

1 **Original article**

2 **Prevalence of SARS-CoV-2 infection among COVID-19 RT-PCR**

3 **laboratory workers in Bangladesh**

4 **Authors:** Mohammad Jahidur Rahman Khan^{*1}, Samshad Jahan Shumu², Ruksana Raihan³,

5 Nusrat Mannan⁴, Md. Selim Reza⁵, Nazia Hasan Khan⁶, Amirul Huda Bhuiyan⁷, Paroma

6 Deb⁸, Farzana Mim⁹, Arifa Akram^{*10}

7 ¹ Department of Microbiology, Shaheed Suhrawardy Medical College, Dhaka, Bangladesh

8 ² Department of Microbiology, Shaheed Suhrawardy Medical College, Dhaka, Bangladesh

9 ³ Department of Microbiology, US-Bangla Medical College, Dhaka, Bangladesh

10 ⁴ Department of Microbiology, US-Bangla Medical College, Dhaka, Bangladesh

11 ⁵ RT-PCR LAB, Bangabandhu Sheikh Mujib Medical College, Faridpur, Bangladesh

12 ⁶ RT-PCR LAB, United Hospital Limited, Dhaka, Bangladesh

13 ⁷ RT-PCR LAB, Narayanganj 300 Bed Hospital, Narayanganj Bangladesh

14 ⁸ Department of Virology, Dhaka Medical College, Dhaka, Bangladesh

15 ⁹ Department of Biochemistry & Molecular Biology, Jahangirnagar University, Dhaka,

16 Bangladesh

17 ¹⁰ Department of Virology, National Institute of Laboratory Medicine and Referral

18 Centre, Dhaka, Bangladesh

19 ***Corresponding Author:**

20 Mohammad Jahidur Rahman Khan

21 Assistant Professor

22 Department of Microbiology, Shaheed Suhrawardy Medical College,

23 Sher-E-Bangla Nagar, Agargaon, Dhaka-1207 Dhaka, Bangladesh

24 Mobile: +880-1760501588

25 E-mail: jahid29th@gmail.com

26 **Abstract**

27 **Background:**

28 Health care workers (HCWs) at the frontline are confronting a substantial risk of infection
29 during the coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) pandemic. This emerging virus created
30 specific hazards to researchers and laboratory staff in a clinical setting, underlined by rapid
31 and extensive worldwide transmission. This study aimed to investigate the prevalence of
32 SARS-CoV-2 infection among COVID-19 RT-PCR laboratory health workers in Bangladesh.

33 **Materials & Methods:**

34 This retrospective study was conducted between October 2 to December 2, 2020. A total of
35 508 participants, including doctors, scientific officers, medical technologists, and cleaners
36 working in several COVID-19 RT-PCR laboratories, were included in this study. Data were
37 collected from each participant using a semi-structured questionnaire prepared in the format
38 of an anonymous Google form. All participants provided informed consent. The Ethical
39 clearance was obtained from the Institutional Ethics Review Committee of Shaheed
40 Suhrawardy Medical College, Dhaka, Bangladesh. All statistical analyses were performed
41 using SPSS (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences) version 25.0 software (SPSS, Inc).

42 **Results:**

43 Out of the 508 participants, 295 tested positive for SARS CoV-2 RT-PCR. Among the
44 positive cases, 202 were men, 93 were women, with the median age of 30 years. The most
45 positive cases were medical technologists (53.22%) followed by doctors (28.8%). Out of the
46 271 symptomatic positive cases, the most typical symptoms were fever (78.5%), fatigue
47 (70%), loss of smell and taste (65%), cough (64%), and others. Hypertension, obesity, and
48 diabetes were found in 8.8%, 8.8%, and 7.1% positive cases. A + blood group was present in
49 37% of the positive cases, followed by the B+ blood group (27%) and O+ blood group
50 (25%). Inadequate supply of personal protection equipment (PPE), absence of negative

51 pressure ventilation, laboratory contamination, and no training on molecular test methods
52 were found in 13.8%, 67.8%, 44.7%, and 40.6% of positive cases, respectively.

