PEER REVIEW HISTORY

BMJ Open publishes all reviews undertaken for accepted manuscripts. Reviewers are asked to complete a checklist review form (http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/resources/checklist.pdf) and are provided with free text boxes to elaborate on their assessment. These free text comments are reproduced below.

ARTICLE DETAILS

TITLE (PROVISIONAL)	Adjusting working conditions and evaluating the risk of infection	
	during the COVID-19 pandemic in different work-place settings in	
	Germany – a study protocol for an explorative modular mixed	
	methods approach	
AUTHORS	Rind, Esther; Kimpel, Klaus; Preiser, Christine; Papenfuss, Falko;	
	Wagner, Anke; Alsyte, Karina; Siegel, Achim; Klink, Antje;	
	Steinhilber, Benjamin; Kauderer, Johanna; Rieger, Monika A.	

VERSION 1 – REVIEW

REVIEWER	Sean Semple
	University of Stirling, Scotland
REVIEW RETURNED	27-Aug-2020

INEVIEW NETONIALD	21 / lug 2020
GENERAL COMMENTS	This manuscript is the description of a protocol for a planned study on the risk of Covid-19 infection in different work settings. It is generally well written and gives a clear description of the planned methodology. I have only a small number of minor suggestions for the authors.
	Study aims/research question #2 refers to the 'new normal'. This concept is not explained in the introduction. While I accept that this is a well understood term currently, I would want the manuscript to be understood in years to come – please make sure this terminology is explained.
	The study aims relate to gathering data from workers and worksites in Germany. This should be stated explicitly. It is not an international study and the findings from Germany may not be translatable to other countries. The discussion (line 420) makes the assertion that the findings will be transferable to other companies but I would like to see some discussion about how working cultures in other countries (e.g. around the use of PPE, importance and presence of occupational health services etc) may impact on how useful the findings will be in other jurisdictions. It may be worth modifying the title to make it clear the study is looking at workplace settings in Germany.
	Line 328 – OCR abbreviation not defined.

REVIEWER	Evangelia Demou
	University of Glasgow, UK
REVIEW RETURNED	18-Sep-2020

GENERAL COMMENTS	This is a very interesting project and much needed as COVID-19
	restrictions have been easing and more and more people are

returning to work. Furthermore, the current increase in cases across Europe means that the 'new normal' in working conditions is actually unknown and possibly fluid for a number of sectors. Having a multi and mixed methods approach, considering a range of stakeholders across the organisation and employees, as well as policies and practices in place is very much needed.

While I appreciate this is a method designed to be implemented across organisations and sectors, it would be good to know a bit more about the type of company that is already recruited.

There are some issues with the language, which I think have contributed to certain sections not being clear or consistent throughout the paper.

It is not clear from the methods section, if within this study the IASV team are planning to conduct the research in the one company or to 'other companies, institutions and public authorities'. This confusion may be a language issue but it should be made clear. (top of page 8).

Page 8: "....how different attitudes and behaviours may impact their perceived and measured risk of infection.". This read as if you expect the difference in perceived and measured |(more importantly) risk of infection is only down to attitudes and behaviours and not to policies and practices put in place (or lack of them). Is this the case?

Why are the employee surveys (T0, T1, T2, T3) timed in this manner? Some justification should be provided.

Page 10-line 237: are the authors talking about 'perception of infection' or rather 'perception of infection risk'?

Page 11-line 285: can you explain the purpose and how confidentiality will be protected if "Several mutual data analysis sessions with the partners from the company are planned." This is important especially as the authors highlight one limitation may be participant fear that the data can/may be used by the company and have negative effects on them as employees. Also this is not in line with your Disclaimer statement.

Typo Table 2 (page 13) should be Table 1

Page 13: Table 1, how will you assess "work-related stress and strain beforethe COVID-19 pandemic concerning work content/task...."

Page 13: Table 1, considering the increased risk to BAME groups, why are you not collecting any information on ethnicity?

