

Variation of SARS-CoV-2 viral loads by sample type, disease severity and time: a systematic review

Running title: Viral load of patients with COVID-19

Thomas Edwards, PhD^{1¶}

Victor S. Santos, PhD^{2¶}

Anne L. Wilson, PhD^{3¶}

Ana I. Cubas-Atienzar, PhD^{1,4}

Konstantina Kontogianni, MSc⁴

Christopher T. Williams, MSc¹

Emily R. Adams, PhD¹

Luis E. Cuevas, MD, PhD^{4*}

[¶]Contributed equally

Affiliations

¹ Department of Tropical Disease Biology, Liverpool School of Tropical Medicine, Liverpool, UK.

² Núcleo de Epidemiologia e Saúde Pública, Universidade Federal de Alagoas, Arapiraca-AL, Brazil.

³ Department of Vector Biology, Liverpool School of Tropical Medicine, Liverpool, UK.

⁴ Department of Clinical Sciences, Liverpool School of Tropical Medicine, Liverpool, UK.

***Corresponding author:** Prof. Luis E. Cuevas, Liverpool School of Tropical Medicine, Pembroke Place, Liverpool L3 5QA, UK. Email Luis.Cuevas@lstmed.ac.uk

Sources of funding: LEC and ERA are funded by the UK National Institute for Health Research Health Protection Research Unit in Emerging and Zoonotic Infections, the Centre of Excellence in Infectious Diseases Research (Liverpool) and the Alder Hey Charity; and Wellcome/DFID through a grant for the development of COVID-19 diagnostics (grant number 220764/Z/20/Z). ALW receives support from the Partnership for Increasing the Impact of Vector Control (PIIVeC),

funded by the UK Medical Research Council (grant number MR/P027873/1) through the UK Global Challenges Research Fund.

Conflicts of Interest: The authors have no conflict of interest to declare.

Key words: COVID-19, diagnosis, Viral Load, disease severity, SARS-CoV-2

Word count: Abstract: 227 Manuscript: 2257

Authors contributions: The study was conceived by ALW, LEC and VSS and study design was developed by ALW, TE, VSS and LEC. Data extraction was conducted by ACA, ALW, KK, CTW, TE, VSS. Statistical analysis was conducted by VSS, LEC and TE. Initial manuscript was prepared by TE, LEC, ALW, and VSS. All authors approved the final manuscript.

Summary

This systematic review found a higher viral load in saliva and sputum than in nasopharyngeal swabs, in asymptomatic individuals and patients with severe COVID-19. Diagnostic testing strategies should consider the type of sample, disease severity and the time since symptoms onset.

ABSTRACT

Background. To describe whether SARS-CoV-2 viral loads (VLs) and cycle thresholds (CTs) vary by sample type, disease severity and symptoms duration.

Methods. Systematic searches were conducted in MEDLINE, EMBASE, BioRxiv and MedRxiv.

Studies reporting individual SARS-CoV-2 VLs and/or CT values from biological samples. Paired reviewers independently screened potentially eligible articles. CT values and VLs distributions were described by sample type, disease severity and time from symptom onset. Differences between groups were examined using Kruskal-Wallis and Dunn's tests (post-hoc test). The risk of bias was assessed using the Joanna Briggs Critical Appraisal Tools.

Results. 14 studies reported CT values, 8 VLs and 2 CTs and VLs, resulting in 432 VL and 873 CT data points. VLs were higher in saliva and sputum (medians 4.7×10^8 and 6.5×10^4 genomes per ml, respectively) than in nasopharyngeal and oropharyngeal swabs (medians 1.7×10^2 and 4.8×10^3). Combined naso/oropharyngeal swabs had lower CT values (i.e. higher VLs) than single site samples ($p < 0.0001$). CT values were also lower in asymptomatic individuals and patients with severe COVID-19 (median CT 30 for both) than among patients with moderate and mild symptoms (31.4 and 31.3, respectively). Stool samples were reported positive for a longer period than other specimens.

Conclusion. VLs are higher in saliva and sputum and in individuals who are asymptomatic of with severe COVID-19. Diagnostic testing strategies should consider that VLs vary by sample type, disease severity and time since symptoms onset.

INTRODUCTION

In late 2019, the emergence of Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) triggered the Coronavirus Disease 19 (COVID-19) pandemic [1,2], which has now affected almost all countries, with devastating consequences. Even though most infections remain asymptomatic or have mild presentation [1–4], a significant proportion progress to severe COVID-19 with high case fatality rates and over 600,000 deaths worldwide by July 2020.

