medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.08.24.20179457; this version posted September 28, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Assessment of the risk of SARS-CoV-2 reinfection in an intense re-exposure setting

Laith J. Abu Raddad PhD,[1,2,3*] Hiam Chemaitelly MSc,[1,2] Joel A. Malek PhD,[4,5] Ayeda A. Ahmed BSc,[4] Yasmin A. Mohamoud MSc,[4] Shameem Younuskunju MSc,[4] Houssein H. Ayoub PhD,[5] Zaina Al Kanaani PhD,[6] Abdullatif Al Khal MD,[6] Einas Al Kuwari MD,[6] Adeel A. Butt MBBS MS,[6] Peter Coyle MD,[6] Andrew Jeremijenko MD,[6] Anvar Hassan Kaleeckal MSc,[6] Ali Nizar Latif MD,[6] Riyazuddin Mohammad Shaik MSc,[6] Hanan F. Abdul Rahim PhD,[7] Hadi M. Yassine PhD,[8,9] Mohamed G. Al Kuwari MD,[10] Hamad Eid Al Romaihi MD,[11] Sheikh Mohammad Al Thani MD,[11] and Roberto Bertollini MD[11]

[1]*Infectious Disease Epidemiology Group, Weill Cornell Medicine-Qatar, Cornell University, Doha, Qatar*

[2]*World Health Organization Collaborating Centre for Disease Epidemiology Analytics on HIV/AIDS, Sexually Transmitted Infections, and Viral Hepatitis, Weill Cornell Medicine–Qatar, Cornell University, Qatar Foundation – Education City, Doha, Qatar*

[3]*Department of Population Health Sciences, Weill Cornell Medicine, Cornell University, New York, New York, USA*

[4]*Genomics Laboratory, Weill Cornell Medicine-Qatar, Cornell University, Doha, Qatar*

[5]*Department of Genetic Medicine, Weill Cornell Medicine-Qatar, Cornell University, Doha, Qatar*

[5]*Department of Mathematics, Statistics, and Physics, Qatar University, Doha, Qatar*

[6]*Hamad Medical Corporation, Doha, Qatar*

[7]*College of Health Sciences, QU Health, Qatar University, Doha, Qatar*

[8]*Biomedical Research Center, Qatar University, Doha, Qatar*

[9]*Department of Biomedical Science, College of Health Sciences, Member of QU Health, Qatar University, Doha, Qatar*

[10]*Primary Health Care Corporation, Doha, Qatar*

[11]*Ministry of Public Health, Doha, Qatar*

[*]Address reprints requests or correspondence to Professor Laith J. Abu-Raddad, Infectious Disease Epidemiology Group, World Health Organization Collaborating Centre for Disease Epidemiology Analytics on HIV/AIDS, Sexually Transmitted Infections, and Viral Hepatitis, Weill Cornell Medicine - Qatar, Qatar Foundation - Education City, P.O. Box 24144, Doha, Qatar. Telephone: +(974) 4492-8321. Fax: +(974) 4492-8333. E-mail: lja2002@qatar-med.cornell.edu.

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

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.08.24.20179457; this version posted September 28, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

ABSTRACT

Background: Reinfection with severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) is debated. We assessed risk and incidence rate of documented SARS-CoV-2 reinfection in a large cohort of laboratory-confirmed cases in Qatar.

Methods: All SARS-CoV-2 laboratory-confirmed cases with at least one PCR positive swab that is ≥45 days after a first-positive swab were individually investigated for evidence of reinfection, and classified as showing *strong*, *good*, *some*, or *weak/no* evidence for reinfection. Viral genome sequencing of the paired first-positive and reinfection viral specimens was conducted to confirm reinfection. Risk and incidence rate of reinfection were estimated.

Results: Out of 133,266 laboratory-confirmed SARS-CoV-2 cases, 243 persons (0.18%) had at least one subsequent positive swab ≥45 days after the first-positive swab. Of these, 54 cases (22.2%) had strong or good evidence for reinfection. Median time between first and reinfection swab was 64.5 days (range: 45-129). Twenty-three of the 54 cases (42.6%) were diagnosed at a health facility suggesting presence of symptoms, while 31 (57.4%) were identified incidentally through random testing campaigns/surveys or contact tracing. Only one person was hospitalized at time of reinfection, but still with mild infection. No deaths were recorded. Viral genome sequencing confirmed four out of 12 cases with available genetic evidence. Risk of reinfection was estimated at 0.01% (95% CI: 0.01-0.02%) and incidence rate of reinfection was estimated at 0.36 (95% CI: 0.28-0.47) per 10,000 person-weeks.

Conclusions: SARS-CoV-2 reinfection can occur but is a rare phenomenon suggestive of a strong protective immunity against reinfection that lasts for at least a few months post primary infection.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.08.24.20179457; this version posted September 28, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Keywords: SARS-CoV-2; epidemiology; COVID-19; incidence; infection; reinfection; immunity; genetics.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.08.24.20179457; this version posted September 28, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

INTRODUCTION

The severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) has been spreading around the globe causing severe disruptions to social and economic activities [1-3]. Qatar, a peninsula in the Arabian Gulf region with a diverse population of 2.8 million [4, 5], has experienced a large epidemic with one of the highest laboratory-confirmed rates of infection at >50,000 infections per million population [6, 7]. Antibody testing and mathematical modeling indicated that about half of the population of Qatar has already been infected [6].

The intensity of the epidemic with a high risk of re-exposure to the infection, as well as the availability of a centralized data-capture system of all laboratory-confirmed infections, provided an opportunity to epidemiologically assess the presence and incidence of reinfections; a debated feature of SARS-CoV-2 epidemiology whose elucidation is critical to inform global response, timing and intensity of future cycles, and impact and durability of potential vaccines [8-11].

Our aim was to assess the risk and incidence rate of documented reinfection in a cohort of 133,266 SARS-CoV-2 laboratory-confirmed infected persons. Since the relevant underlying question is whether risk of reinfection is appreciable or not, we implemented a conservative epidemiological approach for assessing documented reinfections, that is prone to overestimate rather than underestimate risk of reinfection. However, we also conducted sensitivity analyses implementing more stringent criteria for assessing reinfection. We further performed viral genome sequencing to confirm the reinfections.

METHODS

Sources of data

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.08.24.20179457; this version posted September 28, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

We analyzed the centralized and standardized national SARS-CoV-2 testing and hospitalization database compiled at Hamad Medical Corporation (HMC), the main public healthcare provider and the nationally-designated provider for Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) healthcare needs. The database covers all SARS-CoV-2 cases in Qatar and encompasses data on all polymerase chain reaction (PCR) testing conducted from February 28-August 12, 2020, including testing of suspected SARS-CoV-2 cases and traced contacts and infection surveillance testing. The database further includes data on hospital admission of COVID-19 patients and the World Health Organization (WHO) severity classification for each infection [12], which is assessed through individual chart reviews by trained medical personnel. Recently, data on serological testing for antibody on residual blood specimens collected for routine clinical care from attendees at HMC were also incorporated [6].

Laboratory methods

All PCR testing was conducted at HMC Central Laboratory or at Sidra Medicine Laboratory, following standardized protocols. Nasopharyngeal and/or oropharyngeal swabs (Huachenyang Technology, China) were collected and placed in Universal Transport Medium (UTM). Aliquots of UTM were: extracted on the QIAsymphony platform (QIAGEN, USA) and tested with real-time reverse-transcription PCR (RT-qPCR) using the TaqPath™ COVID-19 Combo Kit (Thermo Fisher Scientific, USA) on a ABI 7500 FAST (ThermoFisher, USA); extracted using a custom protocol [13] on a Hamilton Microlab STAR (Hamilton, USA) and tested using the AccuPower SARS-CoV-2 Real-Time RT-PCR Kit (Bioneer, Korea) on a ABI 7500 FAST; or loaded directly to a Roche cobas® 6800 system and assayed with the cobas® SARS-CoV-2 Test (Roche, Switzerland). The first assay targets the S, N, and ORF1ab regions of the virus; the

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.08.24.20179457; this version posted September 28, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

second targets the virus' RdRp and E-gene regions; and the third targets the ORF1ab and E-gene regions.

Serological testing was performed using the Roche Elecsys® Anti-SARS-CoV-2 (Roche, Switzerland), an electrochemiluminescence immunoassay that uses a recombinant protein representing the nucleocapsid (N) antigen for the determination of antibodies against SARS-CoV-2. Qualitative anti-SARS-CoV-2 results were generated following the manufacturer's instructions (reactive: cutoff index ≥1.0 vs. non-reactive: cutoff index <1.0).

