SARS-CoV-2 viral load dynamics, duration of viral shedding and infectiousness – a living systematic review and meta-analysis

Author: Muge Cevik[1,2], Matthew Tate[3], Ollie Lloyd[2,4], Alberto Enrico Maraolo[5], Jenna Schafers[2], Antonia Ho[6]

Affiliations:

1. Division of Infection and Global Health Research, School of Medicine, University of St Andrews, UK
2. NHS Lothian Infection Service, Regional Infectious Diseases Unit, Western General Hospital, Edinburgh, U.K.
3. Respiratory Medicine, University Hospital Wishaw, Wishaw, UK
4. Edinburgh Medical School, College of Medicine & Veterinary Medicine, University of Edinburgh, UK
5. First Division of Infectious Diseases, Cotugno Hospital, AORN dei Colli, Naples, Italy.
6. MRC-University of Glasgow Centre for Virus Research, University of Glasgow, Glasgow, UK

Corresponding author:

Dr Muge Cevik
Division of Infection and Global Health Research,
School of Medicine, University of St Andrews, Fife, KY16 9TF
Telephone number: +447732800814
Email address: mc349@st-andrews.ac.uk

Keywords: SARS-CoV-2, COVID-19, viral shedding, viral dynamics, infectiousness

ABSTRACT

Background Viral load kinetics and the duration of viral shedding are important determinants for disease transmission. We aim i) to characterise viral load dynamics, duration of viral RNA, and viable virus shedding of SARS-CoV-2 in various body fluids and ii) to compare SARS-CoV-2 viral dynamics with SARS-CoV-1 and MERS-CoV.

Methods: Medline, EMBASE, Europe PMC, preprint servers and grey literature were searched to retrieve all articles reporting viral dynamics and duration of SARS-CoV-2, SARS-CoV-1 and MERS-CoV shedding. We excluded case reports and case series with < 5 patients, or studies that did not report shedding duration from symptom onset. PROSPERO registration: CRD42020181914.

Findings: Seventy-nine studies on SARS-CoV-2, 8 on SARS-CoV-1, and 11 on MERS-CoV were included. Mean SARS-CoV-2 RNA shedding duration in upper respiratory tract, lower respiratory tract, stool and serum were 17.0, 14.6, 17.2 and 16.6 days, respectively. Maximum duration of SARS-CoV-2 RNA shedding reported in URT, LRT, stool and serum was 83, 59, 35 and 60 days, respectively. Pooled mean duration of SARS-CoV-2 RNA shedding was positively associated with age ($p=0.002$), but not gender ($p = 0.277$). No study to date has detected live virus beyond day nine of illness despite persistently high viral loads. SARS-CoV-2 viral load in the upper respiratory tract appears to peak in the first week of illness, while SARS-CoV-1 and MERS-CoV peak later.

Conclusion: Although SARS-CoV-2 RNA shedding in respiratory and stool can be prolonged, duration of viable virus is relatively short-lived. Thus, detection of viral RNA cannot be used to infer infectiousness. High SARS-CoV-2 titres are detectable in the first week of illness with an early peak observed at symptom onset to day 5 of illness. This review underscores the importance of early case finding and isolation, as well as public education on the spectrum of illness. However, given potential delays in the isolation of patients, effective containment of SARS-CoV-2 may be challenging even with an early detection and isolation strategy.

Funding: No funding was received.

INTRODUCTION

Viral load kinetics and the duration of viral shedding are important determinants for disease transmission. They determine the duration of infectiousness which is a critical parameter to inform effective control measures and disease modelling. While a number of studies have evaluated SARS-CoV-2 shedding, viral load dynamics and duration of viral shedding reported across studies so far have been heterogenous.[1] In several case series with serial respiratory sampling, peak viral load was observed just before, or at the time of symptom onset.[2-4] Viral ribonucleic acid (RNA) shedding was reported to be persistent in the upper respiratory tract and in faeces, for over one month after illness onset.[1] However, the duration of SARS-CoV-2 RNA detection has not been well characterised. A comprehensive understanding of viral load dynamics, length of viral shedding, and how these relate to other factors, such as age and disease severity is lacking.

The aim of this systematic review and meta-analysis was to i) characterise the viral load dynamics of SARS-CoV-2, duration of viral RNA shedding by reverse transcriptase polymerase chain reaction (RT-PCR) and viable virus shedding in various body fluids and ii) compare SARS-CoV-2 viral dynamics with that of SARS-CoV-1 and MERS-CoV.

METHODS

Search Strategy

We retrieved all articles reporting viral dynamics and/or the duration of shedding of SARS-CoV-2, SARS-CoV-1 or MERS-CoV in various specimens through systematic searches of major databases including Medline, EMBASE, Europe PMC, pre-print databases (MedRxiv, BioRxiv) and the grey literature from 1 January 2003 to 6th June 2020 using Medical Subject Headings (MeSH) terms (Supplementary Material). We also manually screened the references of included original studies to obtain additional studies. Studies prior to 2003 were excluded since the first recognised case of SARS-CoV-1 was identified in March 2003.

This systematic review was registered in PROSPERO on 29th April 2020 (CRD42020181914) and will be updated in three monthly intervals as a living systematic review.

Study Selection

Studies were eligible if they met the following inclusion criteria: (1) report on SARS-CoV-2, SARS-CoV-1 or MERS-CoV infection and (2) report viral load kinetics, duration of viral shedding or viable virus. We excluded: (1) review papers; (2) animal studies; (3) studies on environmental sampling; (4) case reports and case series with < 5 participants, due to likely reporting bias; (5) papers where the starting point of viral shedding was not clear or reported from post-discharge and (6) modelling studies with no original data.

Data Extraction

Two authors (MT and OL) screened and retrieved articles according to the eligibility criteria. Four reviewers (MT, OL, JS, MC) performed full text review and final article selection. From each study, the following variables were extracted as a minimum: name of first author, year of publication, city and country, sample size, median age, sex ratio, time from symptom onset to viral clearance detected by RT-PCR and culture in different specimens, and longest reported time to viral clearance. If these data were not reported, we also contacted the authors to request the data. If available, we extracted data on peak viral load, clinical outcome, and reported factors associated with duration of viral shedding.

Risk of bias in included studies

Two authors (OL and JS) independently assessed study quality and risk of bias using the Joanna Briggs Institute (JBI) Critical Appraisal Checklist tools,[5] which comprise standardised checklists, for the different study designs included in this review. Any disagreements regarding grading of quality were resolved through discussion with a third author (MC).

Meta-Analysis

For every study included, mean duration of viral shedding and 95% confidence interval (CI) were calculated. The random-effects model (DerSimonian or Laird) was applied to estimate a pooled effect size. Forest plots illustrated the detailed representation of all studies based on the effect size and 95% CI. If not reported, means and standard deviations were derived from sample size, median, interquartile range (IQR), minimum and maximum values.[6] Heterogeneity between studies were quantified by the I^2 index and Cochran's Q test. Publication bias was not assessed as usual

appraisal methods are uninformative when meta-analysed studies do not include a test of significance. A weighted meta-regression using an unrestricted maximum likelihood model was performed to assess the impact of potential moderators on the pooled effect size (P-values <0.05 were considered significant). All statistical analyses were performed using Comprehensive Meta-Analysis (CMA) version 3 software (Biostat, Englewood, mNJ).

RESULTS

The systematic search identified 1486 potentially relevant articles. Three hundred and fifty articles were retrieved for full text review. After reviewing the eligibility criteria, a total of 79 studies on SARS-CoV-2, eight on SARS-CoV-1, and 11 on MERS-CoV were included (Figure 1).

Summary of SARS-CoV-2 studies

Of the 79 papers included, 58 studies were conducted in China (Table 1). Six studies included outpatient or community cases, the remainder comprised hospitalised patients only. Six studies reported viral load dynamics exclusively in children.[7-12] Two additional studies included children, but data on viral load dynamics were presented in aggregate with adults.[13,14] One study reported findings in renal transplant patients.[15]

Median duration of viral shedding

In total, 61 studies reported median or maximum viral RNA shedding in at least one body fluid and six studies provided duration of shedding stratified by illness severity only. Of those, 43 (3229 individuals) reported duration of shedding in upper respiratory tract (URT), seven (260 individuals) in lower respiratory tract (LRT), 13 (586 individuals) in stool, and 2 studies (108 individuals) in serum samples were eligible for quantitative analysis. Means viral shedding durations were 17.0 days (95% CI, 15.5-18.6), 14.6 days (95% CI, 9.3-20.0), 17.2 days (95% CI, 14.4-20.1) and 16.6 days (95% CI, 3.6-29.7), respectively (Figures 2 to 5). Maximum duration of RNA shedding reported in URT, LRT, stool and serum was 83, 59, 35 and 60 days, respectively.

