

## Detection of SARS-CoV-2 in Exhaled Breath from COVID-19 Patients Ready for Hospital Discharge

Lian Zhou<sup>1, †</sup>, Maosheng Yao<sup>2, †\*</sup>, Xiang Zhang<sup>3</sup>, Bicheng Hu<sup>4</sup>, Xinyue Li<sup>2</sup>, Haoxuan Chen<sup>2</sup>, Lu Zhang<sup>2</sup>, Yun Liu<sup>3</sup>, Meng Du<sup>5</sup>, Bochao Sun<sup>6</sup>, Yunyu Jiang<sup>7</sup>, Kai Zhou<sup>8</sup>, Jie Hong<sup>1</sup>, Na Yu<sup>9</sup>, Zhen Ding<sup>1</sup>, Yan Xu<sup>1</sup>, Min Hu<sup>2</sup>, Lidia Morawska<sup>10</sup>, Sergey A. Grinshpun<sup>11</sup>, Pratim Biswas<sup>12</sup>, Richard C. Flagan<sup>13</sup>, Baoli Zhu<sup>1,14\*</sup>, Wenqing Liu<sup>15,\*</sup>, Yuanhang Zhang<sup>2,\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Environment and Health, Jiangsu Provincial Center for Disease Control and Prevention, Nanjing, China.

<sup>2</sup>College of Environmental Sciences and Engineering, Peking University, Beijing 100871, China.

<sup>3</sup>The First Affiliated Hospital of Nanjing Medical University (Jiangsu Province Hospital), Nanjing, China.

<sup>4</sup>The Clinical Laboratory, Wuhan No.1 Hospital, Wuhan, China.

<sup>5</sup>Zhenjiang Center for Disease Control and Prevention, Zhenjiang, China.

<sup>6</sup>Yancheng Center for Disease Control and Prevention, Yancheng, China.

<sup>7</sup>Taizhou Center for Disease Control and Prevention, Taizhou, China.

<sup>8</sup>Suzhou Center for Disease Control and Prevention, Suzhou, China.

<sup>9</sup>The First Hospital of China Medical University, Shenyang, China.

<sup>10</sup>International Laboratory for Air Quality and Health (ILAQH), WHO Collaborating Centre for Air Quality and Health, School of Earth and Atmospheric Sciences, Queensland University of Technology, Brisbane, Queensland, Australia.

<sup>11</sup>Center for Health-Related Aerosol Studies, Department of Environmental & Public Health Sciences, University of Cincinnati, Cincinnati, OH 45267, USA.

<sup>12</sup>Department of Energy, Environmental & Chemical Engineering, Washington University in St. Louis, St. Louis, MO 63130, USA.

<sup>13</sup>Department of Environmental Science and Engineering and Department of Chemical Engineering, California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, CA 91109, USA.

<sup>14</sup>Center for Global Health, School of Public Health, Nanjing Medical University, Nanjing, China.

<sup>15</sup>Hefei Institutes of Physical Science, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Hefei City, Anhui Province, China.

† These authors contributed equally.


### Summary

The COVID-19 pandemic has brought an unprecedented crisis to the global health sector<sup>1</sup>. When recovering COVID-19 patients are discharged in accordance with throat or nasal swab protocols using reverse transcription polymerase chain reaction (RT-PCR), the potential risk of re-introducing the infection source to humans and the environment must be resolved<sup>2,3,4</sup>. Here we show that 20% of COVID-19 patients, who were ready for a hospital discharge based on current guidelines, had SARS-CoV-2 in their exhaled breath (~10<sup>5</sup> RNA copies/m<sup>3</sup>). They were estimated to emit about 1400 RNA copies into the air per minute. Although fewer surface swabs (1.3%, N=318) tested positive, medical equipment frequently contacted by healthcare workers and the work shift floor were contaminated by SARS-CoV-2 in four hospitals in Wuhan. All air samples (N=44) appeared negative likely due to the dilution or inactivation through natural ventilation (1.6-3.3 m/s) and applied disinfection. Despite the low risk of cross environmental contamination in the studied hospitals, there is a critical need for strengthening the hospital discharge standards in preventing re-emergence of COVID-19 spread.

