medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.04.17.20069526; this version posted April 22, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Title

Persistent viral shedding of SARS-CoV-2 in faeces - a rapid review

Authors

S Gupta [1], J Parker [1] (Joint First Authors), S Smits[1], J Underwood [2], S Dolwani [1]

Departments and Institutions

[1] Division of Population Medicine, Cardiff University School of Medicine

[2] Division of Infection and Immunity, Department of Infectious Diseases, Cardiff University and Cardiff and Vale University Health Board

Corresponding author

Sunil Dolwani

Division of Population Medicine, 8th Floor Neuadd Meirionnydd, University Hospital Wales, Heath Park Campus, Cardiff, CF14 4YS

DolwaniS@cardiff.ac.uk

Sources of funding

S Gupta is funded by the Wales Cancer Research Centre and Cardiff University
J Parker is funded by a Royal College of Surgeons of England Research Fellowship
S Smits is funded by Health and Care Research Wales health fellowship (ref HF-17-1352)
J Underwood is funded by Medical Research Council (Grant Ref: MR/T023791/1)
S Dolwani is Chief Investigator of the CONSCOP2 study funded by the NIHR (HTA Project: NIHR127914)

Conflicts of interest

None declared

Author contributions

SG – Contributed to conception and design of the project, data collection, analysis and interpretation, drafting of the article, revisions and final approval.
JP – Contributed to conception and design of the project, data collection, analysis and interpretation, drafting of the article, revisions and final approval.
SS - Contributed to data collection, review of manuscript and final approval of the article.
JU- Contributed to data collection, interpretation, review of manuscript and final approval of the article.
SD – Contributed to the conception and design of the project, data collection, revisions and final approval of the article and was overall supervisor.

Abstract

Background and aims

In addition to respiratory symptoms, patients with COVID-19 can present with gastrointestinal complaints suggesting a possible faeco-oral transmission route. The primary

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.04.17.20069526; this version posted April 22, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

aim of this review is to establish the incidence and timing of positive faecal samples for the SARS-CoV-2 virus in patients with COVID-19.

Methods
A systematic literature review was performed to identify studies describing COVID-19 patients tested for the virus in their stool. Data were extracted concerning the nature of the test, number and timing of positive samples, incidence of positive faecal tests after negative nasopharyngeal swabs and any evidence of viable faecal virus or faeco-oral transmission of the virus.
Results
There were 26 relevant articles identified. Combining these results demonstrated that 53·9% of those tested for faecal RNA in these studies were positive. Duration of faecal viral shedding ranged from 1 to 33 days after nasopharyngeal swab turned negative with one result remaining positive after 47 days of onset of symptoms. There was insufficient evidence to draw firm conclusions about the proportion of cases potentially transmitted through infection via faecally shed virus.
Conclusions
There is a relatively high rate of positive tests and persistence of the SARS-CoV-2 virus in faecal samples of selected patients with COVID-19. Further research is needed to demonstrate how much these positive tests correlate with viable virus and transmission through the faeco-oral route. This may have important implications for duration of isolation, precautions recommended in individuals undertaking a period of isolation, protective equipment for health professionals and interventional procedures involving the gastrointestinal tract.

Key words
COVID-19, SARS-CoV-2, gastrointestinal, faeces, viral shedding

Persistent viral shedding of SARS-CoV-2 in faeces – a rapid review

Introduction and background

The rapid progression of the COVID-19 pandemic has created significant challenges for the public as well as healthcare professionals around the world. Knowledge regarding virus incubation, transmission and shedding is crucial for the reduction of new cases and protection of health care professionals. Guidance regarding isolation and protective equipment has changed as evidence has increased and developed.

The high incidence of cough and fever in COVID-19 are well established.[1] Gastrointestinal symptoms are also well documented suggesting a potential faeco-oral transmission route.[2] Discharge guidelines for hospitals or declaring a COVID-19 patient recovered in the UK are largely based on time from either symptom onset or positive test depending on severity of illness and discharge destination.[3] The European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control (ECDC), on the other hand, has advocated the need for continued self-isolation and hand hygiene measures even 14 days post-discharge based on prolonged viral shedding in faeces and respiratory samples.[4] This evidence may influence the recommended duration of self-isolation as well as home sanitation practices during isolation and after discharge, and the use of protective equipment and procedures involving the gastrointestinal tract in UK. Evidence based recommendations for specialities such as gastroenterology, gastrointestinal endoscopy and gastrointestinal surgery are required where there may be an exposure risk to virus shed in

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.04.17.20069526; this version posted April 22, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

faeces. Despite viral RNA being detected in the air or other surface samples like toilets, it is still unclear whether it is viable to transmit infection through this route.[5]

The primary aim of this review is to assess the incidence of COVID-19 patients positive on testing of faecal samples for the virus and the timing with respect to the clinical course (onset of symptoms) when faecal tests may be positive. Our secondary aims are to establish the incidence of patients with positive faecal samples after negative respiratory swabs and any evidence to suggest faecal virus transmitted infection.