Studies reporting duration of viral shedding in URT and stool samples were eligible for meta-regression analysis. Pooled mean viral shedding duration was positively associated with age

135 (slope: +0.304; 95% CI, +0.115 to +0.493; p = 0.002 Fig 6), but not gender (p = 0.277,
136 Supplementary Fig 3). When adjusted for the proportion of male subjects in a multivariable
137 analysis, mean age was positively associated with the mean duration of viral shedding in URT
138 specimens (p = 0.003). There was a positive but non-significant association between mean age
139 and duration of shedding in stool (p=0.37) (Supplementary Fig 4).

140 **Peak viral load**

141 The majority of studies evaluating SARS-CoV-2 viral load in serial URT samples demonstrated
142 peak viral loads within the first week of symptom onset. [2,4,8,16-24] The highest viral loads were
143 reported either soon after or at the time of symptom onset[2,8,16,23,24] or at day 3-5 of illness[4,18,20,22]
144 followed by a consistent decline.

145 Five studies that evaluated viral load dynamics in LRT samples observed a peak viral load in the
146 second week of illness.[4,18,20,23,25] In contrast, the dynamics of SARS-CoV-2 shedding in stool is
147 more erratic, with highest viral loads reported on day 7,[18] 2-3 weeks,[24,25] and up to 5-6 weeks
148 after symptom onset.[23] While several studies reported significantly higher viral titres in stool
149 compared to respiratory samples,[8,25] Huang *et al.* reported lower viral load in stool than in both
150 LRT and URT samples early in the disease course.[23]
151

152 **Severity and association with duration of viral shedding**

153 In total, 20 studies evaluated duration of viral RNA shedding based on disease severity. The
154 majority (n=13) reported longer duration of viral shedding in patients with severe illness than
155 those with non-severe illness, [18,25-36] while five studies reported similar shedding durations
156 according to disease severity in URT samples [17,19,37-39] and one study in stool samples. [40] Only
157 one study reported shorter viral shedding in moderate to severe illness compared to mild to
158 moderate illness.[41] Six studies have performed comparative analysis based on severity of
159 illness;[18,25,27,28,38,39] the majority (n=5) demonstrated significantly longer duration of shedding
160 among the severe illness group compared to the non-severe patients and only one study
161 observed no difference.[39] (Table 2).

162 **Other factors associated with prolonged shedding**

163 All but one study[42] (n=10) that examined the impact of age on SARS-CoV-2 shedding identified
164 an association between older age and prolonged viral RNA shedding.[25,26,28,33,37-39,43-45] Three
165 studies identified age as an independent risk factor for delayed viral clearance.[25,26,38] Male sex
166 was also associated with prolonged shedding,[25,38,46] and the association remained significant
167 even when patients were stratified based on illness severity.[25,38] Corticosteroid treatment was
168 associated with delayed viral clearance in four studies,[33,38,47,48] and one study that recruited 120
169 critically ill patients, found no difference between corticosteroid and control groups.[49]

170 In a phase 2 open-label study evaluating interferon beta-1b, lopinavir–ritonavir, and ribavirin a
171 shorter duration of viral shedding was seen with combination treatment compared to the
172 control.[50] None of the antiviral regimens (chloroquine, oseltamivir, arbidol, and lopinavir/ritonavir)
173 independently improved viral RNA clearance.[28,51] In a retrospective study of 284 patients,
174 lopinavir/ritonavir use was associated with delayed viral clearance even after adjusting for
175 confounders.[28]

176 **Asymptomatic SARS-CoV-2 shedding**

177 Twelve studies reported on viral load dynamics and/or duration of viral shedding among patients
178 with asymptomatic SARS-CoV-2 infection (Table 3); two demonstrated lower viral loads among
179 asymptomatic patients compared to symptomatic patients,[8,52] while four studies found similar
180 initial viral loads. [13,14,53,54] However, Chau *et al* reported significantly lower viral load in
181 asymptomatic patients during the follow up compared to symptomatic patients.[53] Faster viral
182 clearance was observed in asymptomatic individuals in five out of six studies.[13,28,53,55,56] The
183 exception Yongchen *et al*., found longer shedding duration among asymptomatic cases, but the
184 difference was not significant.[36]

185 **Live virus detection**

186 We identified 11 studies that attempted to isolate live virus. All eight studies that attempted virus
187 isolation in respiratory samples successfully cultured viable virus within the first week of illness,
188 [9,17,20,54,57-60] No live virus was isolated from any respiratory samples taken after day 8 of symptoms

189 in three studies,[20,57,58] or beyond day 9 in two studies[17,54] despite persistently high viral RNA loads.
190 One study demonstrated the highest probability of positive culture on day 3 of symptoms.[57] Arons
191 *et al*. cultured viable virus 6 days before typical symptom onset, however onset of symptom was
192 unclear.[54]

193 The success of viral isolation correlated with viral load quantified by RT-PCR. No successful viral
194 culture was obtained from samples with a viral load below 10^6 copies/ml, [20] Ct values >24,[57]
195 or >34,[54,58] with culture positivity declining with increasing Ct values.[58] Several other studies
196 cultured live virus from RT-PCR positive specimens; however, they did not correlate these results
197 with viral load titres.[9,59,60]

198 Only one study reported the duration of viable virus shedding in respiratory samples; the median
199 time to clearance from URT and LRT samples was 3.5 and 6 days, respectively.[20] Arons *et al*.
200 cultured viable virus in one out of three asymptomatic cases from the respiratory tract.[54]

201 Of 3 studies attempting to isolate viable virus from stool,[20,61] culture was successful in two of
202 three RNA-positive patients in one study, but the time points from symptom onset were not
203 reported.[62] Andersson *et al.* failed to culture virus from 27 RT-PCR positive serum samples.[63]

204 **Summary of SARS-CoV-1 and MERS studies**

205 Eight studies on SARS-CoV-1 were included; the majority of studies did not report mean or median
206 duration of viral shedding thus, were not eligible for quantitative analysis. The maximum duration
207 of viral shedding reported was 8 weeks in URT,[64,65] 52 days in LRT,[61,64] 6-7 weeks in serum,[66]
208 and 126 days in stool samples.[61,64,67-69] Dialysis patients had longer viral shedding in stool
209 compared to non-dialysis patients.[68] Studies that have evaluated SARS-CoV-1 kinetics found low
210 viral load in the initial days of illness, increasing after the first week of illness in URT samples,
211 peaking at day 10,[70] or day 12-14,[67] and declining after week 3-4.[65] High viral loads correlated with
212 severity of illness[65] and poor survival.[65] While Chen *et al.* identified an association between
213 younger age and lower viral titers, [65] Leong *et al*. found no difference.[69] Viable SARS-CoV-1 was
214 isolated from stool and respiratory samples up to 4 weeks, and urine specimens up to day 36.[64,66]
215 All attempts to isolate virus from RT-PCR–positive stool specimens collected >6weeks after

disease onset failed.[61] The isolation probability for stool samples was approximately 5 to 10 times lower compared to respiratory specimens.[64]

We identified 11 studies on MERS-CoV. Three studies (324 subjects) reporting MERS-CoV shedding in URT and four studies (93 subjects) in LRT were included in the quantitative analysis. The mean shedding duration was 15.3 days (95% CI, 11.6 – 19.0) and 16.6 days (95% CI, 14.8 – 18.4), respectively (Supplementary Figures 1 and 2). Only one study reported duration of viral shedding in serum with a median of 14 days and max of 38 days.[71] In a small study, mortality rates were higher in patients with viraemia.[72] In URT and LRT specimens, prolonged shedding was associated with illness severity[73,74] and survival[75] with the shortest duration observed in asymptomatic patients.[73] Peak viral loads were observed between days 7 to 10 and higher viral loads was observed among patients with severe illness and fatal outcome.[71,73,74,76,77] Differences in viral loads between survivors and fatal cases was more pronounced in the second week of illness ($P < .0006$).[77] The proportion of successful viable culture was 6% in respiratory samples with a viral load values below 10^7copies/ml.[78]

Qualitative analysis

All but 11 studies (6 cohort studies, 2 cross-sectional studies, and 1 RCT on SARS-CoV-2 and 2 cohort studies on MERS-CoV) were case series, the majority of which recruited non-consecutive patients and therefore prone to possible selection bias. (Supplementary Table 1)

DISCUSSION

This systematic review and meta-analysis provide comprehensive data on the viral dynamics of SARS-CoV-2 including the duration of RNA shedding and viable virus isolation. Our findings suggest that while patients with SARS-CoV-2 may have prolonged RNA shedding, median time to live virus clearance from upper and lower respiratory tract samples were 3.5 days and 6 days respectively. No live virus isolated beyond day nine of symptoms despite persistently high viral RNA loads, thus emphasising that the infectious period cannot be inferred from the duration of viral RNA detection. This finding is supported by several studies demonstrating a relationship

242 between viral load and viability of virus, with no successful culture from samples below a certain
243 viral load threshold.

