 courses of Covid-19,[10, 11]. For instance, the project "Dunkelzifferradar," funded by the Federal
282 Ministry of Education and Research, uses a mathematical model to estimate unreported cases of
283 SARS-CoV-2 infections, assuming a calculation of approximately 6.5 million infected people by
284 01/24/2021. This would result in a Germany-wide prevalence of 7.8% at the time of the survey,[12,
285 13]. Another estimate is given by the Gutenberg Covid-19 study, which indicates that around 42% of
286 infections in Germany are not detected, resulting in a Germany-wide prevalence of 4.5% at the time of
287 the survey,[14]. Considering these estimates, an increased risk for SARS-CoV-2 infection for HCW in
288 the examined disciplines compared to the general population cannot be clearly demonstrated by our
289 study, with the exception of HCW in a GIE clinical setting with a prevalence of SARS-CoV-2
290 infections of 9.9%. Nevertheless, data on the prevalence of SARS-CoV-2 infections among HCW are
291 inconsistent, ranging from 4.3% to 32.5% in the current scientific literature,[3, 4, 15-21]. It seems
292 obvious that the prevalence in HCW depends on multiple factors, such as, healthcare delivery setting,
293 local infection occurrence during the investigation period, pre-interventional testing, political and
294 social measures.

295 Our study revealed a significantly higher proportion of infected HCW in clinics with 6.3% compared
296 to 4.0% in private practices. Furthermore, according to the multivariate model, clinical setting was
297 associated with more than doubled risk of SARS-CoV-2 infection among HCW. Assuming that
298 patients are a potential source of infection in a medical facility, the number of patients seen per day
299 and, thus, procedures performed might influence the risk of infection. This consideration was
300 confirmed in our study by a significant association of occurrence of infection and number of
301 procedures performed per day. Indeed, clinics perform on average more procedures than private
302 practices, bringing HCW at higher risk of transmission. Furthermore, besides the higher accumulation
303 of people, clinics treat more patients with urgent or emergency procedures. In line with this, clinics
304 have treated confirmed SARS-CoV-2 patients almost four times more often than private practices.
305 According to the multivariate model, treatment of confirmed SARS-CoV-2 cases was tending to be a
306 risk of infection in a medical unit, however, this association was marginally not significant.

307 In our study, GIE was shown to have a significantly higher positive HCW rate than Non-GIE in both
308 examined healthcare delivery settings. Interestingly, GIE clinics have been stated to treat confirmed

309 SARS-CoV-2 cases more often than Non-GIE, whereas in private practices, an opposite tendency was
310 observed: GIE reported having had significantly fewer confirmed cases under treatment. Moreover,
311 GIE performed significantly fewer procedures per day compared to Non-GIE medical disciplines.
312 Despite that, GIE showed a significantly higher HCW infection rate in both healthcare delivery
313 settings. The reason for the higher infection rates in the GIE, specifically in a clinical setting, might be
314 the higher rate of non-elective procedures conducted on COVID-19 patients,[22]. Furthermore, Repici
315 et al. (2020) discussed other specific characteristics of GIE applicable to private practices, such as the
316 high level of unnoticed exposure of HCW during endoscopic procedures,[23, 24]. Many COVID-19
317 patients show gastrointestinal symptoms,[25]; hence they might undergo endoscopic examination
318 before the identification of SARS-CoV-2 infection. Furthermore, COVID-19 patients often require
319 endoscopic procedures such as bronchoscopies due to pulmonary involvement and gastroscopies
320 during intensive care stays in case of bleeding complications,[26]. Another reason for the higher rate
321 of SARS-CoV-2 positive HCW in GIE in clinics might be shifting GIE HCW into COVID-19 wards
322 implicating direct contact to confirmed COVID-19 patients. Data on the risk of infection among HCW
323 in designated Covid-19 wards is heterogeneous,[27-29]. A monocentric survey in a tertiary care
324 hospital in Turkey showed an increased risk of infection for HCW working on COVID-19 wards
325 compared with Non-COVID-19 areas. However, incorrect handling and non-compliance with the
326 hygienic/distance rules among HCW were risk factors associated with infection,[3].