Methods

Reports of cases or studies of COVID-19 patients with evidence of the virus in faecal samples were systematically identified and full text articles reviewed for data extraction.

Literature search

A comprehensive search was undertaken as per the search strategy outlined below for literature which included SARS-CoV-2 virus testing of faeces. Medline was searched to find articles published until 3 April 2020. The defined search terms were created after collaboration between the authors experienced in gastroenterology, colorectal surgery and systematic review. Search terms reflected the aim to identify studies with evidence of faecal COVID-19 and included ‘clinical’, ‘faeces’, ‘gastrointestinal secretions’, ‘stool’, ‘COVID-19’, ‘SARS-CoV-2’ and ‘2019-nCoV’. Additional manual searches to identify the most recent evidence were performed in the American Journal of Gastroenterology (AJG), Gastroenterology, GUT, the Lancet Gastroenterology and Hepatology, the WHO database, the Centre for Evidence Based Medicine (CEBM), the New England Journal of Medicine (NEJM), and the National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE). COVID-19 preprints published until 10 April 2020 on medRxiv and bioRxiv and an independent search on social media (Twitter) by the authors (SS, SD) supplemented more articles.

Inclusion and exclusion criteria

Articles describing COVID-19 patients who had faecal or stool specimens tested for the virus were included. Considering the knowledge gaps existing for COVID-19 all articles were considered regardless of the number, age or gender of patients or the country of publication. Animal based studies or articles without an available full text were excluded. Foreign language articles were considered but excluded unless the necessary language expertise was available within the research group.

Study identification

Articles were sorted alphabetically by author name and divided between two reviewers (SG and JP). Abstracts were reviewed and classified by the same two authors through the Rayyan Web Application[6] to identify those for full text review. The same process was used for full text articles and this data was managed through EndNote. Articles were then discussed between the same reviewers to identify the final selection of full text articles. Any conflicts were to be solved by the supervising author if necessary. Reference lists and review articles were cross referenced to identify any further original studies. All articles were categorised and described in a PRISMA flow chart.

Data extraction

The final data extraction was also carried by the two reviewers (JP and SG) and managed through Microsoft Excel files. The data parameters extracted from the studies are shown in

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.04.17.20069526; this version posted April 22, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Table 1. The final data was verified by the two reviewers (JP and SG) with conflict resolution as described previously if necessary.

1. Study reference 2. Country of publication 3. Number and type of patients in the study 4. Type of sample taken (faecal sample, anal swab, RT-PCR, culture) 5. Number of patients having faecal samples tested and number of positive samples 6. Timing of positive faecal swab after symptom onset 7. Duration of positive faecal specimen after negative nasopharyngeal swab 8. Any evidence for viable faecal virus or faeco-oral transmission documented in the study
Table 1 – Data parameters for extraction

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.04.17.20069526; this version posted April 22, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Figure 1 - PRISMA flow chart



Results

Medline searches identified 565 articles and 194 were found through other databases. An overview of the selection process is shown in the PRISMA chart in Figure 1. There were 26 articles[7-32] included in the final analysis. An overview of the data extraction is summarised in Table 2.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.04.17.20069526; this version posted April 22, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Most studies were from China (n=20) with two from the USA and one each from Italy, Korea, Vietnam and France. The number of participants recruited in the studies ranged from 1 to 206 with ages ranging from 3 months to 87 years. Sample collection consisted of either faecal samples, anal or rectal swabs. Quantitative Reverse Transcription Polymerase Chain Reaction (RT-PCR) was the test performed on all samples to detect viral RNA.
The indication for faecal testing was not specified in most studies. In some the test was done in asymptomatic patients for screening after contact with an infected person or travel history to an infected area. The predominant symptoms of presentation in the studies were persistent cough, fever and breathlessness with fewer patients reporting diarrhoea or vomiting. All studies had information regarding our primary aim of reporting faecal samples for the virus in those with COVID-19. Of these, 16 [7,10,11,14-19,23,24,26-30] provided information on the duration of these tests after symptom onset and evidence of positive faecal samples after symptom recovery, discharge from the hospital or negative nasopharyngeal RT-PCR.

