

Connectivity between long-term care homes and subsequent SARS-CoV-2 outbreaks

Yiqing Xia MSc PH¹, Huiting Ma MSc², Kamil Malikov MD, MSc, MBA³, Sharon E. Straus MD MSc^{4,5}, Christine Fahim PhD^{4,5}, Gary Moloney MSA², Qing Huang MSc³, Sahar Asgari PhD³, Jamie M. Boyd MSc⁴, Irene Ferro MGA⁶, Jaimie Johns BA⁶, Kamran Khan MD⁶, Jaydeep Mistry MES⁶, Linwei Wang MSc², Adrienne K. Chan MD, MPH^{5,7,8,9}, Stefan D. Baral MD, MPH¹⁰, Mathieu Maheu-Giroux ScD¹, Sharmistha Mishra MD PhD^{8*,2,5,9,11}

Affiliations:

1. Department of Epidemiology and Biostatistics, School of Population and Global Health, McGill University, Montréal, Québec, Canada
2. MAP-Centre for Urban Health Solutions, St. Michael's Hospital, Unity Health Toronto, Toronto, Ontario, Canada
3. Ontario Ministry of Health, Toronto, Ontario, Canada
4. St. Michael's Hospital Li Ka Shing Knowledge Institute, Unity Health Toronto, Toronto, Ontario, Canada
5. Institute of Health Policy, Management, and Evaluation, University of Toronto, Toronto, Ontario, Canada
6. BlueDot Inc., Toronto, Ontario, Canada
7. Sunnybrook Health Science Centre, Toronto, Ontario, Canada
8. Department of Medicine, Faculty of Medicine, University of Toronto, Toronto, Ontario, Canada
9. Dalla Lana School of Public Health, University of Toronto, Toronto, Ontario, Canada
10. Bloomberg School of Public Health, Johns Hopkins, Baltimore, Maryland, United States
11. Institute of Medical Sciences, University of Toronto, Toronto, Ontario, Canada.

* Corresponding Author

Sharmistha Mishra

Mailing address: Room 315, MAP Centre for Urban Health Solutions, Li Ka Shing Knowledge Institute, University of Toronto, 209 Victoria St., Toronto, ON Canada M5B 1T8

Email: sharmistha.mishra@utoronto.ca

Word count: 3036 / 3000

1 **Key points**

2 **Question:** Were movement of long-term care homes (LTCH) workers between facilities
3 (staff connectivity) associated with the risk, size, and timing of SARS-CoV-2 outbreaks in
4 these facilities during the first wave of the COVID-19 pandemic.

5 **Finding:** After adjusting for facility-level and neighbourhood-level factors, a higher degree
6 of staff connectivity between LTCH was associated with a greater risk of outbreaks (2.2-fold
7 the risk of a LTCH connected with 10 more other LTCHs) and a higher risk of experiencing
8 an earlier outbreak (1.7-fold the hazard with 10 more staff connections with other LTCH).
9 However, we did not observe an association between connectivity and the size of outbreaks.

10 **Meaning:** “One-site” strategy to cohort staff by facility and minimizing movement may
11 reduce risk of pathogen importation. However, structural strategies (e.g. improve facility
12 design and infrastructure) to reduce nosocomial transmission within these facilities remain
13 pivotal to prevent and manage future respiratory virus outbreaks.

14

15 **Abstract (315 /350)**

16 **Objectives:** To describe the relationship between individual workers employed at more than
17 one LTCH (inter-LTCH connectivity) across long-term care homes (LTCH) and SARS-CoV-2
18 outbreaks.

19 **Design:** A retrospective cohort study using long-term care home surveillance and mobile
20 geolocation data.

21 **Setting:** Using data observed between February 26th, 2020, and August 31st, 2020, from
22 Ontario, the province where close to one-third of the Canada's SARS-CoV-2 cases among
23 long-term care homes residents were reported.

24 **Participants:** We included all 179 LTCH in the Greater Toronto Area (population 6.7 million,
25 where close to 50% of Ontario population resides).

26 **Exposures:** The main exposure of interest was the inter-LTCH connectivity, generated from
27 geographic position system location data procured across apps on different platforms.

28 **Main outcomes and measures:** Three outcomes were examined: 1) at least one SARS-CoV-2
29 diagnosis among residents, 2) cumulative cases among residents in each facility, and 3)
30 time to first outbreak.

31 **Results:** The median degree of connectivity for LTCH that experienced an outbreak (59%;
32 106/179) was 1.2 times the degree of those without an outbreak (6 compared to 5). LTCH
33 with higher inter-LTCH connectivity also had larger numbers of residents and beds, and
34 were more likely to have for-profit ownership. After adjusting for facility-level and
35 neighbourhood-level factors, every additional connection to another LTCH increased the
36 odds of an outbreak in the respective LTCH by 8% (adjusted odds ratio=1.08, 90% credible
37 interval [CrI]: 1.02-1.09). Inter-LTCH connectivity was also associated with higher risk of
38 earlier occurrence of a first SARS-CoV-2 case (adjusted hazard ratio=1.05, 90%CrI: 1.02-
39 1.09), but not with outbreak size.