Inclusion criteria

All SARS-CoV-2 laboratory-confirmed cases with at least one PCR positive swab that is ≥45 days after a first-positive swab were considered as *suspected cases* of reinfection. The 45-day cutoff was informed by data from observational cohorts of SARS-CoV-2 infected persons [14, 15], and was set to account for the duration of prolonged PCR positivity of several weeks in these patients. The cutoff determination was further informed by the distribution of the time difference between the first-positive swab and subsequent positive swabs among SARS-CoV-2 cases with multiple swabs (Figure 1). The tail of this distribution indicates that a cutoff of 45 days (at the 99th percentile) provides an appropriate mark for defining the end of prolonged PCR positivity: a subsequent positive swab within 45 days of the first-positive swab is likely to reflect prolonged PCR positivity (due to non-viable virus fragments) rather than reinfection, and thus should not be included in analysis.

Suspected reinfection case classification

Suspected cases of reinfection, that is cases fitting above indicated inclusion criteria, were classified as showing either *strong* evidence, *good* evidence, *some* evidence, or *weak* (or *no*)

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.08.24.20179457; this version posted September 28, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

evidence for reinfection (Box 1). The classification was based on holistic quantitative and qualitative criteria applied to each investigated case. The criteria included the pattern and magnitude of the change in PCR cycle threshold (Ct) value across repeated swabs, time interval between subsequent swabs, PCR testing site (such as outpatients at primary care, hospital emergency, or inpatient hospitalization), purpose of PCR testing (such as appearance of symptoms, contact tracing, or survey/testing campaign), age, history of COVID-19-related hospital admission, and case severity per WHO classification [12].

Overall, swabs with Ct <30 (suggestive of recent active infection) at least 45 days after the first-positive swab were considered as showing *strong evidence for reinfection*. Swabs with Ct ≥30 at least 45 days after the first-positive swab were considered as showing *good evidence for reinfection* if PCR positivity was associated with *contextual evidence* supporting the status of "reinfection" including appearance of symptoms (often as proxied by being diagnosed at a health facility), if the infection was diagnosed through contact tracing (indicating recent exposure to an infected person), if the change in Ct value from the last swab was to a lower Ct value (indicating increasing viral load), and/or if the repeated swabbing did not follow a regular pattern and time interval between repeated swabs was not short (to exclude cases under clinical management that are indicative of poor control of first infection).

Shorter durations bordering the cutoff of 45 days with Ct values ≥30 and with no contextual evidence supporting the status of "reinfection" were indicative of *some evidence for reinfection*, but not strong nor good evidence for reinfection, as they are more likely to reflect the long tail of the prolonged PCR positivity distribution (Figure 1) [14, 15]. Age ≥70 years, repeated swabs on hospitalized patients, and severe or critical WHO disease classifications were considered as contextual factors indicative of poor infection control of the first infection rather than reinfection.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.08.24.20179457; this version posted September 28, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Cases that had such contextual factors (and implicitly did not fit the criteria of strong, good, or some evidence for reinfection) were considered to have *weak (or no) evidence for reinfection*.

Of note that hospitalized COVID-19 cases often had multiple subsequent swabs administered to them as part of clinical care, and repeated swabbing was standard earlier in the epidemic, as the criteria for discharge from an isolation facility required at least two subsequent PCR negative swabs. This was changed later on to a time-based criteria per updated WHO recommendation [16].

Reinfection risk and rate

Documented reinfection *risk* was assessed by quantifying the proportion of cases with *strong or good evidence for reinfection* out of all laboratory-confirmed SARS-CoV-2 cases. *Incidence rate* of documented reinfection was calculated by dividing the number of cases with strong or good evidence by the number of person-weeks contributed by all laboratory-confirmed cases who had their first-positive swab ≥45 days before day of analysis. The follow-up person-time was calculated starting from 45 days after the first-positive swab and up to the reinfection swab, all-cause death, or end-of-study censoring.

Sensitivity analyses

Since we implemented a conservative approach prone to overestimate risk of documented reinfection, several sensitivity analyses were conducted implementing more *stringent criteria* for assessing reinfection: 1) exclusion of cases where the Ct value for the first and/or subsequent positive swab was unknown or with a value ≥35 (to exclude potential PCR false-positive cases), 2) changing the ≥45-day cutoff to a ≥60-day cutoff to further exclude potential cases of long-term prolonged PCR positivity, and (*most stringent*) 3) setting definition of recent active

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.08.24.20179457; this version posted September 28, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

infection at Ct cutoff value of <25 (instead of <30) and excluding any suspected reinfection case with Ct value >25.

Viral genome sequencing and analysis

Viral genome sequencing was conducted on retrieved paired samples of the first-positive swab and reinfection swab for patients with *strong* or *good evidence for reinfection* as confirmatory analysis. Viral RNA was extracted using Quick-RNA Viral Kit (Zymo Research, Irvine, USA; Cat. No. R1041) and eluted in 30ul of nuclease-free water. RNA quality was assessed with RT-qPCR using SARS-CoV-2 (2019-nCoV) CDC qPCR Probe Assay Research Use Only (RUO) kit (Integrated DNA Technologies, USA; Cat number 10006713) and Luna Universal Probe One-Step RT-qPCR Kit (New England BioLabs, USA; Cat number E3006E) on an Applied Biosystems 7500 Fast Real-Time PCR instrument (Applied Biosystems, CA, USA).

Next-generation sequencing (NGS) library construction was performed using the CleanPlex SARS-CoV-2 Panel (Paragon Genomics, USA; SKU: 918012). Gel-size selection on a 3% agarose gel was further utilized to prevent formation of adapter dimers. NGS libraries were then quantified using KAPA Library Quantification Kit (Roche, USA; KK4824), and normalized, pooled, and sequenced on an Illumina MiSeq instrument using a paired-end 150bp kit (Illumina, USA; MS-102-2002). All procedures were implemented following manufacturers' protocols.

Raw sequences were processed with CUTADAPT (v2.10) [17] to exclude the contaminating adapter sequences. Adapter trimming was performed using the parameters -g CCTACACGACGCTCTTCCGATCT **-a** AGATCGGAAGAGCACACGTCTGAA **-A** AGATCGGAAGAGCGTCGTGTAGG **-G** TTCAGACGTGTGCTCTTCCGATCT **-e** 0.1 **-O** 9 **-m** 50 **-n** 2. Only paired reads with minimum length of 50bp were retained for analysis. The latter filtered reads were aligned to SARS-CoV-2 reference genome (NC_045512) using BWA-

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.08.24.20179457; this version posted September 28, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

MEM [18]. FGBIO (v1.3.0) was subsequently used to remove PCR primer sequences from the resulting BAM file.

Variant calling and genotyping were performed with VarScan multi-sample mpileup [19] with the pileup file generated using SAMTOOLS mpileup (v1.10) [20] with --min-BQ 20 and --min-MQ 20 parameters. The mpileup2snp function of VarScan was then applied with the filtering parameters --min-var-freq 0.2, --min-coverage 5, and --min-avg-qual 20, to generate the final VCF file.

Ethical approval

The study was approved by HMC and Weill Cornell Medicine-Qatar Institutional Review Boards.

RESULTS

Epidemiological analysis

Figure 2 illustrates the selection process of SARS-CoV-2 eligible cases and summarizes the results of their reinfection status' evaluation. Out of 133,266 laboratory-confirmed cases, 117,458 had only one single positive swab and thus were excluded from further analysis. Of the remaining 15,808 cases with multiple swabs, only 243 persons had *at least* one subsequent positive swab that is ≥45 days from the first-positive swab, and thus qualified for inclusion in analysis.

There were 299 positive swabs collected ≥45 days after the first-positive swab for these 243 persons. Individual investigation of each of these swabs yielded 54 cases with *strong* or *good* evidence for reinfection. Of these, 35 had *strong* evidence for reinfection (Ct value <30) while

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.08.24.20179457; this version posted September 28, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

the remaining 19 had *good* evidence for reinfection (Ct value ≥30). An additional 26 cases showed *some* evidence for reinfection, while evidence was *weak* for the remaining 163 cases.

Table 1 shows the characteristics of the 54 cases classified as showing strong or good evidence for reinfection. Almost all cases were males, but this reflects the focus of the epidemic in craft and manual workers [6]. The median age was 33 years (range: 16-57) and the median time between the *first* swab and the *reinfection* swab was 64.5 days (range: 45-129). The median Ct value was 28 (range: 14-37): it was 22 (range 14-29) for the 35 swabs classified with strong evidence (Ct <30) and 32 (range: 30-37) for the remaining swabs (Ct ≥30).