Module 4: will the same 8-digit code generated during the online survey be used? – how will the seroprevalence testing results be analysed in combination with other module outputs?

Module 1 needs to be described better; in many instances it is referring to federal and regional regulations and not company level data on the policies, processes and procedure they have implemented (which I gather is what the authors are actually proposing on doing).

VERSION 1 – AUTHOR RESPONSE

Dear Reviewer 1,

Thank you very much for your valuable feedback. We carefully considered your comments and suggestions. The changes made in the manuscript are in blue. Please find below a point by point response to your comments and suggestions:

No	Reviewer's comment	Response to reviewer	Changes in the manuscript
1	Study aims/research question	Thank you for this comment. We explained the	Introduction section, page 4, line 111-115:
	#2 refers to the 'new normal'.	terminology in the Introduction section.	The term "new normal" arose, meaning that as long as
	This concept is not explained in		there will be no vaccination for SARS-CoV-2 and no
	the introduction. While I accept		effective treatment, the state of exception will last,
	that this is a well understood		including implementation of and adherence to strict
	term currently, I would want the		hygiene measures, as well as social and physical
	manuscript to be understood in		distancing in private life and workplaces for individual
	years to come – please make		and collective protection.
	sure this terminology is		
	explained.		
2	The study aims relate to	Thank you for this comment. We added this	Introduction section, page 5, line 133-143:
	gathering data from workers and	aspect in the Introduction section.	See revised Introduction section.
	worksites in Germany. This	We also added the aspect of a lack of	Discussion section, page 15, line 448-450:
	should be stated explicitly. It is	transferability to the discussion.	However, this is not an international study. Therefore,
	not an international study and		the gained results from Germany may not be
	the findings from Germany may		translatable to other countries.

	not be translatable to other		
	countries.		
3	The discussion (line 420) makes	Thank you for your remark. Based on your	Discussion section, page 15, line 447f.:
	the assertion that the findings	suggestion, we specified that the results will be	Furthermore, the design is transferable to other
	will be transferable to other	transferable to other companies in Germany.	companies, institutions and public authorities in
	companies but I would like to	Since the incidence of infection currently differs	Germany.
	see some discussion about how	greatly from country to country, we only focus	
	cultures working in other	on the situation in Germany.	
	countries (e.g. around the use of		
	PPE, importance and presence		
	servic of occupational health es		
	etc) may impact on how useful		
	the findings will be in other		
	jurisdictions.		
4		Thank you for this remark. According to you	See modified title on page 1

	title to make it clear the study is	suggestion, we changed the title.	
	looking at workplace settings in		
	Germany.		
5	Line 328 – OCR abbreviation	Thank you. Corrected that according e	Methods and Analysis section, page 12, line 353f.:
	not defined.	suggestion.	In case of a paper-pencil questionnaire, each survey

sheet will be scanned at the University Hospital
Tuebingen using an Optical Character Recognition
(OCR) system. ³⁹

Dear Reviewer 2,

Thank you very much for your valuable feedback. We carefully considered your comments and suggestions. The changes made in the manuscript are in blue. Please find below a point by point response to your comments and suggestions:

No	Reviewer's comment	Response to reviewer	Changes in the manuscript
1	While I appreciate this is a	Thank you for this remark. We added more	Methods and Analysis section, page 6, line 163-
	method designed to be	information about the recruited company in the	168:
	implemented across	Method section.	Modules 1 – 3 will be carried out in a large German
	organisations and sectors, it		leading global supplier of technology and services. The
	would be good to know a bit		company employs roughly 400,000 associates in
	more about the type of company		approximately 60 countries worldwide, thereof 132,000
	that is already recruited.		in Germany in more than 100 locations where
			employees pursue a variety of professional activities
			differing in their work-related risk of infection with
			SARS-CoV-2.
2	There are some issues with the	Thank you. We added one sentence explaining	Methods and Analysis section, page 6, line 162-
	language, which I think have	that the complete approach is tested and	163:
	contributed to certain sections	evaluated in one company.	The complete explorative multi- modular approach is

