

Airborne contamination of COVID-19 in hospitals: a scoping review of the current evidence.

Gabriel BIRGAND^{1,2}, Nathan PEIFFER-SMADJA^{1,3,4}, Sandra FOURNIER⁵, Solen KERNEIS⁶, François-Xavier LESCURE^{3,4}, Jean-Christophe LUCET^{3,7}

¹ NIHR Health Protection Research Unit in Healthcare Associated Infection and Antimicrobial Resistance at Imperial College London, Hammersmith Campus, Du Cane Road, London, UK

² Centre Hospitalo-Universitaire de Nantes, Nantes, France

³ INSERM, IAME, UMR 1137, F-75018 Paris, France; Univ Paris Diderot, Sorbonne Paris Cité, F-75018 Paris, France

⁴ AP-HP, Hôpital Bichat – Claude Bernard, Infectious diseases Unit, F-75018 Paris, France
EOH, siège AP-HP, 75004 Paris

⁵ Central Infection Control Team, Assistance Publique-Hôpitaux de Paris, Paris, France.

⁶ Equipe mobile d'infectiologie, Hôpital Cochin, AP-HP 75014 Paris, UHLIN Hôpital Bichat, AP-HP 75018 Paris

⁷ AP-HP, Hôpital Bichat – Claude Bernard, Infection Control Unit, F-75018 Paris, France
EOH, siège AP-HP, 75004 Paris

Correspondence to :

Dr Gabriel Birgand

Address: 5 rue du Professeur Yves Boquien 44093 Nantes, France

Tel.: +33 240 08 70 72.

E-mail address: gbirgand@gmail.com (G. Birgand).

ABSTRACT

Introduction

A controversy remains worldwide regarding the transmission routes of SARS-CoV-2 in hospital settings. We reviewed the current evidence on the air contamination with SARS-CoV-2 in hospital settings, and the factors associated to the contamination including the viral load and the particles size.

Methods

The MEDLINE, Embase, Web of Science databases were systematically interrogated for original English-language articles detailing COVID-19 air contamination in hospital settings between 1 December 2019 and 21 July 2020. This study was conducted in accordance with the PRISMA-ScR guidelines. The positivity rate of SARS-CoV-2 viral RNA and culture were described and compared according to the setting, clinical context, air ventilation system, and distance from patient. The SARS-CoV-2 RNA concentrations in copies per m³ of air were pooled and their distribution were described by hospital areas. Particle sizes and SARS-CoV-2 RNA concentrations in copies or TCID50 per m³ were analysed after categorization of sizes in <1 µm, 1-4 µm, and >4 µm.

Results

Among 2,034 records identified, 17 articles were included in the review. Overall, 27.5% (68/247) of air sampled from close patients' environment were positive for SARS-CoV-2 RNA, without difference according to the setting (ICU: 27/97, 27.8%; non-ICU: 41/150, 27.3%; p=0.93), the distance from patients (<1 meter: 1/64, 1.5%; 1-5 meters: 4/67, 6%; p=0.4). In other areas, the positivity rate was 23.8% (5/21) in toilets, 9.5% (20/221) in clinical areas, 12.4% (15/121) in staff areas, and 34.1% (14/41) in public areas. A total of 78 viral cultures were performed in three studies, and 3 (4%) were positive, all from close patients' environment. The median SARS-CoV-2 RNA concentrations varied from 1.10³ copies per m³ (IQR: 0.4.10³-9.10³) in clinical areas to 9.7.10³ (5.1.10³-14.3.10³) in the air of toilets or bathrooms. The protective equipment removal and patients' rooms had high concentrations/titre of SARS-CoV-2 with aerosol size distributions that showed peaks in the <1µm region, and staff offices in the >4 µm region.

Conclusion

In hospital, the air near and away from COVID-19 patients is frequently contaminated with SARS-CoV-2 RNA, with however, rare proofs of their viability. High viral loads found in toilet/bathrooms, staff and public hallways suggests to carefully consider these areas.

Introduction

A controversy remains worldwide regarding the transmission modes of SARS-CoV-2 virus. [1] At the emerging stage of the pandemic, many countries implemented a high-level precautions, including airborne and contact precautions, to prevent the spread from patients to healthcare professionals (HCP).[2] An emerging understanding of the SARS-CoV-2 transmission dynamics led to recommendations toward droplet precautions to care for hospitalized COVID-19 patients.[3] However, separating transmission dynamics into the dichotomy of droplet versus airborne transmission routes is probably simplistic. In some circumstances, large droplets may travel more than the commonly used 1.50 meters, and contaminate surfaces further away.[4]

The environment airflow may ease the spread of large particles.[5] The switch from airborne to droplet precautions, combined with a global shortage of facemasks and respirators, fed the controversy around respiratory protections for the prevention of transmission of SARS-CoV-2. [6,7] This generated a mistrust in personal protective equipment's (PPE), especially surgical mask, and, in their ability to protect HCP from SARS-CoV-2 transmission. As WHO recently acknowledged that a possible airborne transmission could occur in crowded and closed environments in the community. The question arises whether similar transmission could occur in the hospital.[1] Viral contamination of the air surrounding COVID-19 patients and professionals in hospitals may have serious implications for outbreak control strategies.