244 SARS-CoV-2 viral load appears to peak in the URT within the first week of illness, and later in
245 the LRT. In contrast, peaks in SARS-CoV-1 and MERS-CoV viral loads in the URT occurred at
246 days 10-14 and 7-10 days of illness, respectively. Combined with viable isolation in respiratory
247 samples within the first week of illness, patients with SARS-CoV-2 infection are likely to be most
248 infectious in the first week of illness. Several studies report viral load peaks during the prodromal
249 phase of illness or at the time of symptom onset, [2,4,8,16-23] providing a rationale for the efficient
250 spread of SARS-CoV-2. This is supported by the observation in contact tracing studies that the
251 highest risk of transmission occurs during the prodromal phase or early in the disease
252 course.[79,80] No secondary cases were identified beyond 5 days after the symptom onset.[81]
253 Although modelling studies estimated potential viral load peak before symptom onset, we did not
254 identify any study that confirms pre-symptomatic viral load peak.[16]

255 Emerging evidence suggests a correlation between virus persistence and disease severity and
256 outcome. [18,25,27-29,38] This is consistent with the viral load dynamics of influenza, MERS-CoV, and
257 SARS-CoV-1 whereby severity of illness was also associated with prolonged viral
258 shedding.[73,74,82] However, more studies are needed to understand the duration of viable virus in
259 patients with severe illness.

260 Similar to SARS-CoV-1, SARS-CoV-2 can be detected in stool for prolonged periods, with high
261 viral loads detected even after 3 weeks of illness. A clear difference between SARS-CoV and
262 MERS-CoV is the detection of viral RNA in stool. In SARS-CoV-1, RNA prevalence in stool
263 samples was high, with almost all studies reporting shedding in stool. Although viable SARS-CoV-
264 1 was isolated up to 4 weeks of illness, faecal-oral transmission was not considered to be a primary
265 driver of infection. Whereas in MERS-CoV, none of the studies reported duration of viral shedding
266 in stool and RNA detection was low.[77,83] To date, only a few studies demonstrated viable SARS-
267 CoV-2 in stool.[62,84] Thus, the role of faecal shedding in viral transmission remains unclear.

268 Although viral loads at the start of infection appear to be comparable between asymptomatic and
269 symptomatic patients infected with SARS-CoV-2, most studies demonstrate faster viral clearance

among asymptomatic individuals. This suggests similar transmission potential among both groups at the onset of infection, but a shorter period of infectiousness in asymptomatic patients. This is in keeping with viral kinetics observed with other respiratory viruses such as influenza and MERS-CoV, in which people with asymptomatic infection have a shorter duration of viral shedding than symptomatic individuals. [73,85] However, there are limited data on the shedding of infectious virus in asymptomatic individuals to quantify their transmission potential.

We identified a systematic review of SARS CoV-2 viral load kinetics that included studies published up until 12 May 2020.[86] This review included many studies that did not meet our eligibility criteria, including 26 case reports and 13 case series involving <5 individuals; these are prone to significant selection bias, reporting atypical cases with prolonged viral shedding. Additionally, the review included studies that reported viral shedding duration from the time of hospital admission or initial PCR positivity, rather than symptom onset. Furthermore, no meta-analysis of the duration of viral shedding was performed.

This is the first study that has comprehensively examined and compared SARS-CoV-2, SARS-CoV-1 and MERS-CoV viral dynamics and performed a meta-analysis of viral shedding duration. Our study has limitations. First, some patients in the included studies received a range of treatments, including steroids and antivirals, which may have modified the shedding dynamics. Second, most of the included studies are case series, which are particularly vulnerable to selection bias. Third, our meta-analysis identified substantial study heterogeneity, likely due to differences in study population, follow up and management approaches. Further, shedding duration is reported as median ± IQR for most studies, but meta-analysis necessitates conversion to mean ± SD.[6] The validity of this conversion is based on the assumption that duration of viral shedding is normally distributed, which may not apply to some studies.

In conclusion, although SARS-CoV-2 RNA shedding can be prolonged in respiratory and stool samples, the duration of viable virus is short-lived, with culture success associated with viral load levels. No study has reported live SARS-CoV-2 beyond day nine. Most studies detected the SARS-CoV-2 viral load peak within the first week of illness. These findings highlight that isolation practices should be commenced with the start of first symptoms including mild and atypical

symptoms that precede more typical COVID-19 symptoms. This systematic review underscores the importance of early case finding and isolation, as well as public education on the spectrum of illness. However, given potential delays in the isolation of patients, effective containment of SARS-CoV-2 may be challenging even with an early detection and isolation strategy.[87]

Authors contributions:

M. Cevik: conceptualisation, methodology, investigation, data curation, writing – original draft. M. Tate: investigation, data curation, writing – original draft; O Lloyd: investigation, data curation, writing – review and editing; A. E. Maraolo: formal analysis, writing – original draft; J. Schafers: investigation, data curation, writing – review and editing; A Ho: conceptualisation, methodology, data curation, writing – original draft, supervision.

Financial support and sponsorship

No financial support received

Conflicts of interest

All authors have nothing to disclose.

315 **Table 1: Summary of included studies**

316

Study	Geographical location	Study setting	Study design	Number of patients	Age Median (IQR)	Male sex N (%)	Specimen types
SARS-CoV-2							
Andersson et al. [63]	Oxford, UK	Hospital	Case series	167	56 (46-76)	89 (53)	Serum
Arons et al.[54]	King's County, USA	Care home	Cross-sectional	46	78.6 ± 9.5*	NR	URT
Bullard et al.[57]	Manitoba, Canada	Hospital	Case series	90	45 (30-59)	44 (49)	Respiratory samples (not specified)
Cai et al.[7]	Shanghai/ Hefei/ Qingdao, China	Hospital	Case series	10	6	4 (40)	LRT, blood, stool, urine
Cai et al.[26]	Shenzhen, China	Hospital	Case series	298	47 (33-61)	149 (50)	URT
Chang et al.[88]	Bejing, China	Hospital	Case series	16	35.5 (24-53)	11 (69)	URT
Chau et al.[53]	Ho Chi Minh City, Vietnam	Hospital	Case series	30	29 (16-60)	15 (50)	URT
Chen et al.[27]	Shanghai, China	Hospital	Case series	249	51 (36-64)	126 (51)	URT
Chen et al. [89]	Wuhan, China	Hospital	Case series	25	51.4 ±16.6*	11 (44)	URT
Chen et al.[28]	Guangzhou, China	Hospital	Case series	284	48 (33-62)	131 (46)	URT
Chen et al. [29]	Wuhan, China	Hospital	Case series	42	51	15 (36)	URT, stool, urine
Corman et al.[90]	Germany	Hospital	Case series	18	NR	12 (67)	Blood
Fan et al.[30]	Shenyang, China	Hospital	Case series	55	46.8	30 (55)	URT, sputum
Fang et al.[31]	Xiangtan, China	Hospital	Case series	32	41	16 (50)	URT, stool, blood
Fu et al.[91]	Huazhong, China	Hospital	Case series	50	64 (37-87)	27 (54)	URT
Han et al.[8]	Chongqing, South Korea	Hospital	Case series	12	6.5 (0.007-16)	5 (42)	URT, stool
He et al.[16]	Guangzhou, China	Hospital	Case series	94	46	47 (50)	URT
Hu et al.[37]	Qingdao, China	Hospital	Case series	59	46 (33-57)	28 (47)	URT
Hu et al.[55]	Nanjing, China	Hospital	Case series	24	32.5 (21-57)	8 (33)	URT
Huang et al.[51]	Guangzhou, China	Hospital	Case series	27	NR	12 (44)	URT