The detection of SARS-CoV-2 infections relies on amplifying the viral ribonucleic acid (RNA) using reverse transcription quantitative polymerase chain reaction (RT-qPCR) assays; multiple “in-house” and commercial assays are available [5], with assay sensitivity varying from 1 to 100 viral genome copies per reaction. The amount of virus detected is thought to vary according to the specimen examined, the time of sampling after symptoms onset and disease severity, although surprisingly there are no systematic reviews describing these variations [6–9]. There is conflicting information on the association of VLs and disease severity. In some studies high VLs are associated with severe COVID-19, as an indication of higher viral replication, cellular damage and pathology[10], which trigger multiorgan failure [11]; however, not all studies have found this association and asymptomatic individuals can have high VLs [12]. Saliva and sputum tend to have higher VLs [13,14], although nasal and oropharyngeal samples are used more frequently [15–17]. Virions can be detected two days before symptom onset when VLs are high, and generally remain detectable for 7-21 days. However, some patients have detectable RNA for up to two months and virus excretion is more prolonged in stools [18,19].

Most RT-qPCR assays report cycle threshold (CT) values or estimate the viral loads (VL) utilising standard curves, which are assay specific [20]. Most reports therefore include either the CT or the VL, as extrapolation from CT values [21], but rarely both values.

Given the heterogeneity of findings, we conducted a systematic review of SARS-CoV-2 CT values and VLs reported in the literature. Herein we describe virus excretion kinetics and how these titers differ with disease severity, time from symptom onset, type of sample tested and the RT-qPCR assay used.

METHODS

Search strategy and selection criteria

The primary questions were whether VLs and CT values varied according to sample type, disease severity (asymptomatic, mild and severe), the time since the start of symptoms and RT-qPCR assay. The search was conducted within the University of Bern Living Evidence on COVID-19 database (<https://ispmbern.github.io/covid-19/living-review/>), which uses the following search terms: MEDLINE: ("Wuhan coronavirus" [Supplementary Concept] OR "COVID-19" OR "2019 ncov"[tiab] OR (("novel coronavirus"[tiab] OR "new coronavirus"[tiab]) AND (wuhan[tiab] OR 2019[tiab])) OR 2019-nCoV[All Fields] OR (wuhan[tiab] AND coronavirus[tiab]))) EMBASE: ncov OR (wuhan AND corona) OR COVID-19 and BioRxiv/MedRxiv: ncov or corona or wuhan or COVID. The database was downloaded with a cut-off data of 8th April 2020. We sub searched the database by retaining literature that contained "load" OR "dynamic*" OR "diagnostic*" OR "shed*" OR "serial" in the title or abstract. We also searched the bibliography of systematic reviews and modelling studies to identify additional studies. No language restrictions were applied, and we assessed the English abstracts of Chinese language manuscripts for inclusion

and exclusion criteria. Two reviewers (ALW and CTW) independently conducted screening on the title, abstract and, if required, the full text of the manuscript. We included preprints and a second reviewer (VSS) verified all articles excluded during the full-text search. Studies were retained if they had used RT-qPCR and had reported VLs or CT values of SARS-CoV-2 in respiratory samples (oropharyngeal, nasopharyngeal, saliva, sputum, endotracheal aspirate or bronchoalveolar lavage) or stools, at one or more timepoints from individual patients in the community, outpatient or inpatient settings. Studies were included if they reported individual patient data or graphical displays that allowed data extraction and if it was possible to ascertain the day of sampling in relation to the initiation of symptoms. We included single case reports, case series and cohort studies. We excluded publications without original data, those which reported aggregated data, when data extraction of individual values was not possible and those with potentially overlapping data with other studies. The study protocol is registered at PROSPERO (Registration number: CRD42020181955).