We reviewed the current evidence on the air contamination with SARS-CoV-2 in hospital settings, the viral load, and the associated factors, to better assess the risk of cross transmission of COVID-19 among professionals and patients.

Methods

Search strategy

We performed a systematic search of MEDLINE via PubMed, Embase, Web of Science, on 21 July 2020 with the terms covering COVID-19, air contamination in hospital settings in articles published between 1 December 2019 and 21 July 2020 (see Supplement S1 for details of search strategies). Because of potential delays in indexing of databases, we also searched selected infectious disease journals (Supplementary Table S1). We also searched some preprint servers, including BioRxiv (<https://www.biorxiv.org/>), MedRxiv (<https://www.medrxiv.org/>); and reference lists of the identified articles to find reports of additional studies.

Inclusion and exclusion criteria

We included all literature related to COVID-19 published in English between 1 January 2020 and 21 July 2020 without restrictions, including original articles, research letters and comments. We excluded experimental methods and studies performed in dental and primary care settings.

Article selection and data extraction

Two reviewers screened all titles, abstracts and full texts independently and solved disagreements by consensus or consultation with a third reviewer. Then the following information were extracted: (i) the setting, (ii) the clinical context, (iii) the ventilation system, (iv) the number of air samples performed, (v) the sampling method, (vi) the location of sampler and distance from patients, (vi) the duration and air volume sampled, (vii) the method for SARS-CoV-2 search, (vii) the positivity rate, (viii) the viral load (SARS-CoV-2 RNA copies/m³), (ix) viral culture results. The details of the data collection are shown in Supplementary Table S2.

Data analysis

We conducted a descriptive analysis of the characteristics of the included literature. We described the setting, patient clinical contexts, ventilation, air sampling and SARS-CoV-2 search methods, and the qualitative and quantitative results according to settings and the hospital area. We categorized the location of air sampling in five classes of hospital areas: close patient's environment (i.e. patient's room or bay), toilet/bathroom, clinical areas (workstation, anteroom/buffer room, corridors, other, in the clinical unit), staff areas (change room, staff room including office, meeting, dining rooms, others staff areas), public areas (hallway, other public areas indoor and outdoor). We also classified the setting in ICU and non-ICU, the clinical context in severe/critical vs mild/moderate/asymptomatic, the ventilation system in negative pressure vs natural/mechanical, and the distance from patient into ≤ 1 , 1-5 and >5 meters. The positivity rate viral RNA and the viral culture were described and compared according to categories using a chi² test. The results of SARS-CoV-2 RNA concentrations in copies per m³ of air were pooled and their distribution were described by hospital areas. The Kruskal-Wallis test was used to compare the non-normal distributed RNA concentrations across hospital areas. Studies presenting the joined results of particle sizes and SARS-CoV-2 RNA concentrations in copies or TCID₅₀ per m³ were analyzed after categorization of sizes in <1 μm , 1-4 μm , and >4 μm .

We conducted this scoping review in accordance with the PRISMA-ScR Checklist [16] (Supplementary Table S3).

Results

Search results

We identified 2,034 records, 280 of which were excluded as duplicates. Title and abstract screening were conducted for the remaining 1,364 articles, 1,225 of which were excluded because of being unrelated to the air contamination by SARS-CoV-2 in hospital settings. We retrieved the full text of the 139 remaining articles. After further screening, and supplementary searching of articles published or posted between 1 January 2020 and 21 July 2020, we identified an additional article and a total of 17 articles were included in the review (Figure 1).[3,8–23]

Characteristics of included articles/studies

Of the 17 included articles/studies, eight (55%) were from China. The remaining studies were from Hong Kong (n=2), USA (n=2), Singapore (n=2), United Kingdom (n=1), Italy (n=1), Iran (n=1). Of all included articles/studies, 13 (76%) were published in peer-reviewed journals and four (24%) were posted on preprint servers.

A total of 16 (94%) studies sampled the air in the close patients' environment, 10 studies (59%) in clinical areas away from patients, 7 (41%) in staff areas, 5 (29%) in toilet/bathroom, and 5 (29%) in public area. (Table 1) The clinical context of patients hospitalized in the targeted areas was detailed in 11 studies among which six were performed in units hospitalizing severe/critical patients and seven mild/moderate/asymptomatic patients.

A median of 35 air samples were collected per study varying from four to 126 samples. In the close patients' environment, a median of 12 air samples (Min: 2; Max: 42) was performed, 2.5 (1-7) in toilets/bathrooms, 12 (3-72) in patients' environment, 13 (2-45) in staff areas, and 9 (3-12) in public areas. Fourteen studies sampled the air from non-ICU patient's rooms, and nine in ICU. Overall, 89 samples performed in patients' room with negative pressure and 31 with natural/mechanical ventilation. When pooling the 12 studies detailing the distance from patient, a total of 49 samples were performed ≤ 1 meter from patients and 42 from one to five meters.