40 **Conclusions and Relevance:** Staff cohorting was associated with reduced importation risk of
41 SARS-CoV-2 cases into LTCH. However, findings suggest that once importation has
42 occurred, other facility-level factors including facility infrastructure and staff benefits are
43 more important in shaping outbreak size. Implementing these structural strategies to meet
44 the LTCH workers and residents' needs are pivotal to prevent and manage future
45 respiratory virus outbreaks.

47 Introduction

48 Long-term care home (LTCH) residents and workers were disproportionately
49 affected by the COVID-19 pandemic (1). In Canada, LTCH residents accounted for 80% of
50 COVID-19 related deaths during the first wave of the epidemic (2, 3). LTCH in Ontario, the
51 most populous province of Canada, were among the hardest hit (4-6). During the first wave
52 of the SARS-CoV-2 epidemic in early 2020, LTCH residents in Ontario accounted for nearly
53 one-third of the total number of SARS-CoV-2 diagnoses and deaths among LTCH residents
54 in Canada (7). In comparison, Ontario represents approximately 20% of Canada's total
55 number of LTCH residents (8, 9).

56 Even prior to the COVID-19 pandemic, respiratory virus outbreaks including
57 influenza and SARS-CoV-1 have represented sustained threats to the health of residents in
58 LTCH (10). The reasons for elevated risks of nosocomial transmissions in LTCH are
59 multifactorial, including the vulnerability of the residents (e.g., old age, comorbidities),
60 facilities that are not designed for infection control practices (e.g., communal settings and
61 multiple-occupancy rooms), lacking protocols of infection control and personal protective
62 equipment (11). Nosocomial transmissions refer to infections acquired among LTCH
63 residents, in staff, or in visitors when pathogens are transmitted or acquired between
64 persons within the facility. Thus, efforts to reduce nosocomial outbreaks largely centered
65 on infection control practices (such as masking, hand hygiene, etc.), improved
66 environmental cleaning and ventilation, and strategies to reduce the introduction of
67 infections acquired outside the facility. The latter include infections acquired in the
68 community or in other healthcare institutions if personnels work in multiple facilities. Thus,
69 in addition to restrictions on visitors to LTCH (12), one of the earliest pandemic response

70 strategies employed in Ontario was provincial guidance to restrict LTCH personnel from
71 working in more than one congregate facility—strategy implemented across jurisdictions in
72 Canada and other countries (4, 13, 14). That is, nurses, personal support workers, and
73 other care providers had to choose one facility for employment, in an effort to reduce SARS-
74 CoV-2 transmission between LTCHs.

75 However, movement of workers between different LTCH and other congregate
76 settings (e.g. retirement homes, shelters) or home care, is common. This is especially true
77 in the context of the shortage of healthcare workers across Canada (15). Working in
78 multiple facilities is particularly common among part-time LTCH staff and agency-staff (i.e.,
79 temporary caregivers employed by a third party) (16). It is estimated that 24% of LTCH
80 staff work in multiple facilities (17). The majority of LTCH staff who provide direct care for
81 residents are personal support workers earning lower-than-average wages (18-20). In
82 Ontario and across Canada, a confluence of exposure risks for SARS-CoV-2, outside
83 healthcare facilities and within such facilities, led to disproportionate risks of infection
84 among LTCH staff, especially but not limited to personal support workers (21). Chief among
85 these risk factors for SARS-CoV-2 outbreaks were structural barriers to isolation if exposed
86 or infected, such as lack of paid sick leave or crowded housing, as well as heightened risk of
87 repeat exposures at workplaces and in the community (21, 22).

88 The rationale for restricting movement of staff to only work on one facility during
89 pandemic was to limit the potential spread of SARS-CoV-2 between facilities (23). In the
90 context of ongoing staffing shortages, however, there may have been negative consequences
91 such as workloads exceeding capacity leading to burnout and moral injury among staff (24),
92 and gaps in the quality of care (25, 26)—all of which might have contributed to the spread of

93 SARS-CoV-2 (27). To date, it is unknown to what extent staff movement between long-term
94 care facilities could explain outbreaks within congregated settings such as LTCH in Canada.
95 The overarching goal of this study is to characterize the association between LTCH worker
96 connectivity and SARS-CoV-2 outbreaks in the Greater Toronto Area (Canada). Specifically,
97 we aim to examine whether the inter-facility connectivity was associated with 1) an
98 outbreak in LTCH, 2) cumulative numbers of SARS-CoV2 cases in LTCH residents, and 3)
99 time-to-first SARS-CoV-2 case in each LTCH.

100

101 **Methods**

102 *Study design and study population*

103 We conducted a retrospective cohort study of all 179 long-term care homes in the
104 Greater Toronto Area, the largest urban center in Ontario, Canada from February 26th, 2020,
105 to August 31st, 2020 (the first major wave of COVID-19 epidemic). The Greater Toronto
106 Area includes Toronto, York, Peel, Halton, and Durham municipalities, where close to 50%
107 of the Ontario's population resides (6.7 million).

108

109 *Data sources*

110 Aggregated facility-level total number of SARS-CoV-2 cases were extracted from the
111 *Case and Contact Management System* (a central data repository for SARS-CoV-2 case and
112 contact management (28)) and the *Integrated Public Health Information System* (a
113 centralized information system for the reporting and surveillance of all Diseases of Public
114 Health Significance (29)) in Ontario which includes all suspected and laboratory-confirmed
115 cases of SARS-CoV-2 infections. Characteristics and occupancies of each LTCH were

116 obtained from the *Client Profile*, a database containing information on LTCH attributes and
117 residents information (30). Data were obtained from Ontario Ministry of Health and Long-
118 Term Care under a data sharing agreement.