Data extraction and bias assessment

Data were extracted in duplicate (by TE, VSS, ALW, ACA, KK and CTW) using a pre-piloted extraction form. Disagreements were resolved by discussion and involvement of a third party, where necessary. Graphs were digitised using Engauge software (<http://markummitcheil.github.io/engauge-digitizer/>). Extracted data included author, country, participant characteristics, and clinical setting. Individual patient data was retrieved including disease severity (asymptomatic, mild, moderate, severe), as defined by the study authors, frequency and day of symptoms, sample type, diagnostic assay, CT values and/or VLs. When standard curves for the RT-qPCR assays were available, we converted CT values into viral

genome copies per ml to allow their comparison with studies only reporting VLs. Standard curves were available for the Corman 2020 RT-qPCR, the China CDC N and ORF1b RT-qPCR, the United States CDC N1, N2, N3 RT-qPCRs [20] and the BGI Schenzen ORF1ab [22]. The values of converted VLs were included in both the CT values and VLs analyses. Although this method is not as accurate as when the standard curves are run experimentally by the study authors, it allows a good approximation for the conversion of CT values into VLs.

The Joanna Briggs Critical Appraisal Tools was used to assess the risk of bias and study quality for case report and case series, as appropriate [23]. After critical appraisal of each item, the studies were rated as good, fair, or poor and the findings were discussed qualitatively.

Statistical analysis

All laboratory data were standardised to display similar units and presented as medians and interquartile ranges (IQR). Categorical variables were described using descriptive statistics with 95% confidence intervals (95%CI). The normal distribution of continuous data was verified using the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test. As most CT values and VLs had skewed distributions, we used nonparametric tests to verify the statistical significance of the differences between groups. Kruskal-Wallis tests were used to assess differences between CT values and VLs by disease severity, sample type and time from symptom onset. If Kruskal-Wallis's tests were significant, we performed multiple comparisons using Dunn's tests (post-hoc test) to determinate differences between groups. Lines were fitted to longitudinal data sets using non-linear regression or polynomial models depending on the suitability of the data. P values <5% were considered statistically significant. Data were analysed using GraphPad Prism Version 5 (GraphPad Software, Inc., San Diego, CA).

RESULTS

The search strategy identified 746 reports. After screening titles and abstracts, 124 full-text articles were assessed for eligibility and 24 studies [1,7,12,14,16,17,24–41] met the inclusion criteria (Supplementary Figure 1). Most studies were rated good (12/24) or fair (9/24) for risk of bias, with three rated poor (Supplementary Tables 1 and 2). Eighteen studies were case series [1,12,14,16,17,26–29,31,32,34,36–41] and six case reports [7,24,25,30,33,35] (Table 1). Most studies included hospitalized patients and only two reported outpatients' data. CT values were reported in 18 studies [1,7,12,16,24,26,27,29,30,32–35,37–41,], VLs in six studies [14,17,25,28,31,36] and in six studies [7,12,29,33,35,37] with published standard curves CT values were converted to VLs. Individual patient data was identified for 173 participants yielding a database of 873 CT values and 494 VL data points and their characteristics are shown in Table 2.

Viral loads

The median VL across all sample types was 2.3×10^4 viral genomes per ml and ranged from 12 to 1×10^{11} genomes per ml (Supplementary Figure 2). VLs differed by samples type ($P < 0.0001$) (Figure 1) and were highest in saliva (median 4.7×10^8 genomes per ml) and sputum (6.5×10^4 genomes per ml). Nasopharyngeal and oropharyngeal swabs had median VLs of 1.7×10^3 and 4.8×10^3 per ml, respectively, which were lower than in saliva ($P < 0.001$) and sputum ($P < 0.001$). VLs declined with the number of days since symptoms onset (Figure 2) and were reported for a longer time period from stool (28 days) than oropharyngeal (22 days) and nasopharyngeal swabs (18 days). The large VL in Saliva samples was maintained for the duration of positivity, however VLs in saliva were not reported beyond 12 days.

CT values

The median CT values across all samples was 31.2, and ranged from 14.3 to 39.6, (Supplementary Figure 3). Values differed slightly with disease severity ($P = 0.0119$, Figure 3), as severe COVID-19 cases had median CT values of 30, compared with 31.4 and 31.3 for moderate and mild cases. However asymptomatic individuals also had a median of 30, which was not statistically different from severe COVID-19 cases ($P > 0.05$). CT values also differed by sample type, with median CTs of 32.2 for nasopharyngeal, 31.9 for oropharyngeal, 31.7 for stools and 27.3 for sputum ($P < 0.0001$, Figure 4). Combined naso/oropharyngeal swabs had lower median CTs (29.5) than other samples over the first 10 days of symptoms. Median CT values increased over time (indicating lower VLs) (Figure 5) and positive samples were reported for longer periods from nasopharyngeal swabs than oropharyngeal swabs.