53 **Conclusion:**

54 Evaluating the infection status of laboratory health workers is crucial for drawing attention
55 from the public, providing practical suggestions for government agencies, and increasing
56 protective measures for laboratory health workers.

57 **Keywords:** RT-PCR laboratory, Quality control, Personal protection equipment, Risk factor
58 Laboratory health worker, Medical technicians, Contamination

59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75

76 **Introduction**

77 Since its discovery, SARS-CoV-2 has shaken out of the world and has become a pandemic.
 78 As of September 4, 2021, there were 220,362,472 reported cases and 4,562,679 deaths
 79 worldwide¹. In Bangladesh, the first case of SARS-CoV-2 infection was confirmed on March
 80 8, 2020. Subsequently, Bangladesh was facing an increasing risk of imports and some local
 81 cluster cases of COVID-19. As of September 4, 2021, there are 1,510,283 confirmed cases
 82 and 26,432 deaths in Bangladesh².

83

84 Health care personnel around the globe have the most significant risk of getting infected and
 85 infecting others in their surrounding environment³. According to initial estimation, healthcare
 86 workers account for 10%–20% of all confirmed cases⁴. During the pandemic, medical
 87 services worldwide is facing an unavoidable burden of public health challenges⁵. In
 88 Bangladesh, most molecular laboratories performed RT-PCR to detect SARS-CoV-2 have
 89 been established after the pandemic began. These facilities were confronted an increased
 90 amount of real-time reverse transcriptase-polymerase chain reaction (RT-PCR) testing of
 91 SARS-CoV-2 for patients suspected as Covid-19, quarantined healthcare workers; travelers
 92 came back from high-risk countries as well as other required samples. The staff available for
 93 the laboratory was swiftly deployed to receive the large number of clinical samples without
 94 adequate amounts of training and PPEs. To confront this novel coronavirus never
 95 experienced before, some public health laboratory workers overlooked concerns about the
 96 possible risks of SARS-CoV-2 infection from their occupational exposure. While the
 97 protection of laboratory healthcare workers during the COVID-19 pandemic is one of the
 98 primary concerns, data regarding this issue are still inadequate⁶.

99

At present, around 1200 health workers, including doctors, microbiologists, biochemists, molecular biologists, medical technologists, cleaners, are working in over 100 COVID-19 RT-PCR laboratories across the country⁷. Many of them were infected by SARS-CoV-2 during this ongoing pandemic. They become a source of contamination in many laboratories⁸. The testing capacity of a COVID-19 RT-PCR laboratory is reduced when several workers become SARS-CoV-2 infected. The physical environment of the laboratory and workload play an essential role in transmitting SARS-CoV-2 among the laboratory workers⁹. The chance of getting infected by SARS-CoV-2 also depends on a laboratory health worker's age, comorbidity, and functional skill¹⁰.

Thus, we conducted a retrospective study to investigate the prevalence of SARS-CoV-2 infection among COVID-19 RT-PCR laboratory health workers in Bangladesh and assess the underlying factors related to the high infection rate of SARS-CoV-2.

Methods:

Study Design and data collection

We conducted a retrospective online survey from October 2 to December 2, 2020. A semi-structured questionnaire was prepared using an anonymous Google form. The generated link was shared with the focal persons of each laboratory and several Facebook and WhatsApp groups involving doctors and medical technologists. We decided to collect the data using online approaches and maintain social distance during Bangladesh's pandemic condition. Additional data were collected from some participants who did not fill the Google form entirely over the telephone. A hard copy of the questionnaire was also supplied to some participants who were not habituated with online submission by Google form.

Study population

Total 534 laboratory health workers, including doctors, scientific officers (microbiologist, biochemist, molecular biologist), medical technologists, and cleaners, filled up the Google form. Twenty-six participants were excluded as they had COVID-19 like symptoms, but RT-PCR did not confirm the diagnosis. The remaining 508 laboratory health workers from multiple COVID-19 RT-PCR laboratories were included in this study. Informed consent was obtained from all participants.