Reference	Country	Number of patients in study	Type of patients	Patient symptoms	Type of sample	Patients with positive faecal RT-PCR	Timing of positive faecal RT-PCR (from symptom onset unless stated otherwise)	Number of patients with positive faecal RT-PCR and negative NP RT-PCR	Duration of persistent positive faecal RT PCR after negative NP RT-PCR
Cai et al. [7]	China	10	Children, 3 to 131 months	Fever Respiratory symptoms	Faeces	6 tested, 5 positives (83.3%)	First test at 3-13 days Second test at 18-30 days Positive in all patients on both tests	5 out of 5 (100%)	Patient 1: 18 days; Patient 3: 12 days; Patient 4: 11 days; Patient 5: 12 days; Patient 7: 15 days
Chan et al. [8]	China	6	Family cluster (10 to 66 years)	Fever Respiratory symptoms Digestive symptoms (2 patients)	Faeces	4 tested, 0 positive	NA	NA	NA
Chen et al. [9]	China	1	Male, 34 years	Fever Respiratory symptoms	Faeces	1 tested, 0 positive	NA	NA	NA
Chen et al. [10]	China	1	Female, 25 years	Fever Respiratory symptoms	Faeces	1 tested, 1 positive (100%)	Day 11	1 out of 1 (100%)	1 day
Chen et al. [11]	China	57	Unclear	Respiratory symptoms	Anal swabs	28 tested, 11 positives (39·3%)	Only specify timings in two patients Patient 1: day 13 Patient 2: day 10	1 out of 2 (50%)	Patient 1: 3 days

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.04.17.20069526; this version posted April 22, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Han et al. [12]	China	206	Adults	Matched case series of three groups: 1. Mild respiratory symptoms 2. Mild respiratory and digestive symptoms 3. Only digestive symptoms	Faeces	22 tested, 12 positive (54·5%)	Not available	Not available	Not available
Holshue et al.[13]	USA	1	Male, 35 years	Fever Respiratory symptoms Digestive symptoms	Faeces	1 tested, 1 positive (100%)	Day 7	Not available	Not available
Kim et al. [14]	Korea	2	Adult male and female	Fever Respiratory symptoms Digestive symptoms (1 patient)	Faeces	2 tested, 2 positives (100%)	Patient 1: day 8-12 Patient 2: day 17	0 out of 2	NA
Kujawski et al. [15]	USA	12	Adults	Fever Respiratory symptoms Digestive symptoms (1 patient)	Faeces	10 tested, 7 positives (70%)	Patient 1: days 11-18 Patient 2: days 11-18 Patient 3: day 7 Patient 4: days 10-14 Patient 5: days 6-13 Patient 6: days 14-18 Patient 7: days 6-11	2 out of 7 (28·6%)	4 to 6 days
Lescure et al. [16]	France	5	Adults	Fever Respiratory symptoms Digestive symptoms (1 patient)	Faeces	5 tested, 2 positives (40%)	Patient 1: day 2-9 Patient 2: day 3-13	1 out of 2 (50%)	Patient 1: 0 day Patient 2: 3 days
Ling et al. [17]	China	66	Adults	Unknown	Faeces	66 tested, 66 positives (100%)	Not available	43 out of 66 (65%)	Median duration to negative NP RT-PCR: 9.5 days (range 6-11) Median duration to negative faecal RT-PCR: 11 days (range 9-16) N.B.: 11 patients still had positive faecal RT-PCR at 31 days after admission to convalescence