CT values from nasopharyngeal swabs varied with disease severity. Severe cases continued to have positive results recorded for up to 31 days, while the last reported positive result for mild cases was 21 days (Supplementary Figure 4). Finally, CT values varied with the target gene of the RT-qPCR assays (Supplementary Figure 5), with the E gene target providing the lowest CT values, which were statistically significantly lower than the CT values reported for Orf1ab and RdRp ($P < 0.0001$).

DISCUSSION

CTs and VL titers varied by sample type, with saliva and sputum having higher VLs (and lower CTs), than other respiratory samples. Saliva and sputum are easier to collect and less invasive than nasopharyngeal swabs, especially among patients with mild and moderate COVID-19, and can be sampled by the patient, reducing the risk of infection to healthcare workers. However,

all saliva datapoints were obtained from a single study [36], and a follow on publication after the search cut-off date of 39 SARS-CoV-2 positive patients suggested a lower VL in comparison with nasopharyngeal samples [42]. Sputum, which is a diagnostic sample used for other respiratory conditions, had higher VLs and detectable virions for a longer time than other respiratory samples. This may be attributed to RNA from the lungs taking longer to be excreted from the lower respiratory tract, possibly by mechanical trapping in necrotic tissues or to lower airway cells containing greater density of human angiotensin converting enzyme 2 receptors, which are the target for virus binding [43]. VLs in the oropharynx were slightly higher than in the nasopharynx, although this was not statistically significant, as reported in studies not included here [44]. However, combining samples from both sites into a single sample resulted in higher VLs (lower CT values), which has been reported for other viruses [45]. This may reflect that the virus is not always detected simultaneously from all anatomical sites, and multiple-site swabs can decrease false negative results by extending the sampling area. Independently of the underlying reasons, sampling both sites seem to increase the yield for upper respiratory tract specimens.

Our study highlights the presence of high VLs in stools, with shedding recorded up to 28 days post symptoms onset. Although RT-qPCR does not distinguish whole viruses from RNA fractions [15], stool examination is gaining public health importance for surveillance, as its recovery from sewage samples seems to loosely correlate with the levels of infection in the community [46]. This also has the potential to forewarn of epidemics [47].

Although VLs have been considered markers of COVID-19 severity[48], with potential as prognostic biomarkers [47], there is no consensus across studies [49,50]. In our analysis, CT

values were slightly lower (higher VLs) in patients with asymptomatic infections and severe COVID-19 than among patients with mild and moderate presentations. Moreover, CT values had wide ranges with significant overlap across the groups, limiting their value as prognostic markers.

RT-qPCR assays targeting the E gene generally reported lower CTs than other targets. This is potentially due to many studies using the Charité RT-qPCR assays [5], of which the E gene primer/probe set has been shown to be more sensitive than the RdRp set [51]. The lower CTs obtained with the E gene may not be indicative of inherent increased sensitivity with this PCR target, but demonstrate the high sensitivity of this RT-qPCR assay.

Our data has several limitations that need to be considered to interpret the data. Most studies were case reports or case series and therefore testing was initiated by clinical need or patient management. It is thus possible that data was collected from patients with unusual conditions and does not represent the whole spectrum of disease. Data also represents early reports during the pandemic, when diagnostic capacity was limited, and testing was prioritised for patients with the greatest need. Therefore, VLs may have over-represented patients with symptomatic infections and their contacts and further studies are needed to further document VLs in asymptomatic and mild cases through community surveillance. Other potential limitations include the use of the disease severity classifications of the authors, which were not standardised until later in the epidemic. Moreover, we included pre-prints that had not been peer-reviewed, with potentially varying quality. Despite these limitations, few studies had a significant risk of bias and the main issues noted were data aggregation and a lack of timelines to describe the patient clinical progression.

In conclusion, we have demonstrated that SARS-CoV-2 CTs and VLs vary between sample type, time point, and disease severity. This information will be useful for the selection of specimens for SARS-CoV-2 confirmation, the development of new diagnostic assays and a better understanding of the patterns of VLs over time to be expected among the different specimens. This information will also be useful to inform sample pooling strategies, in which samples from several patients are ‘pooled’ and tested together, which are being explored as a resource saving approach to increase diagnostic capacity and for large scale screening of asymptomatic populations.