119 Aggregated LTCH facility-level mobility data were generated by BlueDot using
120 anonymized geographic position system location data procured across apps on different
121 platforms with users' consent from Pelmorex and Veraset (31, 32). BlueDot summarized
122 the mobility data over the study period at the level of each LTCH. Cumulative incidence of
123 SARS-CoV-2 cases in the surrounding dissemination area (a small geographic unit with
124 around 400-700 people; thereafter, "*neighborhood*") where the LTCH were located during
125 study period was extracted from an online database that was verified by the Ontario
126 Ministry of Health (33).

127

128 *Measures and Outcomes*

129 The main exposure of interest was the movement of LTCH workers across facilities.
130 Due to lack of administrative data, we used the overall degree of connectivity between
131 facilities during the study period (thereafter, "*inter-LTCH connectivity*") as proxy. This is
132 measured as the number of facilities a LTCH shares at least one smartphone connection
133 with (34). A connection between two facilities was recorded when a mobile device makes a
134 visit (a minimum of 30 minutes within the facility geographic unit) to one facility and
135 makes another visit to a different facility within 14-days of visiting the first. We assumed
136 the observed connectivity between facilities was due to worker movement, as the lockdown
137 and visiting restriction measures were also implemented at the same time as the study

138 period (35, 36), which limited the movement of the general population and banned visiting
139 of LTCH residents.

140 We adjusted for facility-level factors that were related to COVID-19 outbreaks and
141 transmission in LTCH, including for-profit ownership (Yes/No), total number of beds,
142 proportion of private beds (1 bed per room), and the number of residents (37). Due to data
143 availability limitations, we used the facility attributes on February 1st, 2020, and assumed
144 they are constant throughout the study period given the short time frame of the study.
145 Additionally, we included an area-level measure that was associated with SARS-CoV-2
146 diagnosis in LTCH: number of cases in the surrounding community (23). Given the large
147 heterogeneities in the numbers of cases within surrounding community, we categorized
148 this measure into deciles: the LTCH was categorized as being located in a hotspot if the
149 cumulative rate of SARS-CoV-2 diagnoses in the neighbourhood surrounding the LTCH
150 during the study period was >300 per 100,000 population (33).

151 The primary outcome was the outbreak status (Yes/No) of a LTCH, which is defined
152 as at least one SARS-CoV-2 case diagnosed among the residents (7). We examined two
153 secondary outcomes: outbreak size (measured as the total number of SARS-CoV-2 cases in
154 each LTCH during the study period); and time-to-first SARS-CoV-2 case since the beginning
155 of the epidemic in Ontario (2020-02-26). A SARS-CoV-2 case was defined as a confirmed
156 laboratory test using the polymerase chain reaction among residents (38).

157

158 *Statistical Analyses*

159 To examine whether the inter-LTCH connectivity was associated with LTCH
160 outbreaks, a Bayesian logistic regression model (Model 1) was built. Additionally, a

161 Bayesian negative binomial model (Model 2) and a Bayesian Cox proportional hazard
162 model (Model 3) were used to detect whether the inter-LTCH connectivity was associated
163 with the outbreak size and time-to-first case, respectively. For each of the three models, we
164 considered two types of covariates: facility-level factors (the degree of connectivity, the
165 number of beds, the proportion of private beds, and for-profit status), and area-level factors
166 (hotspot status). Missing data in the degree of connectivity during our study period was
167 imputed using a missingness model as a function of the baseline degree of connectivity
168 before the pandemic (from 2019-01-01-2020-02-25), assuming missing at random. Given
169 the small sample size, the results are reported using 90% credible intervals (CrI). The
170 detailed model structures are summarized in *Supplementary text*.

171 Each of the models was calibrated using using8 chains and 10,000 iterations with
172 the *rstan* package (39). All analyses were performed under R version 4.3.1.

173

174 *Ethical Approval*

175 Ethics approval was obtained from the Unity Health Toronto Research Ethics Board
176 (#23-198).

177

178 **Results**

179 Of the 179 LTCH in Greater Toronto Area, Ontario, 106 (59%) experienced an
180 outbreak (at least one case among residents during the study period, **Table 1**). Among LTCH
181 with an outbreak, the median cumulative diagnosis rate of SARS-CoV-2 during the study
182 period was 237 per 1,000 residents (interquartile range [IQR]: 4 to 474). The median time-
183 to-first case since the beginning of the epidemic in Ontario (2020-02-26) was 47 (IQR: 33-

184 69) days. LTCH that experienced an outbreak were homes with a larger number of
185 residents, a larger number of beds, and homes with a smaller proportion of beds that were
186 private. A higher proportion of LTCH with outbreaks were located in SARS-CoV-2
187 neighbourhood hotspots.

