

1 **Article Summary Line:** High nasopharyngeal viral load around the onset may contribute to  
2 secondary transmission of COVID-19.

3

4 **Running title:** Viral load and secondary transmission in COVID-19

5

6 **Keywords:** viral load, secondary transmission, COVID-19

7

8 **Title**

9 Viral load dynamics in transmissible symptomatic patients with COVID-19

10

11 **Authors:**

12 Hitoshi Kawasuji, Yusuke Takegoshi, Makito Kaneda, Akitoshi Ueno, Yuki Miyajima,

13 Koyomi Kawago, Yasutaka Fukui, Yoshihiko Yoshida, Miyuki Kimura, Hiroshi Yamada,

14 Ippei Sakamaki, Hideki Tani, Yoshitomo Morinaga, and Yoshihiro Yamamoto

15

16 **Author affiliation:**

17 Toyama University Graduate School of Medicine and Pharmaceutical Sciences, Toyama,

18 Japan

19

20 **Abstract**

21 To investigate the relationship between viral load and secondary transmission in novel

22 coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19), we reviewed epidemiological and clinical data

23 obtained from immunocompetent laboratory-confirmed patients with COVID-19 at Toyama

24 University Hospital. In total, 28 patients were included in the analysis. Median viral load at

25 the initial sample collection was significantly higher in adults than in children and in

26 symptomatic than in asymptomatic patients. Among symptomatic patients, non-linear  
27 regression models showed that the estimated viral load at onset was higher in the index  
28 (patients who transmitted the disease to at least one other patient) than in the non-index  
29 patients (patients who were not the cause of secondary transmission; median [95%  
30 confidence interval]: 6.6 [5.2–8.2] vs. 3.1 [1.5–4.8] log copies/ $\mu$ L, respectively). High  
31 nasopharyngeal viral loads around onset may contribute to secondary transmission of  
32 COVID-19.

### 33 **Introduction**

34           Coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19), which is caused by the novel severe acute  
35 respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2), has become a global pandemic, and  
36 currently threatens human health and lifestyles. Thus, it is important to gain an accurate  
37 understanding of the risk of infection with SARS-CoV-2. Generally, the risk of microbial  
38 human-to-human transmission is dependent on the duration of the highly-infectious phase  
39 and the number of virions contained in air particulates such as droplets and aerosols.  
40 However, as it is a new disease, little is yet known about COVID-19 and the risk of infection  
41 in various situations.

42           The viral load of SARS-CoV-2 peaks around the time of symptom onset, followed by  
43 a gradual decrease to a low level after about 10 days (1,2). Regarding the period of high  
44 infectiousness, a recent study reported that exposure to an index case within 5 days of  
45 symptom onset confers a high risk of secondary transmission (3). The high transmissibility  
46 around symptom onset gradually decreases, consistent with the dynamical pattern of viral  
47 shedding (4).

48           In addition, viral load can be associated with infectiousness, especially in the acute  
49 phase of COVID-19. However, little information is available on the relationship between  
50 nasopharyngeal viral load and secondary transmission. Therefore, in this study, we reviewed  
51 patients with COVID-19, including family clusters, and conducted follow-up interviews to  
52 investigate the relationship between viral load and secondary infection.

### 53 **Materials and methods**

54           Epidemiological and clinical data were obtained from immunocompetent  
55 laboratory-confirmed patients with COVID-19 who were admitted to and/or from whom viral  
56 loads were measured at Toyama University Hospital. Index patients and those with secondary  
57 transmission were estimated based on serial intervals in the family clusters, and

58 epidemiological and clinical data, including the number of secondary patients in health care,  
59 household, or other social settings, were investigated through structured telephone interviews.  
60 The study was performed in conformity with the Helsinki Declaration, after approval by the  
61 Ethical Review Board of University of Toyama (approval number: R2019167). Written  
62 informed consent was obtained from all patients.

63 The patients were divided into two groups: those who subsequently transmitted the  
64 disease to at least one other patient (index patients), and those who did not (non-index  
65 patients).