**Main Text:** The world has almost been brought to a standstill by the COVID-19 pandemic, while hospitals around the world are overwhelmed with unprecedented

56 challenges<sup>1</sup>. Inside COVID-19 patient care centers, the air, frequently touched object  
57 surfaces, and floors have been found to be contaminated by SARS-CoV-2<sup>5,6,7</sup>.  
58 Infections of medical staff by SARS-CoV-2 were reported in hospitals across the  
59 globe; some of them have unfortunately lost their lives<sup>8,9</sup>. Stressfully, the medical  
60 community is also coping with the dilemma of discharging patients to re-allocate  
61 precious resources; while accepting the risks of reintroducing the source of infection  
62 to the public. For convenient diagnosis of the disease, the hospitals use throat or nasal  
63 swabs, sometimes supplemented with computed tomography (CT) scans for enhanced  
64 screening<sup>10,11</sup>. After hospital discharge, some COVID-19 patients, however, have  
65 tested positive again for SARS-CoV-2 using the throat swab protocol<sup>2,3,4</sup>. Despite  
66 major progress in understanding the COVID-19, infection risks related to recovering  
67 patients and to contaminated surfaces and air are not well documented. In this work,  
68 we aimed to examine the possible presence of SARS-CoV-2 in exhaled breath  
69 specimens from recovering COVID-19 patients who have repeatedly tested negative  
70 using throat swabs; and to study environmental contamination by SARS-CoV-2  
71 within four hospitals in Wuhan, China.

72  
73 Here we show that the exhaled breath condensate (EBC) samples from recovering  
74 COVID-19 patients in Wuhan hospitals (Table S1) tested positive for SAR-CoV-2  
75 RNA (Fig. 1). These patients were over 70 years old (Fig. 1A, Table S2, S3). The  
76 EBC samples were collected at least 14 days after they had developed clinical  
77 symptoms (Fig. 1B); their throat swabs repeatedly tested negative at the time of the  
78 EBC collection and analysis. Their IgG tests were yet positive on 6 and 9, March  
79 about 4-7 days before their EBC samples were collected (Fig. 1C). Surprisingly, for  
80 patient B-L1(A), all tests with the throat swabs since 21 February had been negative,  
81 but the patient's EBC sample, which was collected on 13 March (about 36 days after  
82 the patient developed symptoms), tested positive for SARS-CoV-2. For patient  
83 B-Z1(B), throat swabs tested positive on 21 February, 2 March, and then negative on  
84 11 March; of two tests performed on March 12, one tested positive, and the other  
85 tested negative. On the following days (13,14, and 15 March) the patient's throat  
86 swabs, however, repeatedly tested negative (Fig. 1D). Similar to patient B-L1 (A),  
87 patient B-Z1's EBC sample, which was collected on 13 March (at least 43 days after  
88 the patient developed clinical symptoms), tested positive. ORF1a/b genes for  
89 SARS-CoV-2 were not detected in either patient (Fig. 1C). The throat swabs from  
90 three non-COVID-19 patients all tested negative for SARS-CoV-2. For one  
91 non-COVID-19 patient (C-Y1), two EBC samples were collected, all of which tested  
92 negative by RT-PCR. The EBC samples of one COVID-19 subject (A-X1) and two  
93 non-COVID-19 subjects (A-J1 and A-U1) also tested negative using the chip  
94 technology as described in the Methods. Overall, the EBC sample positive rate was 20%  
95 among the 10 recovering COVID-19 patients.




96  
97  
98  
99  
100  
101  
102  
103  
104

**Fig. 1** SARS-CoV-2 detection from EBC samples from the 10 recovering COVID-19 patients (Table S2); A) the recovering COVID-19 cases by age group; B) the recovering COVID-19 cases vs time of symptom onset to sample (TS2S) (day); C) medical records for the COVID-19 patients. 2N = two negative results on the same date. P = positive result; NA = no tests available; ND = not detected; N = negative result.