Statistical Analysis

The confirmed COVID-19 cases among HCWs were categorized according to the following parameters: sex, occupation type, hospital type, infection status, and others. All statistical analyses were performed using SPSS (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences) version 25.0 software (SPSS, Inc).

Results

Among the 508 participants, 295 (58%) were tested positive for SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR, and 237 (80.3%) were between the 24-44 years age group; male participants were 68.5%, and females were 31.5% (Table 1). Most participants were medical technologists (53.7%), followed by doctors (27.2%) (Table 2). Among the 295 positive cases, 271 were symptomatic. Analyzing the symptoms, we found 78.5% of them had fever, fatigue (70%), loss of smell and taste (65%), cough (64%), and others (Figure 1). Among the positive cases, the A+ blood group (37%) was affected more by COVID-19, followed by the B+ blood group (27%) (Figure 2). We analyzed their comorbidity status and found that hypertension and obesity were most common, 8% in both cases, followed by diabetes (7%) (Table 3). Among the positive cases, 13.8% had not an adequate supply of personal protection equipment (PPE), 67.8% had not the negative pressure ventilation system, 44.7% had an incidence of laboratory

contamination, and 40.6% did not get any kind of training on molecular test methods or quality control (QC) (Table 4).

Discussion

Findings from a previous pandemic of other coronaviruses revealed that frontline healthcare workers (HCWs) were at the highest risk of infection because of close contact with infected patients, touching the contaminated surfaces, the hiding of epidemiological histories by patients, inadequate training for infection prevention and control and conducting the high-risk procedures in airway management^{11,12}. Additional laboratory professionals, including virologists, microbiologists, medical technologists, cleaners, are also at high risk through exposure to specimens collected from SARS-CoV-2 infected patients. This study retrospectively collected epidemiological and related data of laboratory personnel working in multiple COVID-19 RT-PCR laboratories. Among the 508 participants of our research, we found 295 (58%) lab workers became positive during their services, and most of them were male and young (24-44 years age group).

Among laboratory health workers, medical technicians (MTs) possess a higher risk of regular handling of both symptomatic and asymptomatic cases¹³. Our study also found that medical technicians affected more almost 53% of cases. Analyzing the symptoms of positive cases, we found fever (78%), fatigue (70%), loss of smell and taste (65%), cough (64%), breathlessness (15%), and diarrhea (14%). Most of the cases were symptomatic (91%). A meta-analysis study on COVID-19 comorbidities shows that the most common comorbidities identified are hypertension (15.8%), which also matched our research; we found it in 8% of cases¹⁴. Blood group A had a significantly higher risk for acquiring COVID-19 than other blood groups in our study, which is also matched with the study of Barcelona¹⁵.

174

175 SARS-CoV-2 can be transmitted during the incubation period when a patient has nonspecific
 176 symptoms or no symptoms at all¹⁴. Therefore, it is necessary to protect them from SARS-
 177 CoV-2 infection, and additional transmission-based precautions should be taken¹⁵. HCWs
 178 infected by SARS-CoV-2 can increase the risk of transmission, and their absence from work
 179 can decrease health service performance. These may disrupt the chain management of a
 180 transmission¹⁶. To minimize the risk of transmission, healthcare workers should be provided
 181 with sufficient personal protective equipment (PPE) supplies, training on infection control,
 182 maintenance of personal hygiene, waste management¹⁷. Laboratory staff is advised to use
 183 PPE like the surgical or N95 mask, gowns, shield in the correct order, and they must be
 184 trained about it. Several studies have suggested that factors such as sufficient supplies of
 185 PPE, hands-on training on how to use them, etc., perform a crucial role in controlling such
 186 infections, which notably decreases the risk of transmission¹⁸. During the pandemic,
 187 especially at the initial stage, the global scarcity of masks, respirators, face shields, and
 188 gowns developed due to the sudden increase in demand and supply chain interference.
 189 Therefore, laboratory workers must preserve PPE by increased use or reuse, and infection
 190 prevention and control protocols could be maintained for the same reason¹⁹. Our study
 191 revealed that 13.8% of SARS-CoV-2 infected laboratory workers had an inadequate supply
 192 of PPE, and 67.8% had no negative pressure ventilation system in their workplace. 40.6% of
 193 SARS-CoV-2 infected laboratory workers did not train on molecular test methods or quality
 194 control (QC).