All included studies used RT-PCR to identify SARS-CoV-2 RNA, with a quantification of RNA copies per m³ or liters in 8 (47%) studies. One study used a droplet digital RT-PCR method. The viral

culture was performed in three (18%) studies. Three studies assessed the particle size in parallel to RNA concentration or viral titer.[9,13,16]

RT-PCR and culture results categorized by hospital areas

A total of 646 air samples were performed across the 17 studies reviewed, including 247 (38%) in close patient's environment, 221 (34%) in clinical areas, 121 (19%) in staff area, 41 (6%) in public areas, and 21 (3%) in toilet/bathroom. (Table 2) Overall, 27.5% (68/247) of air sampled from close patients' environment were positive for SARS-CoV-2 RNA. Among the 97 samples performed in the environment of ICU patients, 27 (27.8%) were positive, vs 41 among 150 (27.3%) in non-ICU rooms. The air RNA positivity rate was 23.4% (43/184) in room with negative pressure, and no sample out of 31 were positive in natural/mechanical ventilated rooms. In toilets/bathroom, 5/21 (23.8%) samples were positive. In clinical areas, the overall positivity rate was 9.5% (20/221) varying from 0% (0/44) in anteroom/buffer room, to 27.2% (6/22) at workstations ($p < 0.01$). In staff areas, 12.4% (15/121) of samples were positive, with 19.2% of positivity in staff meeting room (5/26), vs 4% (2/50) in donning/doffing room and 17.8% (8/45) in other types of staff rooms ($p = 0.06$). Overall, 34% (14/41) of samples in public areas were positives with 60% (9/15) in hallways, 11% (2/18) in other indoors areas and 36% (3/8) in outdoors public areas ($p = 0.01$). A total of 78 viral cultures were performed across three studies (39 air samples from close patient's environment, two in toilets/bathroom, 14 in patients area, eight in staff areas, 15 in public areas). Three samples were positive in one study from the close patients' environment (3/39, 7.7%) in a non-ICU setting.

SARS-CoV-2 RNA concentrations in copies per m³ of air according to hospital areas.

Among studies with SARS-CoV-2 positive air samples which performed a quantitative RT-PCR, the median RNA concentrations varied from 1.10^3 copies per m³ (IQR: $0.4.10^3$ - 9.10^3) in clinical areas to $9.7.10^3$ ($5.1.10^3$ - $14.3.10^3$) in the air of toilets/bathrooms. (Figure 2) The median concentration described in close patients' environment was $3.3.10^3$ (1.10^3 - $2.7.10^3$) copies per m³ ($p < 0.01$). Among the three studies which assessed the particle size in air sampled in parallel with the viral load, one found a RNA concentration of 2.10^3 copies/m³ for size $>4 \mu\text{m}$ and $1.3.10^3$ for 1-4 μm particles in one patients' room, and 927 and 916 copies/m³ respectively in a second room, both at a distance of 1 to 2.1 meters from patients. (Figure 3) A second study found 40 and 12.10^3 copies/m³ for $<1\mu\text{m}$ particles, and 2 to 8 copies/m³ for 1-4 μm particles in two PPE removal rooms. A concentration of 7.10^3 copies/m³ was found for $<1\mu\text{m}$ particles, and 13.10^3 copies/m³ for 1-4 μm particles in medical staff office. For the third study which performed viral culture with air samples from six different patients' room, the median viral concentration was 4.8 (3.3-5.8) TCID₅₀/m³ for $<1\mu\text{m}$ particles, 4.27 (2.96-5.48) for 1-4 μm particles, and 1.82 (1.6-2.55) for $>4\mu\text{m}$ particles.

Discussion

This scoping review of the literature suggests the air near hospitalized patients, but also away from patients' environment including toilet/bathrooms, staff and public areas, may carry viral RNA. However, the infectivity of the virus assessed by viral culture was only reported by one study in non-ICU patients' room. The protective equipment removal and patients' rooms had high concentrations/titre of SARS-CoV-2 with aerosol size distributions that showed peaks in the $<1\mu\text{m}$ region, and staff offices in the $>4 \mu\text{m}$ region.