105  
106  
107  
108  
109  
110  
111  
112  
113  
114  
115  
116  
117  
118  
119  
120  
121


From the 318 surface swabs collected, four samples tested positive for SARS-CoV-2 (Fig. 2). Two positive surface swab samples (Fig. 2B) were detected from the medical-staff-touching surface group. One was from a medical trolley D-SS-V8; the other (B-SS-D27), taken on 13 March, was from a medical instrument that had been used for monitoring the health condition of COVID-19 patient B-L2 who tested positive for SARS-CoV-2 on 9, 12, and 14 March. (Table S2). Another two positives included one (D-SS-V10) from the surfaces of the medical supply delivery window (Fig. S1D) installed between the general ward and the nursing center; another (D-SS-T8) from the shoe cabinets. Surprisingly, no positive samples were detected from the 158 patient-frequently-touched surfaces such as cell phones, door handles, patients' hands, or even surfaces of the masks worn by the patients (D-Y1, D-Y2) (Table S4). In line with the surface observation, the EBC samples of the patients who were wearing the tested masks also tested negative (Table S3). None of the 57 hospital floor samples, 21 surface samples from clean areas, and 16 samples from other hospital surfaces tested positive for the virus. Unexpectedly from the common belief, the observed overall positive rate for the surface swab samples was strikingly low, only 1.3% (N=318).



122  
123  
124  
125  
126  
127  
128  
129  
130  
131  
132

**Fig. 2** Detection of SARS-CoV-2 from surface swabs collected from seven categories of various sample collection locations: A) statistics for both positive and negative surface samples (total numbers and percentages); B) associated information of the detected positive surface samples. ND = not detected; NA = no tests available.

None of the 44 air samples, including those collected using the robot (Video S1), tested positive for SARS-CoV-2 using RT-PCR. Even in the five intensive care unit (ICU) air samples, no SARS-CoV-2 was detected. Using the described chip technology, six air samples (A-Air-1-6, A-Air-Un1) (Table S5) were re-tested for both target SARS-CoV-2 genes; all of them were confirmed negative.



133  
134  
135  
136  
137  
138

**Fig. 3** Detection of SARS-CoV-2 in air samples collected from six categories of different sampling locations. Percentages in the figure correspond to the fraction of each category of the total number of air samples.

The highest positive rate for SARS-CoV-2 was observed from the exhaled breath

139 samples (20%), followed by the surface swabs (1.3%) and air samples (0%).  
140 Surprisingly, two recovering COVID-19 patients (B-L1 and B-Z1), who repeatedly  
141 tested negative with their throat swabs, were observed to emit SARS-CoV-2 via  
142 breathing. The emission rate was estimated to be around 1400 copies/ min via  
143 breathing into the air. Another work reported that two COVID-19 cases (one without  
144 clinical symptoms), who repeatedly tested negative using throat swabs, tested positive  
145 for SARS-CoV-2 with their bronchoalveolar lavage fluid samples<sup>12</sup>. These findings  
146 further support our observation that SARS-CoV-2 could be emitted from the lungs via  
147 breathing, presenting a significant health risk for surrounding people and  
148 environments. This highlights a serious hidden airborne infection risk from the  
149 recovering COVID-19 patients, who were ready for hospital discharge using throat  
150 swab sample, but failed the EBC test. However, throat swabs and EBC specimens  
151 might work differently with different COVID-19 patients in terms of SARS-CoV-2  
152 screening. COVID-19 diagnosis efficacy could be further improved by using EBC  
153 specimens or additional techniques such as CT scans as a complement to current  
154 throat swab testing by RT-PCR. Because of resource constraints, we did not study the  
155 viability and biological integrity of breath-borne SARS-CoV-2. Nonetheless, one  
156 study showed that aerosolized SARS-CoV-2 could remain viable in the air for up to 3  
157 hours<sup>13</sup>. Logically, breath-emitted SARS-CoV-2, in a more favourable form of  
158 aerosolization, would be active in the air for a similar time scale, thus capable of  
159 facilitating the spread of the COVID-19. Information about airborne emission and the  
160 viability of SARS-CoV-2 emitted by patients is critical to understanding COVID-19  
161 transmission. As the first effort reported, the present work revealed the SARS-CoV-2  
162 presence in exhaled breath from recovering COVID-19 patients to be discharged,  
163 highlighting the underlying risk (20% failure rate) of the existing protocol in  
164 discharging COVID-19 patients.