195

196 Healthcare workers play an essential role in in-hospital transmission. They are a potential
 197 source of nosocomial infection^{20,21,22}. In severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus
 198 (SERS-CoV) and Middle East respiratory syndrome coronavirus (MERS-CoV) infection,

nosocomial outbreaks have played a crucial part in spreading these viruses. The proportions of nosocomial conditions with early outbreaks of COVID-19, SARS, and MERS were 44.0%, 36.0%, and 56.0%, respectively²³. In our study, 44.7% of SARS-CoV-2 infected laboratory workers gave a history of laboratory contamination within six months.

Our study has some notable limitations. First, we could not collect biochemical data from all HCWs and could not manage the duration of hospital stay. Moreover, we did not obtain Whole Genome Sequencing of the healthcare workers who tested positive for SARS-CoV-2, and analyses should be interpreted with caution because of the small sample size.

Conclusion

The safety of laboratory health workers should be confirmed to end the pandemic, as COVID-19 is ongoing. In this study, we tried to analyze the infection status of laboratory health workers as it is not done before in Bangladesh, and it is essential to attract enough attention from the government and public. It will draw the attention of the government and non-government agencies to maintain the QC of COVID-19 RT-PCR laboratories, to improve protective measures like the adequate supply of PPE, and to arrange more hands-on training for laboratory health workers.

223

224 **Declarations**

225 **Ethics approval and consent to participate:**

226 This study was approved by the Ethical Review Committee of Shaheed Suhrawardy Medical
227 College, Dhaka, Bangladesh (No-ShSMCH/Ethical/2021/08).

228 **Consent for publication:**

229 Written informed consent was taken from each participant.

230 **Data Access Statements:**

231 The datasets used and analyzed during the current study are available from the corresponding
232 author on reasonable request.

233 **Funding:**

234 No funding was received to perform this study.

235 **Authors' contributions:**

236 SJS, NM and RR supervised the study. NR, AHV and PD take part in conceptualization and
237 methodology. AA and FM analyzed and interpreted the patient data. MSR performed the
238 qRT-PCR. MJRK was the main contributor in writing the manuscript. All authors read and
239 approved the final manuscript.

240

241

242

243

244

245

246

247

248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270

Conflict of Interest and Authorship Conformation Form:

All authors have participated in (a) conception and design, or analysis and interpretation of the data; (b) drafting the article or revising it critically for important intellectual content; and (c) approval of the final version. This manuscript has not been submitted to, nor is under review at, another journal or other publishing venue. The authors have no affiliation with any organization with a direct or indirect financial interest in the subject matter discussed in the manuscript.

271

272 **Acknowledgments:**

273 First, we would like to express our sincere gratitude to the Institute of Epidemiology, Disease
 274 Control and Research (IEDCR) for supplying us with all types of rapid antigen test kits as
 275 part of the validation procedure. We would like to thank the principal of Shaheed Suhrawardy
 276 Medical College for permitting this study in his institute. We would also like to thank all of
 277 the doctors and laboratory staff of the Department of Microbiology for their continuous
 278 support throughout the study. We are also grateful to all of the study participants who
 279 actively participated and co-operated to make it possible to complete this study. Finally, we
 280 would like to thank all the people who have supported me to complete the research work
 281 directly or indirectly.