REFERENCES

1. Chan JF-W, Yuan S, Kok K-H, et al. A familial cluster of pneumonia associated with the 2019 novel coronavirus indicating person-to-person transmission: a study of a family cluster. *Lancet (London, England)* **2020**; 395:514–523. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/31986261>.
2. Huang C, Wang Y, Li X, et al. Clinical features of patients infected with 2019 novel coronavirus in Wuhan, China. *Lancet (London, England)* **2020**; 395:497–506. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/31986264>.
3. Chen N, Zhou M, Dong X, et al. Epidemiological and clinical characteristics of 99 cases of 2019 novel coronavirus pneumonia in Wuhan, China: a descriptive study. *Lancet (London, England)* **2020**; 395:507–513. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/32007143>.
4. Guan W-J, Ni Z-Y, Hu Y, et al. Clinical Characteristics of Coronavirus Disease 2019 in China. *N Engl J Med* **2020**; 382:1708–1720. Available at:

- <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/32109013>.
5. Corman VM, Landt O, Kaiser M, et al. Detection of 2019 novel coronavirus (2019-nCoV) by real-time RT-PCR. *Euro Surveill* **2020**; 25. Available at:
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/31992387>.
 6. Rothe C, Schunk M, Sothmann P, et al. Transmission of 2019-nCoV Infection from an Asymptomatic Contact in Germany. *N Engl J Med* **2020**; 382:970–971. Available at:
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/32003551>.
 7. Holshue ML, DeBolt C, Lindquist S, et al. First Case of 2019 Novel Coronavirus in the United States. *N Engl J Med* **2020**; 382:929–936. Available at:
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/32004427>.
 8. Hoehl S, Rabenau H, Berger A, et al. Evidence of SARS-CoV-2 Infection in Returning Travelers from Wuhan, China. *N Engl J Med* **2020**; 382:1278–1280. Available at:
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/32069388>.
 9. He X, Lau EHY, Wu P, et al. Temporal dynamics in viral shedding and transmissibility of COVID-19. *Nat Med* **2020**; 26:672–675. Available at:
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/32296168>.
 10. Mason RJ. Pathogenesis of COVID-19 from a cell biology perspective. *Eur Respir J* **2020**; 55:2000607. Available at:
<http://erj.ersjournals.com/lookup/doi/10.1183/13993003.00607-2020>.
 11. Jose RJ, Manuel A. COVID-19 cytokine storm: the interplay between inflammation and coagulation. *Lancet Respir Med* **2020**; 8:e46–e47. Available at:
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/32353251>.

12. Tan L, Kang X, Zhang B, et al. A special case of COVID-19 with long duration of viral shedding for 49 days. medRxiv **2020**;
13. Han H, Luo Q, Mo F, Long L, Zheng W. SARS-CoV-2 RNA more readily detected in induced sputum than in throat swabs of convalescent COVID-19 patients. Lancet Infect Dis **2020**; 20:655–656. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/32171389>.
14. Pan Y, Zhang D, Yang P, Poon LLM, Wang Q. Viral load of SARS-CoV-2 in clinical samples. Lancet Infect Dis **2020**; 20:411–412. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/32105638>.
15. Wang W, Xu Y, Gao R, et al. Detection of SARS-CoV-2 in Different Types of Clinical Specimens. JAMA **2020**; Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/32159775>.
16. Yang Y, Yang M, Shen C, et al. Evaluating the accuracy of different respiratory specimens in the laboratory diagnosis and monitoring the viral shedding of 2019-nCoV infections. medRxiv. 2020;
17. Woelfel R, Corman VM, Guggemos W, et al. Clinical presentation and virological assessment of hospitalized cases of coronavirus disease 2019 in a travel-associated transmission cluster. medRxiv **2020**;
18. Zheng S, Fan J, Yu F, et al. Viral load dynamics and disease severity in patients infected with SARS-CoV-2 in Zhejiang province, China, January-March 2020: retrospective cohort study. BMJ **2020**; 369:m1443. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/32317267>.
19. Santos VS, Gurgel RQ, Cuevas LE, Martins-Filho PR. Prolonged fecal shedding of SARS-CoV-2 in pediatric patients. A quantitative evidence synthesis. J Pediatr Gastroenterol

Nutr **2020**; Publish Ah. Available at:

<https://journals.lww.com/10.1097/MPG.0000000000002798>.