The results of positivity rate in ICU and non-ICU patients' environment was highly heterogeneous, and appeared equal when pooling the results. In ICU, 5/8 studies did not find SARS-CoV-2 RNA, whereas the remaining did with 40.4 to 100% of positive samples. In non-ICU patients' environment, 9/14 did not find SARS-CoV-2 RNA, and five studies found viral RNA present from 12.5% to 100% of samples. This heterogeneity may be explained either by a different case-mix, or by a difference in

methods used for air sampling. The level of severity of patients' infections was not associated with an increased air contamination. Several studies suggested higher viral loads might be associated with severe clinical outcomes.[24,25] However, the correlation between clinical conditions and the air contamination may be more complex. The potential opportunistic airborne contamination occurring during aerosol generating procedures (AGP), and the ventilation at the time of sampling may influence the results. All these factors were poorly detailed in the articles analyzed. The sampling method, including the sampler used, its position in the clinical unit and from patients, the duration of sampling, the volume sampled, and condition for transfer to the laboratory were highly variable across studies. The volume of a single room is approximately 40 m³. However, most samples volume were less than 10 m³, at various airflow rates, for a duration less or equal to one hour, potentially not reflecting the reality of the air contamination. The climatic conditions (e.g. temperature and hygrometry), were poorly detailed in studies reviewed but may influence the capacity for viral particles to persist in the air.[26] The methods for RNA detection varied, especially the cycle threshold (Ct) for PCR positivity also varied from 37 to 45. The RT-PCR Ct values correlate strongly with cultivable virus. A recent article showed the probability of culturing virus declines to 8% in samples with Ct > 35.[27] Only one study described a positive viral culture on samples with SARS-CoV-2 RNA on RT-PCR, suggesting that most samples do not contain enough infectious virus. Most sampling methods affect viral infectivity, which may partly explain these results.[28] The future studies should consider these points for a better accuracy and comparability of the data.

The concentration of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in aerosols detected in isolation wards and ventilated patients was very low. However, a higher concentration of viral RNA was found in patients' toilets, public areas and in some medical staff areas. The finding of high concentration in staff room (meeting, dining room) is consistent with the possible cross-transmission of COVID-19 among HCP during breaks. During these periods, facemasks are frequently removed in small areas without ventilation. Toilets and staff rooms are often small, and poorly ventilated. The presence of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in stools has been described in several studies. [29,30] The toilet flush may lead to the aerosolization of RNA in small and non-ventilated toilets or bathrooms. Public areas are often crowded in such epidemic context with both a high patient flow and high incidence of COVID-19. These factors have to be considered to control the transmission of COVID-19 between non-masked HCPs in hospital setting, especially staff rooms and lockers.

Only three studies assessed the size of particle found when searching for SARS-CoV-2. Regarding the aerosols in the submicrometre region, observed in the PPE removal and patients' rooms, authors hypothesized the resuspension of virus-laden aerosols from the surface of the protective apparel worn by medical staff while they are removing the equipment. The submicrometre virus-laden aerosols may originally come from the direct deposition of respiratory droplets or airborne SARS-CoV-2 from a patient onto the protective apparel. On the other hand, floor-deposited SARS-CoV-2 is possibly the source of >4 µm virus-laden aerosols and was carried across different areas by medical staff.

The findings of this scoping review suggest COVID-19 to be an opportunistic airborne infection. These results are consistent with the cumulated knowledge on other respiratory viruses. SARS-CoV-1 is commonly recognized to be mainly transmitted through large droplets, and requiring particular conditions to be airborne transmitted, such as AGP.[31] [32] For other respiratory viruses, a recent review described the frequent presence of nucleic material (RNA or DNA) in the air around infected patients (influenza, RSV, adenovirus, rhinovirus, and others coronavirus), but rarely the presence of viable viruses.[33] The current available evidence on hospital air contamination by SARS-CoV-2 leans toward the effectiveness of surgical facemask in most circumstances to prevent cross-transmission of COVID-19 in hospital settings. In contrast, AGP on the respiratory tract require wearing a respirator (N95 or FFP2), in order to prevent transmissions and protect HCPs.[5,34] A randomized clinical trial comparing the surgical facemask with respirator may provide important information for the recommending or not respiratory protection for HCP in addition for AGP. Assessing the SARS-CoV-2 RNA and viable virus contamination of surgical facemasks and

respirators worn by HCP according to a panel of procedures with COVID-19 patients would provide information on the exposition in routine practice.

This study also has some limitations. First, the context (location, ventilation, distance, clinical context) were infrequently detailed in studies. As explained above, this potentially affected the comparability of data, and the reliability of pooled data analysis. Misclassification may have occurred when variables were categorized without enough details. This issue was avoided by performing the categorization only when data were available. Second, for a better clarity of the analysis, we did not include contamination of surfaces. However, air and surface contamination are potentially correlated, and may ease the understanding of resuspension. Finally, we included article not validated through a peer review process.

Conclusion

In hospitals, the air around COVID-19 patients is frequently contaminated with SARS-CoV-2 RNA, but rarely with viable viruses. The available data suggests COVID-19 to be an opportunistic airborne infection. High viral loads found in toilet/bathrooms, staff and public hallways argue for a careful consideration of these areas for the prevention of the COVID-19 transmission. However, the presence of viable virus should be primarily considered, as the required link for the potential of cross-transmission.