Twenty-three cases (42.6%) were diagnosed at a health facility, suggesting presence of symptoms while 31 (57.4%) were identified incidentally either through random testing campaigns/surveys (n=15; 27.8%) or contact tracing (n=16; 29.6%), suggesting minimal symptoms if any.

Nine cases were hospitalized at any time, all but *one* occurred following the first infection episode and mostly for isolation purposes. Only one case had sufficient symptoms to warrant clinical assessment (during primary infection), but was classified with "mild" severity per WHO classification. No deaths were recorded. Of note that the vast majority of infections in Qatar occurred in young and healthy men and had limited severity [6].

Antibody test results were available for 48 out of the 243 assessed individuals (Table 2), of whom 30 (62.5%) had detectable antibodies. Of the 13 with strong evidence for reinfection *and* available antibody results, seven (53.9%) were sero-negative. Meanwhile, both individuals with good evidence for reinfection, three of the four individuals with some evidence for reinfection, and 19 of the 29 individuals with weak evidence for reinfection, were sero-positive.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.08.24.20179457; this version posted September 28, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Risk of documented reinfection was estimated at 0.04% (95% CI: 0.03-0.05%)—that is a total of 54 reinfections in the cohort of 133,266 laboratory-confirmed SARS-CoV-2 infected persons. Incidence rate of reinfection was estimated at 1.09 (95% CI: 0.84-1.42) per 10,000 person-weeks—that is a total of 54 reinfection events in a follow-up person-time of 495,208.7 person-weeks.

The results of the sensitivity analyses can be found in Appendix Table S1. In these analyses, the estimate for the risk of reinfection ranged between 0.01% (95% CI: 0.01-0.02) and 0.02% (95% CI: 0.02-0.03), while the estimate for the incidence rate of reinfection ranged between 0.38 (95% CI: 0.24-0.60) and 1.06 (95% CI: 0.75-1.50) per 10,000 person-weeks. Although these sensitivity analyses confirmed our results, they suggested that we may have overestimated the already low risk of reinfection.

Confirmation of reinfection through viral genome sequencing

Paired specimens of the first-positive and reinfection swabs could be retrieved for 23 out of the 54 cases with strong or good evidence for reinfection. Table 3 summarizes the viral genome sequencing results and Figure 3 and Appendix Figures S1-S2 show the detailed analysis for each genome pair.

There was insufficient evidence to warrant interpretation for 11 pairs because of low genome quality. For six pairs, there were one to several changes of allele frequency indicative at best of a shifting balance of quasi-species, and thus no evidence for reinfection. For two pairs, remarkably, there was conclusive evidence for *no reinfection* as both genomes were of high quality yet no differences were found. For both patients, the Ct value was <25 for the first-positive and reinfection swabs indicating persistent active infection (Table 1). These two cases were also sero-positive (Table 1).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.08.24.20179457; this version posted September 28, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Meanwhile, for two pairs, there was conclusive evidence for reinfection with multiple changes of allele frequency and presence of the D614G mutation (23403bp A>G)—a variant that appeared and expanded replacing the original D614 form [21, 22]. Also for two pairs, and although one of the genomes was of inferior quality, there was sufficient evidence for differences including the presence of the D614G mutation, thereby rendering evidence for reinfection. Three out of these four cases with viral genome sequencing confirmation of reinfection were classified above (epidemiological criteria) as having strong evidence for reinfection, with the fourth classified as having good evidence (Table 1). Antibody test result was available for one case at time of reinfection, and the individual was sero-negative.

In sum, for the 12 cases where viral genome sequencing evidence was available, four cases were confirmed as reinfections, a confirmation rate of 33.3%. Applying this rate to the above-estimated reinfection metrics yielded risk of documented reinfection of 0.01% (95% CI: 0.01-0.02%) and incidence rate of reinfection of 0.36 (95% CI: 0.28-0.47) per 10,000 person-weeks.

DISCUSSION

Results indicate, employing several analyses and sensitivity analyses, conclusive evidence for presence of reinfections in the SARS-CoV-2 epidemic of Qatar, but the risk for documented reinfection was very rare at about 1-2 reinfections per 10,000 infected persons. This finding is striking as the epidemic in Qatar has been intense with half of the population estimated to have been infected [6]. Considering the strength of the force of infection, estimated at a *daily* probability of infection exceeding 1% at the epidemic peak around May 20 [6], it is all but certain that a significant proportion of the population has been repeatedly exposed to the infection, but such re-exposures hardly led to any documentable reinfections.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.08.24.20179457; this version posted September 28, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Indeed, of all epidemiologically-identified reinfections, nearly two-thirds (57%) were discovered accidentally, either through random testing campaigns/surveys or through contact tracing. None were severe, critical, or fatal, all reinfections were asymptomatic or with minimal or mild symptoms. These findings suggest that most infected persons do develop immunity against reinfection that lasts for at least few months, and that reinfections (if they occur) are well tolerated and no more symptomatic than primary infections. Further follow up of this cohort of infected persons over time may allow elucidation of any potential effects of waning of immunity.

Other lines of evidence for this cohort also support this conclusion. Among 2,559 PCR positive persons where an antibody test outcome was available [6], and where the first-positive PCR test was conducted >3 weeks before the serology test to accommodate for the delay in development of antibodies following onset of infection [14, 15], 91.7% were antibody positive [6]. The high antibody positivity was also stable for over three months [6], as described elsewhere [9]. The epidemic curve in Qatar was further characterized by rapid growth followed by rapid decline [6], at a time when levels of social and physical distancing restrictions were fairly stable. This points to susceptibles-infected-recovered "SIR" epidemic dynamics with most infections eliciting immunity against reinfection.

This assessment has limitations. We assessed risk of only *documented* reinfections, but other reinfections could have occurred but went undocumented, perhaps because of minimal or no symptoms. It is possible that with the primed immune system following the primary infection, reinfections are milder and shorter and thus less likely to be documented [10], though still can be infectious as the Ct value was quite low, indicating high viral load, in some of the reinfections. Viral genome sequencing analysis was possible for only a subset of reinfections. Antibody testing outcomes were available for only a number of cases, limiting use and inferences of the

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.08.24.20179457; this version posted September 28, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

link between antibody status and risk of reinfection. Of note that for one of the genetically-confirmed reinfections the antibody test result was available but was sero-negative, just as the Hong Kong reinfected patient [23].

In conclusion, SARS-CoV-2 reinfection appears to be a rare phenomenon. This suggests that immunity develops after the primary infection and lasts for at least a few months, and that immunity protects against reinfection.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.08.24.20179457; this version posted September 28, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Box 1. Classification of suspected cases of SARS-CoV-2 reinfection based on strength of supporting epidemiological evidence.

Suspected cases of SARS-CoV-2 reinfection: all laboratory-confirmed cases with at least one polymerase chain reaction (PCR) positive swab that is ≥45 days after a first-positive swab.

Strong evidence for reinfection: individuals having positive swabs with PCR cycle threshold (Ct) value <30 at least 45 days after the first-positive swab. No contextual evidence supporting poor control of first infection such as age ≥70 years, repeated swabs on hospitalized patients, and severe or critical World Health Organization disease classifications.

Good evidence for reinfection: individuals having positive swabs with PCR Ct value ≥30 at least 45 days after the first-positive swab, but where PCR positivity was associated with contextual evidence supporting the status of reinfection:

- Appearance of symptoms (often as proxied by being diagnosed at a health facility)
- Infection diagnosis through contact tracing (indicating recent exposure to an infected person)
- Lower Ct value compared to last positive swab (indicating increasing viral load)
- Irregular and spaced-out pattern for repeated swabbing (to exclude cases under clinical management that are indicative of poor control of first infection).

No contextual evidence supporting poor control of first infection such as age ≥70 years, repeated swabs on hospitalized patients, and severe or critical World Health Organization disease classifications.

Some evidence for reinfection: individuals having positive swabs with PCR Ct value ≥30 at least 45 days after the first-positive swab, but typically bordering the cutoff of 45 days. PCR positivity was **not** associated with evidence supporting the status of reinfection (listed above).

Weak evidence for reinfection: individuals having swabs with PCR Ct value ≥30 at least 45 days after the first-positive swab, but typically bordering the cutoff of 45 days. PCR positivity was associated with contextual evidence indicative of poor infection control of the first infection rather than reinfection (such as age ≥70 years, repeated swabs on hospitalized patients, and severe or critical World Health Organization disease classifications).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.08.24.20179457; this version posted September 28, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Figure 1. Distribution of the time difference between the first swab and subsequent swabs among all laboratory-confirmed SARS-CoV-2 cases with more than one positive swab. The cutoff of 45 days was at the 99th percentile, and thus provides an appropriate mark for defining the end of the prolonged polymerase chain reaction (PCR) positivity.



medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.08.24.20179457; this version posted September 28, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Figure 2. Flow chart describing the selection process of SARS-CoV-2 eligible cases and summarizing the results of their reinfection status' evaluation.