66 For each patient, the following data were retrieved from medical charts and structured  
67 telephone interview sheets: demographics, clinical presentation, date of symptom onset, date  
68 of initial sample collection, need for supplemental oxygen (moderate) and/or mechanical  
69 ventilation (severe), and dates of the first negative quantitative reverse transcription  
70 polymerase chain reaction (RT-qPCR) test result and hospital discharge.

71 Nasal swab specimens were pretreated with 500  $\mu$ L of Sputazyme (Kyokuto  
72 Pharmaceutical, Tokyo, Japan). After centrifugation at 20,000  $\times$  g for 30 min at 4°C, the  
73 supernatant was used for RNA extraction. A total of 60  $\mu$ L of RNA solution was obtained  
74 from 140  $\mu$ L of the supernatant using the QIAamp ViralRNA Mini Kit (QIAGEN, Hilden,  
75 Germany) or Nippongene Isospin RNA Virus (Nippongene, Tokyo, Japan) according to the  
76 manufacturer's instructions. The viral loads of SARS-CoV-2 were quantified based on an  
77 N2-gene-specific primer/probe set by RT-qPCR according to the Japan National Institute of  
78 Infectious Diseases protocol (5). The quality of quantification was controlled by AcroMetrix  
79 Coronavirus 2019 (COVID-19) RNA Control (Thermo Fisher Scientific, Fremont, CA). The  
80 detection limit was approximately 0.4 copies/ $\mu$ L (2 copies/5  $\mu$ L).

81 Continuous and categorical variables were presented as the median (interquartile  
82 range [IQR]) and n (%), respectively. We used the Mann–Whitney U test,  $\chi^2$  test, or Fisher's

83 exact test to compare differences between the index and non-index patients where appropriate.  
84 Data were analyzed using JMP Pro version 14.2.0 software (SAS Institute Inc., Cary, NC,  
85 USA). The viral load time courses were assessed using nonlinear regression employing a  
86 standard one-phase decay model in Prism version 8.4.2 (GraphPad Software Inc., San Diego,  
87 CA, USA).

## 88 **Results**

89 Among the 28 patients (median age, 45.5 years) with laboratory-confirmed  
90 COVID-19, 15 (53.6%) were male, 21 (75.0%) were adults (18 years or older), and 10  
91 (35.7%) were asymptomatic (Table 1). Among their 105 close contacts, 14 paired  
92 index-secondary cases were found. Fourteen (50.0%) were index patients within 11 family  
93 clusters, 10 (35.7%) were secondary transmission patients without further spreading within  
94 seven family clusters, and the remaining four (14.3%) were sporadic cases. Of the 18  
95 symptomatic patients, the numbers of mild, moderate, and severe cases were 12, 5, and 1,  
96 respectively.

97 A total of 89 nasopharyngeal swabs were collected from the 28 patients from 2 to 36  
98 days after onset. The median (IQR) time at initial sample collection was 6 (2.8–9) days after  
99 symptom onset. The median viral load at the initial sample collection was significantly higher  
100 in adults than in children ( $p=0.02$ , 2.3 vs. 0.9 log copies/ $\mu\text{L}$ , respectively); however, viral  
101 loads during follow-up were not significantly different between the two groups ( $p=0.89$ ). In  
102 addition, the median viral load at initial sample collection was significantly higher in  
103 symptomatic than in asymptomatic patients ( $p<0.01$ , 2.8 vs. 0.9 log copies/ $\mu\text{L}$ , respectively).

104 Next, the viral load in symptomatic patients was compared between the index and  
105 non-index patients (Table 2). Viral loads peaked soon after symptom onset, and then  
106 gradually decreased toward the detection limit (Figure 1A). The time to viral clearance from  
107 onset in the index patients was 21 (15–31) days (median [range]), and no significant

108 difference was found between the index and non-index patients ( $p=0.09$ , 10 [9–26] days,  
109 median [range]).

110 Among the symptomatic patients, the nasopharyngeal viral loads at the initial sample  
111 collection were not significantly different between the index and non-index patients ( $p=0.15$ ,  
112 median [range]: 3.1 [1.6 to 5.2] vs. 1.9 [–0.4 to 4.6] log copies/ $\mu\text{L}$ , respectively). However,  
113 nonlinear regression models using all the data from the index or non-index patients showed  
114 that the viral load of the index patients at onset was higher than that of the non-index patients  
115 (median [95% confidence interval]: 6.6 [5.2 to 8.2] vs. 3.1 [1.5 to 4.8] log copies/ $\mu\text{L}$ ,  
116 respectively), and this trend continued until 10 days after onset (Figure 1B).