Huang et al.[23]	Wenzhou, China	Hospital	Case series	33	47 (range 2-84)	17 (52)	URT, LRT, stool
Huang et al.[92]	Wuhan, China	Hospital	Retrospective cohort	200	58± 17*	115 (48)	URT
Hung et al.[50]	Hong Kong	Hospital	RCT	127	52 (32-62)	68 (54)	URT, stool
Kim et al.[4]	Soeul/ Incheon/ Seongna, South Korea	Hospital	Case series	28	40 (28-54)	15 (54)	URT, LRT
Kujawski et al.[17]	6 states, USA	Hospital /Outpatient	Case series	12	53 (range 21-68)	8 (75)	URT, LRT, stool, blood, urine
L'Huillier et al.[9]	Geneva, Switzerland	Hospital	Case series	23	12 (3.8-14.5)	NR	URT
La Scola et al.[58]	France	Hospital	Case series	155	NR	NR	URT, LRT
Lavezzo et al.[14]	Vo', Italy	Community	Cross-sectional	Only sample # reported	Mixed	Mixed	URT
Le et al.[59]	Hanoi, Vietnam	Hospital	Case series	12	29.5*	3 (25)	URT
Li et al.[93]	Wuhan China	Hospital	Case series	36	57.5 (52-65)	23 (64)	URT
Liang et al.[49]	Wuhan, China	Hospital	Case series	120	61.5 (47-70)	68 (57)	URT
Ling et al.[47]	Shanghai, China	Hospital	Case series	66	44 (16-778)	38 (58)	URT, stool, blood, urine
Liu et al.[94]	Wuhan, China	Hospital	Case series	238	55 (38.3-65)	138 (58)	URT
Liu et al.[32]	Nanchang, China	Hospital	Case series	76	48.3	48 (63)	URT
Lo et al.[95]	Macau, China	Hospital	Case series	10	54 (27-64)	3 (30)	URT, LRT, stool, urine
Lou B et al.[96]	Zhejiang, China	Hospital	Case series	80	55 (45-64)	50 (69)	LRT
Pongpirul et al.[97]	Bangkok, Thailand	Hospital	Case series	11	61 (28-74)	6 (55)	URT
Qian et al.[98]	Ningbo, China	Hospital	Case series	24	NR	NR	URT
Quan et al.[99]	Wuhan/Shenzhen/ Xiangyang, China	Hospital	Case series	23	60.3 ±15.3*	23 (100)	Prostatic secretions all negative (URT)

Sakurai et al.[43]	Aichi, Japan	Hospital	Case series	90	59.5 (36-68)	53 (59)	URT
Seah et al.[100]	Singapore	Hospital	Case series	17	NR	NR	Tears
Shastri et al.[46]	Mumbai, India	Reference lab	Case series	68	37 (range 3-75)	48 (71)	URT
Shi et al.[33]	Wuhan, China	Hospital	Case series	246	58 (47-67)	126 (51)	URT
Song et al.[101]	Nanjing, China	Hospital	Case series	13	22 – 67 (range only)	13 (100)	URT, semen, testicular sample
Song et al. [102]	Beijing, China	Hospital/Outpatient	Case series	21	37 (21-59.5)	8 (38)	URT
Talmy et al.[44]	Ramat Gan, Israel	Outpatient	Case series	119	21 (19-25)	84 (71)	URT
Tan et al. [34]	Chongqing, China	Hospital	Case series	142	NR	NR	URT
Tan et al.[18]	Chongqing, China	Hospital	Case series	67	49 (10-77)	35 (52)	URT, LRT, stool, blood, urine
Tan et al.[10]	Changsha, China	Hospital	Case series	10	7 (1-12)	3 (30)	URT, stool
Tian et al. [41]	Beijing, China	Hospital/Outpatient	Case series	75	41.5 (range 0.8 – 88)*	42 (56)	Respiratory tract sample (not specified further)
To et al.[19]	Hong Kong, China	Hospital	Case series	23	62 (37-75)	13 (57)	URT, stool, blood, urine
To et al. [60]	Hong Kong, China	Hospital	Prospective Cohort	12	62.5 (37-75)	7 (58)	URT (saliva)
Tu et al. [103]	Anhui, China	Hospital	Case series	40	Viral shedding <10 days: 40.86 ± 8.26 Viral shedding ≥10 days: 45.5 ± 14.60	21 (53)	URT
Wang et al.[104]	Henan, China	Hospital	Case series	18	39 (29-55)	10 (56)	URT
Wang et al.[105]	Jinhua, China	Hospital	Case series	17	42 ±17*	10 (59)	URT, stool
Wölfel et al.[20]	Munich, Germany	Hospital	Case series	9	NR	NR	URT, blood, urine
Wu et al.[106]	Hainan, China	Hospital	Case series	91	50 (range 21-83)*	52 (57)	URT, stool

Wu et al.[11]	Qingdao, China	Hospital	Case series	74	6 (0.1-15.08 range)	44 (59)	Stool
Wu et al.[40]	Zhuhai, China	Hospital	Case series	74	43.8*	35 (47)	Stool
Wyllie et al.[21]	New Haven, USA	Hospital	Case series	44	61 (23-92 range)*	23 (52)	URT (saliva)
Xiao et al. [45]	Wuhan, China	Hospital	Case series	56	55 (42-68)	34 (61)	URT
Xiao et al.[62]	Guangzhou, China	Hospital	Case series	28			Stool
Xu et al. [38]	Shenzhen/ Zheijang, China	Hospital	Retrospective Cohort	113	52 (42-63)	66 (58)	URT
Xu et al.[107]	Shenyang, China	Hospital	Case series	14	48 ± 13.4*	7 (50)	URT, LRT, serum, conjunctiva
Xu et al. [12]	Guangzhou, China	Hospital	Case series	10	6.6	6 (60)	URT, rectal swab
Yan et al.[39]	Hubei, China	Hospital	Case series	120	52 (35-63)	54 (45)	URT
Yang et al.[56]	Wuhan, China	Hospital	Case series	78 (45 symptomatic)	Symptomatic: 56 (34-63) Asymptomatic: 37 (26-45)	Symptomatic:31 (40) Asymptomatic: 11 (33)	URT
Yang et al.[108]	Shenzhen, China	Hospital	Case series	213	52 (range 2-86)	108 (51)	URT, LRT
Yongchen et al.[36]	Nanjing, Xuzhou, China	Hospital	Case series	21	37	13 (62)	URT, stool
Young et al.[22]	Singapore	Hospital	Case series	18	47	9 (50)	URT, stool, blood, urine
Zha et al.[48]	Wuhu, China	Hospital	Case series	31	39 (32-54)	20 (65)	URT
Zhang et al.[24]	Beijing, China	Hospital	Case series	23	48 (40-62)	12 (52)	URT, stool, blood, urine
Zhang et al. [13]	Shenzhen, China	Hospital	Case series	56	Mixed	Mixed	URT, stool
Zheng et al.[25]	Zhejiang, China	Hospital	Retrospective Cohort	96	53 (33.4-64.8)	NR	LRT, stool, blood, urine
Zhou et al.[42]	Wuhan, China	Hospital	Case series	41	58 (48-62)	22 (54)	URT
Zhou et al. [35]	Wuhan, China	Hospital	Case series	191	56 (46-67)	119 (62)	URT
Zhou et al.[52]	Guangzhou, China	Hospital	Case series	31	45 (33-60) 37 (28-57)	4 (44) 6 (27)	URT
Zhu et al. [15]	Wuhan, China	Hospital	Case series	10	49.5	8 (80)	URT

Zou et al.[2]	Zhuhai, China	Hospital/outpatient	Case series	18	59 (range 26-76)	9 (50)	URT
SARS-CoV-1							
Chan et al.[64]	Hong Kong, China	Hospital	Case series	415	11.3 ± 4.1* 37.1 ± 11.2*	132 (33)	URT, LRT, stool, urine
Chen et al.[65]	Taiwan	Hospital	Case series	108	Stratified	95	URT
Cheng et al.[67]	Hong Kong, China	Hospital	Case series	1041	NR	NR	URT, LRT, stool, urine
Kwan et al.[68]	Hong Kong, China	Hospital	Case series	12 dialysis 33 controls	Dialysis: 58 (range 34-74);* Controls: 57 (range 34-75)	6 (50)	URT, stools, urine
Liu et al.[61]	Beijing, China	Hospital	Case series	56	31 (male) 34 (female)	31 (55)	LRT, stool
Leong et al.[69]	Singapore	Hospital	Case series	64	35.2 (17-63 range)*	16 (25)	URT, stool, blood, urine
Peiris et al. [70]	Hong Kong, China	Hospital	Case series	75	39.8 (SD 12.2)	0.92	URT
Xu et al.[109]	Beijing, China	Hospital	Case series	54	NR	NR	LRT, blood, urine
MERS-CoV							
Al Hosani et al.[73]	Abu Dhabi, UAE	Hospital/community	Case series	65	20 -59	43 (66)	LRT
Al-Jasser et al.[110]	Riyadh, Saudi Arabia	Hospital	Case series	167	46.71*	142 (57)	URT
Alkendi et al.[111]	Tawam/Al Ain, UAE	Hospital	Case series	58	43.5	41 (71)	URT
Arabi et al.[75]	Saudi Arabia	Hospital	Cohort	330	58 (44-69)	225 (68)	URT
Corman et al.[77]	Riyadh, Saudi Arabia	Hospital	Case series	37	69 (24–90)*	27 (39)	URT, LRT, stool, blood, urine
Hong et al.[76]	Seoul, South Korea	Hospital	Case series	30	49*	19 (63)	Blood
Min et al.[71]	Seoul/others, South Korea	Hospital	Case series	14	62	6 (35)	LRT, serum
Muth et al.[78]	Riyadh, Saudi Arabia	Hospital	Case series	32	66 (24-90)	24 (75)	LRT
Oh et al.[74]	Seoul, South Korea	Hospital	Case series	17	NR	NR	URT, LRT, serum
Park et al.[112]	Seoul, South Korea	Hospital	Case series	17	NR	NR	URT, LRT

Shalhoub et al.[72]	Jeddah, Saudi Arabia	Hospital	Retrospective cohort	32	65	14 (44)	LRT, serum

Abbreviations: UK, United Kingdom, USA; United States of America; UAE, United Arab Emirates; RCT, randomised controlled trial; URT, upper respiratory tract; LRT, lower respiratory tract; NR, not reported.