3	not being clear or consistent throughout the paper. It is not clear from the methods section, if within this study the IASV team are planning to conduct the research in the one company or to 'other companies, institutions and public authorities'. This confusion may be a language issue but it should be made clear. (top of page 8). Page 8: "how different attitudes and behaviours may impact their perceived and measured risk of infection.". This read as if you expect the difference in perceived and	Thank you for this comment. We are aware that our research subject is very complex, and different ways of approaching are therefore needed. So, we will record attitudes and behaviour of employees in module 3. The results from module 3 are combined with the	initially tested and evaluated in one company. No changes.
	difference in perceived and	combined with the	
	measured (more	results of the document analysis of	
	. ` `	results of the document analysis of legal	
		policies and practices concerning dealing with	
		SARS-CoV-2 (module 1), and the additional	

	not to policies and practices put	seroprevalence measurements (module 4).	
	in place (or lack of them). Is this		
	the case?		
4	Why are the employee surveys	Thank you for this comment. We have updated	Methods and Analysis section, page 7:
	(T0, T1, T2, T3) timed in this	our procedure in the meantime. The surveys of	See updated table 1.
	manner? Some justification	module 3 take place in the same time as the	Methods and Analysis section, page 10, line 319-
	should be provided.	seroprevalence testing in module 4. We	322:
		reduced the number of surveys to three waves	T0 allows to apture the initial status in summer/autumn
		in agreement with the responsible persons in	2020 in Germany. T1 will cover the winter months,
		the company. We also added a justification for	while T2 will again be carried out in summer 2021. This
		our approach.	approach makes it possible to identify different phases
			and probably also peaks during the ongoing COVID-19
			pandemic.
5	Page 10-line 237: are the	Thank you for this comment. We meant	Methods and Analysis section, page 8, line 245-
	authors talking about 'perception	perception of infection risk.	247:
	of infection' or rather 'perception		To capture potential regional and activity-related
	of infection risk'?		differences in the occupational risk and perception of
			infection risk, purposive sampling ²⁴ will be used to
			include about six different company sites of the initially
			participating company.

6	Page 11-line 285: can you	We intended this as a form of member check	Methods and Analysis section, page 9-10, line 296-
	explain the purpose and how	for quality control and have refrained from this	304:
	confidentiality will be protected if	idea. We will present preliminary results to our	Interviewees will have the opportunity to re-read their
	"Several mutual data analysis	project partners, but will not go into the details	interviews and give feedback on passages they
	sessions with the partners from	of individual data. We included the opportunity	consider as risky. The data will be imported into
	the company are planned." This	for interviewees to re-read their interviews and	MAXQDA, and analysis will be carried out by two
	is important especially as the	comment on potentially risky sections.	researchers of the IASV following the steps of
	authors highlight one limitation		qualitative content analysis, including the development
	may be participant fear that the		of a coding frame, the segmentation of the material, the
	data can/may be used by the		testing of the coding frame, the evaluation of the trial
	company and have negative		coding and the completion of the main coding.
	effects on them as employees.		Preliminary results will be presented to further
	Also this is not in line with your		members of the study team to discuss remaining open
	Disclaimer statement.		questions and ensure quality control. All data will

			remain at the IASV.
7	Typo Table 2 (page 13) should	Corrected according the suggestion.	Methods and Analysis section, page 7, line 207.
	be Table 1		
8	Page 13: Table 1, how will you	We rely on the theoretical framework of the	No changes.
	assess "work-related stress and	GDA (GDA, 2014. Recommendations of the	