327 One possible action to prevent transmission of SARS-CoV-2 into medical facilities is pre-
328 interventional testing. According to the findings of our study, in private practices, pre-interventional
329 testing of patients was performed only in roughly 10% of the cases, with Non-GIE testing twice as
330 often as GIE. In the clinical setting, all specialties tested their patients before intervention substantially
331 more frequently, with inpatients being tested in over 90% of cases. Despite that, the prevalence of
332 SARS-CoV-2 positive HCW was significantly higher in clinics than private practices, indicating that
333 testing may not play a crucial role at low to moderate incidence levels as discussed by guidelines,[30,
334 31]. In line with that insight, multivariate model revealed no significant association of pre-
335 interventional testing with occurrence of the SARS-Cov-2 infection in a medical unit. On the one
336 hand, it suggests that AGP can be safely performed by HCW using adequate personal protective
337 equipment and following hygienic concepts,[32]. On the other hand, it raises the question of how
338 COVID-19 cases invade medical facilities despite a high rate of pre-interventional testing, especially
339 in clinics. Considering the relatively high proportion of antigen tests used as SARS-CoV-2 detection
340 tools, this might indicate poor sensitivity of these tests, accounting, according to Kahn et al. (2021),
341 for about 50-60%,[33].

342 The prevalence of SARS-CoV-2-infected HCW might strongly depend on the local occurrence of
343 infection. According to the multivariate model ZIP-code regions having higher mean incidence within
344 examined period of time were associated with increased risk of infection in the medical facilities
345 compared to the ZIP-region 20-29, having the lowest observed mean incidence. However not all
346 associations were significant. For instance, the ZIP-region 90-99 having the second-highest mean
347 incidence in the considered period was not significantly different from the region with the lowest
348 mean incidence. This observation highlights the difficulty of associating the SARS-CoV-2 incidence
349 to the prevalence of SARS-CoV-2 infections in medical facilities. Firstly, a mean incidence reflects a
350 tendency across a defined period neglecting development over time. Secondly, medical facilities might
351 apply protective measures and guidelines or cancel procedures and limit access to the facility for non-
352 patients to prevent transmission of the infection. Thirdly political and social measures could be taken
353 and differ even between counties and districts.

354 Finally, even assuming HCW to have higher occupation-related infection risk than other professions,
355 infection outside the workplace cannot be ruled out. Thus, preliminary results of a study from Italy
356 suggest local infections in the private environment rather than occupational exposure,[34]. This is in
357 line with the results of our study, whereas the primary source of infection stated was the private
358 environment in all questioned specialties. Nevertheless, the share of COVID-19 infection attributed to
359 the workplace was still significantly higher in GIE facilities. In particular, in GIE it is significantly
360 more often associated with interventions/procedures or other patient contacts. This underlines the
361 increased risk for HCW in GIE.

362 Like other cross-sectional studies, our study has some limitations. Due to the recruitment strategy via
363 the professional associations, a selection bias cannot be ruled out. In particular, facilities that
364 established elaborate protection and hygiene measures might have been higher motivated to
365 participate. On the other hand, facilities with infected HCWs may also be more motivated to
366 participate. Moreover, there is an uneven distribution of the medical facility types between examined
367 specialties. For instance, in dental medicine, hardly any clinic was represented in comparison to the
368 more than 1000 participating private practices. Nonetheless, Non-GIE specialties had significantly
369 more private practices due to the regional specificity of the respective fields of activity. Another
370 shortcoming of the study worth mentioning is that this study is cross-sectional inquiring information
371 over a considerable period comprising three quarters of the year 2020. Moreover, all calculations
372 presented in the manuscript are based on the assessments and judgments made for a private practice or
373 a hospital ward and its workforce by one person.

374 Despite the limitation mentioned above, the present study is the first to provide data on prevalence and
375 revealing risk factors of SARS-CoV-2 infection among HCW in medical disciplines associated with
376 AGP, such as GIE, ORL, OMS, and dentistry. Due to the results provided in this scientific manuscript,
377 GIE seems to be at a higher risk of infection compared to the other investigated disciplines.