* Mean ± standard deviation (or range if stated).

333 **Table 2: Severity of illness and viral dynamics**

Study	Classification of severity	Median duration - days (IQR)	Viral dynamics in severe patients compared to non-severe patients	P-value
Chen *et al.*[27]	ICU vs. non-ICU patients	11	Median time to viral clearance significantly longer in ICU vs. non-ICU patients (HR=3.17, 95% CI, 2.29-4.37)	Only HR provided
Chen *et al*[28]	China CDC guideline (version 7)	12 (8-16)	Shedding duration varies by severity: asymptomatic 6 days; mild 10 days; moderate 12 days; serious 14 days; critical 32 days	<0.0001
Tan *et al.*[18]	China CDC guideline (version 6)	NP: 12 Any sample: 22	Viral shedding significantly longer in severe patients: any sample 23 vs. 20 days (note NP: 14 vs. 11 days – non-significant)	p=0.023 (any sample)
Xu *et al.*[38]	WHO criteria	17 (13-32)	Higher proportion of severe patients had shedding >21 days (34.2% vs.16.2%)	0.49
Yan *et al.*[39]	China CDC guideline (version 6)	23 (18-32)	No difference in shedding duration (general 23 days vs. severe 26 days vs. critical 28 days)	0.51
Zheng *et al.*[25]	China CDC guideline (version 6)	Resp: 18 (13-29)	Shedding duration significantly longer in severe patients (21 vs 14 days) in respiratory samples. No difference in shedding duration in stool/serum	p=0.04

334 Abbreviations: IQR, interquartile range; ICU, intensive care unit; HR, hazard ratio; CDC, Centers
335 for Disease Control and Prevention; WHO, World Health Organization.

336

337

338

339

340

341

342

343 **Table 3: SARS-CoV-2 viral dynamics in asymptomatic patients compared to symptomatic**
344 **patients**

	Median duration – days (IQR)	Viral dynamics in asymptomatic patients compared to symptomatic patients	P-value
Arons *et al.*[54]	NR	No difference in viral load	NS
Chau *et al.*[53]	NR	Initial viral load similar. Asymptomatic patients had significantly lower viral load during the follow up compared to symptomatic patients and faster viral clearance in asymptomatic, compared to symptomatic individuals	0.027
Chen *et al.*[28]	6 (3.5-10)	Significantly shorter duration of viral shedding among asymptomatic cases (median 6 days, IQR 3.5-10), with increasing shedding duration associated with increasing illness severity	<0.0001
Han *et al.*[8]	NR	Symptomatic children had higher initial RNA load in nasopharyngeal swab specimens than asymptomatic children (9.01 vs. 6.32 $\log_{10}$ copies/mL; p = 0.048).	0.048
Hu *et al.*[55]	6 (2-12)	Asymptomatic patients had shorter duration of viral shedding compared to pre-symptomatic patients (median duration of SARS-CoV-2 positivity was 6.0 (2.0 - 12.0) compared to 12.0 (12.0 - 14.0))	NR
Lavezzo *et al.*[14]	NR	No difference in viral load	NS
Le *et al.*[59]	9	NR	N/A
Sakurai *et al.*[43]	9 (6-11)	NR	N/A
Yang et al.[56]	8 (3-12)	Significantly shorter duration of viral shedding from nasopharynx swabs was observed among asymptomatic compared to symptomatic patients	P= .001
Yongchen *et al.*[36]	18 (5-28)	Longer shedding duration among asymptomatic cases (median 18 days, range 5-28), compared to non-severe (10 days, range 2-21) and severe (14 days, range 9-33) cases	NS
Zhang *et al.*[13]	9.63	Initial viral load similar, viral clearance occurred earlier in the asymptomatic (9.6 days) and symptomatic individuals (9.7 days, compared to pre-symptomatic group (13.6 days)	
Zhou *et al.*[52]	NR	Significantly higher viral load in symptomatic (n=22) compared to asymptomatic (n=9) patients (median cycle threshold (Ct) value 34.5 vs. 39.0, respectively) but duration of shedding was similar	

345 Abbreviations: IQR, interquartile range; RNA, ribonucleic acid; NR, not reported; NS, non-
346 significant; N/A, not applicable

Figure 1. Flowchart describing study selection



From: Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, Altman DG, The PRISMA Group (2009). *P*referred *R*eporting *I*tems for *S*ystematic Reviews and *M*eta-*A*nalyses: The PRISMA Statement. PLoS Med 6(6): e1000097. doi:10.1371/journal.pmed1000097

For more information, visit www.prisma-statement.org.

Figure 2: Pooled mean duration (days) of SARS-CoV-2 shedding from the upper respiratory tract (random-effects model).

Study name	Statistics for each study						Relative weight
	Mean	Standard error	Variance	Upper limit	Lower limit	Total	
Fang et al.	19.3	0.2	0.0	19.7	18.8	32	2.53
Cai Q et al.	12.3	0.2	0.0	12.6	11.9	298	2.53
Hu X et al.	14.3	0.7	0.5	15.6	12.9	59	2.48
Kim et al.	8.3	0.7	0.5	9.8	6.9	28	2.48
Le et al.	7.5	1.0	0.9	9.4	5.6	12	2.44
Lo et al.	18.2	1.5	2.1	21.1	15.3	10	2.34
Ling et al.	10.5	0.6	0.3	11.6	9.4	66	2.50
Qian et al.	11.7	0.8	0.6	13.2	10.1	24	2.47
Wu Y et al.	15.7	0.8	0.6	17.2	14.2	74	2.47
Xiao A et al.	22.8	1.2	1.4	25.1	20.4	56	2.40
Xu K et al.	17.3	0.6	0.4	18.5	16.1	113	2.49
Xu Y et al.	6.0	1.2	1.5	8.4	3.6	10	2.39
Yongchen et al.	13.3	5.4	28.9	23.9	2.8	21	1.18
Young et al.	13.3	2.1	4.2	17.3	9.2	18	2.17
Zhou B et al.	31.7	1.9	3.6	35.4	27.9	41	2.21
Zhou F et al.	20.3	0.4	0.1	21.1	19.6	191	2.52
Zhu et al.	25.0	4.5	20.2	33.8	16.2	10	1.41
Sakurai et al.	8.7	0.4	0.2	9.5	7.8	90	2.52
To et al.	16.5	1.3	1.7	19.0	14.0	23	2.38
Huang et al.	22.0	0.6	0.3	23.1	20.9	200	2.50
Liang M et al.	18.3	0.8	0.6	19.8	16.9	120	2.48
Shi et al.	28.0	0.7	0.5	29.4	26.6	246	2.48
Talmy et al.	21.0	0.8	0.7	22.6	19.4	119	2.47
Chen et al.	12.0	0.4	0.1	12.7	11.3	284	2.52
Hu Z et al.	7.1	1.4	2.0	9.8	4.3	24	2.35
Song R et al.	27.3	3.1	9.8	33.5	21.2	21	1.83
Yang R et al.	19.7	0.9	0.8	21.5	17.9	45	2.45
Wu B et al.	17.3	0.8	0.6	18.9	15.8	91	2.47
Zhang N et al.	9.5	0.9	0.7	11.2	7.8	23	2.46
Fu S et al.	30.0	1.8	3.1	33.5	26.5	50	2.26
Tan W et al.	15.8	1.0	0.9	17.6	13.9	67	2.44
Kujawski et al	15.5	2.2	4.9	19.8	11.2	12	2.12
Yan D et al.	24.3	1.0	0.9	26.2	22.4	120	2.44
Yang Y et al.	16.1	0.6	0.4	17.3	14.9	213	2.50
Xu L et al.	12.0	1.5	2.2	14.9	9.1	14	2.33
Huang J et al.	17.9	1.2	1.4	20.2	15.6	33	2.40
Chen J et al.	11.0	0.1	0.0	11.2	10.8	249	2.53
Chang et al.	9.5	1.2	1.5	11.9	7.1	16	2.39
Li N et al.	53.9	1.6	2.7	57.1	50.7	36	2.29
Pongpirul et al.	16.3	4.3	18.9	24.9	7.8	11	1.45
Tan Y et. al	13.3	2.4	5.5	17.9	8.6	10	2.08
Wang L et al.	16.0	1.5	2.2	18.9	13.1	18	2.33
Zha et al.	13.8	0.6	0.4	15.1	12.6	31	2.49
	17.0	0.8	0.6	18.6	15.5	3229	



Note: the overall effect is plotted as a black square.