Table 1. Characteristics of individuals classified as showing strong or good evidence for reinfection.

	Socio-demographic		PCR testing				Hospitalization			Ab testing
ID#	**Sex**	**Age group***	**Sample type**	**PCR swab date†**	**Positive swab type**	**Average Ct value**	**Case severity‡**	**Hospital admission§**	**LOS (days)**	**Ab status¶**
Strong evidence for reinfection										
1	Male	50-54	Survey	Day 0	First pos swab	Unk	Not assessed††	Not hospitalized	0	Unk
	Male	50-54	Survey**	Day 75	Reinf swab	14	Not assessed††	Not hospitalized	0	Negative
2	Male	30-34	Health facility	Day 0	First pos swab	36	Not assessed††	Not hospitalized	0	Unk
	Male	30-34	Health facility	Day 55	Reinf swab	16	Not assessed††	Not hospitalized	0	Unk
3	Male	30-34	Contact tracing	Day 0	First pos swab	Unk	Not assessed††	1 day in April	1	Unk
	Male	30-34	Survey**	Day 85	Reinf swab	17	Not assessed††	Not hospitalized	0	Negative
4	Male	25-29	Health facility	Day 0	First pos swab	33	Not assessed††	Not hospitalized	0	Unk
	Male	25-29	Health facility	Day 76	Reinf swab	17	Not assessed††	Not hospitalized	0	Unk
5	Male	35-39	Contact tracing	Day 0	First pos swab	Unk	Not assessed††	Not hospitalized	0	Unk
	Male	35-39	Health facility	Day 20	Subs pos swab	24	Not assessed††	Not hospitalized	0	Unk
	Male	35-39	Health facility	Day 129	Reinf swab	17	Not assessed††	Not hospitalized	0	Unk
6	Female	50-54	Contact tracing	Day 0	First pos swab	34	Not assessed††	Not hospitalized	0	Unk
	Female	50-54	Health facility	Day 53	Reinf swab	17	Not assessed††	Not hospitalized	0	Negative
7	Female	20-24	Health facility	Day 0	First pos swab	35	Not assessed††	Not hospitalized	0	Unk
	Female	20-24	Health facility	Day 84	Reinf swab	17	Not assessed††	Not hospitalized	0	Unk
8	Male	30-34	Health facility	Day 0	First pos swab	36	Not assessed††	Not hospitalized	0	Unk
	Male	30-34	Contact tracing	Day 60	Reinf swab	18	Not assessed††	Not hospitalized	0	Unk
9	Male	20-24	Contact tracing	Day 0	First pos swab	Unk	Not assessed††	Not hospitalized	0	Unk
	Male	20-24	Health facility	Day 97	Reinf swab	18	Not assessed††	Not hospitalized	0	Unk
10	Female	20-24	Health facility	Day 0	First pos swab	Unk	Not assessed††	Not hospitalized	0	Unk
	Female	20-24	Contact tracing	Day 91	Reinf swab	19	Not assessed††	Not hospitalized	0	Unk
11	Male	35-39	Contact tracing	Day 0	First pos swab	Unk	Not assessed††	Not hospitalized	0	Unk
	Male	35-39	Contact tracing	Day 86	Reinf swab	19	Not assessed††	Not hospitalized	0	Positive
12	Female	45-49	Health facility	Day 0	First pos swab	30	Not assessed††	Not hospitalized	0	Unk
	Female	45-49	Health facility	Day 74	Reinf swab	20	Not assessed††	Not hospitalized	0	Negative
13	Male	30-34	Contact tracing	Day 0	First pos swab	Unk	Not assessed††	1 day in April	1	Unk
	Male	30-34	Survey**	Day 57	Reinf swab	20	Not assessed††	Not hospitalized	0	Unk
14	Female	40-44	Contact tracing	Day 0	First pos swab	24	Not assessed††	Not hospitalized	0	Unk
	Female	40-44	Health facility	Day 103	Reinf swab	21	Not assessed††	Not hospitalized	0	Positive
15	Male	50-54	Contact tracing	Day 0	First pos swab	34	Not assessed††	Not hospitalized	0	Unk
	Male	50-54	Contact tracing	Day 57	Reinf swab	21	Not assessed††	Not hospitalized	0	Negative
16	Male	25-29	Health facility	Day 0	First pos swab	Unk	Not assessed††	5 days in March§	5	Unk
	Male	25-29	Contact tracing	Day 73	Reinf swab	21	Not assessed††	Not hospitalized	0	Unk
17	Male	20-24	Health facility	Day 0	First pos swab	32	Not assessed††	Not hospitalized	0	Unk
	Male	20-24	Health facility	Day 89	Reinf swab	22	Not assessed††	1 day in August	1	Unk
18	Female	20-24	Health facility	Day 0	First pos swab	33	Not assessed††	Not hospitalized	0	Unk
	Female	20-24	Health facility	Day 76	Reinf swab	22	Not assessed††	Not hospitalized	0	Negative

19	Male	40-44	Health facility	Day 0	First pos swab	23	Not assessed††	Not hospitalized	0	Unk
	Male	40-44	Health facility	Day 65	Reinf swab	23	Not assessed††	Not hospitalized	0	Positive
20	Female	45-49	Health facility	Day 0	First pos swab	36	Not assessed††	Not hospitalized	0	Unk
	Female	45-49	Health facility	Day 88	Reinf swab	25	Not assessed††	Not hospitalized	0	Negative
21	Male	30-34	Survey**	Day 0	First pos swab	32	Not assessed††	Not hospitalized	0	Unk
	Male	30-34	Survey**	Day 76	Reinf swab	25	Not assessed††	Not hospitalized	0	Positive
22	Male	20-24	Health facility	Day 0	First pos swab	28	Not assessed††	Not hospitalized	0	Unk
	Male	20-24	Health facility	Day 66	Reinf swab	26	Not assessed††	Not hospitalized	0	Unk
23	Male	20-24	Health facility	Day 0	First pos swab	31	Not assessed††	Not hospitalized	0	Unk
	Male	20-24	Contact tracing	Day 56	Reinf swab	27	Not assessed††	Not hospitalized	0	Unk
24	Male	35-39	Health facility	Day 0	First pos swab	29	Not assessed††	Not hospitalized	0	Unk
	Male	35-39	Health facility	Day 56	Reinf swab	27	Not assessed††	Not hospitalized	0	Unk
25	Male	40-44	Health facility	Day 0	First pos swab	21	Not assessed††	Not hospitalized	0	Unk
	Male	40-44	Contact tracing	Day 63	Reinf swab	28	Not assessed††	Not hospitalized	0	Unk
26	Male	40-44	Survey**	Day 0	First pos swab	17	Not assessed††	Not hospitalized	0	Unk
	Male	40-44	Health facility	Day 14	Subs pos swab	32	Not assessed††	Not hospitalized	0	Unk
	Male	40-44	Health facility	Day 22	Subs pos swab	28	Not assessed††	Not hospitalized	0	Unk
	Male	40-44	Survey**	Day 51	Reinf swab	28	Not assessed††	Not hospitalized	0	Unk
27	Male	25-29	Health facility	Day 0	First pos swab	36	Not assessed††	Not hospitalized	0	Unk
	Male	25-29	Health facility	Day 46	Reinf swab	28	Not assessed††	Not hospitalized	0	Unk
28	Male	40-44	Health facility	Day 0	First pos swab	Unk	Not assessed††	Not hospitalized	0	Unk
	Male	40-44	Contact tracing	Day 89	Reinf swab	28	Not assessed††	Not hospitalized	0	Positive
29	Male	30-34	Survey**	Day 0	First pos swab	21	Not assessed††	Not hospitalized	0	Unk
	Male	30-34	Survey**	Day 49	Reinf swab	28	Not assessed††	Not hospitalized	0	Unk
30	Male	15-19	Health facility	Day 0	First pos swab	20	Not assessed††	Not hospitalized	0	Unk
	Male	15-19	Health facility	Day 64	Reinf swab	28	Not assessed††	Not hospitalized	0	Unk
31	Male	35-39	Health facility	Day 0	First pos swab	32	Not assessed††	Not hospitalized	0	Unk
	Male	35-39	Survey**	Day 58	Reinf swab	29	Not assessed††	Not hospitalized	0	Unk
32	Male	35-39	Survey**	Day 0	First pos swab	17	Not assessed††	Not hospitalized	0	Unk
	Male	35-39	Survey**	Day 49	Reinf swab	29	Not assessed††	Not hospitalized	0	Unk
33	Male	40-44	Health facility	Day 0	First pos swab	17	Not assessed††	Not hospitalized	0	Unk
	Male	40-44	Health facility	Day 71	Reinf swab	29	Not assessed††	Not hospitalized	0	Unk
34	Male	40-44	Health facility	Day 0	First pos swab	33	Not assessed††	1 day in May	1	Unk
	Male	40-44	Contact tracing	Day 78	Reinf swab	29	Not assessed††	Not hospitalized	0	Unk
35	Male	35-39	Health facility	Day 0	First pos swab	25	Not assessed††	2 days in May-June	2	Unk
	Male	35-39	Health facility	Day 64	Reinf swab	29	Not assessed††	Not hospitalized	0	Positive
Good evidence for reinfection										
36	Male	30-34	Health facility	Day 0	First pos swab	22	Not assessed††	Not hospitalized	0	Unk
	Male	30-34	Contact tracing	Day 57	Reinf swab	30	Not assessed††	Not hospitalized	0	Unk
37	Male	40-44	Health facility	Day 0	First pos swab	35	Not assessed††	Not hospitalized	0	Unk
	Male	40-44	Health facility	Day 68	Reinf swab	30	Not assessed††	Not hospitalized	0	Unk
38	Male	25-29	Health facility	Day 0	First pos swab	35	Not assessed††	Not hospitalized	0	Unk