165  
166 Contrary to the current belief that direct surface contact represents a major route  
167 for COVID-19 transmission, we detected a very low positive rate (1.3%) for surface  
168 swabs (N=318) from various settings in the four Wuhan hospitals. This finding  
169 implies that direct surface contact, even in high risk areas in the environments studied,  
170 may not represent a major route of COVID-19 transmission. Using conventional  
171 RT-PCR, SARS-CoV-2 levels were shown below the detection limits for all 44 air  
172 samples collected (Video S1) in various hospital environments. The observed low  
173 positive rates both for the air and surfaces were a collective consequence of a number  
174 of factors. Firstly, virus emission dynamics from COVID-19 patients – when, how,  
175 where, and at what rate patients emit SARS-CoV-2 – are still largely unknown. The  
176 observed virus emission by at least one patient was not continuous (patient B-Z1, Fig  
177 1); it may strongly depend on the patient's activities, e.g., coughing, sneezing,  
178 talking, or lung self-cleaning during the day. However, such activities, which are  
179 difficult to document, may have occurred before sample collection. Secondly, the  
180 hospitals applied disinfectants three times a day, possibly inactivating the virus and its  
181 RNA segments. Furthermore, all COVID-19 patients were required to wear a mask  
182 while in the hospital, reducing the release of the virus into the air or onto surfaces in  
183 the hospital environment. Lastly, natural air ventilation via open-windows (every  
184 room has at least one window with an outside wind speed of up to 1.6-3.3 m/s)  
185 allowed airborne virus to be rapidly diluted away. Since the time this study was  
186 conducted, no infections of medical staff have been reported from these four hospitals.  
187 The results from air samples indicate that the bio-safety control measures adopted by  
188 the hospitals for the air space were fairly effective. Nonetheless, our surface swab data  
189 suggest that certain surfaces frequently touched by the medical staff should be  
190 regularly disinfected to further lower related infection risks. The reported virus levels  
191 could have been underestimated by the RT-PCR method, which was previously  
192 reported to have a detection limit of 100 SARS-CoV-2 RNA copies/ $\mu$ L<sup>14</sup>. While low  
193 infection risks were shown for surfaces and air in the evaluated hospitals, our data  
194 reveal a critical need to revisit current hospital discharge guidelines to minimize the  
195 public risk.



196  
197  
198  
199  
200  
201  
202  
203  
204  
205  
206  
207  
208  
209  
210  
211  
212  
213  
214  
215  
216  
217  
218  
219  
220  
221  
222  
223  
224  
225  
226  
227  
228  
229  
230  
231  
232  
233  
234  
235  
236  
237  
238  
239  
240  
241  
242  
243  
244  
245  
246  
247  
248  
249  
250  
251  
252

## **Methods**

### ***Details of COVID-19 patients and the four hospital configurations***

We recruited a total of 13 patients from four hospitals (Table S1, S2) in Wuhan, China for this study; and ten of whom were recovering COVID-19 patients ready for discharge based on repeated throat swabs tests (Table S2). The hospital wards had windows which were open during the sample collection. Male patients accounted for 60% of the 10 COVID-19 patients. Statistical distributions of age, severity of disease (the highest recorded during the disease course), and the time from the onset of symptoms to sample collection are shown in Fig. S1A, B (Table S2). The COVID-19 patients were aged from 29 to 81, with 70% of the patients older than 50, as shown in Fig. S1A; half had experienced severe symptoms during the disease course (Fig. S1B). Medical records for all patients were collected at the time of the sample collection (Table S2). The recruitment was conducted from 26 February -25 March, 2020; and the ethics involving non-invasive exhaled breath collection from patients was approved and waived due to the emergency situation by the Ethics committee of Jiangsu Provincial Center for Disease Prevention and Control. Fig. S1 C, D, E and Fig. S2, and S3 show representative hospital layouts, including designated areas, windows, natural air flow directions, and walking directions from the entry to the exit. The hospitals (Table S1) were clearly divided into different functional areas, including nursing center, clinical observation room, doctors' office, restroom, work shift area (disinfection area for medical staff before exiting), and clean areas as indicated in Fig. S1. The usages of these areas were restricted to their designated hospital functions. The meteorological parameters and other information about ambient pollutants during the monitoring campaign are listed in Table S6. The average wind was observed to be category II, which corresponds to a wind speed of 1.6-3.3 m/s. The hospital rooms in four hospitals of Wuhan used a natural ventilation.

