

1                   **Clinical and microbiological assessments of COVID-19 in healthcare**  
2                   **workers: a prospective longitudinal study**

3 Antonin Bal<sup>1,2</sup>, Karen Brengel-Pesce<sup>3</sup>, Alexandre Gaymard<sup>1,2</sup>, Grégory Quéromès<sup>2</sup>, Nicolas  
4 Guibert<sup>4,5</sup>, Emile Frobert<sup>1,2</sup>, Maude Bouscambert<sup>1,2</sup>, Mary-Anne Trabaud<sup>1</sup>, Florence Allantaz-  
5 Frager<sup>6</sup>, Guy Oriol<sup>3</sup>, Valérie Cheynet<sup>3</sup>, Constance d'Aubarede<sup>4,5</sup>, Amélie Massardier-  
6 Pilonchery<sup>4,5</sup>, Marlyse Buisson<sup>7</sup>, Julien Lupo<sup>7</sup>, Bruno Pozzetto<sup>8,9</sup>, Pascal Poignard<sup>7</sup>, Bruno  
7 Lina<sup>1,2</sup>, Jean-Baptiste Fassier<sup>4,5</sup>, Florence Morfin-Sherpa<sup>1,2</sup> and Sophie Trouillet-Assant<sup>2,3</sup> on  
8 behalf of COVID SER STUDY GROUP

9 <sup>1</sup>Laboratoire de Virologie, Institut des Agents Infectieux, Laboratoire associé au Centre National  
10 de Référence des virus des infections respiratoires, Hospices Civils de Lyon, Lyon, France

11 <sup>2</sup>CIRI, Centre International de Recherche en Infectiologie, Team VirPath, Univ Lyon, Inserm,  
12 U1111, Université Claude Bernard Lyon 1, CNRS, UMR5308, ENS de Lyon, F-69007, Lyon,  
13 France

14 <sup>3</sup>Joint Research Unit Hospices Civils de Lyon-bioMérieux, Lyon Sud Hospital, Pierre-Bénite,  
15 France.

16 <sup>4</sup>Lyon University, Université Claude Bernard Lyon1, Ifsttar, UMRESTTE, UMR T\_9405, 8  
17 avenue Rockefeller Lyon, France

18 <sup>5</sup>Occupational Health and Medicine Department, Hospices Civils de Lyon, Lyon, France.  
19 6 biomérieux

20 <sup>7</sup>Institut de Biologie Structurale, Université Grenoble Alpes, CEA, CNRS and Centre  
21 Hospitalier Universitaire Grenoble Alpes, Grenoble, France

22 <sup>8</sup>GIMAP EA 3064 (Groupe Immunité des Muqueuses et Agents Pathogènes), Université Jean  
23 Monnet, Lyon University, Saint-Etienne, France

24 <sup>9</sup>Laboratory of Infectious Agents and Hygiene, University Hospital of Saint-Etienne, Saint-  
25 Etienne, France

26  
27 **Corresponding author:** Dr Sophie Trouillet-Assant, Ph.D

28 Hospices Civils de Lyon, France

29 Centre International de Recherche en Infectiologie, Team VirPath, Univ Lyon, Inserm,U1111,  
30 Université Claude Bernard Lyon 1, CNRS, UMR5308, ENS de Lyon, 69007, Lyon, France

31 Phone: + 33 (0)472678780 Email: [sophie.assant@chu-lyon.fr](mailto:sophie.assant@chu-lyon.fr)

32 **Keywords:** COVID-19; SARS-CoV-2; Health-care workers; viral load; viral culture; RT-  
33 PCR; neutralizing antibody

34 **Running title:** Assessment of COVID-19 in HCW

## 35 **Background**

36 A comprehensive assessment of COVID-19 in healthcare workers (HCWs) including the  
37 investigation of viral shedding duration is critical.

## 38 **Methods**

39 A longitudinal study including 319 HCWs was conducted. After SARS-CoV-2 screening with  
40 RT-PCR assay, other respiratory pathogens were tested with a multiplex molecular panel. For  
41 SARS-CoV-2 positive HCWs, the normalized viral load was determined weekly; viral culture  
42 and virus neutralization assays were also performed. For 190 HCWs tested negative, SARS-  
43 CoV-2 serological testing was performed one month after the inclusion.

## 44 **Findings**

45 Of the 319 HCWs included, 67 (21.0%) were tested positive for SARS-CoV-2; two of them  
46 developed severe COVID-19. The proportion of smell and taste dysfunction was significantly  
47 higher in SARS-CoV-2 positive HCWs than in negative ones (38.8% vs 9.5% and 37.3% vs  
48 10.7%, respectively,  $p < 0.001$ ). Of the 67 positive patients, 9.1% were tested positive for at  
49 least another respiratory pathogen (*vs* 19.5%,  $p = 0.07$ ). The proportion of HCWs with a viral  
50 load  $> 5.0 \log_{10}$  cp/ml (Ct value  $< 25$ ) was less than 15% at 8 days after symptom onset; 12%  
51 of them were still positive after 40 days (Ct  $> 37$ ). More than 90% of culturable virus had a  
52 viral load  $> 4.5 \log_{10}$  cp/ml (Ct  $< 26$ ) and were collected within 10 days after symptom  
53 onset. From HCWs tested negative, 6/190 (3.2%) exhibited seroconversion for IgG  
54 antibodies.

## 55 **Interpretation**

56 Our data suggest that the determination of normalized viral load (or its estimation through Ct  
57 values) can be useful for discontinuing isolation of HCWs and facilitating their safe return to  
58 work. HCWs presenting mild COVID-19 are unlikely infectious 10 days after symptom onset.

59 **Funding.** Fondation des Hospices Civils de Lyon. bioMérieux provided diagnostic kits.

60 **Introduction**

61 Since the beginning of the SARS-CoV-2 pandemic in December 2019, healthcare workers  
62 (HCWs) from all over the world have been on the front line for the management of COVID-  
63 19 patients. Due to close, repeated, and prolonged contact with SARS-CoV-2 infected patients,  
64 HCWs have been a privileged target of the COVID-19 pandemic [1–3]. Similar to the rest of  
65 the population, the clinical spectrum of SARS-CoV-2 infections reported in HCWs  
66 encompassed asymptomatic, mild but also severe and fatal infections [4–7]. The early  
67 detection of SARS-CoV-2 infected HCWs is crucial to reduce the risk of nosocomial  
68 transmission, which is associated with an important mortality when occurring between at-risk  
69 patients including elderly people [6,8,9]. However, medical settings may not have enough  
70 resources to keep infected HCWs on leave for a long time due to HCW shortage. Defining the  
71 duration of infectivity of HCWs is therefore of paramount importance for their appropriate  
72 management, which becomes crucial to face the present intensive recirculation of the virus in  
73 the Northern hemisphere [10,11].

74 The diagnosis of SARS-CoV-2 infection is mainly based on RT-PCR performed on naso-  
75 pharyngeal swabs (NPS). The virus can be detected about 2 to 3 days before the onset of  
76 symptoms and the viral RNA excretion can last up to several weeks depending on the immune  
77 competence, the patient age as well as the severity of the disease [12–17]. As frequently  
78 observed for other viral infections, the SARS-CoV-2 viral RNA can be detected beyond  
79 resolution of symptoms, after seroconversion, and without any detectable infectious virus in  
80 clinical samples [18–21]. To assess the duration of infectivity in COVID-19 patients, no  
81 standard, rapid, and reliable method is available, and so viral isolation in cell culture remains  
82 the most appropriate approach despite its fastidiousness [22]. In previous reports, SARS-CoV-  
83 2 isolation could be performed up to 10 days after symptom onset in mild patients [18,23–25]  
84 and up to 22 days after the first positive result in severe patients [20,25–27]. To enhance

85 clinical management of SARS-CoV-2 infection in HCWs, a virological investigation  
86 including quantitative RT-PCR, viral culture as well as the determination of neutralizing  
87 antibodies titers over the course of the disease is needed. With this aim, we performed a  
88 comprehensive assessment of COVID-19 in a longitudinal cohort study of 319 front-line  
89 HCWs enrolled during the first wave of the pandemic.