	Male	25-29	Contact tracing	Day 63	Reinf swab	30	Not assessed[††]	Not hospitalized	0	Unk
39	Male	20-24	Survey[**]	Day 0	First pos swab	Unk	Not assessed[††]	Not hospitalized	0	Unk
	Male	20-24	Survey[**]	Day 4	Subs pos swab	Unk	Not assessed[††]	Not hospitalized	0	Unk
	Male	20-24	Survey[**]	Day 14	Subs pos swab	36	Not assessed[††]	Not hospitalized	0	Unk
	Male	20-24	Survey[**]	Day 55	Reinf swab	30	Not assessed[††]	Not hospitalized	0	Unk
40	Male	55-59	Health facility	Day 0	First pos swab	Unk	Mild	7 days in March[§]	7	Unk
	Male	55-59	Health facility	Day 85	Reinf swab	31	Not assessed[††]	Not hospitalized	0	Positive
41	Male	30-34	Survey[**]	Day 0	First pos swab	26	Not assessed[††]	Not hospitalized	0	Unk
	Male	30-34	Health facility	Day 14	Subs pos swab	36	Not assessed[††]	Not hospitalized	0	Unk
	Male	30-34	Survey[**]	Day 50	Reinf swab	31	Not assessed[††]	Not hospitalized	0	Unk
42	Male	15-19	Health facility	Day 0	First pos swab	33	Not assessed[††]	Not hospitalized	0	Unk
	Male	15-19	Health facility	Day 46	Reinf swab	32	Not assessed[††]	Not hospitalized	0	Unk
43	Male	15-19	Health facility	Day 0	First pos swab	Unk	Not assessed[††]	8 days in March[§]	8	Unk
	Male	15-19	Contact tracing	Day 78	Reinf swab	32	Not assessed[††]	Not hospitalized	0	Unk
44	Male	25-29	Survey[**]	Day 0	First pos swab	30	Not assessed[††]	Not hospitalized	0	Unk
	Male	25-29	Survey[**]	Day 20	Subs pos swab	34	Not assessed[††]	Not hospitalized	0	Unk
	Male	25-29	Survey[**]	Day 55	Reinf swab	32	Not assessed[††]	Not hospitalized	0	Unk
45	Male	25-29	Contact tracing	Day 0	First pos swab	29	Not assessed[††]	Not hospitalized	0	Unk
	Male	25-29	Contact tracing	Day 58	Reinf swab	33	Not assessed[††]	Not hospitalized	0	Unk
46	Male	20-24	Health facility	Day 0	First pos swab	20	Not assessed[††]	Not hospitalized	0	Unk
	Male	20-24	Contact tracing	Day 58	Reinf swab	34	Not assessed[††]	Not hospitalized	0	Unk
47	Male	20-24	Survey[**]	Day 0	First pos swab	36	Not assessed[††]	Not hospitalized	0	Unk
	Male	20-24	Survey[**]	Day 52	Reinf swab	34	Not assessed[††]	Not hospitalized	0	Unk
48	Male	35-39	Health facility	Day 0	First pos swab	20	Not assessed[††]	Not hospitalized	0	Unk
	Male	35-39	Health facility	Day 69	Reinf swab	35	Not assessed[††]	Not hospitalized	0	Unk
49	Male	40-44	Survey[**]	Day 0	First pos swab	Unk	Not assessed[††]	Not hospitalized	0	Unk
	Male	40-44	Health facility	Day 59	Reinf swab	35	Not assessed[††]	Not hospitalized	0	Unk
50	Male	50-54	Contact tracing	Day 0	First pos swab	Unk	Not assessed[††]	Not hospitalized	0	Unk
	Male	50-54	Contact tracing	Day 52	Reinf swab	35	Not assessed[††]	Not hospitalized	0	Unk
51	Male	45-49	Health facility	Day 0	First pos swab	37	Not assessed[††]	Not hospitalized	0	Unk
	Male	45-49	Survey[**]	Day 59	Reinf swab	36	Not assessed[††]	Not hospitalized	0	Positive
52	Male	30-34	Contact tracing	Day 0	First pos swab	Unk	Not assessed[††]	Not hospitalized	0	Unk
	Male	30-34	Survey[**]	Day 78	Reinf swab	37	Not assessed[††]	Not hospitalized	0	Unk
53	Male	30-34	Contact tracing	Day 0	First pos swab	36	Not assessed[††]	Not hospitalized	0	Unk
	Male	30-34	Contact tracing	Day 45	Reinf swab	Unk	Not assessed[††]	Not hospitalized	0	Unk
54	Male	20-24	Health facility	Day 0	First pos swab	27	Not assessed[††]	17 days in April[§]	17	Unk
	Male	20-24	Health facility	Day 15	Subs pos swab	36	Not assessed[††]	Inpatient	--	Unk
	Male	20-24	Survey[**]	Day 74	Reinf swab	Unk	Not assessed[††]	Not hospitalized	0	Unk

Ab, antibody; LOS, length of stay; Reinf, reinfection; PCR, polymerase chain reaction; Pos, positive; Subs, subsequent; Unk, unknown.
[*]Age was included as a range for anonymity.
[†]Precise swab dates not included for anonymity.
[‡]Severity classification per WHO guidelines was conducted only on a subset of all cases where it was deemed relevant. Asymptomatic cases or cases with minimal symptoms were not formally assessed for severity.

[§]It has been common to use hospitalization as a form of isolation especially early in the epidemic.
[¶]Precise antibody test dates not included for anonymity.
[**]The category "survey" refers to surveillance testing campaigns conducted in workplaces and residential areas.
[††]Not assessed because of no or minimal symptoms to warrant clinical assessment.
The light blue color highlights reinfection cases that were confirmed by viral genome sequencing.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.08.24.20179457; this version posted September 28, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Table 2. Distribution of cases according to reinfection and antibody statuses (for individuals with complete information for these statuses).

Reinfection status	**Seronegative**	**Seropositive**	**Total**
	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)
Strong evidence for reinfection	7 (53.9)	6 (46.2)	13 (100.0)
Good evidence for reinfection	0 (0.0)	2 (100.0)	2 (100.0)
Some evidence for reinfection	1 (25.0)	3 (75.0)	4 (100.0)
Weak evidence for reinfection	10 (34.5)	19 (65.5)	29 (100.0)
Total N (%)	18 (37.5)	30 (62.5)	48 (100.0)

Table 3. Results of reinfection confirmatory analysis based on viral genome sequencing of the paired viral specimens of the first-positive and reinfection swabs for 23 patients with strong or good epidemiological evidence for reinfection.

Viral genome sequencing evidence for reinfection	Indication upon comparing each genome pair	N
Insufficient evidence to warrant interpretation	One or two genomes of low quality	11
No evidence for reinfection	One change of allele frequency	3
Shifting balance of quasi-species with no evidence for reinfection	Several changes of allele frequency	3
Conclusive evidence for no reinfection	Both genomes of high quality yet no differences found	2
Supporting evidence for reinfection	One genome of inferior quality but with D614G mutation	2
Conclusive evidence for reinfection	Multiple changes of allele frequency and D614G mutation	2
Total		**23**

Figure 3. Viral genome sequencing analysis of the paired viral specimens of the first-positive and reinfection swabs for the six patients with conclusive or supporting evidence for reinfection or no reinfection.