## 117 **Discussion**

118 In this study, we analyzed viral loads in nasopharyngeal swabs obtained from 18  
119 symptomatic and 10 asymptomatic patients with laboratory-confirmed COVID-19 to assess  
120 the relationship between viral load and secondary transmission.

121 Although a recent study suggested that the viral load detected in asymptomatic  
122 patients was similar to that in symptomatic patients (2), in this study, the viral load at the time  
123 of initial sample collection was significantly higher in symptomatic than in asymptomatic  
124 patients. Furthermore, among the symptomatic patients, the viral loads in the index patients  
125 were significantly higher than those in the non-index patients at about 5 days after onset.  
126 Further studies are needed to confirm these results, as this study only involved a small  
127 number of patients. However, it is plausible that high nasopharyngeal viral loads contribute to  
128 secondary transmission of COVID-19. To our knowledge, no previous study has assessed the  
129 relationship between viral load and secondary transmission. Among the asymptomatic  
130 carriers, it was difficult to determine whether the viral load could impact transmission  
131 because no carrier had a high viral load.

132           After symptom onset, the viral load decreased monotonically. The median time to  
133 clearance of the virus was similar to that in a previous report, in which virus was detected for  
134 a median of 20 days (up to 37 days among survivors) after symptom onset (6). However, the  
135 median time did not differ between the index and non-index patients. These findings imply  
136 that viral clearance is independent of the initial virus load, but may be regulated by the host  
137 immune response. In most patients, the virus was detected for about 3 weeks; however, when  
138 the risk of transmission disappears remains unclear. A previous report demonstrated that  
139 infectiousness may decline at 8 days after symptom onset (7). Although the relationship  
140 between viral load and the infectiousness of COVID-19 remains unknown (8), the present  
141 study provides insight into the viral load threshold associated with infectivity.

142           This study has several limitations inherent to the small sample size and potential for  
143 confounding viral load and clinical conditions that cannot be excluded. The date of symptom  
144 onset and disappearance and information on disease transmission relied on self-reported  
145 information from the patients and their families, as well as information from public health  
146 centers, which could potentially lead to missing some cases of secondary transmission. In  
147 addition, the viral load dynamics were based on data from patients who received treatment,  
148 including combinations of antivirals and antibiotics, which could have modified the patterns  
149 of the viral load dynamics.

150           In conclusion, the results of this study suggest that a high nasopharyngeal viral load  
151 may contribute to the secondary transmission of COVID-19. In addition, the viral load may  
152 help explain why transmission is observed in some instances, but not in others, especially  
153 among household contacts. Although RT-qPCR does not distinguish between infectious virus  
154 and noninfectious nucleic acid, our findings may lead to the establishment of a viral load  
155 threshold to clarify COVID-19 disease transmission and infectivity.

156

157 **Acknowledgment**

158 We thank Ai Kakumoto for supporting PCR.

159

160 **Author Bio**

161 H. Kawasuji is a clinical fellow of Toyama University Hospital. He is also a  
162 PhD-course student and has one publication about methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus*  
163 *aureus* bacteremia as first author.

164

165 **Conflict of interest**

166 We declare that we have no conflict of interest.

167

168 **Funding**

169 This research did not receive any specific grant from funding agencies in the public,  
170 commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