## 90 **Methods**

### 91 **Study design**

92 A prospective longitudinal cohort study was conducted at the university hospital of Lyon,  
93 France (*Hospices Civils de Lyon*, HCL) [28] in HCWs with symptoms suggesting a SARS-  
94 CoV-2 infection. HCWs with a previous positive SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR test were excluded.  
95 Clinical and microbiological data were recorded for all included HCWs. Patients with a  
96 positive RT-PCR result at inclusion (V1) came back during 6 consecutive weeks for SARS-  
97 CoV-2 (V2-V7) quantitative RT-PCR on NPS and blood sampling at each time point. HCWs  
98 with negative SARS-CoV-2 PCR at inclusion came back one month later (V5) for SARS-  
99 CoV-2 serology testing (Figure 1).

### 100 **Microbiological investigations**

101 HCWs were tested for SARS-CoV-2 with a real-time RT-PCR on NPS (Cobas® SARS-CoV-  
102 2 Test, Roche, Basel, Switzerland). NSP used were either in Copan Universal Transport  
103 Medium (UTM-RT®) or in Cobas® PCR medium tube.

104 To evaluate the number of symptomatic HCWs negative for SARS-COV-2 but positive for  
105 another pathogen and to evaluate the co-infection rate in COVID-19 HCWs, a total of 307  
106 NPS collected at inclusion were tested with the BIOFIRE® Respiratory 2.1 *plus* Panel  
107 (RP2.1*plus*) detecting 23 respiratory pathogens including SARS-CoV-2 (bioMérieux, Lyon,  
108 France).

109 SARS-CoV-2 positive HCWs with a co-infection were removed from the rest of the analysis  
110 because symptoms could not be exclusively attributed to SARS-CoV-2.  
111 For COVID-19 HCWs, the SARS-CoV-2 load was determined weekly from inclusion until  
112 becoming negative by RT-PCR using SARS-CoV-2 R-gene® kit (bioMérieux, Lyon, France).  
113 Nucleic acid extraction was performed from 0.2 mL NPS on NUCLISENS® easyMAG® and  
114 amplification using Biorad CFX96. Quantitative viral load was determined using four  
115 internally developed quantification standards targeting the SARS-CoV-2 N gene: QS1 to QS4  
116 respectively at  $2.5 \cdot 10^6$ ,  $2.5 \cdot 10^5$ ,  $2.5 \cdot 10^4$ ,  $2.5 \cdot 10^3$  copies/mL of a SARS-CoV-2 DNA standard.  
117 These QS were controlled and quantified using the Nanodrop spectrophotometer  
118 (ThermoFisher) and Applied Biosystems QuantStudio 3D Digital PCR.  
119 In parallel, NPS were tested using the CELL Control R-GENE® kit (amplification of the  
120 HPRT1 housekeeping gene) that contains 2 quantification standards QS1 and QS2,  
121 respectively at  $10^4$  copies/ $\mu$ L (50,000 cells/PCR i.e.  $1.25 \cdot 10^6$  cells/mL in our conditions) and  
122  $10^3$  copies/ $\mu$ L (5000 cells/PCR i.e.  $1.25 \cdot 10^5$  cells/mL in our conditions) of DNA standard, to  
123 normalize the viral load according to sampling quality.

$$\text{Normalized viral load [Log}_{10} \text{ cp/mL}] = \text{Log}_{10} \left[ \frac{\text{Number of SARS-CoV-2 copies per mL} \times 10^6 \text{ cells per mL}}{\text{Number of cells per mL}} \right]$$

124  
125 Viral culture was performed following interim biosafety guidelines established by WHO [29]  
126 from NPS in UTM-RT® only; guanidine contained in the Cobas PCR medium tube prevented  
127 culture assay due to cytotoxic activity. RT-PCR positive NPS were inoculated on confluent  
128 Vero cells (ATCC CCL-81) with Eagle's Minimum Essential Media (EMEM) supplemented  
129 with 2% penicillin-streptomycin, 1% L-glutamine, and 2% inactivated fetal bovine serum.  
130 Plates were incubated at 33°C with 5% CO<sub>2</sub> for 96 hours. Cytopathic effects (CPE) were  
131 monitored daily; samples were harvested when positive, while negative samples at 96 hours

132 underwent subculture on new plates. Culture supernatants were sampled at 2 hours post-  
133 inoculation, at 96 hours, and at an additional 96 hours on subculture. RNA from supernatants  
134 was extracted by the automated MGISP-960 workstation using MGI Easy Magnetic Beads  
135 Virus DNA/RNA Extraction Kit (MGI Tech®, Marupe, Latvia), and SARS-CoV-2 detection  
136 was performed using TaqPath™ COVID-19 CE-IVD RT-PCR kit on a QuantStudio™ 5  
137 System (Applied Biosystems, Thermo Fisher Scientific, Waltham, USA).

### 138 **Serological investigations**

139 The presence of anti-SARS CoV-2 antibodies was evaluated on serum samples using the  
140 Wantai SARS-CoV-2 Ab ELISA kit (Wantai, Beijing, China), which detects total antibodies,  
141 and the VIDAS® SARS-COV-2 IgG test (bioMérieux, Lyon, France), according to the  
142 manufacturers' instructions. Positivity was established according to the threshold value  
143 recommended by each manufacturer.

144 Neutralizing antibodies were quantified with a neutralization assay using lentiviral  
145 pseudotypes on serum samples. Briefly, gag/pol and luciferase plasmids were co-transfected  
146 with a SARS-CoV-2 full length S plasmid in HEK293T cells and pseudoviruses were  
147 harvested after 72h. Serial dilutions of human serum were incubated with pseudoviruses at  
148 37°C for 1 h, then transferred onto HeLa-ACE2 cells in 96-well plates at 10 000 cells/well  
149 (Corning). Plates were incubated at 37°C for 48 hours and HeLa-ACE2 cells were further  
150 lysed using 1x luciferase lysis buffer (Oz Biosciences), at room temperature for 1h. Luciferase  
151 activity was measured by adding luciferase substrate (Oz Biosciences), according to the  
152 manufacturer's instructions. Luciferase intensity was then read on a TECAN® luminometer.  
153 The results from this assay were expressed as the serum dilution required to reduce infection  
154 by 50% (neutralization titer).

### 155 **Statistical analysis**

156 The median (interquartile range, IQR) was applied for describing continuous variables. The  
157 difference between groups was assessed by Student's T test or Mann-Whitney U test, as  
158 appropriate. For categorical variables, n (%) was used for description and examined by Chi-  
159 square test or Fisher's exact test. All statistical analyses were conducted by R (the R  
160 foundation, <https://www.r-project.org/foundation/>, version 3.6.1). Adjusted p-values were  
161 calculated using Benjamini & Hochberg method. An adjusted p-value <0.05 was considered  
162 statistically relevant.