Patient ID		Patient 14		Patient 19		Patient 27		Patient 33		Patient 20		Patient 44	
Positive swab type		First positive swab	Reinfection swab	First positive swab	Reinfection swab	First positive swab	Reinfection swab	First positive swab	Reinfection swab	First positive swab	Reinfection swab	First positive swab	Reinfection swab
Swab date		Day 0	Day 103	Day 0	Day 65	Day 0	Day 46	Day 0	Day 71	Day 0	Day 88	Day 0	Day 55
241	C	T	T	T	T	C	T	C	T	N	T	T	N
373	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	N	G	G	N
1302	C	T	T	T	T	C	T	C	T	N	T	T	N
2644	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	N	C	N	N
2788	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	N	C	C	C
2878	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	N	C	C	N
3037	C	T	T	T	T	C	T	C	T	N	T	T	N
3373	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	N	C	C	N
3695	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	N	C	C	N
6181	T	T	T	T	T	T	T	T	T	N	T	T	N
6817	A	A	A	A	A	A	19\7	A	A	N	A	A	A
7733	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	N	A	A	A
9841	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	N	G	G	N
10595	T	T	T	T	T	T	T	T	T	N	T	T	N
12695	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	N	C	C	N
14408	C	T	T	T	T	C	T	C	T	N	T	T	N
14805	C	C	C	C	C	T	C	T	C	Evid of T	C	C	C
15315	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	N	C	C	N
15486	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	N	A	A	N
15672	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	N	G	G	N
16537	G	G	G	G	G	A	G	A	G	Evid of A	G	G	N
16989	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	T	N	C	C	N
17193	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	N	G	G	N
17550	C	N	C	N	N	N	C	N	C	N	N	N	N
17907	T	T	T	T	T	T	T	T	T	N	T	T	N
20870	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	N	G	G	N
21712	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	N	A	A	N
21737	T	T	T	T	T	T	T	T	T	N	T	T	N
21846	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	N	C	C	N
22015	T	T	T	T	T	T	T	T	T	N	T	T	N
23403	A	N	G	G	G	A	G	A	G	1 read A	G	G	A
24675	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	N	A	A	N
24926	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	N	G	G	N
25207	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	N	C	C	N
25460	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	N	C	C	C
25552	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	N	G	G	N
25563	G	T	T	T	T	G	T	G	T	N	T	T	N
25704	T	T	T	T	T	T	T	T	T	N	T	T	N
26144	G	G	G	G	G	T	G	T	G	N	G	G	N
26801	C	N	N	N	N	N	C	N	C	N	N	C	C
26963	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	N	A	A	A
27341	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A
27476	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	N	C	C	N
27769	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	N	C	41\45	N
28054	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	N	N	18\28	N
28087	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	N	C	C	C
29144	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	N	C	C	N
29370	C	T	T	C	C	C	C	C	C	N	T	C	N
29554	G	G	G	T	T	G	G	G	T	N	G	G	N
29642	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	N	C	C	N
Description		Both genomes of high quality yet no difference found		Both genomes of high quality yet no difference found		Multiple changes of allele frequency and D614G mutation		Multiple changes of allele frequency and D614G mutation		One of the genomes of inferior quality, but with differences including the D614G mutation		One of the genomes of inferior quality, but with differences including the D614G mutation	
Interpretation		Conclusive evidence for no reinfection		Conclusive evidence for no reinfection		Conclusive evidence for reinfection		Conclusive evidence for reinfection		Supporting evidence for reinfection		Supporting evidence for reinfection	

Letter N denotes unknown.
Numbers in cells represent the balance of reads for the reference and alternate alleles in that order.
Manual calls are represented by white cells with the nucleotide call.
Yellow-color-highligted positions are likely homoplasic.
Green-color-highlighted positions denote a D614G mutation.
Light blue color highlights reinfection cases that were confirmed by viral genome sequencing.
Light grey color highlights no reinfection cases that were confirmed by viral genome sequencing.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.08.24.20179457; this version posted September 28, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

References

1. World Health Organization (WHO), *WHO Director-General's opening remarks at the media briefing on COVID-19 - 11 March 2020. Available from: https://www.who.int/dg/speeches/detail/who-director-general-s-opening-remarks-at-the-media-briefing-on-covid-19---11-march-2020. Accessed on March 14, 2020.* 2020.
2. De Walque D., et al., *How two tests can help contain COVID-19 and revive the economy. Available from: http://documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/766471586360658318/pdf/How-Two-Tests-Can-Help-Contain-COVID-19-and-Revive-the-Economy.pdf. Accessed on April 16, 2020.* Research & Policy Briefs, World Bank Malaysia Hub., 2020.
3. Kaplan J., Frias L., and McFall-Johnsen M., *A third of the global population is on coronavirus lockdown. Available from: https://www.businessinsider.com.au/countries-on-lockdown-coronavirus-italy-2020-3 Accessd on: April 25, 2020.* Business Insider Australia, 2020.
4. Planning and Statistics Authority- State of Qatar, *Qatar Monthly Statistics. Available from: https://www.psa.gov.qa/en/pages/default.aspx. Accessed on: may 26,2020.* 2020.
5. Planning and Statistics Authority-State of Qatar, *The Simplified Census of Population, Housing & Establishments. Available from: https://www.psa.gov.qa/en/statistics/Statistical%20Releases/Population/Population/2018/Population_social_1_2018_AE.pdf Accessed on: April 2, 2020.* 2019.
6. Abu-Raddad, L.J., et al., *Characterizing the Qatar advanced-phase SARS-CoV-2 epidemic.* medRxiv, 2020: p. 2020.07.16.20155317v2.
7. Al Kuwari, H.M., et al., *Characterization of the SARS-CoV-2 outbreak in the State of Qatar, February 28-April 18, 2020.* BMJ open (accepted for publication), 2020.
8. Seow, J., et al., *Longitudinal evaluation and decline of antibody responses in SARS-CoV-2 infection.* medRxiv, 2020: p. 2020.07.09.20148429.
9. Wajnberg, A., et al., *SARS-CoV-2 infection induces robust, neutralizing antibody responses that are stable for at least three months.* medRxiv, 2020: p. 2020.07.14.20151126.
10. Kellam, P. and W. Barclay, *The dynamics of humoral immune responses following SARS-CoV-2 infection and the potential for reinfection.* J Gen Virol, 2020.
11. Makhoul, M., et al., *Epidemiological impact of SARS-CoV-2 vaccination: mathematical modeling analyses.* medRxiv, 2020: p. 2020.04.19.20070805.
12. World Health Organization, *Clinical management of COVID-19. Available from: https://www.who.int/publications-detail/clinical-management-of-covid-19. Accessed on: May 31st 2020.* 2020.
13. Kalikiri, M.K.R., et al., *High-throughput extraction of SARS-CoV-2 RNA from nasopharyngeal swabs using solid-phase reverse immobilization beads.* medRxiv, 2020: p. 2020.04.08.20055731.
14. Sethuraman, N., S.S. Jeremiah, and A. Ryo, *Interpreting Diagnostic Tests for SARS-CoV-2.* JAMA, 2020.
15. Wajnberg, A., et al., *Humoral immune response and prolonged PCR positivity in a cohort of 1343 SARS-CoV 2 patients in the New York City region.* medRxiv, 2020: p. 2020.04.30.20085613.
16. World Health Organization, *Criteria for releasing COVID-19 patients from isolation. Available from: https://www.who.int/news-room/commentaries/detail/criteria-for-releasing-covid-19-patients-from-isolation. Accessed on July 01, 2020.* 2020.
17. Martin M., *Cutadapt removes adapter sequences from high-throughput sequencing reads. ISSN 2226-6089. Available at: <http://journal.embnet.org/index.php/embnetjournal/article/view/200>. Date accessed: 17 sep. 2020. doi:https://doi.org/10.14806/ej.17.1.200.* EMBnet.journal, 2011. **17**(1): p. 10-12.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.08.24.20179457; this version posted September 28, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

