

1 **Distribution of SARS-CoV-2 RNA Signal in a Home with COVID-19 Positive Occupants**

2
3 Juan P. Maestre¹, David Jarma¹, Cesca Yu¹, Jeff Siegel², Sharon Horner³, Kerry A. Kinney^{1*}

4
5 ¹Department of Civil, Architectural and Environmental Engineering, The University of Texas at
6 Austin, Austin, Texas

7 ²Department of Civil and Mineral Engineering, University of Toronto, Toronto, Ontario, Canada
8 Dalla Lana School of Public Health, University of Toronto, Toronto, Ontario, Canada

9 ³School of Nursing, The University of Texas at Austin, TX, USA

10 11 **Abstract**

12
13 Although many COVID-19 patients quarantine and recover at home, the dispersal of SARS-
14 CoV-2 onto surfaces and dust within the home environment remains poorly understood. To
15 investigate the distribution and persistence of SARS-CoV-2 in a quarantine home, samples were
16 collected from a household with two confirmed COVID-19 cases (one adult and one child).
17 Home surface swab and dust samples were collected two months after symptom onset (and one
18 month after symptom resolution) in the household. The strength of the SARS-CoV-2 molecular
19 signal in fomites varied as a function of sample location, surface material and cleaning practices.
20 Notably, the SARS-CoV-2 RNA signal was detected at several locations throughout the
21 household although cleaning appears to have attenuated the signal on many surfaces. Of the 24
22 surfaces sampled, 46% were SARS-CoV-2 positive at the time of sampling. The SARS-CoV-2
23 concentrations in dust recovered from floor and HVAC filter samples ranged from 10^4 - 10^5 N2
24 gene copies/g dust. While detection of viral RNA does not imply infectivity, this study confirms
25 that the SARS-CoV-2 RNA signal can be detected at several locations within a COVID-19
26 quarantine home and can persist after symptoms have resolved. In addition, the concentration of
27 SARS-CoV-2 (normalized per unit mass of dust) recovered in home HVAC filters may prove
28 useful for estimating SARS-CoV-2 airborne levels in homes.

29 30 **Introduction**

31
32 SARS-CoV-2 transmission inside buildings remains a significant concern as the COVID-19
33 pandemic continues to surge worldwide. While studies of SARS-CoV-2 contamination in
34 buildings have focused on locations with outbreaks or medical facilities treating critical COVID-
35 19 patients, most individuals with COVID-19 spend their recovery period quarantined at home.
36 Reported transmission rates of SARS-CoV-2 in homes are relatively sparse and vary
37 considerably (Li et al., 2020; Madewell et al., 2020; Qian et al., 2020; Wang et al., 2020b; Wu et
38 al., 2020). However, household COVID-19 transmission may be more common than previously
39 recognized with a secondary infection rate of 36% recently reported for a sample of 101 U.S.
40 households with COVID-19 (Lewis et al., 2020). Unfortunately, the extent to which SARS-CoV-
41 2 contaminates materials within a quarantine home remains poorly understood. Thus, it is
42 difficult to establish if contaminated surfaces or dust reservoirs within a home affect the risk for
43 transmission in households with COVID-19. This uncertainty is compounded by the complexity
44 of airborne viral transport in the built environment as well as the effect of occupant cleaning
45 practices on the dispersal and persistence of SARS-CoV-2 in homes. Here we report on the

46 distribution of SARS-CoV-2 contamination detected on surface and dust samples collected from
47 a quarantine household with two COVID-19 cases.

48
49 Both symptomatic and asymptomatic individuals with COVID-19 can emit SARS-CoV-2 into
50 the air via breathing, coughing and talking (Ma et al., 2020; Pan et al., 2020; To et al., 2020).
51 Viral shedding varies among individuals and can begin two days prior to symptom onset and
52 persist for 14 days or even longer (Wölfel et al., 2020). Although young children with COVID-
53 19 are often asymptomatic, SARS-CoV-2 viral loads in children can be high and subsequent
54 infection of parents is possible (Lopez et al., 2020; Lu et al., 2020). One important pathway for
55 COVID-19 transmission is the inhalation of aerosolized SARS-CoV-2 respiratory droplets
56 generated by an infected individual (Allen and Marr, 2020; Prather et al., 2020). Larger
57 respiratory droplets will often settle relatively quickly to the floor or other interior surfaces.
58 However, local air currents as well as evaporation of droplets can lead to extended lifetimes.
59 Smaller viral particles can remain airborne for hours or longer (Allen and Marr, 2020) with
60 recent modeling results indicating that these droplets may also be significant drivers of person-
61 to-person transmission (Augenbraun et al., 2020; Miller et al., 2020). Given that controlled
62 laboratory studies indicate that SARS-CoV-2 aerosols may remain infectious for up to 3 hours or
63 even longer in air (Van Doremalen et al., 2020), this is a concern for occupants sharing a home.
64 Indeed, experimental studies have verified that a short aerosol release in one room of a house can
65 distribute and eventually settle on surfaces throughout a house (Tang et al., 2020). While
66 increasing ventilation is one of the major controls available to reduce airborne exposures to
67 SARS-CoV-2 in buildings, this can be difficult to achieve in U.S. households where outdoor air
68 ventilation rates are typically low (Bekö et al., 2016; Shrestha et al., 2019; Yamamoto et al.,
69 2010). Finally, the temperature and relative humidity in homes can also affect the SARS-CoV-2
70 virus with longer viabilities and airborne survival times expected at lower temperatures and
71 lower humidity levels (Biryukov et al., 2020; Guillier et al., 2020; Matson et al., 2020).