282

283

284

285

286

287

288

289

290

291

292

293

294

295

296

297 REFERENCES

- 298 1. COVID Live Update: 220,362,472 Cases and 4,562,679 Deaths from the Coronavirus -
299 Worldometer [Internet]. [cited 2021 Sep 4]. Available from:
300 <https://www.worldometers.info/coronavirus/>
- 301 2. COVID-19 [Internet]. [cited 2021 Sep 4]. Available from:
302 <http://103.247.238.92/webportal/pages/covid19.php>
- 303 3. Lahner E, Dilaghi E, Prestigiacomo C, Alessio G, Marcellini L, Simmaco M, et al.
304 Prevalence of Sars-Cov-2 Infection in Health Workers (HWs) and Diagnostic Test
305 Performance: The Experience of a Teaching Hospital in Central Italy. *Int J Environ Res*
306 *Public Health*. 2020 Jan;17(12):4417.
- 307 4. Anderson RM, Heesterbeek H, Klinkenberg D, Hollingsworth TD. How will country-
308 based mitigation measures influence the course of the COVID-19 epidemic? *Lancet*
309 [Internet]. 2020 Mar 9 [cited 2021 Sep 4];395(10228). Available from:
310 <https://ora.ox.ac.uk/objects/uuid:adb3a0b8-7de6-4fc8-9092-7934e36192b0>
- 311 5. Albano PM, Notarte KI, Macaranas I, Maralit B. Cross-contamination in Molecular
312 Diagnostic Laboratories in Low- and Middle-income Countries□: *PJP*. 2020 Nov
313 5;5(2):7–11.
- 314 6. Iwen PC, Stiles KL, Pentella MA. Safety Considerations in the Laboratory Testing of
315 Specimens Suspected or Known to Contain the Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome
316 Coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2). *Am J Clin Pathol*. 2020 April 15;153(5):567–70.
- 317 7. *rt_pcr_lab.pdf* [Internet]. [cited 2021 Sep 4]. Available from:
318 https://dghs.gov.bd/images/docs/Notice/rt_pcr_lab.pdf

- 319 8. University of Santo Tomas, Manila, Philippines, Albano PM. Cross-contamination in
320 Molecular Diagnostic Laboratories in Low- and Middle-income Countries: A Challenge
321 to COVID-19 Testing. *Philipp J Pathol*. 2020 December 31;5(2):7–11.
- 322 9. Huggett JF, Benes V, Bustin SA, Garson JA, Harris K, Kammel M, et al. Cautionary
323 Note on Contamination of Reagents Used for Molecular Detection of SARS-CoV-2.
324 *Clin Chem*. 2020 Nov 1;66(11):1369–72.
- 325 10. Zuckerman NS, Pando R, Bucris E, Drori Y, Lustig Y, Erster O, et al. Comprehensive
326 Analyses of SARS-CoV-2 Transmission in a Public Health Virology Laboratory.
327 *Viruses*. 2020 Aug;12(8):854.
- 328 11. Escombe AR, Oeser CC, Gilman RH, Navincopa M, Ticona E, Pan W, et al. Natural
329 ventilation for the prevention of airborne contagion. *PLoS Med*. 2007;4(2):e68.
- 330 12. Frieden TR, Lee CT. Identifying and interrupting superspreading events—implications
331 for control of severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2. *Emerg Infect Dis*.
332 2020;26(6):1059.
- 333 13. Sadeghi M. The Role of Possible Factors Affecting the Risk of Getting Infected by
334 COVID-19 in Emergency Medical Technicians: A Case-Control Study. :12.
- 335 14. Sanyaolu A, Okorie C, Marinkovic A, Patidar R, Younis K, Desai P, Hosein Z, Padda I,
336 Mangat J, Altaf M. Comorbidity and its Impact on Patients with COVID-19. *SN Compr Clin*
337 *Med*. 2020 Jun 25:1-8. doi: 10.1007/s42399-020-00363-4. Epub ahead of print. PMID:
338 32838147; PMCID: PMC7314621.
- 339 15. Muñoz-Díaz E, Llopis J, Parra R, Roig I, Ferrer G, Grifols J, Millán A, Ene G, Ramiro L,
340 Maglio L, García N. Relationship between the ABO blood group and COVID-19

341 susceptibility, severity and mortality in two cohorts of patients. *Blood Transfusion*. 2021
342 Jan;19(1):54.

343 16. Callaway E, Cyranoski D. China coronavirus: six questions scientists are asking. *Nature*.
344 2020;577(7791):605–8.