### 163 **Ethics**

164 The clinical study registered on ClinicalTrial.gov (NCT04341142) has been fully detailed  
165 [28]. Written informed consent was obtained from all participants and approval was obtained  
166 from the national review board for biomedical research in April 2020 (*Comité de Protection*  
167 *des Personnes Sud Méditerranée I*, Marseille, France; ID RCB 2020-A00932-37).

168 **Results**

169 **Demographic and clinical characteristics of SARS-CoV-2 positive and negative HCWs**

170 Between April 10th and May 28th, 2020, a total of 319 symptomatic HCWs were included  
171 (Figure 1). The main symptoms leading to SARS-CoV-2 screening were fever (61%,  
172 194/319), cough (182/319, 57%) and asthenia (260/317, 82%). Among the 319 HCW, 67  
173 (21.0%) were tested positive for SARS-CoV-2 (Table 1). The median [IQR] time between  
174 SARS-CoV-2 screening and symptom onset was 3 [2-6] and 5 [3-8] days for positive and  
175 negative patients, respectively (p=0.091). The median age of patients was 36 years old for  
176 positive and negative SARS-CoV-2 HCWs (p=0.93). Sex ratio (M/F) was 1:6 vs 1:4 for  
177 positive and negative patients respectively (p=0.64). The proportion of active smokers was  
178 lower in positive SARS-CoV-2 patients compared to negative ones (6/67 (8.9%) vs 64/252  
179 (25.4%), p-adjusted=0.09). The proportion of smell and taste dysfunction was significantly  
180 higher in positive patients than in negative ones (26/67 (38.8%) vs 24/250 (9.5%) and 25/67  
181 (37.3%) vs 27/250 (10.7%), respectively, p<0.001 for both symptoms). Diarrhea was reported  
182 in 23.9% (16/67) vs 41.3% (104/252) in positive and negative patients, respectively (p=0.091).  
183 Among the 67 positive patients, only two severe forms required conventional hospitalization,  
184 and one of them required ventilation support. No ICU admission was needed.

185 **Investigation of bacterial and viral respiratory pathogens**

186 To explore the potential presence of other respiratory infections in symptomatic HCWs tested  
187 negative for SARS-CoV-2 and to assess the co-infection rate in COVID-19 HCWs, a  
188 multiplex molecular respiratory panel was performed. The detection of SARS-CoV-2 with the  
189 multiplex panel was fully concordant with the initial routine diagnosis. Other respiratory  
190 pathogens were found in 6/66 (9.1%) vs 47/241 (19.5%) in SARS-CoV-2 positive and  
191 negative HCWs, respectively (p = 0.07) (Table 2). The pathogens responsible for co-infection  
192 in the 6 COVID-19 HCWs were rhinovirus/enterovirus (n=3), adenovirus (n=2), and

193 parainfluenza virus 2 (n=2); one patient had a multiple infection (adenovirus -  
194 rhinovirus/enterovirus) in addition to SARS-CoV-2. Clinical and demographical  
195 characteristics of these 6 co-infected patients are detailed in supplementary Table 1. No  
196 bacterial co-infection was found for positive SARS-CoV-2 patients. For negative SARS-CoV-  
197 2 HCWs, the most frequent pathogens were rhinovirus/enterovirus (n=27), adenovirus (n=15)  
198 and other coronaviruses (HKU1 or NL63, n=7). *Chlamydia pneumoniae* (n=2) or  
199 *Mycoplasma pneumoniae* (n=1) were also found in negative SARS-CoV-2 HCWs (Table 2).

#### 200 **Duration of SARS-CoV-2 PCR positivity according to normalized viral load**

201 For the 61 SARS-CoV-2 positive HCWs without co-infection, normalized viral load was  
202 determined each week up to negativity of the RT-PCR test (Figure 2).

203 The percentage of HCWs with a viral load  $>5 \log_{10}$  cp/mL, corresponding to a cycle threshold  
204 (Ct) value  $< 25$ , rapidly decreased during the first days after symptom onset and reached less  
205 than 15% at 8 days. At 20 days after symptom onset, about 40% of HCWs had a positive RT-  
206 PCR with a viral load  $> 2 \log_{10}$  cp/mL. At 40 days post-symptom onset, SARS-CoV-2 RNA  
207 was still detectable for 12% of HCWs ( $< 1 \log_{10}$  cp/mL, Ct value  $>37$ ).

#### 208 **Viral culture results according to viral load and date of symptom onset**

209 A total of 64 SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR positive NPS samples collected from 40 patients without  
210 co-infection were inoculated for cell culture (Figure 3A, supplementary Figure 1). Forty-two  
211 of these 64 samples (65.6%) showed a positive viral culture. The median [IQR] of normalized  
212 viral load for the culturable samples was 6.7 [5.6-7.4]  $\log_{10}$  cp/mL vs 3.6 [2.9-4.9]  $\log_{10}$  cp/ml  
213 for non-culturable specimens ( $p<0.001$ ). The lowest viral load associated with culturable virus  
214 was 3.7  $\log_{10}$  cp/mL (Ct value of 30.2) (supplementary Figure 1, supplementary Table 2).  
215 More than 90% of samples (38/42) with culturable virus had a viral load  $> 4.5 \log_{10}$  cp/mL,  
216 corresponding to a Ct value of 26 for the N gene, and were collected before 10 days after  
217 symptom onset.

218 Further than twelve days after symptom onset, infectious virus could be retrieved in 3 samples,  
219 only after subculture. The positivity of these subcultures was established using an RT-PCR  
220 test performed on culture supernatant as the Ct difference was  $> 10$  compared to the first  
221 passage despite the absence of CPE. These 3 samples had a viral load ranging from 3.85 to  
222  $4.20 \log_{10}$  cp/mL and were collected from 2 patients. At 15 days after symptom onset for one  
223 patient, who presented a severe form, and at 16 and 21 days after symptom onset for the other  
224 with mild disease.

225 Neutralizing antibody (nAb) titers were measured in contemporaneous serum samples using a  
226 SARS-CoV-2 pseudo-typed virus assay. Among individuals with negative viral culture, a  
227 large fraction, 18/22, were positive for serum neutralizing activity, suggesting that nAbs may  
228 inhibit viral culture from respiratory samples. Of note, 6/7 individuals with a high viral load in  
229 NPS ( $>4.5 \log_{10}$  cp/mL) and negative viral culture were positive for the detection of nAb.  
230 Conversely, high nAb titers were found in the three serum samples of the 2 HCWs with  
231 positive viral cultures more than twelve days after symptom onset. We also noticed that 3  
232 additional NPS samples positive for viral culture were from individuals with a  
233 contemporaneous nAb activity but at very low titers (Figure 3B).

#### 234 **Retrospective SARS-CoV-2 infection assessment with serological testing**

235 Out of the 252 PCR negative HCW at initial screening, a total of 190 returned 1 month after  
236 inclusion (V5) for serological testing. Seven of 190 were seropositive at V5 with both of the  
237 selected serological assays. At inclusion, no other respiratory pathogens were detected with  
238 the multiplex respiratory panel for these seven individuals who developed mild respiratory  
239 symptoms (cough (5/7), shortness of breath (5/7) and rhinorrhea (3/7)). Interestingly, 4 out of  
240 the 7 suffered of ophthalmic pain, compared to 30 out of 270 in the rest of the cohort tested  
241 with the multiplex respiratory panel.

242 A problem in sampling quality did not appear to explain the negativity of the SARS-CoV-2  
243 PCR from these 7 seropositive HCWs as the mean cell number in NPS from these individuals,  
244 as evaluated using a house keeping gene, was not significantly different from that of the rest  
245 of seronegative HCWs, at  $4.0 \cdot 10^4$  cells/PCR and  $6.9 \cdot 10^4$  cells/PCR, respectively (p-value =  
246 0.14).