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.04.17.20069526; this version posted April 22, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Lo et al. [18]	China	10	9 adults, 1 child	Fever Respiratory symptoms Digestive symptoms (8 patients)	Faeces	10 tested, 10 positives (100%)	Patient 1: day 3 Patient 2: days 2-19 Patient 3: days 3-11 Patient 4: days 14-17 Patient 5: days 5-15 Patient 6: days 8-15 Patient 7: days 3-10 Patient 8: days 3-10 Patient 9: days 2-14 Patient 10: day 11	4 out of 10 (40%)	Patient 4: 9 days Patient 5: 2 days Patient 9: 2 days Patient 10: 10 days
Nicastri et al. [19]	Italy	1	Adult, late 20s	Fever Conjunctivitis	Faeces	1 tested, 1 positive (100%)	Day 3 of admission	0 out of 1	NA
Pan et al. [20]	China	17	Laboratory samples	Unknown	Faeces	17 tested, 9 positives (53%)	Day 0 to 11	Not available	Not available
Peng et al.[21]	China	9	Adults	Fever Respiratory symptoms Digestive symptoms (1 patient)	Anal swab	9 tested, 2 positives (22·2%)	Patient 1: day 3 Patient 2: unknown	Not available	Not available
Song et al.[22]	China	1	Middle aged female	Respiratory symptoms	Anal swab	1 tested, 0 positive	NA	NA	NA
Tan et al. [23]	China	1	Male, 73 years	Respiratory symptoms	Rectal swab	1 tested, 1 positive (100%)	Up to day 23	1 out of 1 (100%)	7 days
Tang et al. [24]	China	1	Male, 10 years	Asymptomatic	Faeces	1 tested, 1 positive (100%)	17-25 days after exposure	1 out of 1 (100%)	10 days
Wang et al. [25]	China	205	Adults and children, mean age 44 years (range 5 to 67 years)	Unknown	Faeces	153 tested, 44 positives (29%)	Not available	Not available	Not available
Wu et al. [26]	China	74	Laboratory samples	Fever Respiratory symptoms Digestive symptoms	Faeces	74 tested, 41 positives (55%)	Variable	32 out of 41 (78%)	Faecal RT-PCR remained positive for a mean duration of 27.9 days which was on average 9.2 days longer than positive NP RT-PCR Patient 1: 33 days after -ve nasopharyngeal swab Patient 2: 47 days from symptom onset

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.04.17.20069526; this version posted April 22, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Xiao et al. [27]	China	73	Children and adults, 10 months to 78 years old	Unknown	Faeces	73 tested, 39 positives (53·4%)	1 to 12 days	17 out of 39 (23·3%)	Not available
Xing et al. [28]	China	3	Children, 1·5 to 6 years	Fever	Faeces	3 tested, 3 positives (100%)	Patient 1 and 2: day 4 Patient 3: day 9 (after discharge)	3 out of 3 (100%)	8 and 20 days
Xu et al. [29]	China	10	Children, 2 months to 15 years	Asymptomatic Fever Respiratory symptoms Digestive symptoms	Rectal swab	10 tested, 8 positives (80%)	Patient 1: day 2 Patient 2: day 2 Patient 3: day 3 Patient 4: day 1 of admission Patient 5: day 1 of admission Patient 6: day 1 of admission Patient 8: day 1 of admission Patient 10: 1 day before symptom onset	8 out of 8 (100%)	Patient 1: 19 days Patient 2: 21 days Patient 3: 21 days Patient 4: 3 days Patient 5: 21 days Patient 6: 19 days Patient 8: 6 days Patient 10: 8 days after discharge
Zhang et al. [30]	China	23	Adults, median age 48 years	Unknown	Faeces	12 tested, 10 positives (83·3%)	Day 4	6 out of 10 (60%)	Median duration of positive NP RT-PCR: 10 days Median duration of positive faecal RT-PCR: 22 days
Zhang et al.[31]	China	14	Adults, median age 41 years (range 18 to 87 years)	Fever Respiratory symptoms	Faeces	14 tested, 5 positives (35·7%)	Day 4 to 10	Not available	Not available
Zhang et al. [32]	China	15	Laboratory samples	Unknown	Anal swab	15 tested, 4 positives (26·7%)	Day 0 to 5	Not available	Not available

NP: Nasopharyngeal; NA: Not applicable; RT-PCR: Reverse Transcriptase Polymerase Chain reaction

Table 2: Overview of data extracted from studies included in review [7-32]

A total of 824 patients were included across the studies and 540 were tested for faecal viral RNA. [7-32] Positive faecal RT-PCR tests occurred in 291 (53·9%). The timing of the first positive sample was available in 21 studies and varied from day 0 of symptom onset to day 17. Late positive tests do not necessarily equate to absence of the virus earlier in the illness but may likely reflect the heterogeneity in testing patterns amongst the studies. First stool samples were often reported late after hospital admission[11] or even after discharge [28] while some were analysed from day 1 of hospitalisation or symptom onset [19,20,27,29,32]. There is a

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.04.17.20069526; this version posted April 22, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

similar discrepancy in follow up testing. Some tested until samples were found to be negative [17] while others did not [18,29].