188 The average degree of inter-LTCH connectivity between the LTCH during the study
189 period decreased by 53%, compared to their baseline level. LTCH with an outbreak had
190 slightly higher degree connectivity than those without an outbreak (**Figure 1**). Regardless of
191 outbreak status, LTCH located in neighbourhood hotspots, with larger number of beds and
192 residents, and with for-profit ownership had higher inter-LTCH connectivity with other
193 LTCH (**Figure 1; Figure S1-4**). No differences in the degree of inter-LTCH connectivity were
194 observed by proportion of private beds (**Figure S5**).

195 In the unadjusted analysis of our primary outcome, a one-unit increase in inter-
196 LTCH connectivity was associated with an increased odds of a SARS-CoV-2 outbreak
197 (adjusted odds ratio [aOR]=1.11, 90% CrI: 1.03-1.20). The magnitude of association
198 reduced after adjusting for facility-level and neighbourhood-level factors (aOR=1.08, 90%
199 CrI: 1.00-1.17). Analyses of secondary outcomes demonstrated that increased inter-LTCH
200 connectivity was associated with earlier SARS-CoV-2 outbreaks (adjusted hazard ratio
201 [aHR]=1.05, 90%CrI: 1.02-1.09). However, we did not observe a statistically significant
202 association between the degree of connectivity and the outbreak size (adjusted rate ratio
203 [aRR] = 1.04, 90%CrI: 0.96-1.13).

204 Location of the home in a neighbourhood hotspot was also associated with greater
205 odds of an outbreak (aOR=2.00, 90%CrI: 1.14-3.58) and with the hazard of an earlier first
206 SARS-CoV-2 case (HR = 1.66, 90%CrI: 1.14-2.42). A higher proportion of private beds was

207 associated with a lower odd of an outbreak (aOR=0.28, 90%CrI: 0.08-0.95), a lower hazard
208 for earlier first SARS-CoV-2 cases (aHR=0.47, 90%CrI: 0.24-0.94), and a smaller outbreak
209 size (aRR=0.19, 90%CrI: 0.05-0.80. We did not observe an association of number of total
210 beds and for-profit ownership on all of the three outcomes examined.

211

212 Discussion

213 Using connectivity information derived from the mobile-device data, we quantified
214 the strength of association between inter-LTCH connectivity and risk, timing, and size an
215 outbreak of SARS-CoV-2 during the first wave of the COVID-19 epidemic. We found that for
216 each additional facility to which an LTCH was connected, there was an 8 percent-point
217 increase in the odds of an outbreak and a 5 percentage-point higher risk of an earlier
218 outbreak. However, there was no evidence of an association between inter-LTHCH
219 connectivity and outbreak size. Facility-level attributes including proportion of private beds
220 and the incidence of SARS-CoV-2 cases in surrounding communities were also strongly
221 associated with the probability and timing of an outbreak in the LTCH.

222 Our study suggests that inter-LTCH connectivity increased the risk of an outbreak
223 and earlier timing of an outbreak with an exponential augmentation. For example,
224 connections with 10 additional facilities meant 2.2-fold higher odds of an outbreak.
225 However, connectivity was not associated with the size of an outbreak. Taken together, this
226 association of the first two outcomes suggests that connectivity may represent an
227 important risk factor for the introduction of a pathogen; nevertheless, it becomes less
228 important once nosocomial transmission within a facility takes hold. This interpretation
229 aligns with epidemic theory that staff who worked in multiple facilities posed a higher risk

230 of case importation into these facilities (40). Empirical studies using mobile-device data to
231 measure connectivity in the United States and Canada also found that cross-facility staff
232 movements accounted for approximately 50% of the cases in LTCH (34) and reduced
233 mobility between facilities was associated with lower risk of SARS-CoV-2 in LTCH (41).
234 Moreover, case studies that explicitly measured staff movement in the United Kingdom
235 provided further evidence of staff-to-resident transmission and elevated risk of infection
236 among staff working at multiple facilities (42). Therefore, these empirical associations (and
237 which were conceptualized as risk factors), alongside epidemic theory, suggest that efforts
238 to reduce connectivity could be an important early strategy but alone would be insufficient
239 to reduce nosocomial transmission risks.

240 Our findings on other facility-level and area-level factors beyond connectivity align
241 with previous literature on the importance of the facility and community characteristics.
242 These studies demonstrated the important role of lower staff-to-resident ratio, outbreaks
243 in surrounding community, for-profit status, and other architectural structure (e.g.,
244 proportion of private beds) factors on risks of SARS-CoV-2 outbreaks in congregated living
245 settings (23, 34, 37, 43, 44). This is expected because more cases in surrounding
246 community can increase the risk of case importation, and lacking space for distancing and
247 isolation increases the risk of transmission among residents. Low staff-to-resident ratio not
248 only decreases the quality of care, but also increases the likelihood of staff not taking sick
249 leave, and therefore increasing the risk of transmission (45). We also found a protective
250 association between the proportion of private beds and the timing of an outbreak which
251 has not yet been discussed elsewhere. A possible explanation could be that LTCH with
252 higher proportion of private beds were newer (better design) and had higher quality of

253 care (46). These findings provide further evidence to support structural strategies within
254 LTCH to reduce transmission risks for SARS-CoV-2, and other respiratory viruses (23, 27,
255 43).