72
73 To our knowledge, SARS-CoV-2 contamination within a quarantine household has not been
74 determined directly. However, measurements of SARS-CoV-2 distribution in other
75 environments with COVID-19 occupants (e.g., healthcare facilities, quarantine units and cruise
76 ships) provides insight as to the potential contamination that may be possible (Chia et al., 2020;
77 Guo et al., 2020; Ong et al., 2020; Santarpia et al., 2020). In hospitals, for instance, SARS-CoV-
78 2 has been detected on a variety of surfaces (floors, handrails, and soles of medical staff) as well
79 as in short-term air samples collected near patients (Chia et al., 2020; Guo et al., 2020; Ye et al.,
80 2020). The evidence suggests that some contaminated surfaces may serve as reservoirs for
81 resuspension (Chia et al., 2020; Santarpia et al., 2020) and fecal aerosolization of SARS-CoV-2
82 during flushing of the toilet is another possibility (Elsamadony et al., 2021; Liu et al., 2020; Ma
83 et al., 2020). In the more confined environment of a commercial cruise ship, Yamagishi et al.
84 (2020) found that 10% of surface samples in case-cabins were SARS-CoV-2 positive but almost
85 no positive detections were observed in common area surfaces or in air samples suggesting
86 limited dispersal. Notably, numerous studies have detected SARS-CoV-2 on the surfaces of
87 ventilation grates or air outlets in buildings with COVID-19 patients (Guo et al., 2020;
88 Mouchtouri et al., 2020; Nissen et al., 2020; Santarpia et al., 2020). Recently, the SARS-CoV-2
89 virus was detected in 25% of the swab samples collected from a heating, ventilation and air
90 conditioning (HVAC) system in one hospital (Horve et al., 2020), and in 36.8% of vent openings
91 and 89% of HVAC filter dust samples in a COVID-19 ward (Nissen et al., 2020). The fact that

92 the SARS-CoV-2 virus can be recovered from HVAC filter dust is not too surprising given that
93 previous research has demonstrated that filters from central HVAC systems can serve as long-
94 term spatially integrated samplers of the indoor environment. The filter forensics approach has
95 been used for the assessment of particle-bound contaminants that accumulate in the dust collected
96 on HVAC filters (Bi et al., 2018; Givehchi et al., 2019; Maestre et al., 2018; Noris et al., 2011)
97 including viruses (Goyal et al., 2011; Prussin et al., 2016). When this approach is combined with
98 HVAC parameters such as flowrate through the filter and usage time, it is possible to
99 quantitatively estimate the time-averaged indoor concentrations of the particle-bound
100 contaminants (Givehchi et al., 2019; Haaland and Siegel, 2017). This approach has not yet
101 been used to estimate SARS-CoV-2 airborne concentrations but this could be possible if the
102 SARS-CoV-2 concentrations in home HVAC filter dust were known.

103
104 In addition to investigating the dispersal of SARS-CoV-2 in home environments, the potential
105 for SARS-CoV-2 to persist on materials and dust reservoirs within homes is an important
106 consideration. Fundamental laboratory studies have demonstrated that SARS-CoV-2 can survive
107 on paper for up to 3 hours, treated-wood and other low porosity surfaces for up to 24 hours
108 (Aboubakr et al., 2020; Chin and Poon, 2020). Other studies have shown longer survivability
109 times up to 28 days (Riddell et al., 2020) at 20°C for high porosity surfaces, such as paper and
110 banknotes. Furthermore, some viruses such as Influenza A can remain infective upon
111 resuspension from surfaces (Asadi et al., 2020).

112
113 Cleaning of contaminated surfaces with disinfectants is expected to mitigate the spread of SARS-
114 CoV-2 in hospitals and other environments including homes (Hirotsu et al., 2020; Kampf et al.,
115 2020; Ong et al., 2020). Beyond the frequency at which surfaces are sanitized, the effectiveness
116 of cleaning agents vary widely (Sanekata et al., 2010). Because SARS-CoV-2 is an enveloped
117 virus, surfactants, such as soapy water and other household cleaners, are expected to lyse the
118 viral membrane and eliminate the infectivity of the virus on surfaces (Jahromi et al., 2020).
119 However, the persistence of SARS-CoV-2 on surfaces is likely affected by the active ingredient
120 in a given cleaner which, for EPA approved cleaners, includes quaternary ammonium salts,
121 sodium hypochlorite, hydrogen peroxide among several others (Sanekata et al., 2010; Tuladhar
122 et al., 2012b).