### ***Exhaled breath sample collection***

Exhaled breath condensate (EBC) samples were collected from 13 recruited patients (10 recovering COVID-19 patients, and three with influenza symptoms who tested negative for SARS-CoV-2), their using a BioScreen II device (Beijing dBlueTech Inc., Beijing, China) following the protocols provided by the manufacturer (Fig. S4). To avoid saliva contamination, a long straw was used to allow the patient to breathe into a tube that was electrically cooled. The EBC sample of one non-COVID-19 patient (C-Y1) was collected twice to confirm the result. EBC sample volumes of approximately 300-500  $\mu$ L were obtained for all patients. The samples were immediately pipetted into a corning tube and transported to the laboratory for SARS-CoV-2 analysis. The clinical information for non-COVID-19 patients is listed in Table S2. The throat swabs of the recovering COVID-19 patients were all tested negative for SARS-CoV-2 by the hospital (Table S2) before their EBC samples were collected. Examples of the EBC sample collection points in four different hospitals are shown in Fig. S2 and S3. A total of 14 EBC samples were collected (see Table S3 for detailed information).

### ***Surface swab sample collection***

To evaluate environmental contamination with SARS-CoV-2, swab samples were collected from surfaces associated with the COVID-19 patients and medical staff, and from many other surfaces inside the four hospitals in Wuhan. Specifically, a wet cotton swab was used to scrub a surface (an area of 10 cm  $\times$  10 cm or 5 cm  $\times$  5 cm) of objects in the hospital environment and from personal items of the patients. The surface swab samples were deposited in the virus collection liquid (Jiangsu Kangjian Medical Supply, Inc, Nanjing, China), and then transported to the laboratory and stored at -20  $^{\circ}$ C for SARS-CoV-2 analysis. A total of 318 surface swabs were collected. Details are listed in Table S4.

### ***Air sample collection***

253 To examine environmental bio-safety, air samples were collected from the  
254 corridors, hospital waste storage rooms, ICU rooms, toilets, medical preparation  
255 rooms, clinical observation rooms, and general wards of four hospitals in Wuhan,  
256 China. The air samples were collected using impinger samplers (WA-15, WA-400;  
257 Beijing dBlueTech, Inc., Beijing, China) (examples for onsite sampling are shown in  
258 Fig.S5). The WA-15 sampled at a flow rate of 15 L/min, while the WA-400 sampled at  
259 400 L/min. For corridor spaces or naturally ventilated environments, the WA-400 was  
260 installed on a robot for air sampling (Fig. S5B), while for semi-enclosed environments  
261 such as toilets or ICU rooms, the WA-15 was used for sampling (Fig. S5A). The robot  
262 was programmed to move along pre-determined routes inside the hospital (Fig. S5C;  
263 Video S1). In each case, air was sampled into 3 mL of virus sampling liquid (Jiangsu  
264 Kangjian Medical Supply, Inc., Nanjing, China) for 40 min; after the sampling, about  
265 1.5-2 mL collection liquid remained due to the evaporation. The collected air samples  
266 were transported to the laboratory for SARS-CoV-2 analysis. The air samples  
267 collected using the robot comprised air from different areas of the interior hospital  
268 corridor, and thus were more representative than those from a stationary sampling.  
269 Representative air sample collection points are also shown in Fig. S2, and S3. A total  
270 of 44 air samples were collected; detailed information is listed in Table S5.