247 At inclusion, no anti-SARS-CoV-2 Abs had been detected for 6 of these seven HCWs. The  
248 one HCW who was already seropositive at inclusion was, however, included late in our study,  
249 at 24 days after symptom onset, which may explain the negativity of their PCR test. For the  
250 other 6 HCWs, the median (range) time between symptom onset and inclusion, i.e. RT-PCR  
251 screening, was 3 (1-4) days, as for PCR positive patients, suggesting that the negative SARS-  
252 CoV-2 RT-PCR cannot be explained by a delayed diagnosis. Taken together, SARS-CoV-2  
253 detection was potentially missed in 6/190 (3.15%) HCWs by RT-PCR performed on  
254 nasopharyngeal swabs.

## 255 **Discussion**

256 We analysed data obtained from front-line HCWs enrolled during the first wave of the  
257 COVID-19 pandemic. A high prevalence of COVID-19 was found, which is consistent with  
258 previous reports on this highly exposed population [7,30–32]. Regarding clinical findings,  
259 HCWs presented mostly mild disease, which can be explained by their relatively young age  
260 (median of 36 years) [33]. In addition, we confirmed the important proportion of smell and  
261 taste dysfunction in these mild COVID-19 patients. As already reported [7,34], the specificity  
262 of these symptoms in the present study was high (> 90%). We also found a low rate (9.1%)  
263 of co-infection in SARS-CoV-2 positive patients. Higher rates have been reported elsewhere  
264 which can be explained by several factors, including the severity of the disease and the timing  
265 of testing [35,36].

266 In the present study, only 3.2 % of HCWs with a negative RT-PCR test at inclusion developed  
267 a seroconversion one month later, suggesting the possibility of a false negative PCR test result  
268 at initial screening. Several factors can explain false negative results with RT-PCR, including  
269 the low sensitivity of some assays [37,38], a poor quality of the sample or an inappropriate  
270 timing of sampling [39]. However, the Cobas RT-PCR assay used for screening herein has  
271 been widely evaluated and a lack of sensitivity has not been reported [40]. Furthermore, the  
272 quality of the samples was checked with the use of a cell control [41] in order to prevent false  
273 negative results due to a lack of cells. Taken together, our findings confirmed a low rate (<5%)  
274 of false negative RT-PCR results using serology testing [42], although initial reports wrongly  
275 alerted the scientific community about a poor sensitivity of RT-PCR tests for COVID-19  
276 screening [43]. Due to our study design, it cannot be excluded that some individuals may  
277 have developed COVID-19 between inclusion and the serological testing performed one  
278 month later for negative patients at inclusion.

279 Herein we found that a substantial (12%) part of the cohort was still RT-PCR positive 40 days  
280 post-symptom onset, which is consistent with a large study conducted in mild COVID-19  
281 patients, in which 10% of patients had detectable RNA four weeks after symptom onset [14].  
282 In a recent meta-analysis, a mean duration of RT-PCR positivity of 17 days has been reported  
283 with a maximum of 83 days [44]. It is important to emphasize that RT-PCR tests cannot  
284 distinguish between infectious virus and non-infectious RNA, and that RNA detection  
285 frequently outlasts the duration of infectivity. In the present study, we reported that upper  
286 respiratory samples from HCWs with positive RT-PCR ten days after symptom onset, even  
287 those with significant viral loads, were mainly (90%) found negative in viral culture.

288 Contagiousness is potentially dependent on many factors, including the presence of infectious  
289 virus and the presence of upper respiratory symptoms, but according to our results,  
290 contagiousness seems very unlikely 10 days after symptom onset in HCWs presenting a mild  
291 infection. These findings are consistent with others who reported a less than 6% probability of  
292 cultivating the virus after 10 [25] or 15 [20] days. Another large study on 3,790 SARS-CoV-  
293 2 positive samples inoculated for viral culture found that 1700/1941 (87.6%) of culturable  
294 samples were collected during the first week [45].

295 This delay might be in line with the time required for the elicitation of nAbs as suggested by  
296 the limited number of infectious virus found herein in samples with high viral load taken after  
297 seroconversion, and by the contemporaneous presence of nAbs in the serum of most  
298 individuals with negative viral culture. Similarly, in a report on hospitalized patients, serum  
299 nAb titers were independently associated with the absence of detection of infectious SARS-  
300 CoV-2. In addition, this study also found that some hospitalized patients with a low titer of  
301 neutralizing antibodies can still have a positive culture, as also observed in our cohort [20].

302 A viral load threshold could be useful to assess the presence of infectious virus. Herein, the  
303 median viral load of positive culture specimens was 6.67 log<sub>10</sub> copies/mL. In a study among

304 hospitalized patients, in samples with detectable infectious virus, the viral load median was  
305 8.14 log<sub>10</sub> copies/mL [20], while in children another study reported a median of 7.2 log<sub>10</sub>  
306 copies/mL [46].

307 In addition to age [17], the observed difference concerning the viral load threshold in  
308 predicting the presence of infectious virus might be related to the severity of the disease, as  
309 higher viral loads are usually noticed in severe patients [47].

310 Although the measured viral load can vary depending on the gene targeted by the quantitative  
311 RT-PCR, a viral load of 5 to 6 log<sub>10</sub> copies/mL has been suggested as a proxy for the  
312 presence of infectious virus [18,22]. Our findings suggest a viral load threshold of 4,5 log<sub>10</sub>  
313 copies/mL might be used in patients with mild disease. This viral load corresponds to a Ct  
314 value of 26 with the Argene RT-PCR kit targeting the N gene used in the present study. For  
315 most clinical laboratories that cannot afford true quantitative RT-PCR results, Ct values can  
316 therefore be used to assess the presence of infectious virus, as previously reported [22–  
317 25,27,45]. However, as underlined by Han et al., Ct values are highly dependent on the RT-  
318 PCR used and can be affected by batch effect or PCR conditions. Therefore, Ct values should  
319 be interpreted with caution [48]. Combined with other management strategies [49], the  
320 duration of symptoms and the determination of viral load can be helpful to discontinue HCWs  
321 isolation, which should contribute to reduce the risk of staff shortage.

322 The present study has several limitations. First, the inclusion period between April to June  
323 corresponded to the second half of the first wave in France and led to a limited number of  
324 enrolled patients. Furthermore, the national lockdown may have had a substantial impact on  
325 the circulation of other respiratory viruses and the rate of co-infection is possibly  
326 underestimated. In addition, the date of symptom onset can be difficult to determine  
327 accurately. As asymptomatic HCWs were not screened, the prevalence of SARS-CoV-2  
328 infection among HCWs was certainly underestimated in our cohort [4,7,32]. Finally, the

329 results of viral culture must be considered with caution as this method can lack sensitivity,  
330 with its performance being highly dependent on the proper collection, transport, and rapidity  
331 of inoculation of samples on cells.

332 In conclusion, we confirm the high prevalence of SARS-CoV-2 infection among HCWs who  
333 developed mainly mild COVID-19. Our data suggest that true quantitative viral load  
334 measured by RT-PCR or, at least, Ct values can be useful for appreciating the infectiousness  
335 of infected HCWs. In addition, we show that these patients are unlikely infectious 10 days  
336 after symptom onset, despite a high viral load. Taken together, these data could be very  
337 helpful for defining rules for discontinuing isolation of HCWs and facilitating their safe return  
338 to work.

339 **Figure legends**

340 **Figure 1.** Flow diagram of study population – HCWs, healthcare workers.