	strain <u> before</u>	institutions of the Joint German Occupational	
	COVID-19 pandemic concerning	Safety and HealthStrategy (GDA) for	
	work content/task,"	impleme psychos ris assessm nting ocial k ent.	
		Management of the GDA Mental Health	
		Working Programme, Berlin.). We used and	
		adapted single items from a recent survey by	
		the Institute for Occupational Medicine,	
		Prevention and Corporate Health Management	
		in Lübeck on work and health in times of the	
		coronavir pandemic. asked us We the	
		participants to evaluate each item based on	
		how it was before the pandemic and how it is	
		currently during the pandemic. The individual	
		items will be combined into a mean value	
		score and cover each dimension of the	
		framework of the GDA.	
9	Page 13: Table 1, considering	Thank you for this remark. Our focus lies on	No changes.
	the increased risk to BAME	the participants' experiences and attitudes	
	groups, why are you not	towards working conditions during the COVID-	

19 pandemic as well as their collecting any information on perceived risk of infection at the workplace and ethnicity? outside the working environment in Germany. In the first wave of our survey, we focussed on some risk factors (e.g. number of children, residence, contact to risk groups, leisure activities, attendance of children in day-care centers or schools, relevant underlying medical conditions, work in changing teams) We are aware that especially BAME groups have an increased risk of infection with the SARSvirus. recent CoV-2 One review confirmed this (Public Health

the data: Understanding the impact of COVID
19 on BAME groups, June 2020).

Nevertheless, the concept of ethnicity and race

differ between the British and the German

England: Beyond

context. In the German context, race and

		ethnicity have a rather biological connotation	
		and are thus highly charged terms due to the	
		German history. This has among other things	
		the effect, that there are no developed items to	
		ask about race and ethnicity as socially	
		constructed concepts. In many studies, this is	
		solved by asking about migration background	
		(defined as being born or one parent being	
		born abroad). As this has been currently	
		contested in academic and public discourse,	
		we decided to refrain from this concept, too,	
		and focus on the above mentioned risk factors	
		as most relevant dimensions. Therefore, we	
		would like to discuss in our team whether we	
		should take up the aspect of ethnicity in the	
		following two waves of the survey.	
10	Module 4: will the same 8-digit	Yes. The data can be matched with the	Methods and Analysis section, page 12, line 347-
	code generated during the	questionnaire data from module 3 using the	350:
	online survey be used? – how	code. Based on age, gender and job profile, it	At the end of the first survey wave, participants will be
	will the seroprevalence testing	can be checked whether there are differences	asked to generate an 8-digit code which will be the

	results be analysed in	in the two samples (sample module 3 vs.	same for all survey waves and can be used to merge
	combination with other module	module 4). More exact suitable analysis	the data of each person anonymously over subsequent
	outputs?	strategies will be planned with the biometrician.	survey waves. ³⁷ Participants can (but do not have to)
			provide the result of the seroprevalence testing to the
			questionnaire.
11	Module 1 needs to be described	Thank you for the remark. We now explain	Methods and Analysis section, page 8-9, line 252-
	better; in many instances it is	module 1 in more detail in the revised section.	259:
	referring to federal and regional		Module 1 is a continuous literature search and
	regulations and not company		document analysis. The objective is to present
	level data on the policies,		workplace-related, legal, infectiological and social
	processes and procedure they		conditions facing companies in the context of the
			COVID-19 pandemic following the first lockdown in
	have implemented (which I gather is what the authors are		Germany. of Three researchers from the IASV analyse and discuss prevailing federal and regional laws (e.g., from the Federal Ministry of Health and from the Federal Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs), the development of infection rates in Germany (e.g., from the Robert Koch Institute), and occupational health and safety and infection control regulations
	actually proposing on doing).		at the respective sites of the participating companies.

VERSION 2 – REVIEW

REVIEWER	Sean Semple
	University of Stirling, Scotland

REVIEW RETURNED	20-Oct-2020
GENERAL COMMENTS	Thank you for making the revisions requested and providing clear responses to facilitate re-review. I am satisfied that you have addressed my previous points.