Test for heterogeneity: Q-value = 4076,08, df(Q) = 42, $p < 0.001$, $I^2 = 99\%$.

Figure 3: Pooled mean duration (days) of SARS-CoV-2 shedding from the lower respiratory tract (random-effects model).

Study name	Statistics for each study						Relative weight
	Mean	Standard error	Variance	Upper limit	Lower limit	Total	
Zheng et al.	20.0	1.2	1.5	22.4	17.6	96	14.52
Cai et al.	11.8	2.1	4.6	16.0	7.5	10	13.70
Kim et al.	6.2	0.8	0.7	7.8	4.6	28	14.77
Tan W et al.	19.0	0.9	0.9	20.8	17.2	67	14.70
Kujawski et al.	11.5	2.5	6.1	16.3	6.7	12	13.33
Xu L et al.	11.0	1.3	1.8	13.6	8.4	14	14.45
Huang J et al.	22.7	1.2	1.5	25.0	20.3	33	14.53
	14.6	2.7	7.5	20.0	9.3	260	



Note: the overall effect is plotted as a black square.

Test for heterogeneity: Q-value = 203.3, df(Q) = 6, $p < 0.001$, $I^2 = 97\%$.

Figure 4. Pooled mean duration (days) of SARS-CoV-2 shedding in the blood (random-effects model).

Study name	Statistics for each study						Relative weight
	Mean	Standard error	Variance	Upper limit	Lower limit	Total	
Zheng et al.	23.3	1.1	1.2	25.4	21.2	96	49.99
Kujawski et al	10.0	1.1	1.1	12.1	7.9	12	50.01
	16.6	6.6	44.2	29.7	3.6	108	



Note: the overall effect is plotted as a black square.

Test for heterogeneity: Q-value = 77,6, df(Q) = 1, $p < 0.001$, $I^2 = 99\%$.

Figure 5. Pooled mean duration (days) of SARS-CoV-2 shedding from the stool (random-effects model).

Study name	Statistics for each study						Relative weight
	Mean	Standard error	Variance	Upper limit	Lower limit	Total	
Zheng et al.	16.0	0.8	0.6	17.5	14.5	96	8.44
Cai et al.	16.8	3.0	8.8	22.6	10.9	10	6.33
Lo et al.	19.3	1.1	1.2	21.4	17.2	10	8.25
Ling et al.	9.8	0.4	0.2	10.5	9.0	66	8.59
Wu Y et al.	27.9	1.2	1.5	30.3	25.5	74	8.12
Xu Y et al.	17.0	3.0	9.2	23.0	11.0	10	6.25
Wang S et al.	18.8	2.6	6.9	23.9	13.6	17	6.71
Wu B et al.	19.7	0.9	0.9	21.5	17.8	91	8.34
Zhang N et al.	17.8	1.3	1.6	20.2	15.3	26	8.10
Tan W et al.	15.8	0.6	0.4	17.0	14.5	67	8.50
Kujawski et al.	15.0	2.1	4.5	19.2	10.8	12	7.28
Wu Q et al.	11.5	0.5	0.3	12.6	10.4	74	8.55
Huang J et al.	20.2	2.8	7.7	25.6	14.7	33	6.55
	17.2	1.4	2.1	20.1	14.4	586	



Note: the overall effect is plotted as a black square.

Test for heterogeneity: Q-value = 356.0, df(Q) = 12, $p < 0.001$, I2 = 96.6%.

Figure 6. Meta-regression bubble plot of the impact of age on mean SARS-CoV-2 shedding from the upper respiratory tract



URT: upper respiratory tract.

Note: the plot was built upon 41 studies (no data on mean age from the study of Qian et al.[98]). A random-effects model was used.

References:

1. Cevik M, Bamford CGG, Ho A. COVID-19 pandemic-a focused review for clinicians. *Clin Microbiol Infect* 2020; **26**(7): 842-7.
2. Zou L, Ruan F, Huang M, et al. SARS-CoV-2 Viral Load in Upper Respiratory Specimens of Infected Patients. *New England Journal of Medicine* 2020; **382**(12): 1177-9.
3. Wolfel R, Corman VM, Guggemos W, et al. Virological assessment of hospitalized patients with COVID-2019. *Nature* 2020.
4. Kim ES, Chin BS, Kang CK, et al. Clinical Course and Outcomes of Patients with Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 Infection: a Preliminary Report of the First 28 Patients from the Korean Cohort Study on COVID-19. *J Korean Med Sci* 2020; **35**(13): e142.
5. Institute TJB. The Joanna Briggs Institute Critical Appraisal tools for use in JBI systematic reviews–checklist for case series. , 2017.
6. Wan X, Wang W, Liu J, Tong T. Estimating the sample mean and standard deviation from the sample size, median, range and/or interquartile range. *BMC Medical Research Methodology* 2014; **14**(1): 135.
7. Cai J, Xu J, Lin D, et al. A Case Series of children with 2019 novel coronavirus infection: clinical and epidemiological features. *Clinical Infectious Diseases* 2020; **28**: 28.
8. Han MS, Seong M-W, Kim N, et al. Early Release - Viral RNA Load in Mildly Symptomatic and Asymptomatic Children with COVID-19, Seoul - Volume 26, Number 10—October 2020 - Emerging Infectious Diseases journal - CDC.
9. L'Huillier A, Torriani G, Pigny F, Kaiser L, Eckerle I. Shedding of infectious SARS-CoV-2 in symptomatic neonates, children and adolescents. 2020.
10. Tan Y-p, Tan B-y, Pan J, Wu J, Zeng S-z, Wei H-y. Epidemiologic and clinical characteristics of 10 children with coronavirus disease 2019 in Changsha, China. *Journal of Clinical Virology* 2020; **127**: 104353.
11. Wu Q, Xing Y, Shi L, et al. Epidemiological and Clinical Characteristics of Children with Coronavirus Disease 2019. 2020.
12. Xu Y, Li X, Zhu B, et al. Characteristics of pediatric SARS-CoV-2 infection and potential evidence for persistent fecal viral shedding. *Nature Medicine* 2020; **26**(4): 502-5.
13. Zhang Z, Xiao T, Wang Y, et al. Early viral clearance and antibody kinetics of COVID-19 among asymptomatic carriers. *medRxiv* 2020: 2020.04.28.20083139.
14. Lavezzo E, Franchin E, Ciavarella C, et al. Suppression of a SARS-CoV-2 outbreak in the Italian municipality of Vo'. *Nature* 2020: 1-.
15. Zhu L, Gong N, Liu B, et al. Coronavirus Disease 2019 Pneumonia in Immunosuppressed Renal Transplant Recipients: A Summary of 10 Confirmed Cases in Wuhan, China. *Eur Urol* 2020; **18**: 18.
16. He X, Lau EHY, Wu P, et al. Temporal dynamics in viral shedding and transmissibility of COVID-19. *Nature Medicine*; **26**(5): 672-5.
17. Kujawski SA, Wong KK, Collins JP, et al. Clinical and virologic characteristics of the first 12 patients with coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) in the United States. *Nature Medicine* 2020; **26**(6): 861-8.
18. Tan W, Lu Y, Zhang J, et al. Viral Kinetics and Antibody Responses in Patients with COVID-19. 2020.
19. To KK-W, Tsang OT-Y, Leung W-S, et al. Temporal profiles of viral load in posterior oropharyngeal saliva samples and serum antibody responses during infection by SARS-CoV-2: an observational cohort study. *The Lancet Infectious Diseases* 2020; **20**(5): 565-74.
20. Wolfel R, Corman VM, Guggemos W, et al. Virological assessment of hospitalized patients with COVID-2019. *Nature* 2020; **581**(7809): 465-9.
21. Wyllie AL, Fournier J, Casanovas-Massana A, et al. Saliva is more sensitive for SARS-CoV-2 detection in COVID-19 patients than nasopharyngeal swabs.