341 **Figure 2.** Longitudinal proportion of positive SARS-CoV-2 healthcare workers according to  
342 normalized viral load. Fit Loess curve represents local polynomial regression performed with  
343 Loess method. CI at 95% is indicated (grey area).

344 **Figure 3.** Viral culture results of SARS-CoV-2 according to post symptom delay and the  
345 presence of neutralizing antibodies. Black circles represent negative virus culture samples and  
346 orange circles or triangles represent the positive virus culture samples. Triangles correspond  
347 to samples positive on cell culture without cytopathic effect. Solid circles indicate samples  
348 with a presence of neutralizing antibodies while empty circles indicate the absence of  
349 neutralizing antibodies in serum. A. The Y-axis corresponds to the normalized viral load  
350 expressed in Log<sub>10</sub> cp/mL or Cycle threshold (Ct) values. B. Dotted lines correspond to the  
351 limit of quantification of neutralizing antibody titers.

352 **Supplementary Figure 1.** Normalized SARS-CoV-2 viral load according to viral culture  
353 results. The Y-axis corresponds to the normalized viral load expressed in Log<sub>10</sub> cp/mL or  
354 Cycle threshold (Ct) values.

355 **Declaration of interests**

356 Several authors (KBP, FAF, GO, VC) are bioMérieux employees. AB has received a grant  
357 from bioMérieux and has served as consultant for bioMérieux. KBP, FAF, GO VC and AB  
358 were involved in data analysis, interpretation and wrote the article.

359 **Acknowledgements**

360 We thank all the personnel of the occupational health and medicine department of Hospices Civils  
361 de Lyon who contributed to the sample collection. We thank Virginie Pitiot, the Clinical  
362 Research Associate, for her excellent work. We thank all the technicians from the virology  
363 laboratory whose work made it possible to obtain all these data. We thank Karima Brahima and  
364 all members of the clinical research and innovation department for their reactivity (DRCI,

365 Hospices Civils de Lyon). We thank Come Barranger for his help regarding the implementation of  
366 the quantitative RT-PCR. And lastly, we thank all the health care workers for their participation in  
367 this clinical study.

### 368 **Role of funding sources**

369 This research is being supported by Hospices Civils de Lyon and by Fondation des Hospices  
370 Civils de Lyon. The bioMérieux employees were involved in data analysis, interpretation and  
371 wrote the article. bioMérieux provided qRT-PCR Argene kits and BIOFIRE® Respiratory 2.1  
372 *plus* Panel (RP2.1*plus*) kits for the study.

### 373 **COVID-SER Study group**

374 Adnot Jérôme, Alfaiate Dulce, Bal Antonin, Bergeret Alain, Boibieux André, Bonnet Florent,  
375 Bourgeois Gaëlle, Brunel-Dalmas Florence, Caire Eurydice, Charbotel Barbara, Chiarello  
376 Pierre, Cotte Laurent, d'Aubarede Constance, Durupt François, Escuret Vanessa, Fascia  
377 Pascal, Fassier Jean-Baptiste, Fontaine Juliette, Gaillot-Durand Lucie, Gaymard Alexandre,  
378 Gillet Myriam, Godinot Matthieu, Gueyffier François, Guibert Nicolas, Josset Laurence,  
379 Lahousse Matthieu, Lina Bruno, Lozano Hélène, Makhloufi Djamila, Massardier-Pilonchéry  
380 Amélie, Milon Marie-Paule, Moll Frédéric, Morfin Florence, Narbey David, Nazare Julie-  
381 Anne, Oria Fatima, Paul Adèle, Perry Marielle, Pitiot Virginie, Prudent Mélanie, Rabilloud  
382 Muriel, Samperiz Audrey, Schlienger Isabelle, Simon Chantal, Trabaud Mary-Anne,  
383 Trouillet-Assant Sophie

384

## 385 References

- 386 [1] Wang J, Zhou M, Liu F. Reasons for healthcare workers becoming infected with novel  
387 coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) in China. *J Hosp Infect* 2020;105:100–1.  
388 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhin.2020.03.002>.
- 389 [2] Xiang B, Li P, Yang X, Zhong S, Manyande A, Feng M. The impact of novel  
390 coronavirus SARS-CoV-2 among healthcare workers in hospitals: An aerial overview.  
391 *Am J Infect Control* 2020;48:915–7. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ajic.2020.05.020>.
- 392 [3] Report of the WHO-China Joint Mission on Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) n.d.  
393 [https://www.who.int/publications-detail-redirect/report-of-the-who-china-joint-mission-](https://www.who.int/publications-detail-redirect/report-of-the-who-china-joint-mission-on-coronavirus-disease-2019-(covid-19))  
394 [on-coronavirus-disease-2019-\(covid-19\)](https://www.who.int/publications-detail-redirect/report-of-the-who-china-joint-mission-on-coronavirus-disease-2019-(covid-19)) (accessed October 30, 2020).
- 395 [4] Treibel TA, Manisty C, Burton M, McKnight Á, Lambourne J, Augusto JB, et al.  
396 COVID-19: PCR screening of asymptomatic health-care workers at London hospital.  
397 *Lancet* 2020;395:1608–10. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(20\)31100-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(20)31100-4).
- 398 [5] Zhan M, Qin Y, Xue X, Zhu S. Death from Covid-19 of 23 Health Care Workers in  
399 China. *N Engl J Med* 2020;382:2267–8. <https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMc2005696>.
- 400 [6] Wang X, Zhou Q, He Y, Liu L, Ma X, Wei X, et al. Nosocomial outbreak of COVID-19  
401 pneumonia in Wuhan, China. *Eur Respir J* 2020;55.  
402 <https://doi.org/10.1183/13993003.00544-2020>.
- 403 [7] Gómez-Ochoa SA, Franco OH, Rojas LZ, Raguindin PF, Roa-Díaz ZM, Wyssmann BM,  
404 et al. COVID-19 in Healthcare Workers: A Living Systematic Review and Meta-analysis  
405 of Prevalence, Risk Factors, Clinical Characteristics, and Outcomes. *Am J Epidemiol*  
406 2020. <https://doi.org/10.1093/aje/kwaa191>.
- 407 [8] Quéromès G, Destras G, Bal A, Regue H, Burfin G, Brun S, et al. Characterization of  
408 SARS-CoV-2 ORF6 deletion variants detected in a nosocomial cluster during routine  
409 genomic surveillance, Lyon, France. *BioRxiv* 2020:2020.08.07.241653.  
410 <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.08.07.241653>.
- 411 [9] Rickman HM, Rampling T, Shaw K, Martinez-Garcia G, Hail L, Coen P, et al.  
412 Nosocomial transmission of COVID-19: a retrospective study of 66 hospital-acquired  
413 cases in a London teaching hospital. *Clin Infect Dis* 2020.  
414 <https://doi.org/10.1093/cid/ciaa816>.
- 415 [10] Zhang JC, Findlater A, Cram P, Adisesh A. Return to work for healthcare workers with  
416 confirmed COVID-19 infection. *Occup Med (Lond)* 2020;70:345–6.  
417 <https://doi.org/10.1093/occmed/kqaa092>.
- 418 [11] Rhee C, Kanjilal S, Baker M, Klompas M. Duration of Severe Acute Respiratory  
419 Syndrome Coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) Infectivity: When Is It Safe to Discontinue  
420 Isolation? *Clin Infect Dis* 2020. <https://doi.org/10.1093/cid/ciaa1249>.
- 421 [12] Pan Y, Zhang D, Yang P, Poon LLM, Wang Q. Viral load of SARS-CoV-2 in clinical  
422 samples. *Lancet Infect Dis* 2020;20:411–2. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1473-](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1473-3099(20)30113-4)  
423 [3099\(20\)30113-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1473-3099(20)30113-4).
- 424 [13] Weiss A, Jellingsø M, Sommer MOA. Spatial and temporal dynamics of SARS-CoV-2  
425 in COVID-19 patients: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *EBioMedicine*  
426 2020;58:102916. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ebiom.2020.102916>.
- 427 [14] Omar S, Bartz C, Becker S, Basenach S, Pfeifer S, Trapp C, et al. Duration of SARS-  
428 CoV-2 RNA detection in COVID-19 patients in home isolation, Rhineland-Palatinate,  
429 Germany, 2020 - an interval-censored survival analysis. *Euro Surveill* 2020;25.  
430 <https://doi.org/10.2807/1560-7917.ES.2020.25.30.2001292>.
- 431 [15] He X, Lau EHY, Wu P, Deng X, Wang J, Hao X, et al. Temporal dynamics in viral  
432 shedding and transmissibility of COVID-19. *Nat Med* 2020;26:672–5.  
433 <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41591-020-0869-5>.