271  
272 ***SARS-CoV-2 analysis for the air samples, exhaled breath condensate samples and***  
273 ***surface swabs using RT-PCR and loop-mediated isothermal amplification (LAMP)***

274 The collected samples (200  $\mu$ L taken from the collection liquid) went through  
275 several steps for SARS-Cov-2 detection. First, an automated nucleic acid extraction  
276 device (NP968-S, Xi'an Tianlong Sci &Tech Co., Ltd, Xi'an, China) and an RNA  
277 extraction kit (Jiangsu Bioperfectus Technologies, Nanjing, China) were used to  
278 extract SARS-CoV-2 RNA, achieving a final sample RNA suspension of 70-80  $\mu$ L.  
279 SARS-CoV-2 detection was then performed using RT-PCR (BioRAD CFX96  
280 Real-Time System C1000 Thermal Cycler, Hercules, California) together with a  
281 detection kit (Jiangsu Bioperfectus Technologies) except the sample D-SS-V10 (N, E  
282 and RdRP genes analyzed) under the following cycle conditions: 50°C for 10min, and  
283 97°C for 1min, followed by 45 cycles of 97°C for 5s, and 58°C for 30s. The reaction  
284 mixture included 7.5  $\mu$ L of nucleic acid amplification mix, 5 $\mu$ L of Taq EnzymeMix, 4  
285  $\mu$ L of SARS-CoV-2 reaction mix, 3.5  $\mu$ L of RNA-free H<sub>2</sub>O, and 5  $\mu$ L of sample RNA.  
286 In accordance with the instructions, for cycle threshold (Ct) values of less than 37,  
287 and those less than 40 but greater than 37, with an “S” shape amplification curve, the  
288 corresponding samples were treated as a positive. The RT-PCR detection limits using  
289 various primer sets were shown to be around 100 SARS-CoV-2 RNA copies/ $\mu$ L; those  
290 obtained by the Chinese CDC were lower (below 50 RNA copies/ $\mu$ L) for the N gene  
291 with a maximum Ct value of approximately 39.5<sup>14</sup>. The primer set was not disclosed  
292 for the kit used here by the company. Some of the collected samples were retested for  
293 SARS-CoV-2 for both N and ORF1a/b genes using the LAMP chip technology  
294 (Beijing CapitalBio Technology Co., Ltd., Beijing, China) following the  
295 manufacturer's instructions. In addition to SARS-CoV-2, this technology can also  
296 detect 18 other viruses. All samplings were performed using single-use consumables  
297 and deionized (DI) water served as the negative controls.

298  
299 **References**

- 300 1. Wan, W., Cha, A. E. & Sun, L. H. This is the coronavirus math that has experts so  
301 worried: Running out of ventilators, hospital beds. The Washington Post.  
302 <https://www.washingtonpost.com/health/2020/03/13/coronavirus-numbers-we-really-should-be-worried-about/> (2020).  
303  
304 2. Xiao, A. T., Tong, Y. X. & Zhang, S. False-negative of RT-PCR and prolonged  
305 nucleic acid conversion in COVID-19: rather than recurrence. *J. Med. Virol.*  
306 <https://doi.org/10.1002/jmv.25855> (2020).  
307  
308 3. Zhang, J. et al. SARS-CoV-2 turned positive in a discharged patient with  
309 COVID-19 arouses concern regarding the present standard for discharge. *Int. J. Infect. Dis.* <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijid.2020.03.007> (2020).