22. Young BE, Ong SWX, Kalimuddin S, et al. Epidemiologic Features and Clinical Course of Patients Infected With SARS-CoV-2 in Singapore. *JAMA* 2020; **03**: 03.
23. Huang J, Mao T, Li S, et al. Long period dynamics of viral load and antibodies for SARS-CoV-2 infection: an observational cohort study. *medRxiv* 2020: 2020.04.22.20071258.
24. 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.
25. Zheng S, Fan J, Yu F, et al. Viral load dynamics and disease severity in patients infected with SARS-CoV-2 in Zhejiang province, China, January-March 2020: retrospective cohort study. *BMJ* 2020; **369**.
26. Cai Q, Huang D, Ou P, et al. COVID-19 in a designated infectious diseases hospital outside Hubei Province, China. *Allergy* 2020; **n/a**(n/a).
27. Chen J, Qi T, Liu L, et al. Clinical progression of patients with COVID-19 in Shanghai, China. *Journal of Infection* 2020; **80**(5): e1-e6.
28. Chen X, Zhang Y, Zhu B, et al. Associations of clinical characteristics and antiviral drugs with viral RNA clearance in patients with COVID-19 in Guangzhou, China: a retrospective cohort study.
29. Chen Y, Chen L, Deng Q, et al. The presence of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in the feces of COVID-19 patients. *Journal of Medical Virology* 2020; **03**: 03.
30. Fan L, Liu C, Li N, et al. Medical treatment of 55 patients with COVID-19 from seven cities in northeast China who fully recovered: a single-center, retrospective, observational study.
31. Fang Z, Zhang Y, Hang C, Ai J, Li S, Zhang W. Comparisons of viral shedding time of SARS-CoV-2 of different samples in ICU and non-ICU patients. *Journal of Infection* 2020; **21**: 21.
32. Liu Y, Yan L-M, Wan L, et al. Viral dynamics in mild and severe cases of COVID-19. *Lancet Infect Dis* 2020; **20**(6): 656-7.
33. Shi J, Cheng C, Yu M, et al. Systemic Inflammatory Cytokines Associate With SARS-COV-2 Viral Shedding Time in Covid-19 Inpatients. *ResearchSquare* 2020.
34. Tan L, Kang X, Ji X, et al. Validation of Predictors of Disease Severity and Outcomes in COVID-19 Patients: A Descriptive and Retrospective Study. *Med* 2020.
35. Zhou F, Yu T, Du R, et al. Clinical course and risk factors for mortality of adult inpatients with COVID-19 in Wuhan, China: a retrospective cohort study. *Lancet* 2020; **395**(10229): 1054-62.
36. Yongchen Z, Shen H, Wang X, et al. Different longitudinal patterns of nucleic acid and serology testing results based on disease severity of COVID-19 patients. *Emerg* 2020; **9**(1): 833-6.
37. Hu X, Xing Y, Jia J, et al. Factors associated with negative conversion of viral RNA in patients hospitalized with COVID-19. *Science of the Total Environment* 2020; **728 (no pagination)**.
38. Xu K, Chen Y, Yuan J, et al. Factors associated with prolonged viral RNA shedding in patients with COVID-19. *Clinical Infectious Diseases* 2020; **09**: 09.
39. Yan D, Liu X-y, Zhu Y-n, et al. Factors associated with prolonged viral shedding and impact of Lopinavir/Ritonavir treatment in patients with SARS-CoV-2 infection.
40. Wu Y, Guo C, Tang L, et al. Prolonged presence of SARS-CoV-2 viral RNA in faecal samples. *Lancet Gastroenterol Hepatol* 2020; **5**(5): 434-5.
41. Tian D, Wang L, Wang X, et al. Clinical research and factors associated with prolonged duration of viral shedding in patients with COVID-19. *ResearchSquare* 2020.
42. Zhou B, She J, Wang Y, Ma X. The duration of viral shedding of discharged patients with severe COVID-19. *Clinical Infectious Diseases* 2020; **17**: 17.
43. Sakurai A, Sasaki T, Kato S, et al. Natural History of Asymptomatic SARS-CoV-2 Infection. *New England Journal of Medicine* 2020.
44. Talmy T, Tsur A, Shabtay O. Duration of Viral Clearance in IDF Soldiers with Mild COVID-19. *medRxiv*.
45. Xiao AT, Tong YX, Zhang S. Profile of RT-PCR for SARS-CoV-2: a preliminary study from 56 COVID-19 patients. *Clinical Infectious Diseases* 2020; **19**: 19.

46. Shastri A, Wheat J, Agrawal S, et al. Delayed clearance of SARS-CoV2 in male compared to female patients: High ACE2 expression in testes suggests possible existence of gender-specific viral reservoirs.
47. Ling Y, Xu S-B, Lin Y-X, et al. Persistence and clearance of viral RNA in 2019 novel coronavirus disease rehabilitation patients. *Chinese Medical Journal* 2020; **133**(9).
48. Zha L, Li S, Pan L, et al. Corticosteroid treatment of patients with coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19). *Medical Journal of Australia* 2020; **212**(9): 416-20.
49. Liang M, Chen P, He M, et al. Corticosteroid Treatment in Critically Ill Patients with COVID-19: A Retrospective Cohort Study. *ResearchSquare* 2020.
50. Hung IFN, Lung KC, Tso EYK, et al. Triple combination of interferon beta-1b, lopinavir-ritonavir, and ribavirin in the treatment of patients admitted to hospital with COVID-19: an open-label, randomised, phase 2 trial. *The Lancet* 2020; **395**(10238): 1695-704.
51. Huang H, Guan L, Yang Y, et al. Chloroquine, arbidol (umifenovir) or lopinavir/ritonavir as the antiviral monotherapy for COVID-19 patients: a retrospective cohort study. 2020.
52. Zhou R, Li F, Chen F, et al. Viral dynamics in asymptomatic patients with COVID-19. *International Journal of Infectious Diseases* 2020; **96**: 288-90.
53. Chau NVV, Thanh Lam V, Thanh Dung N, et al. The natural history and transmission potential of asymptomatic SARS-CoV-2 infection. *Clinical Infectious Diseases* 2020.
54. Arons MM, Hatfield KM, Reddy SC, et al. Presymptomatic SARS-CoV-2 Infections and Transmission in a Skilled Nursing Facility. *New England Journal of Medicine* 2020; **382**(22): 2081-90.
55. Hu Z, Song C, Xu C, et al. Clinical characteristics of 24 asymptomatic infections with COVID-19 screened among close contacts in Nanjing, China. *Science China Life Sciences* 2020; **63**(5): 706-11.
56. Yang R, Gui X, Xiong Y. Comparison of Clinical Characteristics of Patients with Asymptomatic vs Symptomatic Coronavirus Disease 2019 in Wuhan, China. *JAMA Netw Open* 2020; **3**(5).
57. Bullard J, Dust K, Funk D, et al. Predicting infectious SARS-CoV-2 from diagnostic samples. *Clinical Infectious Diseases*.
58. La Scola B, Le Bideau M, Andreani J, et al. Viral RNA load as determined by cell culture as a management tool for discharge of SARS-CoV-2 patients from infectious disease wards. *Eur J Clin Microbiol Infect Dis* 2020: 1-3.
59. Le TQM, Takemura T, Moi ML, et al. Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 Shedding by Travelers, Vietnam, 2020. *Emerg Infect Dis* 2020; **26**(7): 02.
60. To KK-W, Tsang OT-Y, Yip CC-Y, et al. Consistent Detection of 2019 Novel Coronavirus in Saliva. *Clinical Infectious Diseases* 2020; (ciaa149).
61. Liu W, Tang F, Fontanet A, et al. Long-term SARS coronavirus excretion from patient cohort, China. *Emerg Infect Dis* 2004; **10**(10): 1841-3.
62. Xiao F, Sun J, Xu Y, et al. Infectious SARS-CoV-2 in Feces of Patient with Severe COVID-19. *Emerging Infectious Disease journal* 2020; **26**(8).
63. Andersson M, Arancibia - Carcamo CV, Auckland K, et al. SARS-CoV-2 RNA detected in blood samples from patients with COVID-19 is not associated with infectious virus. *medRxiv*.
64. Chan PK, To WK, Ng KC, et al. Laboratory diagnosis of SARS. *Emerg Infect Dis* 2004; **10**(5): 825-31.
65. Chen WJ, Yang JY, Lin JH, et al. Nasopharyngeal shedding of severe acute respiratory syndrome-associated coronavirus is associated with genetic polymorphisms. *Clinical Infectious Diseases* 2006; **42**(11): 1561-9.
66. Xu D, Zhang Z, Jin L, et al. Persistent shedding of viable SARS-CoV in urine and stool of SARS patients during the convalescent phase. *European Journal of Clinical Microbiology and Infectious Diseases* 2005; **24**(3): 165-71.
67. Cheng PK, Wong DA, Tong LK, et al. Viral shedding patterns of coronavirus in patients with probable severe acute respiratory syndrome. *Lancet* 2004; **363**(9422): 1699-700.
68. Kwan BC, Leung CB, Szeto CC, et al. Severe acute respiratory syndrome in dialysis patients. *J Am Soc Nephrol* 2004; **15**(7): 1883-8.