256 Our study should be interpreted considering certain limitations. First, we used
257 mobile device connectivity as proxy to staff movement. The quality of the data highly
258 depends on the extent of measurement error and the degree of completeness of the data.
259 This may induce bias if there exists systematic error (e.g., mobile device sensor quality,
260 device signal not captured) and missingness of staff mobile connectivity not at random (e.g.,
261 geolocation failure, invalid geocoordinate) (47). For example, if missingness among LTCH
262 with an outbreak was higher than those without an outbreak, then it might bias the effect of
263 connectivity towards the null, and vice versa. However, mobile data is one of the most
264 feasible sources of mobility information for large-scale studies on movement, compared to
265 methods that need to distribute specific devices such as portable sensors. Second, the
266 availability and quality of time-series network connection data were limited. Therefore, we
267 only used overall degree of connectivity as measures of the inter-LTCH movement, instead
268 of also looking into the impact of other network connectivity measures (e.g., the strength of
269 connection, which also takes into account of the total number of visits between linked
270 facility (34)) and the changing connectivity across time. These variables may help generate
271 more precise estimates of the association, especially for the time-to-event analysis.
272 Moreover, we did not study the mixing pattern of the connections between LTCH due to the
273 quality of the data. For example, staff working at a facility with an outbreak may be more
274 likely to have another job at the other facility, or the linkages were random, or those who
275 moved between facilities were more likely to be personal supporting staff who had direct

276 contact with residents (48). This information can help estimate the causal relationship
277 between the staff movement and the outbreaks in LTCH. Future efforts should be paid to
278 overcome these data limitations.

279 This study also has several strengths. First, we used mobile data to measure the
280 mobility of LTCH workers. This type of data provides valid and nearly real-time population
281 movement information at a large scale that can hardly be achieved by traditional surveys
282 (49, 50). Moreover, this study adopted a Bayesian approach to deal with the missing data,
283 which incorporated the uncertainty directly into the model and provided more robust and
284 realistic estimates.

285 These findings have two key implications. First, if most of the connectivity between
286 facilities is due to movement of staff who work in multiple facilities, then our findings
287 suggest that implementing a “work only in one-site” strategy (staff cohorting) could help
288 reduce risks of an outbreak but may not reduce the size of an outbreak. The latter is critical
289 given trade-offs that have been identified and include low staffing levels associated with
290 higher rates of SARS-CoV-2 in LTCH (4), staff burnout (24), lower care quality and pressure
291 on LTCH residents (25), etc. A pandemic response strategy that carefully separates
292 strategies to reduce “importation” risks and “nosocomial” risks, therefore, can balance
293 these trade-offs. For example, structural strategies to reduce nosocomial transmission risks,
294 such as ensuring training of LTCH staff and strict protocols of infection control, increasing
295 staff-residence ratio and adequate staff sick pay, and improving living environment of the
296 residents (17, 23, 27), are particularly important because it is the nosocomial risks and
297 outbreak size that shape the burden of morbidity and mortality. Second, our findings on the

298 importance of location (in a hotspot) highlight the critical role that reducing transmission
299 in the community could have on reducing importation risks in facilities (43).

300

301 **Conclusion**

302 To prevent and manage outbreaks of SARS-CoV-2 and other respiratory viruses in
303 long-term care homes, policies should focus on limiting staff movement between facilities
304 to reduce virus importation. Simultaneously, addressing widespread staffing shortages is
305 critical to ensure care quality without compromising infection control. Structural strategies,
306 such as improving infection prevention protocols and facility infrastructure, are essential to
307 minimize nosocomial transmission and enhance outbreak preparedness in these
308 congregate living settings.

309 **Acknowledgements**

310 We thank Kristy Yiu (Unity Health Toronto) and Mackenzie Hamilton (Unity Health
311 Toronto) for data management support.

312 **Funding**

313 This study was funded by the COVID-19 Immunity Task Force via the Public Health
314 Agency of Canada (#2021-HQ-000143). Sharon E Straus's research program is supported
315 by a Canada Research Chair (Tier 1) in Knowledge Translation and Quality of Care.
316 Sharmistha Mishra's research program is supported by a Canada Research Chair (Tier 2) in
317 Mathematical Modeling and Program Science. Mathieu Maheu-Giroux's research program is
318 supported by a Canada Research Chair (Tier 2) in Population Health Modeling. Yiqing Xia's
319 work is supported by the CIHR doctoral award.

Author contributions

320 YX, HM and SM conceived of and designed the study. YX conducted the literature
321 search, developed and conducted the statistical analysis, and drafted the manuscript with
322 editing by SM. KM, QH, SA, JMB, IF, JJ, KK, JM, and GM supported data curation. HM, KM, SES,
323 CF, GM, QG, SA, JMB, IF, JJ, KK, JM, LW, AKC, SDB, MMG, and SM interpreted results, critically
324 reviewed and edited the article.