Out of 199 patients who tested positive for faecal viral RNA and were followed up with stool testing, 125 (62·8%) showed persistent shedding of virus in the stool samples after a negative nasopharyngeal swab while in the individual studies it ranged from 23·3% to 100%. The duration for fecal shedding of viral RNA after clearance of respiratory samples ranged from 1 to 33 days and in 1 patient up to 47 days from symptom onset [26].

None of the studies were designed to detect live virus in the faeces except for the study by Wang et al. [25] Out of 153 stool specimens tested in this study, 44 were PCR positive and out of 4 specimens cultured, live virus was detected in 2.[25]

Discussion

This rapid review demonstrates a relatively high incidence and persistence of stool positivity for SARS-CoV-2 on RT-PCR after negative nasopharyngeal swabs in faecal specimens of selected patients with COVID-19. This may have important implications regarding measures to prevent the spread of the disease, especially for precautions recommended for the public, protective equipment for health professionals involved in procedures and interventions involving the gastrointestinal tract.

Similar patterns of virus isolation from stool and faeco-oral transmission were observed for other coronaviruses including SARS-CoV-1.[33] Bio-aerosol generation of viral particles as a result of flushing of toilets as well as the impact of disinfection on these have also been studied before[34,35] along with the persistence of coronaviruses on surfaces.[36] A review performed by Tian et al. summarised the evidence on the importance of identifying gastrointestinal symptoms in addition to the respiratory symptoms of COVID-19 based on data from China.[37] Despite persistent shedding of SARS-CoV-2 virus in faeces there seems to be no direct correlation with the presence or severity of gastrointestinal symptoms based on the limited data available. Our review adds evidence from other countries now involved by the pandemic and supports the possibility of faeco-oral transmission.

The risk to health care professionals from patient exposure is well known, specifically in high aerosol generating procedures. Professional societies and investigator groups from countries with experience of managing COVID 19 in the context of gastrointestinal interventions[38,39] highlight the risk to individuals in endoscopy departments and the need for necessary precautions including negative pressure rooms and personal protective equipment. This review supports the importance of these measures given the relatively high prevalence and persistence of SARS-CoV-2 virus in faeces. Isolation of live virus is confirmed by one study[25] but the proportion of cases that might be transmitted by this route is unclear due to the heterogeneity in case selection and lack of standardisation of study designs and protocols. Areas such as Care homes may be particularly vulnerable to transmission of infection by this route and recommendations must take into account this evidence to ensure the protection of health and social care providers and the general public in the meantime.

Limitations

The heterogeneity of included studies was a significant limitation of this review. This was not formally assessed due to it being a rapid review but can be clearly identified on inspection of the study designs and outcomes. The variability in patient numbers and characteristics,

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.04.17.20069526; this version posted April 22, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

sample timing and follow up testing should be considered when interpreting the reliability of the results. The heterogenous nature of sampling may also affect viral detection as some studies reported faecal samples and others anal or faecal swabs. There were two foreign language articles excluded due to lack of translation resources.

Conclusion

The duration of viral shedding in the faeces is mostly reported as 1 to 33 days after a negative nasopharyngeal swab but can continue for up to 47 days after onset of symptoms in patients with COVID-19. These positive samples can occur after negative nasopharyngeal swabs or resolution of patient symptoms. Isolation of live virus in stool specimens in a single study of 2 cases supports the possibility of faeco-oral transmission. Further research is needed to prove if this viral shedding in stool results in a significant proportion of case transmission in the community as well as within care institutions and secondary care. Until further evidence is generated appropriate precautions should be strictly recommended for the protection of healthcare workers and patients.

Implications for the Public:

1. In addition to strict adherence to hand washing recommendations, home toilet sanitary and disinfection precautions should be taken in the case of isolation or contact with a symptomatic COVID 19 case with or without gastrointestinal symptoms. This recommendation is based on limited evidence of possible viable faecal virus excretion.
2. These precautions may need to continue for longer than the period of symptoms and the current recommendations for isolation after symptoms cease. This recommendation is based on limited evidence of the duration after the onset of symptoms that a RT-PCR stool test might still be positive

Implications for Healthcare professionals:

1. Professional bodies recommendations on protective equipment, endoscopic and surgical procedures for COVID-19 patients should be followed.[40-43]
2. The possibility of faeco-oral transmission should be borne in mind with implications for endoscopy and theatre disinfection of surfaces in between procedures.
3. Ward areas for COVID-19 patients and Care homes or similar institutions may need to consider the implications for infection control and disinfection in light of the possibility of faeco-oral transmission
4. Screening processes for patients due to undergo investigational or interventional procedures should consider including gastrointestinal symptoms and stool testing in future pre-procedure questionnaires.
5. Healthcare teams managing patients with gastrointestinal symptoms may need to consider the possibility of COVID-19 coexisting with or worsening symptoms of underlying conditions such as Inflammatory Bowel Disease.[44]

Recommendations for further research:

1. Future studies on viral shedding and infectivity of SARS-CoV-2 should consider standardisation of sampling methods with appropriate precautions for laboratory staff handling these samples until the situation is clearer.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.04.17.20069526; this version posted April 22, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

2. Study designs may wish to consider repeat and parallel sampling with nasopharyngeal swabs at defined time points. This may be correlated with symptoms and serology to clarify the effect of neutralising antibodies and viable virus excretion in the stool.
3. Study designs may benefit from testing stool samples from comparable groups. This could include symptomatic, asymptomatic or recovered individuals in and out of family clusters and with or without gastrointestinal symptoms. This may improve our understanding of clinical and public health implications and potential targets for intervention in these settings.

Acknowledgement: We would like to thank Dr SA Roberts for critical review and comments on the manuscript

References

1. Rodriguez-Morales AJ, Cardona-Ospina JA, Gutierrez-Ocampo E, Villamizar-Pena R, Holguin-Rivera Y, Escalera-Antezana JP, et al. Clinical, laboratory and imaging features of COVID-19: A systematic review and meta-analysis. Travel medicine and infectious disease. 2020:101623.
2. Nobel YR, Phipps M, Zucker J, Lebwohl B, Wang TC, Sobieszczyk ME, et al. Gastrointestinal Symptoms and COVID-19: Case-Control Study from the United States. Gastroenterology. doi: https://doi.org/10.1053/j.gastro.2020.04.017
3. PHE. Guidance for stepdown of infection control precautions and discharging COVID-19 patients [Internet]. [Cited 2020 Apr 17]. Available from: https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/covid-19-guidance-for-stepdown-of-infection-control-precautions-within-hospitals-and-discharging-covid-19-patients-from-hospital-to-home-settings/guidance-for-stepdown-of-infection-control-precautions-and-discharging-covid-19-patients
4. ECDC. Discharge criteria for confirmed COVID-19 cases – When is it safe to discharge COVID-19 cases from the hospital or end home isolation?
5. Santarpia JL, Rivera DN, Herrera V, Morwitzer MJ, Creager H, Santarpia GW, et al. Transmission Potential of SARS-CoV-2 in Viral Shedding Observed at the University of Nebraska Medical Center medRxiv 2020.03.23.20039446; doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.03.23.20039446
6. Ouzzani M, Hammady H, Fedorowicz Z, Elmagarmid A. Rayyan — a web and mobile app for systematic reviews. Systematic Reviews (2016) 5:210, doi: 10.1186/s13643-016-0384-4.
7. Cai J, Xu J, Lin D, Yang Z, Xu L, Qu Z, et al. A Case Series of children with 2019 novel coronavirus infection: clinical and epidemiological features. Clinical infectious diseases: an official publication of the Infectious Diseases Society of America.2020. doi: https://doi.org/10.1093/cid/ciaa198
8. Chan JFW, Yuan S, Kok KH, To KKW, Chu H, Yang J, et al. A familial cluster of pneumonia associated with the 2019 novel coronavirus indicating person-to-person transmission: a study of a family cluster. Lancet,.395:514-23.
9. Chen EQ, Wang LC, Tang GM, Yang Y, Wang MJ, Deng R, et al. Brief report of the first cured 2019-nCoV pneumonia patient in West China Hospital. Eur J Clin Microbiol Infect Dis.1-3. doi: 10.1007/s10096-020-03866-z.
10. Chen L, Lou J, Bai Y, Wang M. COVID-19 Disease With Positive Fecal and Negative Pharyngeal and Sputum Viral Tests. Am J Gastroenterol. 2020. doi: 10.14309/ajg.0000000000000610
11. Chen W, Lan Y, Yuan X, Deng X, Li Y, Cai X, et al. Detectable 2019-nCoV viral RNA in blood is a strong indicator for the further clinical severity. Emerg Microbes Infect. 2020;9(1):469-73.
12. Han C, Duan C, Zhang S, Spiegel B, Shi H, Wang W, et al. Digestive Symptoms in COVID-19 Patients with Mild Disease Severity: Clinical Presentation, Stool Viral RNA Testing, and Outcomes.
13. Holshue ML, DeBolt C, Lindquist S, Lofy KH, Wiesman J, Bruce H, et al. First case of 2019 novel coronavirus in the United States. N Engl J Med. doi: 10.1056/NEJMoa2001191
14. Kim JY, Ko JH, Kim Y, Kim YJ, Kim JM, Chung YS, et al. Viral Load Kinetics of SARS-CoV-2 Infection in First Two Patients in Korea. J Korean Med Sci. 2020;35(7).
15. Kujawski SA, Wong KK, Collins JP, Epstein L, Killerby ME, Midfley CM, et al. First 12 patients with coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) in the United States. 2020. medRxiv 2020.03.09.20032896; doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.03.09.20032896