69. Leong HN, Chan KP, Khan AS, et al. Virus-specific RNA and antibody from convalescent-phase SARS patients discharged from hospital. *Emerg Infect Dis* 2004; **10**(10): 1745-50.
70. Peiris JSM, Chu CM, Cheng VCC, et al. Clinical progression and viral load in a community outbreak of coronavirus-associated SARS pneumonia: a prospective study. *The Lancet* 2003; **361**(9371): 1767-72.
71. Min CK, Cheon S, Ha NY, et al. Comparative and kinetic analysis of viral shedding and immunological responses in MERS patients representing a broad spectrum of disease severity. *Sci* 2016; **6**: 25359.
72. Shalhoub S, Farahat F, Al-Jiffri A, et al. IFN-alpha2a or IFN-beta1a in combination with ribavirin to treat Middle East respiratory syndrome coronavirus pneumonia: a retrospective study. *J Antimicrob Chemother* 2015; **70**(7): 2129-32.
73. Al Hosani FI, Pringle K, Al Mulla M, et al. Response to Emergence of Middle East Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus, Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates, 2013-2014. *Emerg Infect Dis* 2016; **22**(7): 1162-8.
74. Oh MD, Park WB, Choe PG, et al. Viral load kinetics of MERS coronavirus infection. *New England Journal of Medicine* 2016; **375**(13): 1303-5.
75. Arabi YM, Al-Omari A, Mandourah Y, et al. Critically Ill Patients With the Middle East Respiratory Syndrome: A Multicenter Retrospective Cohort Study. *Crit Care Med* 2017; **45**(10): 1683-95.
76. Hong KH, Choi JP, Hong SH, et al. Predictors of mortality in Middle East respiratory syndrome (MERS). *Thorax* 2018; **73**(3): 286-9.
77. Corman VM, Albarrak AM, Omrani AS, et al. Viral Shedding and Antibody Response in 37 Patients With Middle East Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus Infection. *Clinical Infectious Diseases* 2016; **62**(4): 477-83.
78. Muth D, Corman VM, Meyer B, et al. Infectious middle east respiratory syndrome coronavirus excretion and serotype variability based on live virus isolates from patients in Saudi Arabia. *Journal of Clinical Microbiology* 2015; **53**(9): 2951-5.
79. Wang Y, Tian H, Zhang L, et al. Reduction of secondary transmission of SARS-CoV-2 in households by face mask use, disinfection and social distancing: a cohort study in Beijing, China. *BMJ Global Health* 2020; **5**(5): e002794.
80. Böhmer MM, Buchholz U, Corman VM, et al. Investigation of a COVID-19 outbreak in Germany resulting from a single travel-associated primary case: a case series. *The Lancet Infectious Diseases*.
81. Cheng H-Y, Jian S-W, Liu D-P, et al. Contact Tracing Assessment of COVID-19 Transmission Dynamics in Taiwan and Risk at Different Exposure Periods Before and After Symptom Onset. *JAMA Internal Medicine* 2020.
82. Wang Y, Guo Q, Yan Z, et al. Factors Associated With Prolonged Viral Shedding in Patients With Avian Influenza A(H7N9) Virus Infection. *J Infect Dis* 2018; **217**(11): 1708-17.
83. Memish A. Viral shedding and antibody response in MERS. *Vox Sanguinis* 2016; **111 (Supplement 1)**: 48-9.
84. Wang W, Xu Y, Gao R, et al. Detection of SARS-CoV-2 in Different Types of Clinical Specimens. *JAMA* 2020; **323**(18): 1843-4.
85. Ip DKM, Lau LLH, Leung NHL, et al. Viral Shedding and Transmission Potential of Asymptomatic and Paucisymptomatic Influenza Virus Infections in the Community. *Clin Infect Dis* 2017; **64**(6): 736-42.
86. Walsh KA, Jordan K, Clyne B, et al. SARS-CoV-2 detection, viral load and infectivity over the course of an infection. *Journal of Infection*.
87. Kretzschmar ME, Rozhnova G, Bootsma MCJ, van Boven M, van de Wijgert JHHM, Bonten MJM. Impact of delays on effectiveness of contact tracing strategies for COVID-19: a modelling study. *The Lancet Public Health*.

88. Chang D, Mo G, Yuan X, et al. Time Kinetics of Viral Clearance and Resolution of Symptoms in Novel Coronavirus Infection. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med* 2020; **201**(9): 1150-2.
89. Chen X, Ling J, Mo P, et al. Restoration of leukomonocyte counts is associated with viral clearance in COVID-19 hospitalized patients. *medRxiv* 2020: 2020.03.03.20030437.
90. Corman VM, Rabenau HF, Adams O, et al. SARS-CoV-2 asymptomatic and symptomatic patients and risk for transfusion transmission. *Transfusion* 2020; **60**(6): 1119-22.
91. Fu S, Fu X, Song Y, et al. Virologic and clinical characteristics for prognosis of severe COVID-19: a retrospective observational study in Wuhan, China. 2020.
92. Huang L, Chen Z, Ni L, et al. Impact of Angiotensin-converting Enzyme Inhibitors and Angiotensin Receptor Blockers on Inflammatory Responses and Viral Clearance in COVID-19 Patients: A Multicenter Retrospective Cohort Study. *ResearchSquare* 2020.
93. Li N, Wang X, Lv T. Prolonged SARS-CoV-2 RNA shedding: Not a rare phenomenon. *Journal of Medical Virology*; **n/a**(n/a).
94. Liu L, Liu W, Zheng Y, et al. A preliminary study on serological assay for severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) in 238 admitted hospital patients. *Microbes and Infection* 2020; **22**(4): 206-11.
95. Lo IL, Lio CF, Cheong HH, 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* 2020; **16**(10): 1698-707.
96. Lou B, Li T, Zheng S, et al. Serology characteristics of SARS-CoV-2 infection since the exposure and post symptoms onset.
97. Pongpirul WA, Mott JA, Woodring JV, et al. Clinical Characteristics of Patients Hospitalized with Coronavirus Disease, Thailand - Volume 26, Number 7—July 2020 - Emerging Infectious Diseases journal - CDC.
98. Qian GQ, Chen XQ, Lv DF, et al. Duration of SARS-CoV-2 viral shedding during COVID-19 infection. *Infect Dis (Lond)* 2020: 1-2.
99. quan w, zheng q, tian j, et al. No SARS-CoV-2 in expressed prostatic secretion of patients with coronavirus disease 2019: a descriptive multicentre study in China.
100. Seah IYJ, Anderson DE, Kang AEZ, et al. Assessing Viral Shedding and Infectivity of Tears in Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) Patients. *Ophthalmology* 2020; **24**: 24.
101. Song C, Wang Y, Li W, et al. Detection of 2019 novel coronavirus in semen and testicular biopsy specimen of COVID-19 patients.
102. Song R, Han B, Song M, et al. Clinical and epidemiological features of COVID-19 family clusters in Beijing, China. *Journal of Infection* 2020.
103. Tu Y-H, Wei Y-Y, Zhang D-W, Chen C-S, Hu X-W, Fei G. Analysis of factors affected the SARS-CoV-2 viral shedding time of COVID-19 patients in Anhui, China: a retrospective study. 2020.
104. Wang L, Gao Y-h, Lou L-L, Zhang G-J. The clinical dynamics of 18 cases of COVID-19 outside of Wuhan, China. *European Respiratory Journal* 2020.
105. Wang S, Tu J, Sheng Y. Clinical characteristics and fecal-oral transmission potential of patients with COVID-19. *medRxiv*.
106. Wu B, Lei Z-Y, Wu K-L, et al. Epidemiological and clinical features of imported and local patients with coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) in Hainan, China. *ResearchSquare* 2020.
107. Xu l, Zhang X, Song W, et al. Conjunctival polymerase chain reaction-tests of 2019 novel coronavirus in patients in Shenyang,China.
108. Yang Y, Yang M, Shen C, et al. Evaluating the accuracy of different respiratory specimens in the laboratory diagnosis and monitoring the viral shedding of 2019-nCoV infections. 2020.
109. Xu D, Zhang Z, Jin L, et al. Persistent shedding of viable SARS-CoV in urine and stool of SARS patients during the convalescent phase. *Eur J Clin Microbiol Infect Dis* 2005; **24**(3): 165-71.
110. Al-Jasser FS, Nouh RM, Youssef RM. Epidemiology and predictors of survival of MERS-CoV infections in Riyadh region, 2014-2015. *J Infect Public Health* 2019; **12**(2): 171-7.

111. Alkendi F, Nair SC, Hashmey R. Descriptive Epidemiology, Clinical Characteristics and Outcomes for Middle East Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus (MERS-CoV) Infected Patients in AlAin - Abu Dhabi Emirate. *J Infect Public Health* 2019; **12 (1)**: 137.
112. Park WB, Poon LLM, Choi SJ, et al. Replicative virus shedding in the respiratory tract of patients with Middle East respiratory syndrome coronavirus infection. *International Journal of Infectious Diseases* 2018; **72**: 8-10.