Declarations

Ethics approval and consent to participate: not applicable

Consent for publication: not applicable

Availability of data and material: Data sharing not applicable to this article as no datasets were generated or analysed during the current study

Funding: The research was funded by the National Institute for Health Research Health Protection Research Unit (NIHR HPRU) in Healthcare Associated Infection and Antimicrobial Resistance at Imperial College London in partnership with Public Health England (PHE). The views expressed are those of the author(s) and not necessarily those of the NHS, the NIHR, the Department of Health or Public Health England. GB has received an Early Career Research Fellowship from the Antimicrobial Research Collaborative at Imperial College London, and acknowledges the support of the Wellcome trust. RA is supported by a NIHR Fellowship in knowledge mobilisation. The support of ESRC as part of the Antimicrobial Cross Council initiative supported by the seven UK research councils, and also the support of the Global Challenges Research Fund, is gratefully acknowledged.

Acknowledgements: We thanks Marta Castrica and Laura Menchetti for providing their data.

Competing Interests: The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

REFERENCES

1. World Health Organisation. Transmission of SARS-CoV-2: implications for infection prevention precautions. 2020; Available at: <https://www.who.int/news-room/commentaries/detail/transmission-of-sars-cov-2-implications-for-infection-prevention-precautions>.
2. Birgand G, Mutters NT, Otter JA, et al. Analysis of national and international guidelines on respiratory protection equipment for COVID-19 in healthcare settings. **2020**;
3. Ong SWX, Tan YK, Chia PY, et al. Air, Surface Environmental, and Personal Protective Equipment Contamination by Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) From a Symptomatic Patient. *JAMA* **2020**;

4. Bourouiba L. Turbulent Gas Clouds and Respiratory Pathogen Emissions: Potential Implications for Reducing Transmission of COVID-19. *JAMA* **2020**;
5. Seto WH. Airborne transmission and precautions: facts and myths. *J Hosp Infect* **2015**; 89:225–228.
6. Morawska L, Tang JW, Bahnfleth W, et al. How can airborne transmission of COVID-19 indoors be minimised? *Environ Int* **2020**; 142:105832.
7. Chagla Z, Hota S, Khan S, Mertz D, International Hospital and Community Epidemiology Group. Airborne Transmission of COVID-19. *Clin Infect Dis* **2020**; :ciaa1118.
8. Faridi S, Niazi S, Sadeghi K, et al. A field indoor air measurement of SARS-CoV-2 in the patient rooms of the largest hospital in Iran. *Sci Total Environ* **2020**; 725:138401.
9. Liu Y, Ning Z, Chen Y, et al. Aerodynamic analysis of SARS-CoV-2 in two Wuhan hospitals. *Nature* **2020**;
10. Li YH, Fan YZ, Jiang L, Wang HB. Aerosol and environmental surface monitoring for SARS-CoV-2 RNA in a designated hospital for severe COVID-19 patients. *Epidemiol Infect* **2020**; :1–14.
11. Guo Z-D, Wang Z-Y, Zhang S-F, et al. Aerosol and Surface Distribution of Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 in Hospital Wards, Wuhan, China, 2020. *Emerg Infect Dis* **2020**; 26.
12. Santarpia JL, Rivera DN, Herrera V, et al. Aerosol and Surface Transmission Potential of SARS-CoV-2. *Infectious Diseases (except HIV/AIDS)*, 2020. Available at: <http://medrxiv.org/lookup/doi/10.1101/2020.03.23.20039446>. Accessed 16 July 2020.
13. Santarpia JL, Herrera VL, Rivera DN, et al. The Infectious Nature of Patient-Generated SARS-CoV-2 Aerosol. *Infectious Diseases (except HIV/AIDS)*, 2020. Available at: <http://medrxiv.org/lookup/doi/10.1101/2020.07.13.20041632>. Accessed 22 July 2020.
14. Cheng VC-C, Wong S-C, Chan VW-M, et al. Air and environmental sampling for SARS-CoV-2 around hospitalized patients with coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19). *Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol* **2020**; :1–8.
15. Wei L., Lin J., Duan X., et al. Asymptomatic COVID-19 Patients Can Contaminate Their Surroundings: an Environment Sampling Study. *mSphere* **2020**; 5.
16. Chia PY, Coleman KK, Tan YK, et al. Detection of Air and Surface Contamination by Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome 2 Coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) in Hospital Rooms of Infected Patients. *medRxiv*. 2020; Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.03.29.20046557>.
17. Zhou J, Otter JA, Price JR, et al. Investigating SARS-CoV-2 surface and air contamination in an acute healthcare setting during the peak of the COVID-19 pandemic in London. *Clin Infect Dis Off Publ Infect Dis Soc Am* **2020**;
18. Ding Z, Qian H, Xu B, et al. Toilets dominate environmental detection of SARS-CoV-2 virus in a hospital. *Infectious Diseases (except HIV/AIDS)*, 2020. Available at: <http://medrxiv.org/lookup/doi/10.1101/2020.04.03.20052175>. Accessed 16 July 2020.