378 **ACKNOWLEDGMENTS**

379 We thank all medical facilities for participating in this study.

380

381 **CONTRIBUTORS**

382 Conception and design: CR, AE, HM, MK, SZ, CTH. Analysis and interpretation of the data: AM,

383 CR, AE, HM, MK, SZ. Drafting of the article: CR, AM, SZ, MK. Critical revision of the article for

384 important intellectual content: AE, HM. Final approval of the article: all authors; Statistical expertise:

385 AM. Administrative, technical or logistic support: GH, CB, AB, JR, TS, JZ, BA, RF, JH, CA, FL.

386 Collection and assembly of data: CR, AE, MK, SZ.

387 **FUNDING**

388 This study received public funds by B-FAST of the Network of University Medicine (NUM)

389 (Award/Grant Number: 01KX2021) and Bavarian State Ministry for Science and Arts (Award/Grant

390 Number: 152820012).

391 **COMPETING INTEREST**

392 All authors declare that they have no competing interests.

393

394 **ETHICS APPROVAL**

395 The study was conducted in accordance with the Declaration of Helsinki and Good Clinical Practices.

396 An approval of the study was given by the Ethics Committee of the University Hospital of Augsburg

397 (713/20 S-SR).

398 **PATIENT CONSENT FOR PUBLICATION**

399 Not required.

400 **DATA AVAILABILITY STATEMENT**

401 Data are available upon reasonable request.

402 **ORCID IDS**

403 Anna Muzalyova: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4441-8006>

404 Christoph Römmele: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8745-8510>

405 REFERENCES

- 406 1. Center, J.H.C.R. *COVID-19 Map*. 2020; Available from:
407 <https://coronavirus.jhu.edu/map.html>.
- 408 2. Kambhampati, A.K., et al., *COVID-19–Associated Hospitalizations Among Health*
409 *Care Personnel — COVID-NET, 13 States, March 1–May 31, 2020*. MMWR.
410 Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report, 2020. **69**(43): p. 1576-1583.
- 411 3. Çelebi, G., et al., *Specific risk factors for SARS-CoV-2 transmission among health*
412 *care workers in a university hospital*. American journal of infection control, 2020.
413 **48**(10): p. 1225-1230.
- 414 4. Jespersen, S., et al., *SARS-CoV-2 seroprevalence survey among 17,971 healthcare and*
415 *administrative personnel at hospitals, pre-hospital services, and specialist*
416 *practitioners in the Central Denmark Region*. Clinical infectious diseases : an official
417 publication of the Infectious Diseases Society of America, 2020: p. ciae1471.
- 418 5. Bahl, P., et al., *Airborne or droplet precautions for health workers treating COVID-*
419 *19?* J Infect Dis, 2020.
- 420 6. Robert Koch-Institut: *SurvStat@RKI 2.0*, <https://survstat.rki.de>.
- 421 7. (Destatis), S.B. 2021; Available from:
422 [https://www.destatis.de/DE/Themen/Gesellschaft-](https://www.destatis.de/DE/Themen/Gesellschaft-Umwelt/Bevoelkerung/Bevoelkerungsstand/Tabellen/bevoelkerung-nichtdeutsch-laender.html)
423 [Umwelt/Bevoelkerung/Bevoelkerungsstand/Tabellen/bevoelkerung-nichtdeutsch-](https://www.destatis.de/DE/Themen/Gesellschaft-Umwelt/Bevoelkerung/Bevoelkerungsstand/Tabellen/bevoelkerung-nichtdeutsch-laender.html)