- 434 [16] Wei WE. Presymptomatic Transmission of SARS-CoV-2 — Singapore, January 23–  
435 March 16, 2020. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep* 2020;69.  
436 <https://doi.org/10.15585/mmwr.mm6914e1>.
- 437 [17] Benefield AE, Skrip LA, Clement A, Althouse RA, Chang S, Althouse BM. SARS-  
438 CoV-2 viral load peaks prior to symptom onset: a systematic review and individual-  
439 pooled analysis of coronavirus viral load from 66 studies. *MedRxiv*  
440 2020:2020.09.28.20202028. <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.09.28.20202028>.
- 441 [18] Wölfel R, Corman VM, Guggemos W, Seilmaier M, Zange S, Müller MA, et al.  
442 Virological assessment of hospitalized patients with COVID-2019. *Nature*  
443 2020;581:465–9. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-020-2196-x>.
- 444 [19] Atkinson B, Petersen E. SARS-CoV-2 shedding and infectivity. *Lancet* 2020;395:1339–  
445 40. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(20\)30868-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(20)30868-0).
- 446 [20] Kampen JJA van, Vijver DAMC van de, Fraaij PLA, Haagmans BL, Lamers MM, Okba  
447 N, et al. Shedding of infectious virus in hospitalized patients with coronavirus disease-  
448 2019 (COVID-19): duration and key determinants. *MedRxiv* 2020:2020.06.08.20125310.  
449 <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.08.20125310>.
- 450 [21] Walsh KA, Jordan K, Clyne B, Rohde D, Drummond L, Byrne P, et al. SARS-CoV-2  
451 detection, viral load and infectivity over the course of an infection. *J Infect*  
452 2020;81:357–71. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jinf.2020.06.067>.
- 453 [22] Huang C-G, Lee K-M, Hsiao M-J, Yang S-L, Huang P-N, Gong Y-N, et al. Culture-  
454 Based Virus Isolation To Evaluate Potential Infectivity of Clinical Specimens Tested for  
455 COVID-19. *J Clin Microbiol* 2020;58. <https://doi.org/10.1128/JCM.01068-20>.
- 456 [23] Bullard J, Dust K, Funk D, Strong JE, Alexander D, Garnett L, et al. Predicting  
457 infectious SARS-CoV-2 from diagnostic samples. *Clin Infect Dis* 2020.  
458 <https://doi.org/10.1093/cid/ciaa638>.
- 459 [24] La Scola B, Le Bideau M, Andreani J, Hoang VT, Grimaldier C, Colson P, et al. Viral  
460 RNA load as determined by cell culture as a management tool for discharge of SARS-  
461 CoV-2 patients from infectious disease wards. *Eur J Clin Microbiol Infect Dis*  
462 2020;39:1059–61. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10096-020-03913-9>.
- 463 [25] Singanayagam A, Patel M, Charlett A, Lopez Bernal J, Saliba V, Ellis J, et al. Duration  
464 of infectiousness and correlation with RT-PCR cycle threshold values in cases of  
465 COVID-19, England, January to May 2020. *Euro Surveill* 2020;25.  
466 <https://doi.org/10.2807/1560-7917.ES.2020.25.32.2001483>.
- 467 [26] Liu W-D, Chang S-Y, Wang J-T, Tsai M-J, Hung C-C, Hsu C-L, et al. Prolonged virus  
468 shedding even after seroconversion in a patient with COVID-19. *J Infect* 2020;81:318–  
469 56. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jinf.2020.03.063>.
- 470 [27] Gniazdowski V, Morris CP, Wohl S, Mehoke T, Ramakrishnan S, Thielen P, et al.  
471 Repeat COVID-19 Molecular Testing: Correlation of SARS-CoV-2 Culture with  
472 Molecular Assays and Cycle Thresholds. *Clin Infect Dis* 2020.  
473 <https://doi.org/10.1093/cid/ciaa1616>.
- 474 [28] Trouillet-Assant et al. Assessment of Serological Techniques for Screening Patients  
475 Regarding COVID-19 (COVID-SER): a prospective multicentric study. *BMJ open*. 2020.  
476 In press., n.d.
- 477 [29] Laboratory biosafety guidance related to coronavirus disease (COVID-19) n.d.  
478 [https://www.who.int/publications-detail-redirect/laboratory-biosafety-guidance-related-](https://www.who.int/publications-detail-redirect/laboratory-biosafety-guidance-related-to-coronavirus-disease-(covid-19))  
479 [to-coronavirus-disease-\(covid-19\)](https://www.who.int/publications-detail-redirect/laboratory-biosafety-guidance-related-to-coronavirus-disease-(covid-19)) (accessed October 30, 2020).
- 480 [30] Hunter E, Price DA, Murphy E, van der Loeff IS, Baker KF, Lendrem D, et al. First  
481 experience of COVID-19 screening of health-care workers in England. *Lancet*  
482 2020;395:e77–8. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(20\)30970-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(20)30970-3).