19. Zhou L, Yao M, Zhang X, et al. Detection of SARS-CoV-2 in Exhaled Breath from COVID-19 Patients Ready for Hospital Discharge. *Public and Global Health*, 2020. Available at: <http://medrxiv.org/lookup/doi/10.1101/2020.05.31.20115196>. Accessed 16 July 2020.
20. Wu S, Wang Y, Jin X, Tian J, Liu J, Mao Y. Environmental contamination by SARS-CoV-2 in a designated hospital for coronavirus disease 2019. *Am J Infect Control* **2020**;
21. Cheng VCC, Wong S-C, Chen JHK, et al. Escalating infection control response to the rapidly evolving epidemiology of the coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) due to SARS-CoV-2 in Hong Kong. *Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol* **2020**; 41:493–498.
22. Lei H, Ye F, Liu X, et al. SARS-CoV-2 environmental contamination associated with persistently infected. *Influenza Other Respir Viruses* **2020**;
23. Razzini K, Castrica M, Menchetti L, et al. SARS-CoV-2 RNA detection in the air and on surfaces in the COVID-19 ward of a hospital in Milan, Italy. *Sci Total Environ* **2020**; 742:140540.
24. Liu Y, Yan L-M, Wan L, et al. Viral dynamics in mild and severe cases of COVID-19. *Lancet Infect Dis* **2020**; 20:656–657.
25. Wolfel R., Corman V.M., Guggemos W., et al. Virological assessment of hospitalized patients with COVID-2019. *Nature* **2020**; 581:465–469.
26. Tang S, Mao Y, Jones RM, et al. Aerosol transmission of SARS-CoV-2? Evidence, prevention and control. *Environ Int* **2020**; 144:106039.
27. Singanayagam A, Patel M, Charlett A, et al. Duration of infectiousness and correlation with RT-PCR cycle threshold values in cases of COVID-19, England, January to May 2020. *Eurosurveillance* **2020**; 25. Available at: <https://www.eurosurveillance.org/content/10.2807/1560-7917.ES.2020.25.32.2001483>. Accessed 31 August 2020.
28. Verreault D, Moineau S, Duchaine C. Methods for sampling of airborne viruses. *Microbiol Mol Biol Rev MMBR* **2008**; 72:413–444.
29. Wang W, Xu Y, Gao R, et al. Detection of SARS-CoV-2 in Different Types of Clinical Specimens. *JAMA* **2020**; Available at: <https://jamanetwork.com/journals/jama/fullarticle/2762997>. Accessed 28 August 2020.
30. Wu Y, Guo C, Tang L, et al. Prolonged presence of SARS-CoV-2 viral RNA in faecal samples. *Lancet Gastroenterol Hepatol* **2020**; 5:434–435.
31. Roy CJ, Milton DK. Airborne transmission of communicable infection--the elusive pathway. *N Engl J Med* **2004**; 350:1710–1712.
32. Booth TF, Kournikakis B, Bastien N, et al. Detection of airborne severe acute respiratory syndrome (SARS) coronavirus and environmental contamination in SARS outbreak units. *J Infect Dis* **2005**; 191:1472–1477.
33. Shiu EYC, Leung NHL, Cowling BJ. Controversy around airborne versus droplet transmission of respiratory viruses: implication for infection prevention. *Curr Opin Infect Dis* **2019**; 32:372–379.

34. Seto WH, Tsang D, Yung RWH, et al. Effectiveness of precautions against droplets and contact in prevention of nosocomial transmission of severe acute respiratory syndrome (SARS). *Lancet Lond Engl* **2003**; 361:1519–1520.

Figure 1. Flowchart of the search strategy.




Table 1. Summary of included studies evaluating the air contamination with SARS-CoV-2 in the hospital environment.