- 310 4. Peng, J., Wang, M., Zhang, G. & Lu, E. Seven discharged patients turning positive  
311 again for SARS-CoV-2 on quantitative RT-PCR. *Am. J. Infect. Control* **48**, 725-726  
312 (2020).
- 313 5. Guo, Z. D. et al. Aerosol and Surface Distribution of Severe Acute Respiratory  
314 Syndrome Coronavirus 2 in Hospital Wards, Wuhan, China, 2020. *Emerg. Infect. Dis.*  
315 <https://doi.org/10.3201/eid2607.200885> (2020).
- 316 6. Liu, Y. et al. Aerodynamic analysis of SARS-CoV-2 in two Wuhan hospitals. *Nature*  
317 <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.03.08.982637> (2020).
- 318 7. Santarpia, J. L. et al. Transmission potential of SARS-CoV-2 in viral shedding  
319 observed at the University of Nebraska Medical Center. Preprint at  
320 <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.03.23.20039446> (2020).
- 321 8. Reusken, C. B. et al. Rapid assessment of regional SARS-CoV-2 community  
322 transmission through a convenience sample of healthcare workers, the Netherlands,  
323 March 2020. *Euro Surveill.* **25**, 2000334 (2020).
- 324 9. Epidemiology Working Group for NCIP Epidemic Response, Chinese Center for  
325 Disease Control and Prevention. The epidemiological characteristics of an outbreak of  
326 2019 novel coronavirus diseases (COVID-19) in China, 2020. *Chin. J. Epidemiol.* **41**,  
327 145-151 (2020).
- 328 10. Xie, X. et al. Chest CT for typical 2019-nCoV pneumonia: relationship to negative  
329 RT-PCR testing. *Radiology* <https://doi.org/10.1148/radiol.2020200343> (2020).
- 330 11. Zhao, W., Zhong, Z., Xie, X., Yu, Q. & Liu, J. Relation between chest CT findings  
331 and clinical conditions of coronavirus disease (COVID-19) pneumonia: a multicenter  
332 study. *Am. J. Roentgenol.* **214**, 1072-1077 (2020).
- 333 12. Tan, F., Qiu, Y. & Xu, Z. Novel coronavirus pneumonia diagnosis for two cases  
334 using Bronchoalveolar lavage fluid (in Chinese). *Chin. J. Tuberc. Respir. Med.* **43**,  
335 337-339 (2020).
- 336 13. van Doremalen, N. et al. Aerosol and surface stability of SARS-CoV-2 as  
337 compared with SARS-CoV-1. *N. Engl. J. Med.* **382**, 1564-1567 (2020).
- 338 14. Vogels, C. B. F. et al. Analytical sensitivity and efficiency comparisons of  
339 SARS-COV-2 qRT-PCR primer-probe sets. Preprint at  
340 <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.03.30.20048108> (2020).

341

#### 342 **Acknowledgements**

343 This research was supported by a National Natural Science Foundation of China  
344 (NSFC) grant (22040101) (PI: M. Yao), the Chinese Academy of Engineering  
345 Grant(2020-ZD-15) dedicated to the COVID-19 pandemic. This work was also  
346 partially supported by the NSFC Distinguished Young Scholars Fund Awarded to M.  
347 Yao (21725701), and Scientific Research Fund of Jiangsu Provincial Health  
348 Committee(S2017002).

#### 349 **Author Contributions:**

350 M.Y., Y.Z., W.L., and B.Z. conceptualized the study design, provided resources,  
351 and managed the project; L.Z., X.Z., Y.L., M.D., B.S., Y.J., K.Z., J.H., and N.Y. collected  
352 samples and performed the laboratory tests; M.Y. provided the sampling and analysis  
353 devices; M.Y., L.Z., Y.Z., W.L., B.Z., L.M., S.A.G., P.B., and R.C.F. analysed the data;  
354 M.Y., L.Z., Y.Z., W.L., L.M., S.A.G., P.B., and R.C.F. interpreted the results; M.Y. wrote  
355 the initial drafts of the manuscript, and X.L., L.Z., and H.C. assisted the manuscript  
356 figure preparation and references; M.Y., L.Z., Y.Z., W.L., B.Z., M.H., L.M., S.A.G.,  
357 P.B., R.C.F., X.L., L.Z., H.C., Z.D., and Y.X. revised and commented the manuscript.  
358 All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

#### 359 **Declaration of interests**

360 We declare no competing interests.

361 **Additional Information:** Supplementary Information is available for this paper.  
362 Correspondence and requests for materials should be addressed to M.Y.  
363 (yao@pku.edu.cn), B.Z. (zhubl@jscdc.cn), W.L. (wqliu@aiofm.ac.cn), or Y.  
364 Z. (yhzhang@pku.edu.cn)