325

326 References

- 327 1. Grinspun D, Matthews JH, Bonner R, Moreno-Casbas T, Mo J. COVID-19
328 pandemic in long-term care: An international perspective for policy considerations. *Int J*
329 *Nurs Sci.* 2023;10(2):158-66.
- 330 2. Webster P. COVID-19 highlights Canada's care home crisis. *Lancet.*
331 2021;397(10270):183.
- 332 3. Pandemic Experience in the Long-Term Care Sector: How Does Canada
333 Compare With Other Countries? Ottawa, ON: Canadian Institute for Health Information;
334 2020.
- 335 4. Liu M, Maxwell CJ, Armstrong P, Schwandt M, Moser A, McGregor MJ, et al.
336 COVID-19 in long-term care homes in Ontario and British Columbia. *CMAJ.*
337 2020;192(47):E1540-E6.
- 338 5. Oldenburger D, Baumann A, Crea-Arsenio M, Deber R, Baba V. COVID-19
339 Issues in Long-Term Care in Ontario: A Document Analysis. *Healthc Policy.*
340 2022;17(SP):53-65.
- 341 6. Amy T. Hsu NL, Samir K. Sinha, Julie Dunning,, Misha Dhuper ZK, Heidi
342 Sveistrup. Understanding the impact of COVID-19 on residents of Canada's long-term
343 care homes – ongoing challenges and policy responses. *International Long-Term Care*
344 *Policy Network* Jun 4, 2020.
- 345 7. The Impact of COVID-19 on Long-Term Care in Canada: Focus on the First 6
346 Months. Ottawa, ON: Canadian Institute for Health Information; 2021.
- 347 8. Clarke J. Impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic in nursing and residential care
348 facilities in Canada. Ontario: Statistics Canada; 2021 June 10.
- 349 9. Long-Term Care Homes Program - A Review of the Plan to Create 15,000 New
350 Long-Term Care Beds in Ontario. Toronto: Financial Accountability Office of Ontario;
351 2019.
- 352 10. Lansbury LE, Brown CS, Nguyen-Van-Tam JS. Influenza in long-term care
353 facilities. *Influenza Other Respir Viruses.* 2017;11(5):356-66.
- 354 11. Estabrooks CA SS, Flood, CM, Keefe J, Armstrong P, Donner G, Boscart V,
355 Ducharme F., Silvius J WM. Restoring Trust: COVID-19 and The Future of Long-Term
356 Care. In: Canada RSo, editor. Ottawa2020.
- 357 12. COVID-19 Visiting Policy. November 23, 2020 ed. ON, Canada.
- 358 13. Newswire B. How do Canada's provinces compare on restricting movement of
359 care workers during COVID-19? : BC Care Provider Association; 2020 [updated May 29,
360 2020. Available from: [https://bccare.ca/2020/05/how-do-canadas-provinces-compare-](https://bccare.ca/2020/05/how-do-canadas-provinces-compare-on-restricting-movement-of-care-workers-during-covid-19/)
361 [on-restricting-movement-of-care-workers-during-covid-19/](https://bccare.ca/2020/05/how-do-canadas-provinces-compare-on-restricting-movement-of-care-workers-during-covid-19/).
- 362 14. Low L.-F. CS, Taylor W., Breuer E. and Yu J.J. COVID-19 and the Long-Term
363 Care system in Australia. LTCcovid, Care Policy and Evaluation Centre, London School
364 of Economics and Political Science.
- 365 15. Addressing the Staffing Emergency in Long-Term Care in Canada. The Canadian
366 Association for Long Term Care.
- 367 16. Drost A, Alam MI, Boamah S, Kralj B, Costa A, Sweetman A. Multiple jobholding
368 and part-time work among nurses in long-term care homes compared to other
369 healthcare sectors: Evidence from Ontario. *Health Policy.* 2023;130:104713.