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.04.17.20069526; this version posted April 22, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

16. Lescure FX, Bouadma L, Nguyen D, Parisey M, Wicky PH, Behillil S, et al. Clinical and virological data of the first cases of COVID-19 in Europe: a case series. The Lancet Infectious Diseases. 2020. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/S1473-3099(20)30200-0
17. Ling YX, Xu SB, Lin YX, Tian D, Zhu ZQ, Dai FH, et al. Persistence and clearance of viral RNA in 2019 novel coronavirus disease rehabilitation patients. Chin Med J (Engl). doi: 10.1097/CM9.0000000000000774
18. Lo IL, Lio CF, Cheong HH, Lei CI, Cheong TH, Zhong X, et al. Evaluation of SARS-CoV-2 RNA shedding in clinical specimens and clinical characteristics of 10 patients with COVID-19 in Macau. Int J Biol Sci.16(10):1698–707.
19. Nicastri E, D'Abramo A, Faggioni G, De Santis R, Mariano A, Lepore L, et al. Coronavirus disease (COVID-19) in a paucisymptomatic patient: epidemiological and clinical challenge in settings with limited community transmission, Italy, February 2020. Euro Surveill. 2020;25(11).
20. Pan Y, Zhang D, Yang P, Poon LL, Wang Q. Viral load of SARS-CoV-2 in clinical samples. The Lancet Infectious Diseases. 2020. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/S1473-3099(20)30113-4
21. Peng L, Liu J, Xu W, Luo Q, Deng K, Lin B, et al. 2019 Novel Coronavirus can be detected in urine, blood, anal swabs and oropharyngeal swabs samples. 2020. medRxiv 2020.02.21.20026179; doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.02.21.20026179
22. Song L, Xiao G, Zhang X, Gao Z, Sun S, Zhang L, et al. A case of SARS-CoV-2 carrier for 32 days with several times false negative nucleic acid tests. 2020.medRxiv 2020.03.31.20045401; doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.03.31.20045401
23. Tan LV, Ngoc NM, That BTT, Uyen LTT, Hong NTT, Dung NTP, et al. Duration of viral detection in throat and rectum of a patient with COVID-19. 2020. medRxiv 2020.03.07.20032052; doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.03.07.20032052
24. Tang A, Tong Z-d, Wang H-l, Dal Y-x, Li K-f, Liu J-n, et al. Detection of Novel Coronavirus by RT-PCR in Stool Specimen from Asymptomatic Child, China. Emerging Infectious Disease journal. 2020;26(6).
25. Wang W, Xu Y, Gao R, Lu R, Han K, Wu G, et al. Detection of SARS-CoV-2 in Different Types of Clinical Specimens. JAMA. Published online March 11, 2020. doi:10.1001/jama.2020.3786
26. Wu Y, Guo C, Tang L, Hong Z, Zhou J, Dong X, et al. Prolonged presence of SARS-CoV-2 viral RNA in faecal samples. The Lancet Gastroenterology & Hepatology. 2020. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/S2468-1253(20)30083-2
27. Xiao F, Tang M, Zheng X, Liu Y, Li X, Shan H. Evidence for Gastrointestinal Infection of SARS-CoV-2 [published online ahead of print, 2020 Mar 3]. Gastroenterology. 2020;S0016-5085(20)30282-1. doi:10.1053/j.gastro.2020.02.055
28. Xing Y, Wei N, Qin W, Li W, Li G, Tong J, et al. Prolonged presence of SARS-CoV-2 in feces of pediatric patients during the convalescent phase. medRxiv 2020.03.11.20033159; doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.03.11.20033159
29. Xu Y, Li X, Zhu B, Liang H, Fang C, Gong Y, et al. Characteristics of pediatric SARS-CoV-2 infection and potential evidence for persistent fecal viral shedding. Nat Med.1-4.
30. Zhang N, Gong Y, Meng F, Bi Y, Yang P, Wang F. Virus shedding patterns in nasopharyngeal and fecal specimens of COVID-19 patients. 2020. medRxiv 2020.03.28.20043059; doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.03.28.20043059
31. Zhang W, Du RH, Li B, Zheng XS, Yang XL, Hu B, et al. Molecular and serological investigation of 2019-nCoV infected patients: implication of multiple shedding routes. Emerg Microbes Infect. 2020;9(1):386-9.
32. Zhang JC, Wang S, Xue Y. Fecal specimen diagnosis 2019 novel coronavirus–infected pneumonia. J Med Virol. 2020
33. Gu J, Han B, Wang J. COVID-19: Gastrointestinal Manifestations and Potential Fecal-Oral Transmission [published online ahead of print, 2020 Mar 3]. Gastroenterology. 2020;S0016-5085(20)30281-X. doi:10.1053/j.gastro.2020.02.054
34. Sassi HP, Reynolds KA, Pepper IL, Gerba CP. Evaluation of hospital-grade disinfectants on viral deposition on surfaces after toilet flushing. American Journal of Infection Control. 2018;46(5):507-11.
35. Knowlton SD, Boles CL, Perencevich EN, Diekema DJ, Nonnenmann MW. Bioaerosol concentrations generated from toilet flushing in a hospital-based patient care setting. Antimicrob Resist Infect Control 7, 16 (2018). https://doi.org/10.1186/s13756-018-0301-9
36. Kampf G, Todt D, Pfaender S, Steinmann E, et al. Persistence of coronaviruses on inanimate surfaces and their inactivation with biocidal agents. Journal of Hospital Infection. 2020;104(3):246-51.
37. Tian Y, Rong L, Nian W, He Y. Review article: gastrointestinal features in COVID□19 and the possibility of faecal transmission. Aliment Pharmacol Ther. 2020; 00: 1–9. https://doi.org/10.1111/apt.15731