20. Jung YJ, Park G-S, Moon JH, et al. Comparative analysis of primer-probe sets for the laboratory confirmation of SARS-CoV-2. *BioRxiv* **2020**;
21. Foundation of Innovative New Diagnostics. SARS-COV-2 molecular assay evaluation: results. 2020. Available at: <https://www.finddx.org/covid-19/sarscov2-eval-molecular/molecular-eval-results/>. Accessed 8 July 2020.
22. Liu C, Huang B, Zhou R, et al. The application of a testing platform in high-throughput nucleic acid detection of SARS-CoV-2. *OSF Prepr* **2020**;
23. Moola S, Munn Z, Tufanaru C, et al. Systematic review of etiology and risk. In: Aromatari E, Munn Z, eds. *Joanna Briggs Institute Reviewer’s Manual*. Adelaide, Australia: The Joanna Briggs Institute, 2017. Available at: <https://reviewersmanual.joannabriggs.org/>.
24. Caly L, Druce J, Roberts J, et al. Isolation and rapid sharing of the 2019 novel coronavirus (SARS-CoV-2) from the first patient diagnosed with COVID-19 in Australia. *Med J Aust* **2020**;
25. Chen D, Xu W, Lei Z, et al. Recurrence of positive SARS-CoV-2 RNA in COVID-19: A case report. *Int J Infect Dis* **2020**; 93:297–299. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijid.2020.03.003>.
26. Kam KQ, Yung CF, Cui L, et al. A Well Infant with Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) with High Viral Load. *Clin Infect Dis* **2020**; :2019–2021.
27. Kim ES, Chin BS, Kang CK, et al. Clinical course and outcomes of patients with severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 infection: A preliminary report of the first 28

- patients from the Korean cohort study on COVID-19. *J Korean Med Sci* **2020**; 35:1–12.
28. Kim JY, Ko JH, Kim Y, et al. Viral load kinetics of SARS-CoV-2 infection in first two patients in Korea. *J Korean Med Sci* **2020**; 35:1–7.
 29. Le TQM, Takemura T, Moi ML, et al. Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 Shedding by Travelers, Vietnam, 2020. *Emerg Infect Dis* **2020**;
 30. Lee NY, Li CW, Tsai HP, et al. A case of COVID-19 and pneumonia returning from Macau in Taiwan: Clinical course and anti-SARS-CoV-2 IgG dynamic. *J Microbiol Immunol Infect* **2020**; :3–5. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jmii.2020.03.003>.
 31. Lescure FX, Bouadma L, Nguyen D, et al. Clinical and virological data of the first cases of COVID-19 in Europe: a case series. *Lancet Infect Dis* **2020**; 20:697–706.
 32. Liu Y, Yang Y, Zhang C, et al. Clinical and biochemical indexes from 2019-nCoV infected patients linked. *Sci China Life Sci* **2020**; 63:364–374.
 33. Scott SE, Zabel K, Collins J, et al. First Mildly Ill, Nonhospitalized Case of Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) Without Viral Transmission in the United States—Maricopa County, Arizona, 2020. *Clin Infect Dis* **2020**; 2019:1–4. Available at: <https://academic.oup.com/cid/advance-article/doi/10.1093/cid/ciaa374/5815221>.
 34. Shen C, Wang Z, Zhao F, et al. Treatment of 5 Critically Ill Patients with COVID-19 with Convalescent Plasma. *JAMA - J Am Med Assoc* **2020**; 323:1582–1589.
 35. Tan L Van, Ngoc NM, That BTT, et al. Duration of viral detection in throat and rectum of a patient with COVID-19. 2020.
 36. To KKW, Tsang OTY, Chik-Yan Yip C, et al. Consistent detection of 2019 novel coronavirus in saliva. *Clin Infect Dis* **2020**; :4–6.