424 [laender.html](https://www.destatis.de/DE/Themen/Gesellschaft-Umwelt/Bevoelkerung/Bevoelkerungsstand/Tabellen/bevoelkerung-nichtdeutsch-laender.html).
- 425 8. Jungo, S., et al., *Prevalence and risk indicators of first-wave COVID-19 among oral*
426 *health-care workers: A French epidemiological survey*. PLOS ONE, 2021. **16**(2): p.
427 e0246586.
- 428 9. *COVID-19 Datenhub: RKI Corona Bundesländer*. Available from: [https://npgeo-](https://npgeo-corona-npgeo-de.hub.arcgis.com/datasets/ef4b445a53c1406892257fe63129a8ea_0/explore?location=51.164254%2C8.127781%2C6.78&showTable=true)
429 [corona-npgeo-](https://npgeo-corona-npgeo-de.hub.arcgis.com/datasets/ef4b445a53c1406892257fe63129a8ea_0/explore?location=51.164254%2C8.127781%2C6.78&showTable=true)
430 [de.hub.arcgis.com/datasets/ef4b445a53c1406892257fe63129a8ea_0/explore?location](https://npgeo-corona-npgeo-de.hub.arcgis.com/datasets/ef4b445a53c1406892257fe63129a8ea_0/explore?location=51.164254%2C8.127781%2C6.78&showTable=true)
431 [=51.164254%2C8.127781%2C6.78&showTable=true](https://npgeo-corona-npgeo-de.hub.arcgis.com/datasets/ef4b445a53c1406892257fe63129a8ea_0/explore?location=51.164254%2C8.127781%2C6.78&showTable=true).
- 432 10. Gao, Z., et al., *A systematic review of asymptomatic infections with COVID-19*. J
433 Microbiol Immunol Infect, 2021. **54**(1): p. 12-16.
- 434 11. Zhao, H., Lu, X., Deng, Y., Tang, Y., & Lu, J. , *COVID-19: Asymptomatic carrier*
435 *transmission is an underestimated problem*. Epidemiology and Infection, 148, E116.,
436 2020.
- 437 12. e.V., D. *Covid-19 Dunkelzifferradar*. 2021 [18.02.21]; Available from:
438 <https://covid19.dunkelzifferradar.de/>.
- 439 13. Liu, Z., P. Magal, and G. Webb, *Predicting the number of reported and unreported*
440 *cases for the COVID-19 epidemics in China, South Korea, Italy, France, Germany*
441 *and United Kingdom*. J Theor Biol, 2021. **509**: p. 110501.
- 442 14. *Dashboard Gutenberg Covid-19 Studie*. Available from: [https://www.unimedizin-](https://www.unimedizin-mainz.de/GCS/dashboard/#/app/pages/AktuelleErgebnisse/ergebnisse)
443 [mainz.de/GCS/dashboard/#/app/pages/AktuelleErgebnisse/ergebnisse](https://www.unimedizin-mainz.de/GCS/dashboard/#/app/pages/AktuelleErgebnisse/ergebnisse).
- 444 15. Garcia-Basteiro, A.L., et al., *Seroprevalence of antibodies against SARS-CoV-2*
445 *among health care workers in a large Spanish reference hospital*. Nature
446 Communications, 2020. **11**(1).
- 447 16. Rudberg, A.S., et al., *SARS-CoV-2 exposure, symptoms and seroprevalence in*
448 *healthcare workers in Sweden*. Nat Commun, 2020. **11**(1): p. 5064.
- 449 17. Brehm, T.T., et al., *Seroprevalence of SARS-CoV-2 antibodies among hospital*
450 *workers in a German tertiary care center: A sequential follow-up study*. Int J Hyg
451 Environ Health, 2021. **232**: p. 113671.
- 452 18. Korth, J., et al., *SARS-CoV-2-specific antibody detection in healthcare workers in*
453 *Germany with direct contact to COVID-19 patients*. J Clin Virol, 2020. **128**: p.
454 104437.