- 370 17. Duan Y, Iaconi A, Song Y, Norton PG, Squires JE, Keefe J, et al. Care Aides
371 Working Multiple Jobs: Considerations for Staffing Policies in Long-Term Care Homes
372 During and After the COVID-19 Pandemic. *J Am Med Dir Assoc.* 2020;21(10):1390-1.
373 18. Van Houtven CH, DePasquale N, Coe NB. Essential Long-Term Care Workers
374 Commonly Hold Second Jobs and Double- or Triple-Duty Caregiving Roles. *J Am*
375 *Geriatr Soc.* 2020;68(8):1657-60.
376 19. Value-for-Money Audit: Long-Term Care Homes: Delivery of Resident-Centred
377 Care: Office of the Auditor General of Ontario; [updated December, 2023. Available
378 from:
379 [https://www.auditor.on.ca/en/content/annualreports/arreports/en23/AR_LTCresidential_e](https://www.auditor.on.ca/en/content/annualreports/arreports/en23/AR_LTCresidential_en23.pdf)
380 [n23.pdf](https://www.auditor.on.ca/en/content/annualreports/arreports/en23/AR_LTCresidential_en23.pdf).
381 20. Labour market report, December 2022: Ministry of Labour, Immigration, Training
382 and Skills Development; [updated Jan 20, 2023. Available from:
383 [https://www.ontario.ca/page/labour-market-report-december-](https://www.ontario.ca/page/labour-market-report-december-2022#:~:text=Chart%20%20shows%20the%20year,(data%20unadjusted%20for%20seasonality).&text=The%20average%20hourly%20wage%20rate,10.2%25%20($2.39)%20to%20$25.90)
384 [2022#:~:text=Chart%20%20shows%20the%20year,\(data%20unadjusted%20for%20se](https://www.ontario.ca/page/labour-market-report-december-2022#:~:text=Chart%20%20shows%20the%20year,(data%20unadjusted%20for%20seasonality).&text=The%20average%20hourly%20wage%20rate,10.2%25%20($2.39)%20to%20$25.90)
385 [asonality\).&text=The%20average%20hourly%20wage%20rate,10.2%25%20\(\\$2.39\)%20](https://www.ontario.ca/page/labour-market-report-december-2022#:~:text=Chart%20%20shows%20the%20year,(data%20unadjusted%20for%20seasonality).&text=The%20average%20hourly%20wage%20rate,10.2%25%20($2.39)%20to%20$25.90)
386 [to%20\\$25.90](https://www.ontario.ca/page/labour-market-report-december-2022#:~:text=Chart%20%20shows%20the%20year,(data%20unadjusted%20for%20seasonality).&text=The%20average%20hourly%20wage%20rate,10.2%25%20($2.39)%20to%20$25.90).
387 21. Ma H, Yiu KCY, Baral SD, Fahim C, Moloney G, Darvin D, et al. COVID-19 Cases
388 Among Congregate Care Facility Staff by Neighborhood of Residence and Social and
389 Structural Determinants: Observational Study. *JMIR Public Health Surveill.*
390 2022;8(10):e34927.
391 22. Shi SM, Bakaev I, Chen H, Trivison TG, Berry SD. Risk Factors, Presentation,
392 and Course of Coronavirus Disease 2019 in a Large, Academic Long-Term Care Facility.
393 *J Am Med Dir Assoc.* 2020;21(10):1378-83 e1.
394 23. Heckman GA, Kay K, Morrison A, Grabowski DC, Hirdes JP, Mor V, et al.
395 Proceedings from an International Virtual Townhall: Reflecting on the COVID-19
396 Pandemic: Themes from Long-Term Care. *J Am Med Dir Assoc.* 2021;22(6):1128-32.
397 24. Titley HK, Young S, Savage A, Thorne T, Spiers J, Estabrooks CA. Cracks in the
398 foundation: The experience of care aides in long-term care homes during the COVID-19
399 pandemic. *J Am Geriatr Soc.* 2023;71(1):198-205.
400 25. Havaei F, Staempfli S, Ma A, Sims-Gould J, Franke T, Park M. Resident Impact of
401 the Single Site Order Restricting Staff Mobility across Long-Term Care Homes in British
402 Columbia, Canada. *Healthcare (Basel).* 2023;11(24).
403 26. Havaei F, Sims-Gould J, Staempfli S, Franke T, Park M, Ma A, et al. Impact of the
404 single site order in LTC: exacerbation of an overburdened system. *BMC Health Serv*
405 *Res.* 2023;23(1):666.
406 27. Henriques HR, Sousa D, Faria J, Pinto J, Costa A, Henriques MA, et al. Learning
407 from the covid-19 outbreaks in long-term care facilities: a systematic review. *BMC*
408 *Geriatr.* 2023;23(1):618.
409 28. COVID-19 Case and Contact Management: Public Health Ontario; [Available
410 from: [https://www.publichealthontario.ca/en/Diseases-and-Conditions/Infectious-](https://www.publichealthontario.ca/en/Diseases-and-Conditions/Infectious-Diseases/Respiratory-Diseases/Novel-Coronavirus/Case-Contact-Management)
411 [Diseases/Respiratory-Diseases/Novel-Coronavirus/Case-Contact-Management](https://www.publichealthontario.ca/en/Diseases-and-Conditions/Infectious-Diseases/Respiratory-Diseases/Novel-Coronavirus/Case-Contact-Management).
412 29. iPHIS Resources: Public Health Ontario; [Available from:
413 [https://www.publichealthontario.ca/en/Diseases-and-Conditions/Infectious-](https://www.publichealthontario.ca/en/Diseases-and-Conditions/Infectious-Diseases/CCM/iPHIS)
414 [Diseases/CCM/iPHIS](https://www.publichealthontario.ca/en/Diseases-and-Conditions/Infectious-Diseases/CCM/iPHIS).