37. Xu Y, Li X, Zhu B, et al. Characteristics of pediatric SARS-CoV-2 infection and potential evidence for persistent fecal viral shedding. *Nat Med* **2020**; 26:502–505.
38. Young BE, Ong SWX, Kalimuddin S, et al. Epidemiologic Features and Clinical Course of Patients Infected with SARS-CoV-2 in Singapore. *JAMA - J Am Med Assoc* **2020**; 323:1488–1494.
39. Zhang N, Gong Y, Meng F, Bi Y, Yang P, Wang F. Virus shedding patterns in nasopharyngeal and fecal specimens of COVID-19 patients. *medRxiv* **2020**; :2020.03.28.20043059. Available at: <http://medrxiv.org/lookup/doi/10.1101/2020.03.28.20043059>.
40. Zhang W, Du RH, Li B, et al. Molecular and serological investigation of 2019-nCoV infected patients: implication of multiple shedding routes. *Emerg Microbes Infect* **2020**; 9:386–389.
41. Zou L, Ruan F, Huang M, et al. SARS-CoV-2 Viral Load in Upper Respiratory Specimens of Infected Patients. *N Engl J Med* **2020**; 382:1177–1179. Available at: <http://www.nejm.org/doi/10.1056/NEJMc2001737>.
42. Williams E, Bond K, Zhang B, Putland M, Williamson DA. Saliva as a non-invasive specimen for detection of SARS-CoV-2. *J Clin Microbiol* **2020**; Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/32317257>.
43. Perrotta F, Matera MG, Cazzola M, Bianco A. Severe respiratory SARS-CoV2 infection: Does ACE2 receptor matter? *Respir Med* **2020**; 168:105996. Available at: <https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S095461120301360>.
44. Patel MR, Carroll D, Ussery E, et al. Performance of oropharyngeal swab testing

- compared to nasopharyngeal swab testing for diagnosis of COVID-19 — United States, January-February 2020. *Clin Infect Dis* **2020**; Available at: <https://academic.oup.com/cid/advance-article/doi/10.1093/cid/ciaa759/5858273>.
45. Ek P, Böttiger B, Dahlman D, Hansen KB, Nyman M, Nilsson AC. A combination of naso- and oropharyngeal swabs improves the diagnostic yield of respiratory viruses in adult emergency department patients. *Infect Dis (Auckl)* **2019**; 51:241–248. Available at: <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/23744235.2018.1546055>.
46. Chavarria-Miró G, Anfruns-Estrada E, Guix S, et al. Sentinel surveillance of SARS-CoV-2 in wastewater anticipates the occurrence of COVID-19 cases. *medRxiv* **2020**;
47. Amirian ES. Potential fecal transmission of SARS-CoV-2: Current evidence and implications for public health. *Int J Infect Dis* **2020**; 95:363–370. Available at: <https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S1201971220302733>.
48. Magleby R, Westblade LF, Trzebucki A, et al. Impact of SARS-CoV-2 Viral Load on Risk of Intubation and Mortality Among Hospitalized Patients with Coronavirus Disease 2019. *Clin Infect Dis* **2020**; Available at: <https://academic.oup.com/cid/advance-article/doi/10.1093/cid/ciaa851/5865363>.
49. Argyropoulos K V., Serrano A, Hu J, et al. Association of initial viral load in SARS-CoV-2 patients with outcome and symptoms. *Am J Pathol* **2020**; Available at: <https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0002944020303333>.
50. Arons MM, Hatfield KM, Reddy SC, et al. Presymptomatic SARS-CoV-2 Infections and Transmission in a Skilled Nursing Facility. *N Engl J Med* **2020**; 382:2081–2090. Available at: <http://www.nejm.org/doi/10.1056/NEJMoa2008457>.

51. Vogels CBF, Brito AF, Wyllie AL, et al. Analytical sensitivity and efficiency comparisons of SARS-COV-2 qRT-PCR primer-probe sets. medRxiv **2020**;

Tables

Table 1: Characteristics of included studies

Author	Country	Study design	Setting	Number of patients	Sample type	PCR target gene	CT or VL reported
Caly L.	Australia	Case report	In-patient	1	NP, SP, U, SE, R	RdRP	CT
Chan J.	China	Case series (family cluster)	OPD, in-patient	6	NP, OP, R, U, SE, P, SP	S	CT
Chen D.	China	Case report	In-patient	1	OP	Unknown	VL
Holshue M.L.	China	Case report	In-patient	1	OP	N1, N2, N3	CT*
Kam K.	Singapore	Case series	In-patient	2	NP, R, U, B	ORF1ab, N	CT
Kim E.	Korea	Case series	In-patient	28 (9 with viral kinetics)	OPNP, SP	E, RdRP	CT
Kim J.Y.	Korea	Case series	In-patient	2	OPNP, SP, SE, U, R, P (viral kinetics only available for OPNP and SP)	E	VL
Le T.	Vietnam	Case series / cluster analysis	In-patient	24 (12 with data)	OP	E, RdRP, N	CT*
Lee N.	Taiwan	Case report	In-patient	1	OP, NP (CT value reported for OP only)	E, RdRP1, N	CT
Lescure F.	France	Case series / cohort study	In-patient (3 in ICU)	5	NP (aspirate or swab), R, B	E, RdRP	VL
Liu Y.	China	Case series	In-patient (several ICU)	12	OP, BALF	N, ORF1ab	CT
Pan Y.	China	Case series	In-patient	82 (2 with IPD)	OP, SP, U, R	Unknown	VL
Scott, S.	USA	Case report	OPD	1	OP, NP, SE, SP	N1, N2, N3	CT*
Shen C.	China	Case series	ICU	5	NP	N, ORF1ab	CT
Tan L.	China	Case series	In-patient	2 (viral load on 1 patient)	OP	RdRP/E	CT*
Tan L.	Vietnam	Case report	In-patient	1	OP, R, P, U	RdRP	CT*
To K.K.W.	Hong Kong,	Case series	In-patient	12	SA	S	VL