- 455 19. Gomez-Ochoa, S.A., et al., *COVID-19 in Health-Care Workers: A Living Systematic*
456 *Review and Meta-Analysis of Prevalence, Risk Factors, Clinical Characteristics, and*
457 *Outcomes*. Am J Epidemiol, 2021. **190**(1): p. 161-175.
- 458 20. Poletti, P., et al., *Seroprevalence of and Risk Factors Associated With SARS-CoV-2*
459 *Infection in Health Care Workers During the Early COVID-19 Pandemic in Italy*.
460 JAMA Netw Open, 2021. **4**(7): p. e2115699.
- 461 21. Kumar Goenka, M., et al., *COVID-19 prevalence among health-care workers of*
462 *Gastroenterology department: An audit from a tertiary-care hospital in India*. JGH
463 Open, 2021. **5**(1): p. 56-63.
- 464 22. Repici, A., et al., *Endoscopy Units and the Coronavirus Disease 2019 Outbreak: A*
465 *Multicenter Experience From Italy*. Gastroenterology, 2020. **159**(1): p. 363-366 e3.
- 466 23. Repici, A., et al., *Coronavirus (COVID-19) outbreak: what the department of*
467 *endoscopy should know*. Gastrointestinal Endoscopy, 2020. **92**(1): p. 192-197.
- 468 24. Tang, J.W., et al., *Factors involved in the aerosol transmission of infection and*
469 *control of ventilation in healthcare premises*. Journal of Hospital Infection, 2006.
470 **64**(2): p. 100-114.
- 471 25. D'Amico, F., et al., *Diarrhea During COVID-19 Infection: Pathogenesis,*
472 *Epidemiology, Prevention, and Management*. Clinical Gastroenterology and
473 Hepatology, 2020. **18**(8): p. 1663-1672.
- 474 26. Holtermüller, K.H., et al., *[Stress ulcerations: pathogenesis and prevention]*. Z
475 Gastroenterol, 1983. **21** Suppl: p. 88-100.
- 476 27. Finkenzeller, T., et al., *[SARS-CoV-2 antibodies in ICU and clinic staff: From*
477 *Germany's region with the highest infection rate]*. Med Klin Intensivmed Notfmed,
478 2020. **115**(Suppl 3): p. 139-145.
- 479 28. Bahrs, C., et al., *Seroprevalence of SARS CoV-2 antibodies in healthcare workers and*
480 *administration employees: a prospective surveillance study at a 1,400-bed university*
481 *hospital in Germany*. medRxiv, 2020.
- 482 29. Weinberger, T., et al., *Prospective Longitudinal Serosurvey of Health Care Workers in*
483 *the First Wave of the SARS-CoV-2 Pandemic in a Quaternary Care Hospital in*
484 *Munich, Germany*. Clin Infect Dis, 2021.
- 485 30. Sultan, S., et al., *AGA Institute Rapid Review and Recommendations on the Role of*
486 *Pre-Procedure SARS-CoV-2 Testing and Endoscopy*. Gastroenterology, 2020. **159**(5):
487 p. 1935-1948 e5.
- 488 31. Ebigbo, A., et al., *Cost-effectiveness analysis of SARS-CoV-2 infection prevention*
489 *strategies including pre-endoscopic virus testing and use of high risk personal*
490 *protective equipment*. Endoscopy, 2021. **53**(2): p. 156-161.
- 491 32. Kahn M, Z.S., Ebigbo A, Muzalyova A, Classen J, Grünherz V, Boeser J, Breitling
492 LP, Beyer A, Rosendahl J, Lammert F, Traidl-Hoffmann C, Messmann H, Römmele
493 C, *Ein Jahr Covid-19: Testung, Verwendung von Schutzausrüstung und Auswirkungen*
494 *auf die Gastrointestinale Endoskopie in Deutschland*. Zeitschrift für
495 Gastroenterologie, accepted for publication 2021.
- 496 33. Kahn, M., et al., *Performance of antigen testing for diagnosis of COVID-19: a direct*
497 *comparison of a lateral flow device to nucleic acid amplification based tests*. BMC
498 Infect Dis, 2021. **21**(1): p. 798.
- 499 34. Sandri, M.T., et al., *SARS-CoV-2 serology in 4000 health care and administrative staff*
500 *across seven sites in Lombardy, Italy*. medRxiv, 2020: p. 2020.05.24.20111245.

501

502 **Figure 1:** *Mean incidence of COVID-19 infection per 100,000 inhabitants in Germany by the ZIP-*
503 *code region beginning from the 2nd COVID-19-wave (calendar week 40th 2020) until the end of the*
504 *survey (3rd calendar week 2021) Source: Robert Koch-Institut: SurvStat@RKI 2.0,*
505 *<https://survstat.rki.de>, Data request: 02.08.2021*

506 **Figure 2:** *Implied source of infection by specialisation*
507 *The confounding effect of the medical facility was adjusted using Cochran-Mantel-Haenszel test. One*
508 *model was calculated for each implied source of infection. Only significant differences are marked.*
509 *** Significance level $p < 0.01$; * Significance level $p < 0.05$; n.s. not significant*
510 *GIE: Gastrointestinal Endoscopy; Non-GIE: other AGP-associated specialties: otorhinolaryngology,*
511 *oral and maxillofacial surgery, and dentistry.*