- 415 30. Client Profile (CPRO) Database: Ontario Ministry of Health; [Available from:
416 <https://data.ontario.ca/dataset/client-profile-cpro-database>.
417 31. BlueDot website: BlueDot; [Available from: <https://bluedot.global>.
418 32. Wang S, Wang L, Baral SD, Moloney G, Johns J, Huber C, et al. Mobility
419 changes following COVID-19 stay-at-home policies varied by socioeconomic measures:
420 An observational study in Ontario, Canada. PLOS Glob Public Health.
421 2024;4(11):e0002926.
422 33. Kaur M, Bragazzi NL, Heffernan J, Tsasis P, Wu J, Kong JD. COVID-19 in
423 Ontario Long-term Care Facilities Project, a manually curated and validated database.
424 Front Public Health. 2023;11:1133419.
425 34. Chen MK, Chevalier JA, Long EF. Nursing home staff networks and COVID-19.
426 Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A. 2021;118(1).
427 35. COVID-19 in Long-Term Care: Family Councils Ontario; [Available from:
428 <https://fco.ngo/resources/covid-19-1>.
429 36. A timeline of COVID-19 in Ontario: Global News; [updated May 10, 2021.
430 Available from: <https://globalnews.ca/news/6859636/ontario-coronavirus-timeline/>.
431 37. Stall NM, Jones A, Brown KA, Rochon PA, Costa AP. For-profit long-term care
432 homes and the risk of COVID-19 outbreaks and resident deaths. CMAJ.
433 2020;192(33):E946-E55.
434 38. COVID-19 Testing: What You Need to Know: Centers for Disease Control and
435 Prevention (CDC); [updated 2023 Sep 25. Available from:
436 <https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/symptoms-testing/testing.html>.
437 39. RStan: the R interface to Stan: Stan Development Team; 2024 [R package
438 version 2.32.6:[Available from: <https://mc-stan.org/rstan/>.
439 40. McMichael TM, Clark S, Pogosjans S, Kay M, Lewis J, Baer A, et al. COVID-19 in
440 a Long-Term Care Facility - King County, Washington, February 27-March 9, 2020.
441 MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep. 2020;69(12):339-42.
442 41. Jones A, Watts AG, Khan SU, Forsyth J, Brown KA, Costa AP, et al. Impact of a
443 Public Policy Restricting Staff Mobility Between Nursing Homes in Ontario, Canada
444 During the COVID-19 Pandemic. J Am Med Dir Assoc. 2021;22(3):494-7.
445 42. Ladhani SN, Chow JY, Janarthanan R, Fok J, Crawley-Boevey E, Vusirikala A, et
446 al. Increased risk of SARS-CoV-2 infection in staff working across different care homes:
447 enhanced CoVID-19 outbreak investigations in London care Homes. J Infect.
448 2020;81(4):621-4.
449 43. Alavinejad M, Tosato M, Bragazzi NL, McCarthy Z, Wu J, Bourouiba L. Markers
450 of community outbreak and facility type for mitigation of COVID-19 in long-term care
451 homes in Ontario, Canada: Insights and implications from a time-series analysis. Ann
452 Epidemiol. 2024;90:9-20.
453 44. Dee BB, Rysanek A, editors. Single-versus shared-occupancy bedrooms in long-
454 term care homes during the COVID-19 pandemic: A regional cohort study of 355
455 facilities in British Columbia, Canada. E3S Web of Conferences; 2023: EDP Sciences.
456 45. Cimiotti JP, Aiken LH, Sloane DM, Wu ES. Nurse staffing, burnout, and health
457 care-associated infection. Am J Infect Control. 2012;40(6):486-90.
458 46. Calkins M, Cassella C. Exploring the cost and value of private versus shared
459 bedrooms in nursing homes. Gerontologist. 2007;47(2):169-83.

- 460 47. Bähr S, Haas G-C, Keusch F, Kreuter F, Trappmann M. Missing Data and Other
461 Measurement Quality Issues in Mobile Geolocation Sensor Data. *Social Science*
462 *Computer Review*. 2022;40(1):212-35.
- 463 48. Tim Bates M, Spetz J, Wagner L. Characteristics of Multiple Job Holders in Long-
464 term Care. 2022.
- 465 49. Isfeld-Kiely H. Insights for Public Health's Use of Mobility Data Winnipeg,
466 Manitoba: National Collaborating Centre for Infectious Diseases; 2023 [Available from:
467 <https://nccid.ca/publications/insights-for-public-healths-use-of-mobility-data/>.
468
- 469 50. Caceres N, Romero LM, Benitez FG. Exploring strengths and weaknesses of
470 mobility inference from mobile phone data vs. travel surveys. *Transportmetrica A:*
471 *Transport Science*. 2020;16(3):574-601.

472


473 **Table 1.** Characteristics of long-term care homes by outbreak status in Greater Toronto Area,
474 Ontario.

	Outbreak (N = 106)	No outbreak (N = 73)
Degree of connectivity (median (interquartile range, IQR))		
<i>Baseline</i> ¹	11 (7-15)	9 (5-16)
<i>Study period</i>	6 (3-8)	5 (3-7)
<i>Number of missing</i>	11	19
Number of total beds (median (IQR))	161 (128-205)	134 (93-160)
Proportion of private beds (median (IQR), %)	28 (9-59)	45 (9-60)
Number of residents (median (IQR))	169.9 (75.8)	130.6 (57.7)
For-profit status (N (%))		
<i>Yes</i>	53 (50%)	43 (59%)
<i>No</i>	53 (50%)	30 (41%)
Hotspot status ² (N (%))		
<i>Yes</i>	77 (73%)	36 (49%)
<i>No</i>	29 (27%)	37 (51%)
Number of cases among residents during study period (median (IQR))	40 (4-66)	/
Time to first case since 2020-02-26 in days (median (IQR))	47 (33-69)	/

475 ¹ Baseline period is from 2019-01-01 to 2020-02-25; Study period is from 2020-02-26 to 2020-08-31.

476 ² Hotspot: a LTCH was categorized as being located in a hotspot if the cumulative rate of SARS-CoV-2
477 diagnoses in the dissemination area (a small geographic unit with around 400-700 people) surrounding the
478 LTCH during the study period was >300 per 100,000 population.

479



480
481 **Figure 1.** Network connection across long-term care homes (LTCH) in Greater Toronto Area,
482 Ontario by outbreak status. Each node represents a LTCH. The bigger the node, the higher
483 degree of connectivity (panel A) and number of total beds (panel B) that LTCH had between
484 2020-02-26 and 2020-08-31.

485