345 17. McGarry BE, Grabowski DC, Barnett ML. Severe staffing and personal protective
346 equipment shortages faced by nursing homes during the COVID-19 pandemic: study
347 examines staffing and personal protective equipment shortages faced by nursing homes
348 during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Health Aff (Millwood)*. 2020;39(10):1812–21.

349 18. Fischer RJ, Morris DH, van Doremalen N, Sarchette S, Matson MJ, Bushmaker T, et al.
350 Effectiveness of N95 respirator decontamination and reuse against SARS-CoV-2 virus.
351 *Emerg Infect Dis*. 2020;26(9):2253.

352 19. Schwartz A, Stiegel M, Greeson N, Vogel A, Thomann W, Brown M, et al.
353 Decontamination and reuse of N95 respirators with hydrogen peroxide vapor to address
354 worldwide personal protective equipment shortages during the SARS-CoV-2 (COVID-
355 19) pandemic. *Appl Biosaf*. 2020;25(2):67–70.

356 20. Cook T. Personal protective equipment during the coronavirus disease (COVID) 2019
357 pandemic—a narrative review. *Anaesthesia*. 2020;75(7):920–7.

358 21. Lancet T. COVID-19: protecting healthcare workers. *Lancet Lond Engl*.
359 2020;395(10228):922.

360 22. Lai X, Wang M, Qin C, Tan L, Ran L, Chen D, et al. Coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-
361 2019) infection among healthcare workers and implications for prevention measures in a
362 tertiary hospital in Wuhan, China. *JAMA Netw Open*. 2020;3(5):e209666–e209666.

23. Zhou Q, Gao Y, Wang X, Liu R, Du P, Wang X, et al. Nosocomial infections among patients with COVID-19, SARS and MERS: a rapid review and meta-analysis. *Ann Transl Med.* 2020;8(10).

Table 1: Demographic data of the study population.

		SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR	
	Total	Positive	Negative
	508 (100%)	295 (58%)	213 (42%)
Age (years)			
Median	30	30	30
<24 (%)	50 (9.8%)	27 (9.2%)	23 (10.8%)
24-44 (%)	413 (81.3%)	237 (80.3%)	176 (82.6%)
>44 (%)	45 (8.9%)	31 (10.5%)	14 (6.6%)
Sex			
Male (%)	344 (67.7%)	202 (68.5%)	142 (66.7%)
Female (%)	164 (32.3%)	93 (31.5%)	71 (33.3%)

402

403 Table 2: Infection rate according to the designation of laboratory workers.

Designation	Total participants (n= 508)	SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR	
		Positive (n= 295)	Negative (n= 213)
Doctor	138 (27.2%)	85 (61.6%)	53 (38.4%)
Scientific officer	53 (10.5%)	27 (50.9%)	26 (49.1%)
Medical Technologist	273 (53.7%)	157 (57.5%)	116 (42.5%)
Cleaner	44 (8.6%)	26 (59.0%)	18 (41.0%)

404

405

406

407

408

409

410

411

412

413

414

415

416

417




Figure 1: Symptoms of the SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR-positive cases (%)




Figure 2: Blood group distribution among the SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR-positive cases.

Table 3: Comorbidities found in SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR-positive and SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR-negative cases.

Comorbidity	Total participants (n= 508)	SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR	
		Positive (n= 295)	Negative (n= 213)
DM	28 (5.5%)	21 (7.1%)	07 (3.3%)
HTN	38 (7.5%)	26 (8.8%)	12 (5.6%)
Asthma	21 (4.1%)	15 (5.0%)	06 (2.8%)
Obesity	44 (8.6%)	26 (8.8%)	18 (8.4%)
IHD	06 (1.1%)	05 (1.7%)	01 (0.5%)

474

475 Table 4: Association of risk factors among SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR-positive cases.

Risk factors	SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR-positive cases
Inadequate supply of standard PPE	13.8%
Absence of negative pressure ventilation	67.8%
Incidence of laboratory contamination	44.7%
No training on molecular test methods	40.6%

476

477

478

479

480