171

172



173 **References:**

- 174 1. PanY, Zhang D, Yang P, Poon LLM, Wang Q. Viral load of SARS-CoV-2 in clinical  
175 samples. *Lancet Infect Dis.* 2020;20(4):411-2.
- 176 2. Zou L, Ruan F, Huang M, Liang L, Huang H, Hong Z, et al. SARS-CoV-2 Viral Load  
177 in Upper Respiratory Specimens of Infected Patients. *N Engl J Med.*  
178 2020;382(12):1177-9.
- 179 3. Cheng HY, Jian SW, Liu DP, Ng TC, Huang WT, Lin HH. Contact Tracing  
180 Assessment of COVID-19 Transmission Dynamics in Taiwan and Risk at Different  
181 Exposure Periods Before and After Symptom Onset. *JAMA Intern Med.*  
182 2020;e202020; Epub ahead of print. doi: 10.1001/jamainternmed.2020.2020.
- 183 4. He X, Lau EHY, Wu P, Deng X, Wang J, Hao X, et al. Temporal dynamics in viral  
184 shedding and transmissibility of COVID-19. *Nat Med.* 2020;26:672-5.
- 185 5. Shirato K, Nao N, Katano H, Takayama I, Saito S, Kato F, et al. Development of  
186 Genetic Diagnostic Methods for Novel Coronavirus 2019 (nCoV-2019) in Japan. *Jpn*  
187 *J Infect Dis.* 2020;10.7883/yoken.JJID.2020.061; Epub ahead of print.  
188 doi:10.7883/yoken.JJID.2020.061
- 189 6. Zhou F, Yu T, Du R, Fan G, Liu Y, Liu Z, et al. Clinical course and risk factors for  
190 mortality of adult inpatients with COVID-19 in Wuhan, China: a retrospective cohort  
191 study. *Lancet.* 2020;395(10229):1054-62.
- 192 7. Wölfel R, Corman VM, Guggemos W, Seilmaier M, Zange S, Müller MA, et al.  
193 Virological assessment of hospitalized patients with COVID-2019. *Nature.*  
194 2020;581(7809):465-9.
- 195 8. Atkinson B, Petersen E. SARS-CoV-2 shedding and infectivity. *Lancet.*  
196 2020;395(10233):1339-40.

197 Address for correspondence: Yoshihiro Yamamoto, Department of Clinical Infectious  
198 Diseases, Toyama University Graduate School of Medicine and Pharmaceutical Sciences,  
199 2630 Sugitani, Toyama 930-0194, Japan; TEL: +81-76-434-7245; FAX:  
200 +81-76-434-5018; e-mail: yamamoto@med.u-toyama.ac.jp  
201

202 **Table 1.** Basic characteristics of the patients.

Characteristics	Study population	203
Age, median, y	45.5	204
0–17, n (%)	7 (25.0)	
18–64, n (%)	14 (50.0)	
≥65, n (%)	7 (25.0)	
Sex		
Male, n (%)	15 (53.6)	
Situation, n (%)		
Index	14 (50.0)	
Secondary	10 (35.7)	
Sporadic	4 (14.3)	
Presence of symptoms, n (%)		
Asymptomatic	10 (35.7)	
Symptomatic	18 (64.3)	
Mild	12 (42.9)	
Moderate	5 (17.9)	
Severe	1 (3.6)	

205 **Table 2.** Summary of viral load in the index and non-index patients.

Characteristics	Index patients, n = 11	Non-index patients, n = 7	P-value
Initial sampling			
Sampling days after onset, median (range)	6 (2 to 12)	4 (-1 to 10)	0.52
Viral load (log copies/ $\mu$ L), median (range)	3.1 (1.6 to 5.2)	1.9 (-0.4 to 4.6)	0.15
Trend of viral load (log copies/ $\mu$ L), median (range)			
-1 to 5 days after onset	4.9 (4.4 to 5.2)	3.0 (0.7 to 4.6)	0.11
6 to 10 days after onset	2.3 (1.6 to 4.9)	0.7 (-0.4 to 3.1)	0.17
Days to viral clearance from onset, median (range)	21 (15 to 31)	11 (9 to 26)	0.09

206

207 **Figure legend**

208 **Figure 1.** Trends in viral loads in the symptomatic patients.

209 (A) Viral load time courses of index (red) and non-index patients (blue). (B) Nonlinear  
210 regression models of index (red) and non-index patients (blue). The models were calculated  
211 by using all the data of the index or non-index patients. When no virus was detected, the data  
212 were hypothetically plotted as  $-0.5 \log \text{copies}/\mu\text{L}$ . Solid curves are best-fit models and dotted  
213 lines indicate the 95% confidence interval of each model.

214

Figure 1A




Figure 1B