18. Li, H. and R. Durbin, *Fast and accurate short read alignment with Burrows-Wheeler transform.* Bioinformatics, 2009. **25**(14): p. 1754-60.
19. Koboldt, D.C., et al., *VarScan: variant detection in massively parallel sequencing of individual and pooled samples.* Bioinformatics, 2009. **25**(17): p. 2283-5.
20. Li, H., et al., *The Sequence Alignment/Map format and SAMtools.* Bioinformatics, 2009. **25**(16): p. 2078-9.
21. Korber, B., et al., *Tracking Changes in SARS-CoV-2 Spike: Evidence that D614G Increases Infectivity of the COVID-19 Virus.* Cell, 2020. **182**(4): p. 812-827 e19.
22. Grubaugh, N.D., W.P. Hanage, and A.L. Rasmussen, *Making Sense of Mutation: What D614G Means for the COVID-19 Pandemic Remains Unclear.* Cell, 2020. **182**(4): p. 794-795.
23. To, K.K., et al., *COVID-19 re-infection by a phylogenetically distinct SARS-coronavirus-2 strain confirmed by whole genome sequencing.* Clin Infect Dis, 2020.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.08.24.20179457; this version posted September 28, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank Her Excellency Dr. Hanan Al Kuwari, the Minister of Public Health, for her vision, guidance, leadership, and support. We also would like to thank Dr. Saad Al Kaabi, Chair of the System Wide Incident Command and Control (SWICC) Committee for the COVID-19 national healthcare response, for his leadership, analytical insights, and for his instrumental role in enacting the data information systems that made these studies possible. We further extend our appreciation to the SWICC Committee and the Scientific Reference and Research Taskforce (SRRT) members for their informative input, scientific technical advice, and enriching discussions. We would also like to thank Dr. Mariam Abdulmalik, the CEO of the Primary Health Care Corporation and the Chairperson of the Tactical Community Command Group on COVID-19, as well as members of this committee, for providing support to the teams that worked on the field surveillance. We also would like to acknowledge the dedicated efforts of the Clinical Coding Team and the COVID-19 Mortality Review Team, both at Hamad Medical Corporation, and the Surveillance Team at the Ministry of Public Health.

Funding

The authors are grateful for support provided by the Ministry of Public Health, Hamad Medical Corporation, and the Biomedical Research Program, the Biostatistics, Epidemiology, and Biomathematics Research Core, and the Genomics Core at Weill Cornell Medicine-Qatar. The statements made herein are solely the responsibility of the authors.

Author contributions

LJA conceived and co-designed the study and led the statistical analyses. HC co-designed the study, performed the data analyses, and wrote the first draft of the article. JAM led the viral

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.08.24.20179457; this version posted September 28, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

genome sequencing analyses and AAA, YAM, and SY conducted these analyses. All authors contributed to data collection and acquisition, database development, discussion and interpretation of the results, and to the writing of the manuscript. All authors have read and approved the final manuscript.

Competing interests

We declare no competing interests.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.08.24.20179457; this version posted September 28, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Appendix

Assessment of the risk of SARS-CoV-2 reinfection in an intense re-exposure setting

Table S1. Sensitivity analyses assessing the robustness of our estimates for the risk of reinfection and the incidence rate of reinfection to more stringent criteria for determining reinfection.

Analysis type	**Risk of reinfection**	**Incidence rate of reinfection**
	Estimate (95% CI) in %	Estimate (95% CI) per 10,000 person-weeks
Sensitivity analysis		
Excluding all cases where PCR cycle threshold (Ct) value for the first and/or subsequent positive swab was unknown or with a value ≥35 (to exclude potential PCR false-positive cases)	0.02 (95% CI: 0.01-0.03)	0.52 (95% CI: 0.36-0.77)
Changing the ≥45-day cutoff to a ≥60-day cutoff to further exclude potential cases of long-term prolonged PCR positivity	0.02 (95% CI: 0.02-0.03)	1.06 (95% CI: 0.75-1.50)
Excluding any suspected reinfection with Ct value >25	0.01 (95% CI: 0.01-0.02)	0.38 (95% CI: 0.24-0.60)
Main analysis	0.04 (95% CI: 0.03-0.05)	1.09 (95% CI: 0.84-1.42)

CI, confidence interval; PCR, polymerase chain reaction.

Figure S1. Genetic sequencing analysis of the paired viral specimens of the first-positive and reinfection swabs for the six patients with no genetic evidence for reinfection.

Patient ID		Patient 21		Patient 26		Patient 36		Patient 25		Patient 29		Patient 32	
Positive swab type		First positive swab	Reinfection swab	First positive swab	Reinfection swab	First positive swab	Reinfection swab	First positive swab	Reinfection swab	First positive swab	Reinfection swab	First positive swab	Reinfection swab
Swab date		Day 0	Day 76	Day 0	Day 51	Day 0	Day 57	Day 0	Day 63	Day 0	Day 49	Day 0	Day 49
241	C	T	T	T	N	T	N	C	C	T	T	T	T
373	G	G	G	G	G	G	N	A	A	G	G	G	G
1302	C	C	C	T	T	C	N	C	C	T	T	T	T
2644	C	C	C	C	N	C	N	C	C	C	C	C	N
2788	C	T	T	C	N	C	N	C	C	C	C	C	C
2878	C	C	C	C	N	C	N	C	C	T	T	C	N
3037	C	T	T	T	N	T	N	C	C	T	T	T	3\8
3373	C	A	N	C	C	C	N	C	C	C	C	C	C
3695	C	C	C	38\42	N	C	N	C	C	C	C	C	C
6181	T	T	T	T	T	T	N	C	C	T	T	T	T
6817	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A
7733	A	A	N	A	N	A	A	G	15\26	A	A	A	N
9841	G	G	G	G	G	G	N	G	G	G	27\7	G	G
10595	T	T	T	T	T	T	N	T	T	T	T	T	19\7
12695	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C
14408	C	T	T	T	T	T	N	C	C	T	T	T	N
14805	C	C	C	C	C	C	N	T	T	C	C	C	N
15315	C	C	C	C	C	C	N	C	30\10	C	C	C	N
15486	A	A	A	A	A	A	N	A	A	342\384	37\46	A	A
15672	G	G	G	G	G	G	N	G	G	T	10\23	G	G
16537	G	G	G	G	G	G	N	A	A	G	G	G	G
16989	C	C	C	C	C	C	N	C	C	C	C	C	C
17193	G	43\14	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G
17550	C	C	C	C	N	N	N	N	C	C	C	C	60\16
17907	T	T	T	T	T	T	N	C	C	T	T	T	T
20870	G	G	G	G	G	G	N	G	43\16	G	G	G	N
21712	A	A	A	A	A	A	N	A	A	A	A	A	A
21737	T	T	T	T	T	T	T	T	38\31	T	T	T	T
21846	C	C	C	C	C	C	N	C	C	C	C	C	C
22015	T	T	T	T	T	T	N	T	T	T	T	T	T
23403	A	G	G	G	G	G	N	N	A	G	G	G	G
24675	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A
24926	G	G	G	G	N	G	N	G	G	G	G	150\105	G
25207	C	C	C	C	C	C	N	C	C	C	C	C	C
25460	C	C	N	C	N	C	N	C	C	C	C	C	C
25552	G	G	G	G	G	G	N	G	46\12	G	G	G	G
25563	G	G	G	T	T	G	N	G	G	T	T	T	T
25704	T	T	T	T	N	T	N	T	T	T	29\10	T	T
26144	G	G	G	G	G	G	N	T	T	G	G	G	G
26801	C	C	C	C	C	N	N	N	C	C	C	C	C
26963	A	A	A	A	A	A	N	A	A	A	A	A	30\8
27341	A	A	A	A	A	342\486	A	A	A	A	A	A	A
27476	C	C	C	C	N	C	N	C	C	C	C	225\151	12\17
27769	C	C	C	C	C	C	N	C	C	C	C	C	C
28054	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C
28087	C	C	C	C	C	C	N	T	T	C	C	C	C
29144	C	C	C	C	C	C	N	C	C	C	C	C	C
29370	C	C	C	C	C	C	N	C	C	C	C	C	C
29554	G	G	G	G	G	G	N	G	G	G	G	G	G
29642	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C
Description		One change of allele frequency		One change of allele frequency		One change of allele frequency		Several changes of allele frequency		Several changes of allele frequency		Several changes of allele frequency	
Interpretation		No evidence for reinfection		No evidence for reinfection		No evidence for reinfection		Shifting balance of quasi species with no evidence for reinfection		Shifting balance of quasi species with no evidence for reinfection		Shifting balance of quasi species with no evidence for reinfection	

Letter N denotes unknown.
Numbers in cells represent the balance of reads for the reference and alternate alleles in that order.
Manual calls are represented by white cells with the nucleotide call.
Yellow-color-highligted positions are likely homoplasic.
Green-color-highlighted positions denote a D614G mutation.

Figure S2. Genetic sequencing analysis of the paired viral specimens of the first-positive and reinfection swabs for the cases with insufficient genetic evidence to confirm reinfection.