- 483 [31] Contejean A, Leporrier J, Canoui E, Alby-Laurent F, Lafont E, Beaudeau L, et al.  
484 Comparing dynamics and determinants of SARS-CoV-2 transmissions among health  
485 care workers of adult and pediatric settings in central Paris. *Clin Infect Dis* 2020.  
486 <https://doi.org/10.1093/cid/ciaa977>.
- 487 [32] Rivett L, Sridhar S, Sparkes D, Routledge M, Jones NK, Forrest S, et al. Screening of  
488 healthcare workers for SARS-CoV-2 highlights the role of asymptomatic carriage in  
489 COVID-19 transmission. *Elife* 2020;9. <https://doi.org/10.7554/eLife.58728>.
- 490 [33] Gomez E, Gustafson DR, Rosenblatt JE, Patel R. Actinobaculum bacteremia: a report of  
491 12 cases. *J Clin Microbiol* 2011;49:4311–3. <https://doi.org/10.1128/JCM.00798-11>.
- 492 [34] Maechler F, Gertler M, Hermes J, van Loon W, Schwab F, Piening B, et al.  
493 Epidemiological and clinical characteristics of SARS-CoV-2 infections at a testing site  
494 in Berlin, Germany, March and April 2020—a cross-sectional study. *Clin Microbiol Infect*  
495 2020. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cmi.2020.08.017>.
- 496 [35] Kreitmann L, Monard C, Dauwalder O, Simon M, Argaud L. Early bacterial co-infection  
497 in ARDS related to COVID-19. *Intensive Care Med* 2020;46:1787–9.  
498 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00134-020-06165-5>.
- 499 [36] Kim D, Quinn J, Pinsky B, Shah NH, Brown I. Rates of Co-infection Between SARS-  
500 CoV-2 and Other Respiratory Pathogens. *JAMA* 2020;323:2085–6.  
501 <https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.2020.6266>.
- 502 [37] Etievant S, Bal A, Escuret V, Brengel-Pesce K, Bouscambert M, Cheynet V, et al.  
503 Performance Assessment of SARS-CoV-2 PCR Assays Developed by WHO Referral  
504 Laboratories. *J Clin Med* 2020;9. <https://doi.org/10.3390/jcm9061871>.
- 505 [38] Vogels CBF, Brito AF, Wyllie AL, Fauver JR, Ott IM, Kalinich CC, et al. Analytical  
506 sensitivity and efficiency comparisons of SARS-COV-2 qRT-PCR assays. *Infectious*  
507 *Diseases (except HIV/AIDS)*; 2020. <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.03.30.20048108>.
- 508 [39] Ginocchio CC, McAdam AJ. Current Best Practices for Respiratory Virus Testing. *J*  
509 *Clin Microbiol* 2011;49:S44–8. <https://doi.org/10.1128/JCM.00698-11>.
- 510 [40] Poljak M, Korva M, Knap Gašper N, Fujs Komloš K, Sagadin M, Uršič T, et al. Clinical  
511 Evaluation of the cobas SARS-CoV-2 Test and a Diagnostic Platform Switch during 48  
512 Hours in the Midst of the COVID-19 Pandemic. *J Clin Microbiol* 2020;58.  
513 <https://doi.org/10.1128/JCM.00599-20>.
- 514 [41] Resa C, Magro S, Marechal P, Barranger C, Joannes M, Mischczak F, et al. Development  
515 of an efficient qRT-PCR assay for quality control and cellular quantification of  
516 respiratory samples. *J Clin Virol* 2014;60:270–5.  
517 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcv.2014.03.019>.
- 518 [42] Long Q-X, Liu B-Z, Deng H-J, Wu G-C, Deng K, Chen Y-K, et al. Antibody responses  
519 to SARS-CoV-2 in patients with COVID-19. *Nat Med* 2020;26:845–8.  
520 <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41591-020-0897-1>.
- 521 [43] Ai T, Yang Z, Hou H, Zhan C, Chen C, Lv W, et al. Correlation of Chest CT and RT-  
522 PCR Testing for Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) in China: A Report of 1014  
523 Cases. *Radiology* 2020;296:E32–40. <https://doi.org/10.1148/radiol.2020200642>.
- 524 [44] Cevik M, Tate M, Lloyd O, Maraolo AE, Schafers J, Ho A. SARS-CoV-2, SARS-CoV-1  
525 and MERS-CoV viral load dynamics, duration of viral shedding and infectiousness: a  
526 living systematic review and meta-analysis. *MedRxiv* 2020:2020.07.25.20162107.  
527 <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.07.25.20162107>.
- 528 [45] Jaafar R, Aherfi S, Wurtz N, Grimaldier C, Hoang VT, Colson P, et al. Correlation  
529 between 3790 qPCR positives samples and positive cell cultures including 1941 SARS-  
530 CoV-2 isolates. *Clin Infect Dis* 2020. <https://doi.org/10.1093/cid/ciaa1491>.

- 531 [46] L’Huillier AG, Torriani G, Pigny F, Kaiser L, Eckerle I. Culture-Competent SARS-  
532 CoV-2 in Nasopharynx of Symptomatic Neonates, Children, and Adolescents. *Emerg*  
533 *Infect Dis* 2020;26:2494–7. <https://doi.org/10.3201/eid2610.202403>.
- 534 [47] Liu Y, Yan L-M, Wan L, Xiang T-X, Le A, Liu J-M, et al. Viral dynamics in mild and  
535 severe cases of COVID-19. *Lancet Infect Dis* 2020;20:656–7.  
536 [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1473-3099\(20\)30232-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1473-3099(20)30232-2).
- 537 [48] Han MS, Byun J-H, Cho Y, Rim JH. RT-PCR for SARS-CoV-2: quantitative versus  
538 qualitative. *Lancet Infect Dis* 2020. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1473-3099\(20\)30424-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1473-3099(20)30424-2).
- 539 [49] Bielicki JA, Duval X, Gobat N, Goossens H, Koopmans M, Tacconelli E, et al.  
540 Monitoring approaches for health-care workers during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Lancet*  
541 *Infect Dis* 2020;20:e261–7. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1473-3099\(20\)30458-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1473-3099(20)30458-8).  
542  
543

544

	Negative SARS-CoV-2 patients (n=252)	Positive SARS-CoV2 patients (n= 67)	p-value	Adjusted p-value
Gender. male. n (%)	50 (19.84)	9 (13.43)	0.306	0.638
Age. years. median [IQR]	35.9 [27.5-47]	36 [29.4-47.7]	0.656	0.926
Body Mass Index*. n	249	67	0.148	0.473
median [IQR]	23.3 [21.1-27.1]	24 [22.5-27.3]		
Currently Smoker. n(%)	64/252 (25.4)	6/67 (8.96)	0.013	0.091
Alcohol consumption*. Daily. n(%)	8/251 (3.19)	3/67 (4.48)	0.248	0.606
Presence of Comorbidity*. n (%)	109/249 (43.78)	17/66 (25.76)	0.012	0.091
Description of Comorbidity.				
Neurological disorders . n (%)	7 (6.42)	1 (5.88)	1.000	1.000
Cardiovascular disorders . n (%)	2 (1.83)	1 (5.88)	0.355	0.649
Hypertension. n (%)	14 (12.84)	3 (17.65)	0.701	0.935
Heart Failure. n (%)	3 (2.75)	1 (5.88)	0.444	0.735
Diabetes. n (%)	5 (4.59)	0 (0)	1.000	1.000
Immune deficiency . n (%)	2 (1.83)	0 (0)	1.000	1.000
Liver disease . n (%)	2 (1.83)	0 (0)	1.000	1.000
Kidney disease . n (%)	1 (0.92)	1 (5.88)	0.253	0.606
Cancer . n (%)	2 (1.83)	1 (5.88)	0.355	0.649
Hypothyroidie. n (%)	11 (10.09)	2 (11.76)	0.688	0.935
Rheumatic Disease. n (%)	2 (1.83)	2 (11.76)	0.088	0.324
Chronic respiratory disease . n (%)	25 (22.94)	1 (5.88)	0.193	0.580
HCW Contact patient. n(%)	228/252 (90.48)	64/67 (95.52)	0.284	0.634
Post-symptom delay. day. median [IQR]	5 [3-8]	3 [2-6]	0.015	0.091
Symptom.				
Fever. n(%)	149/252 (59.13)	45/67 (67.16)	0.291	0.634
Sore throat*. n (%)	55/250 (22)	12/67 (17.91)	0.576	0.837
Diarrhoeas. n(%)	104/252 (41.27)	16/67 (23.88)	0.014	0.091
Pain. n(%)	187/252 (74.21)	53/67 (79.1)	0.505	0.758
Muscular. n(%)	155 (82.89)	50 (94.34)	0.062	0.249
Chest. n(%)	38 (20.32)	11 (20.75)	1.000	1.000
Joints. n(%)	24 (12.83)	3 (5.66)	0.225	0.601
Abdominal. n(%)	72 (38.5)	12 (22.64)	0.048	0.232
Asthenia*. n(%)	204/250 (81.6)	56/67 (83.58)	0.845	1.000
Rhinorrhea *. n(%)	121/250 (48.4)	46/67 (68.66)	0.005	0.079
Nauseas*. n(%)	68/249 (27.31)	14/67 (20.9)	0.365	0.649
Cough. n(%)	135 (53.57)	47 (70.15)	0.022	0.115
Shortness of breath*. n(%)	96/249 (38.55)	21/67 (31.34)	0.346	0.649
Headache. n(%)	198 (78.57)	54 (80.6)	0.847	1.000
Irritability*. n(%)	65/250 (26)	14/67 (20.9)	0.485	0.758
Anosmia. n(%)	24 (9.52)	26 (38.81)	<0.001	<b>&lt;0.001</b>
Ageusia. n(%)	27 (10.71)	25 (37.31)	<0.001	<b>&lt;0.001</b>
Ophthalmic pain. n(%)	28 (11.11)	6 (8.96)	0.775	0.979
Hospitalized*. n(%)	0/179 (0)	2/58 (3.45)	0.059	0.249