Ref	Setting	Clinical context	Location	Air ventilation	Distance from Pts, meters	Duration and air volume per sample	Microbiology	SARS-CoV-2 Viral load (RNA copies/liter)	SARS-CoV-2 Viral culture	Positivity, n/N (%)
ICU Patients environment										
[9]	ICU	Severe	Isolation rooms	Negative Pressure	ND	5h to 7 days, 1500 – 50400L	ddPCR	31, 113	-	2/3 (66)
[8]	ICU	Severe	Multiple beds room	Mechanical/Natural	2 to 5	60 min/90L	RT-PCR, CT=38	-	-	0/9 (0)
[11]	ICU	Severe	Isolation rooms, bay room	12 air supplies; 16 air discharges/h	ND	30 min, 300L	RT-qPCR	Mean 3.8 near air outlet, 1.4 near Pts.	-	13/32 (40.6), CT= 35.7, 44.4
[22]	ICU	Critical	Multiple beds room	Not detailed	1	4h, 1260L	RT-qPCR	-	-	0/1 (0), CT= 41.5
[10]	ICU	Severe	Multiple beds room (n=3)	12 air supplies; 16 air discharges/h	1 to 5	5h, 21600L	RT-PCR CT <37; >40	-	-	0/9 (0)
[19]	ICU	Not detailed	ND	Natural ventilation	1 to 5	40 min; 600-16000L	RT-qPCR, CT=39.5	NP	-	0/5 (0)
[23]	ICU	2 Pts intubated, 1 non intubated	Multiple beds room	Negative Pressure	ND	40 min, 2000L	RT-PCR	Mean 22.7	-	12/12 (100)
[18]	ICU	Mild	Isolation rooms	Negative Pressure	0.5	20-30min, 300-10000L	RT-PCR	-	-	0/26 (0)
Non-ICU Patients environment										
[9]	GW	Severe	4 Single and 1 multiple bed room (n=2)	Negative Pressure	ND	5h, 1500L	ddPCR	0	-	0/2 (0)
[8]	GW	Severe	Multiple beds room (n= 2 to 9)	Mechanical/Natural	2 to 5	60 min/90L	RT-PCR, CT=38	-	-	0/1 (0)
[3]	GW	Moderate/mild	Isolation rooms	12 air exchanges per hour	<1 and 2-5	4h, 3600L	RT-PCR, CT=45	Not determined	-	0/18 (0)
[12]	IW	Mild	Isolation rooms	Negative Pressure	bedside table or desk	15 min, 750L	RT-PCR, CT=45		0/10	10/18 (0)
[11]	GW	Mild	Single, bay room	8 air supplies and 12 air discharges per hour	Near Pts, near air outlet	30 min, 300L	RT-qPCR	0.68 near air outlet	-	2/16 (12.5)
[16]	GW	Mild/Asympto	Isolation rooms	12 air changes per	1 and 2.1	4h, 840L	RT-PCR	Mean 1.3 (Min	-	4/10 (40)

[22]	IW	matic Critical	ND	hour ND	1	4h, 1260L	RT-qPCR	0.916-Max 2)	-	-	1/1 (100) CT=44.6
[14]	IW	Severe/mild/asymptomatic	Isolation rooms	12 air changes per hour, shelter	0.1	20min, 1000L	RT-PCR	0	-	-	0/6 (0)
[21]	IW	ND	Isolation rooms	Negative Pressure	0.1	5min, 1000L	RT-PCR	0	-	-	0/8 (0)
[17]	IW/GW	ND	ND	Not detailed	ND	ND, 1000L	RT-qPCR CT<40.4	1.17 (0.16-7.04)	0	-	6/12 (50)
[10]	IW	Severe	Multiple beds room (n=3)	8 air supplies; 12 air discharges/h	1 to 5	5h, 21600L	RT-PCR CT <37; >40	-	-	-	0/18 (0)
[15]	IW	Mild/Asymptomatic	Isolation rooms	12 air exchanges per hour	0.6	15 min, 1500L	RT-PCR, CT<35	-	-	-	0/6 (0)
[19]	GW	ND	Isolation rooms	Natural	1 to 5	40 min, 600-16000L	RT-PCR, CT <39.5	-	-	-	0/16 (0)
[13]	ND	ND	Isolation rooms	Not detailed	ND	30 min, ND	RT-qPCR	2.41 TCID50/cm3 of Air	3/18	-	18/18 (100)
Toilet/Bathroom											
[9]	Non-ICU	-	Patient mobile toilet room	No Ventilation	-	20h, 6000L	ddPCR	1	-	-	1/1 (100)
[3]	GW	-	Isolation rooms	ND	-	8h, 2400L	RT-PCR, CT=45	-	-	-	0/6 (0)
[22]	Isolation ward	-	Patient bathroom	ND	-	4h, 1680L	quantitative RT-PCR	-	-	-	2/2 (100) CT=35.6, 35.5
[17]	Cohort ward	-	Outside the patients' bay, in the ward	ND	-	ND, 1000L	RT-qPCR CT<40.4	1/2, 0.464	Negative	-	1/2 (50)
[19]	Fever clinic	-	In the ward	Natural	-	40, 16000L	RT-PCR, CT <39.5	-	-	-	0/3 (0)
[18]	4 in ICU	-	Patient bathroom	4 with negative pressure	-	20-30min, 420-10000L	RT-PCR	-	-	-	1/7 (14)
Clinical areas											
[9]	Non-ICU	ND	Workstation	Natural	ND	320-1200min, 1600-6000L	ddPCR	0, 1, 1, 5, 9	-	-	4/5 (80)
[3]	ICU, Non-ICU	ND	Corridor, anteroom	-	ND	15min/3000L, 480min/2400L	RT-PCR, CT=45	-	-	-	0/12 (0)
[12]	ND	Mild	Floor adjacent to rooms	-	> 6ft	15min/750L	RT-PCR, CT=45	2.58, 3.76	0/3	-	2/3 (66)
[11]	ICU, GW	1 severe, ND	Near office, pharmacy, nurse	ND	ND	30min, 27000-72000L	RT-qPCR	0.54	-	-	1/34 (3)