A) Six of 11 patients

Patient ID		Patient 2		Patient 15		Patient 17		Patient 22		Patient 23		Patient 30	
Positive swab type		First positive swab	Reinfection swab	First positive swab	Reinfection swab	First positive swab	Reinfection swab	First positive swab	Reinfection swab	First positive swab	Reinfection swab	First positive swab	Reinfection swab
Swab date		Day 0	Day 55	Day 0	Day 57	Day 0	Day 89	Day 0	Day 66	Day 0	Day 56	Day 0	Day 64
241	C	N	T	N	T	N	T	N	T	N	T	T	N
373	G	N	G	N	G	N	G	N	G	N	G	G	N
1302	C	N	T	N	T	N	T	N	T	N	T	T	N
2644	C	N	C	N	C	N	C	N	C	N	C	C	N
2788	C	N	C	N	C	N	C	N	C	N	C	C	N
2878	C	N	C	N	C	N	C	N	C	N	C	C	N
3037	C	N	T	N	T	N	T	N	T	N	T	T	N
3373	C	N	C	N	C	N	C	N	C	N	C	C	N
3695	C	N	C	N	C	N	C	N	C	N	C	C	N
6181	T	N	T	N	T	N	T	N	T	N	T	T	T
6817	A	N	A	A	A	N	A	N	A	N	A	A	N
7733	A	N	A	N	A	N	A	A	A	N	A	A	N
9841	G	N	G	N	G	N	G	N	G	N	G	G	N
10595	T	N	T	N	T	N	T	N	T	N	T	T	N
12695	C	N	C	N	C	N	C	N	C	N	C	C	C
14408	C	N	T	N	T	N	T	N	T	N	T	T	N
14805	C	N	C	N	C	N	T	N	C	N	C	C	N
15315	C	N	C	N	C	N	C	N	C	N	C	C	N
15486	A	N	A	N	A	N	A	N	A	N	A	A	N
15672	G	N	G	N	G	N	G	N	G	N	G	G	N
16537	G	N	G	N	G	N	G	N	G	N	G	G	G
16989	C	N	C	N	C	N	C	N	C	N	C	C	N
17193	G	N	G	G	G	N	G	N	G	N	G	T	G
17550	C	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	C	C
17907	T	N	T	N	T	N	T	N	T	N	T	T	N
20870	G	N	G	N	G	N	G	N	G	N	G	G	N
21712	A	N	A	N	A	N	A	N	A	N	A	A	N
21737	T	N	T	N	T	N	T	N	T	N	T	T	N
21846	C	N	C	N	C	N	C	N	206\531	N	C	C	C
22015	T	N	T	N	T	N	T	N	T	N	T	T	N
23403	A	N	G	N	G	N	N	N	G	N	G	G	N
24675	A	N	A	N	A	N	A	N	320\101	N	A	A	N
24926	G	N	G	N	G	N	G	N	G	N	G	G	N
25207	C	N	T	N	C	N	C	N	C	N	T	C	N
25460	C	N	C	N	C	N	C	N	C	N	C	C	N
25552	G	N	G	N	G	N	G	N	G	N	G	G	N
25563	G	N	T	N	T	N	T	N	T	N	T	T	N
25704	T	N	T	N	T	N	T	N	T	N	T	T	T
26144	G	N	G	N	G	N	G	N	G	N	G	G	N
26801	C	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	C	N
26963	A	N	A	N	A	N	A	N	A	N	A	A	N
27341	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	N	A	N	A	A	N
27476	C	N	C	N	C	N	C	N	C	N	C	C	C
27769	C	N	C	N	C	N	C	N	C	N	C	C	C
28054	C	N	C	C	C	N	C	N	C	N	C	C	C
28087	C	N	C	N	C	N	C	N	C	N	C	C	N
29144	C	N	T	N	C	N	C	N	C	N	T	C	N
29370	C	N	C	N	C	N	C	N	T	N	C	C	C
29554	G	N	G	N	G	N	G	N	G	N	G	G	G
29642	C	N	C	N	T	N	T	N	C	N	C	C	N
Description		One genome of low quality		One genome of low quality		One genome of low quality		One genome of low quality		One genome of low quality		One difference of low quality	
Interpretation		Insufficient evidence for interpretation		Insufficient evidence for interpretation		Insufficient evidence for interpretation		Insufficient evidence for interpretation		Insufficient evidence for interpretation		Insufficient evidence for interpretation	

Letter N denotes unknown.
Numbers in cells represent the balance of reads for the reference and alternate alleles in that order.
Manual calls are represented by white cells with the nucleotide call.
Yellow-color-highligted positions are likely homoplasic.
Green-color-highlighted positions denote a D614G mutation.

B) Remaining five patients

Patient ID		Patient 31		Patient 41		Patient 45		Patient 47		Patient 51	
Positive swab type		First positive swab	Reinfection swab	First positive swab	Reinfection swab	First positive swab	Reinfection swab	First positive swab	Reinfection swab	First positive swab	Reinfection swab
Swab date		Day 0	Day 58	Day 0	Day 50	Day 0	Day 58	Day 0	Day 52	Day 0	Day 59
241	C	C	N	T	N	T	N	N	N	N	N
373	G	N	N	G	N	G	N	N	N	N	N
1302	C	N	N	T	N	C	N	N	N	N	N
2644	C	T	N	C	N	C	N	N	N	N	N
2788	C	N	N	C	N	C	N	N	N	N	N
2878	C	C	N	C	N	C	N	N	N	C	N
3037	C	C	N	T	N	T	N	N	N	N	N
3373	C	N	N	C	N	C	N	N	N	N	N
3695	C	N	N	C	N	C	N	N	N	N	N
6181	T	T	N	T	N	T	N	N	N	T	N
6817	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A
7733	A	A	N	A	A	A	A	A	N	A	A
9841	G	N	N	G	N	G	N	N	N	N	N
10595	T	T	N	T	N	T	N	N	N	N	N
12695	C	5\7	N	C	N	C	N	N	N	C	N
14408	C	C	N	T	N	T	N	N	N	C	N
14805	C	3\7	N	C	N	C	N	N	N	N	N
15315	C	C	N	C	N	C	N	N	N	N	N
15486	A	A	N	A	N	A	N	N	N	A	N
15672	G	G	N	G	N	G	N	N	N	G	N
16537	G	A	N	G	N	G	N	N	N	15\15	N
16989	C	C	N	C	N	C	N	N	N	C	N
17193	G	G	N	G	G	G	N	N	N	G	N
17550	C	C	N	C	N	C	N	N	N	C	N
17907	T	T	N	T	N	T	N	N	N	T	N
20870	G	G	N	G	N	G	N	N	N	G	N
21712	A	5\7	N	A	N	A	N	N	N	N	N
21737	T	T	N	T	N	T	N	N	N	N	N
21846	C	C	N	C	N	C	N	N	N	N	N
22015	T	T	N	T	N	C	N	N	N	T	N
23403	A	13\8	N	G	N	G	N	N	N	N	N
24675	A	A	A	A	N	A	N	N	N	A	A
24926	G	N	N	G	N	G	N	N	N	N	N
25207	C	C	N	C	N	C	N	N	N	N	N
25460	C	T	N	C	N	C	N	N	N	C	N
25552	G	N	N	G	N	G	N	N	N	G	N
25563	G	G	N	T	N	G	N	N	N	G	N
25704	T	T	N	T	N	T	N	N	N	N	N
26144	G	T	N	G	N	G	N	N	N	N	N
26801	C	N	N	T	N	C	N	N	N	N	N
26963	A	N	N	A	N	A	N	N	N	N	N
27341	A	A	N	A	N	A	N	N	N	N	N
27476	C	N	N	C	N	C	N	N	N	C	N
27769	C	C	N	C	N	C	N	N	N	N	N
28054	C	C	N	C	N	C	C	N	N	C	N
28087	C	C	N	C	N	C	N	N	N	C	N
29144	C	C	N	C	N	C	N	N	N	C	N
29370	C	C	N	C	N	C	N	N	N	C	N
29554	G	G	N	G	N	G	N	N	N	G	N
29642	C	C	N	C	N	C	N	N	N	N	N
Description		One genome of low quality		One genome of low quality		One genome of low quality		Two genomes of low quality		One genome of low quality	
Interpretation		Insufficient evidence for interpretation		Insufficient evidence for interpretation		Insufficient evidence for interpretation		Insufficient evidence for interpretation		Insufficient evidence for interpretation	

Letter N denotes unknown.
Numbers in cells represent the balance of reads for the reference and alternate alleles in that order.
Manual calls are represented by white cells with the nucleotide call.
Yellow-color-highligted positions are likely homoplasic.
Green-color-highlighted positions denote a D614G mutation.