	China						
Woelfel, R.	Germany	Case series	In-patient	9	OP, SP, R	RdRP	VL
Xu Y.	China	Case series / screening programme	In-patient	10	NP, R	N, ORF1ab	CT*
Yang Y.	China	Case series	In-patient	10	OP, NP, SP, BALF	N, ORF1ab	CT
Young B.	Singapore	Case series	In-patient (2 patients in ICU)	18	NP, B, U, R	N, S, ORF1ab	CT
Zhang N.	China	Case series	In-patient	10	OPNP, R	ORF1ab	CT
Zhang W.	China	Case series	In-patient	13	OP, R	ORF1ab	CT
Zou L.	China	Case series / cluster analysis	Unclear	17	OP, NP	ORF1ab	CT

IPD: individual patient data

OPD: out-patient, ICU: intensive care unit

OP: oropharyngeal, NP: nasopharyngeal, OPNP: combined oropharyngeal and nasopharyngeal, SA: saliva, SE: serum, SP: sputum, U: urine, B: blood, R: rectal/faecal/stool, BALF: Bronchoalveolar Lavage Fluid, P: plasma, B: blood, P: plasma

*CT values converted to VLs using published standard curves for the RT-qPCR used in the study

Table 2. Characteristic of the 173 patients included.

Variables	N (%)
Age, median (IQR*) in years	46 (28.5-62.5)
Sex	
Male	45 (26.0)
Female	45 (26.0)
Not reported	83 (48.0)
Comorbidity, yes	26 (15.0)
Type of comorbidity**	
Hypertension	11 (30.6)
Diabetes	5 (13.9)
Heart disease	4 (11.1)
Smoker	4 (11.1)
Cancer	3 (8.3)
Lung diseases	2 (5.6)
Chronic renal disease	2 (13.9)
Other	5 (13.9)
Symptoms***	
Fever	81 (59.5)
Cough	65 (47.8)
Diarrhoea	17 (12.5)
Sore throat	11 (8.1)
Shortness of breath	11 (8.1)
Headache	9 (6.6)
Chest pain	7 (5.1)
Myalgia	6 (4.4)
Fatigue	3 (2.2)
Stage of disease	
Asymptomatic	3 (2.2)
Mild	80 (58.8)
Moderate	2 (1.5)
Severe	33 (24.3)
Not reported	18 (13.2)
ARDS	11 (8.1)
Bacterial pneumonia	11 (11.0)
Outcome	
Continued follow up	35 (25.7)
Discharged	34 (25.0)
Death	1 (0.7)
Not reported	103 (59.5)

* IQR: interquartile range

**Some patients had more than one comorbidity.

*** Some patients had more than 1 symptom.

Figures

$p < 0.0001$




Figure 1. Distribution of viral loads by sample type. Error bars indicate medians and interquartile range (NP = nasopharyngeal, OP = oropharyngeal).




Figure 2. Viral loads reported after symptoms onset by sample type. Error bars indicate medians and interquartile range (NP = nasopharyngeal, OP = oropharyngeal).

It is made available under a [CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/).

Viral load in patients with SARS-CoV-2




Figure 3. CT values by disease severity. Error bars indicate medians and interquartile range.




Figure 4. CT values by sample type. Error bars indicate medians and interquartile range (NP = nasopharyngeal, OP = oropharyngeal).




Figure 5. CT values reported after symptoms onset by sample type. Error bars indicate medians and interquartile range (NP = nasopharyngeal, OP = oropharyngeal).