			station, corridor, buffer room							
[20]	1 ICU	Ward, and various clinical rooms	ND	ND	ND	30min/ND	RT-PCR, CT=43	-	-	0/69 (0)
[17]	ICU, Non-ICU	ND	Nurse station, Ward, Ambulatory waiting, Resus bay, CPAP unit	ND	ND	ND, 1000L	RT-qPCR CT<40.4	0.404, 0.035, 1.922, 0.031	0/10	4/10 (40)
[10]	ICU, Non-ICU	Severe	Corridor, clinic, buffer room	1 with Negative pressure	ND	250min, 21600L	RT-PCR CT <37; >40	-	-	0/45 (0)
[19]	ND	ND	Corridor, pre-room	Natural	ND	40min, 16000L	RT-PCR, CT <39.5	-	-	0/18 (0)
[23]	ND	ND	Corridor	ND	ND	40min, 16000L	RT-PCR	-	-	8/8 (100), CT=31.1
[18]	IW	3 mild, ND for others	Ward, corridor, nurse station, storage room	3 negative pressure, ND for others	ND	20-30, 300-10000	RT-PCR	-	-	1/12 (8), CT=37.8
Staff areas										
[9]	ICU	-	Change, meeting, dinning, warehouse	Natural/mechanical, small air purifier	-	300-1200min/1500-6000L	ddPCR	Mean: 13.8	-	10/13 (77)
[12]	Isolation ward	-	Personal air sample	-	ND	-	RT-PCR, CT=45	Mean: 20.037	-	4/4 (100)
[11]	ICU/GW	-	Dressing rooms	-	ND	30min/45000-108000L	RT-qPCR	-	-	0/36 (0)
[17]	ND	-	Staff room, doffing room	-	ND	ND/1000L	RT-qPCR CT<40.4	0.249	0/4	1/4
[10]	ICU/IW	-	Conference room, clean zone	2/3 with negative pressure	ND	270-540min/21600-43200L	RT-PCR CT <37; >40	-	-	0/45
[19]	ND	-	Waste storage	Natural	ND	40min/16000L	RT-PCR, CT <39.5	-	-	0/2
[23]	ND	-	Dressing/undressing, lockers	-	ND	40min/8000-14000L	RT-PCR	Not determined	-	0/17
Public areas										
[9]	-	-	Pharmacy, hall, office, store, supermarket	Mechanical, natural, outdoor	-	300-1000min, 1500-5000L	ddPCR	3, 7, 11, 3	-	4/11

[12]	-	-	Hallway	ND	-	ND	RT-PCR, CT=45	0.979 to 8.688	0/12	8/12
[20]	-	-	Public area	ND	-	30min/ND	RT-PCR, CT=43	-	-	0/6
[17]	-	-	Main entrance, toilet entrance, lift area	ND	-	ND, 1000L	RT-qPCR CT<40.4	1.574, 1.545	0/3	2/3
[10]i	-	-	Public area	ND	-	270min, 21600L	RT-PCR CT <37; >40	-	-	0/9

Abbreviations: ICU, intensive care unit ; IW, isolation ward; ND, not detailed; ddPCR, droplet-digital polymerase chain reaction; RT-PCR, reverse transcriptase polymerase chain reaction; RT-qPCR, quantitative reverse transcriptase polymerase chain reaction; CT, cycle threshold; Pts, patients; GW, general wards; IR, isolation room; ft, feet.

Table 2. Description of RT-PCR and culture results categorized by hospital areas.

	SARS-CoV-2 Viral RNA			SARS-CoV-2 Viral culture	
	n/N	Positivity, %	p value	n/N	Positivity, %
Patients environment	68/247	27.5		3/39	7.7
Ward					
ICU	27/97	27.8	0.93	-	-
Non-ICU	41/150	27.3		3/39	7.7
Ventilation					
Negative pressure	43/184	23.4	0.03	0/10	0
Mechanical/natural	0/31	0		-	-
Distance from patient					
≤1 meter	1/64	0	0.19	-	-
1-5 meter	4/67	6		-	-
Clinical context					
Severe/critical	16/77	20.8	0.43	-	-
Other (mild, moderate, asymptomatic)	16/99	16.1		0/10	0
Patients' toilet/bathroom	5/21	23.8		0/2	0
Clinical areas	20/221	9.5		0/14	0
Corridor	9/47	19.1	<0.01	-	-
Workstation	6/22	27.2		0/5	0
Anteroom/Buffer room	0/44	0		-	-
Others	5/103	4.8		0/9	0
Staff areas	15/121	12.4		0/8	0
Donning/doffing room	2/50	4	0.06	0/1	0
Meeting/staff room	5/26	19.2		0/3	0
Others	8/45	17.8		0/4	0
Public areas	14/41	34.1		0/15	0
Hall/Hallway	9/15	60	0.01	0/14	0
Others indoor	2/18	11.1		0/1	0
Hospital Outdoors	3/8	37.5		-	-

Figure 2. Distribution of the pooled SARS-CoV-2 RNA concentrations in copies per m³ of air according to hospital areas.







Figure 3. Concentration of airborne SARS-CoV-2 in different aerosol size.



Footnote: A, Lui et al; B, Chia et al; C, Santapadia et al.