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.04.17.20069526; this version posted April 22, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

38. Repici A, Maselli R, Colombo M, Gabbiadini R, Spadaccini M, Anderloni A, et al. Coronavirus (COVID-19) outbreak: what the department of endoscopy should know [published online ahead of print, 2020 Mar 14]. Gastrointest Endosc. 2020;S0016-5107(20)30245-5. doi:10.1016/j.gie.2020.03.019
39. Sultan S, Lim JK, Altayar O, Davitkov P, Feuerstein JD, Siddique SM, et al. AGA Institute rapid recommendations for gastrointestinal procedures during the COVID-19 pandemic. [published online ahead of print, 2020 Apr 1]. Gastroenterology. doi:https://doi.org/10.1053/j.gastro.2020.03.072
40. BSG/JAG summary recommendations for PPE in Endoscopy – protecting staff, patients and the PPE supply chain [Internet]. [Cited 2020 Apr 13]. Available from: https://www.bsg.org.uk/covid-19-advice/bsg-jag-summary-recommendations-for-ppe-in-endoscopy-protecting-staff-patients-and-the-ppe-supply-chain/
41. Endoscopy activity and COVID-19: BSG and JAG guidance – update 03.04.20 [Internet]. [Cited 2020 Apr 13]. Available from: https://www.bsg.org.uk/covid-19-advice/endoscopy-activity-and-covid-19-bsg-and-jag-guidance/
42. Joint gastroenterology society message: COVID-19 use of personal protective equipment in GI endoscopy [Internet]. [Cited 2020 Apr 13]. Available from: https://www.gastro.org/news/joint-gastroenterology-society-message-covid-19-use-of-personal-protective-equipment-in-gi-endoscopy
43. Gastroenterology professional society guidance in endoscopic procedures during the COVID-19 pandemic [Internet]. [Cited 2020 Apr 13]. Available from: https://www.gastro.org/practice-guidance/practice-updates/covid-19/gastroenterology-professional-society-guidance-on-endoscopic-procedures-during-the-covid-19-pandemi
44. Rubin DT, Feuerstein JD, Wang AY, Cohen RD. AGA Clinical Practice Update on Management of Inflammatory Bowel Disease During the COVID-19 Pandemic: Expert Commentary. Gastroenterology. doi:https://doi.org/10.1053/j.gastro.2020.04.012