545 **Table 1.** Demographic and clinical characteristics of health-care workers exhibiting a  
546 negative or a positive RT-PCR test for SARS-CoV-2.

547 \*missing data

Respiratory pathogen	Negative SARS-CoV-2 patients (n=241)	Positive SARS-CoV-2 patients (n= 66)
	N (%)	N (%)
Coronavirus SARS-CoV-2	0 (0)	66 (100)
Samples with detection of at least one respiratory virus (excluding SARS-CoV-2)	44 (18.26)	6 (9.09)
Adenovirus	15 (6.22)	2 (3.03)
Coronavirus 229E	0 (0)	0 (0)
Coronavirus HKU1	2 (0.83)	0 (0)
Coronavirus NL63	5 (2.07)	0 (0)
Coronavirus OC43	0 (0)	0 (0)
Human metapneumovirus	1 (0.41)	0 (0)
Human rhinovirus/enterovirus	27 (11.20)	3 (4.55)
Influenzavirus A	0 (0)	0 (0)
Influenzavirus B	0 (0)	0 (0)
MERS-CoV	0 (0)	0 (0)
Parainfluenza virus 1	0 (0)	0 (0)
Parainfluenza virus 2	3 (1.24)	2 (3.03)
Parainfluenza virus 3	0 (0)	0 (0)
Parainfluenza virus 4	1 (0.41)	0 (0)
Respiratory syncytial virus	4 (1.66)	0 (0)
Samples with detection of at least one bacterium	3 (1.24)	0 (0)
<i>Bordetella parapertussis</i>	0 (0)	0 (0)
<i>Bordetella pertussis</i>	0 (0)	0 (0)
<i>Chlamydia pneumoniae</i>	2 (0.83)	0 (0)
<i>Mycoplasma pneumoniae</i>	1 (0.41)	0 (0)

548 **Table 2.** Investigation of respiratory pathogens in nasopharyngeal samples from symptomatic  
549 healthcare workers using the BIOFIRE® Respiratory Panel 2.1 plus. No significant statistical  
550 difference (p-value>0.05) was observed between samples tested negative or positive by  
551 SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR.

	Positive SARS-CoV-2 patients (n= 61)	Positive SARS-CoV-2 patients with co-infection (n= 6)	p-value	Adjusted p-value
Gender. male. n (%)	8 (13.11)	1 (16.67)	1.000	1.000
Age. years. median [IQR]	37.1 [29.4-47.9]	31.5 [31.1-32.5]	0.263	1.000
Body Mass Index. median [IQR]	24 [22.5-27.3]	24.4 [22.8-25.2]	0.974	1.000
Current Smoker. n (%)	6/61 (9.84)	0/6 (0)	0.785	1.000
Alcohol consumption. Daily. n (%)	3/61 (4.92)	0/6 (0)	1.000	1.000
Presence of Comorbidity*. n (%)	17/60 (28.33)	0/6 (0)	0.326	1.000
Description of Comorbidity.				
Neurological disorders n (%)	1 (5.88)	0 (0)		
Cardiovascular disorders n (%)	1 (5.88)	0 (0)		
Hypertension. n (%)	3 (17.65)	0 (0)		
Heart Failure n (%)	1 (5.88)	0 (0)		
Diabetes. n (%)	0 (0)	0 (0)		
Immune deficiency n (%)	0 (0)	0 (0)		
Liver disease. n (%)	0 (0)	0 (0)		
Kidney disease. n (%)	1 (5.88)	0 (0)		
Cancer. n (%)	1 (5.88)	0 (0)		
Hypothyroidy. n (%)	2 (11.76)	0 (0)		
Rheumatic Disease. n (%)	2 (11.76)	0 (0)		
Chronic respiratory disease n (%)	1 (5.88)	0 (0)		
HCW Contact patient. n (%)	59/61 (96.72)	5/6 (83.33)	0.249	1.000
Post-symptom delay. day. median [IQR]	3 [2-6.2]	4 [1.5-5]	0.893	1.000
Symptom.				
Fever. n (%)	41/61 (67.21)	4/6 (66.67)	1.000	1.000
Sore throat. n (%)	12/61 (19.67)	0/6 (0)	0.582	1.000
Diarrhea. n (%)	15/61 (24.59)	1/6 (16.67)	1.000	1.000
Pain. n (%)	48/61 (78.69)	5/6 (83.33)	1.000	1.000
Muscular. n (%)	45 (93.75)	5 (100)	1.000	1.000
Chest. n (%)	9 (18.75)	2 (40)	0.274	1.000
Joints. n (%)	3 (6.25)	0 (0)	1.000	1.000
Abdominal. n (%)	11 (22.92)	1 (20)	1.000	1.000
Asthenia. n (%)	51/61 (83.61)	5/6 (83.33)	1.000	1.000
Rhinorrhea. n (%)	41 (67.21)	5 (83.33)	0.657	1.000
Nauseas. n (%)	14 (22.95)	0 (0)	0.330	1.000
Cough. n (%)	44 (72.13)	3 (50)	0.353	1.000
Shortness of breath. n (%)	20 (32.79)	1 (16.67)	0.657	1.000
Headache. n (%)	49 (80.33)	5 (83.33)	1.000	1.000
Irritability. n (%)	12 (19.67)	2 (33.33)	0.597	1.000
Anosmia. n (%)	24 (39.34)	2 (33.33)	1.000	1.000
Ageusia. n (%)	24 (39.34)	1 (16.67)	0.399	1.000
Ophthalmic pain. n (%)	5 (8.2)	1 (16.67)	0.444	1.000
Hospitalized. n (%)	2/61 (3.85)	0/6 (0)	1.000	1.000

552 **Supplementary Table 1.** Demographic and clinical characteristics of SARS-CoV-2 positive health-  
553 care workers exhibiting a negative or a positive detection of at least another respiratory  
554 pathogen \* missing data

	sample (n)	Ct value ( N gene)			Log10 cp/mL		
		Median [IQR]	Highest	lowest	Median [IQR]	Highest	lowest
Culturable	n=42	19.46 [17.31-23.33]	30.2	14.15	6.67 [5.6-7.37]	8.84	3.65
Non culturable	n=22	29.63 [25.77-30.99]	34.48	18.61	3.58 [2.37-4.85]	7	2.37

555

556 **Supplementary Table 2.** Normalized viral load and Ct-values according to viral culture results.

Detection of other respiratory pathogens

Determination of SARS-CoV-2 viral load

Assessment of the presence of infectious virus by viral culture

Determination of serum neutralizing antibody titers