123
124 Investigating SARS-CoV-2 in homes and other built environments is crucial since the spread of
125 SARS-CoV-2 is influenced not only by occupant behavior but also by the characteristics of the
126 buildings themselves. While a substantial number of studies have investigated hospitals,
127 quarantine units, restaurants, and cruise ships, additional research is needed in homes where
128 many COVID-19 patients recover. The objective of this study was to determine the spatial
129 distribution of the SARS-CoV-2 RNA signal in a quarantine home one month after two
130 household members recovered from COVID-19. In addition to examining surface samples, we
131 also quantify the viral signal in dust and surface swab samples from the home environment,
132 providing the first concentration level (N2 gene copy numbers/g dust) for HVAC and floor dust
133 samples for comparison with other built environments.

134
135 **Methods**

136

137 Two members of a family in a home environment study (i.e., a parent (participant 1, P1) and a
138 child (participant 2, P2)) experienced COVID-19 symptoms (CDC, 2020) that were confirmed
139 with a positive COVID-19 test. The family remained quarantined in their home until symptoms
140 resolved one month after symptoms began. The parent agreed to use a researcher-supplied home
141 sampling kit to obtain samples of the home environment as well as to answer an IRB-approved
142 survey on COVID symptoms and home environment management. All home environment
143 samples were collected by the parent approximately one month after COVID-19 symptoms had
144 resolved in the household.

145

146

147 **Sample Collection**

148

149 A total of 22 swab samples were collected from a variety of surfaces across the home as well as
150 from the surface of the HVAC filter. A single phosphate-buffered saline Tween-20 (PBST)
151 wetted swab (Floq Swab, Copan, Murrieta CA) was used to swab each of the surfaces for 20
152 seconds. When possible, a 929 cm² (1ft x1ft) area was swabbed. In other cases, where the
153 sampling area was difficult to estimate (e.g., door handles), the entire available surface was
154 swabbed. For the home HVAC filter, a 32.26 cm² area was swabbed. Dust samples were also
155 collected from the master bedroom floor and from the home HVAC filter via a handheld vacuum
156 cleaner (Eureka, Medford, MA, USA). For each vacuum sample, a new vacuum thimble was
157 inserted into a clean thermoset plastic nozzle (Indoor Biotechnologies, Charlottesville VA)
158 attached to the hand-held vacuum cleaner. For floor samples, a 929 cm² (1ft x1ft) area was
159 vacuumed for one minute. For HVAC filter dust samples, the whole filter area (2064.5 cm²; 16
160 inch x 20 inch) was vacuumed for one minute. All samples were transported on ice and stored at
161 -20 °C in the laboratory until extraction which occurred within 5 days of sample collection.

162

163 **Nucleic acids extraction and RT-qPCR**

164 For total nucleic acids extraction, the MagMAX™ Total Nucleic Acids extraction kit
165 (ThermoFisher Eugene, Oregon, USA) was used in combination with the KingFisher
166 (ThermoFisher) nucleic acid extractor. At the beginning of sample processing, the dust cake
167 from vacuum samples and the swabs were transferred to the extraction kit bead beating tubes
168 (ThermoFisher) and processed per manufacturer's instructions.

169

170 The concentration of SARS-CoV-2 in RNA extracts was determined in triplicate on the ViiA7
171 Real-Time PCR System (ThermoFisher). RT-qPCR utilized the CDC nCOV_N2 primer/probe
172 and CDC nCOV_N1 primer/probe set (Lu et al., 2020) (Integrated DNA Technologies). Standard
173 curves were developed using the 2019-nCoV_N_Positive Control (Integrated DNA
174 Technologies, Coralville, USA). Samples were analyzed using the TaqMan™ Fast Virus 1-Step
175 Master Mix in 20-µl reactions run at 50 °C for 5 min, 95 °C for 20s, followed by 40 cycles of
176 95 °C for 15 s and 60 °C for 60 s per the manufacturer's recommendations. The limit of detection
177 was established at 82 N1 gene copies recovered per sample, and 56 N2 gene copies recovered
178 per sample (see Supplemental Information). To ensure the quality of the results, all qPCR
179 analyses were performed in triplicate and positive controls (synthetic SARS-CoV-2, IDT CDC)
180 as well as negative controls (PCR grade water) were used in each RT-qPCR plate. Additionally,
181 negative controls were included in the study and processed concurrently with the samples to
182 account for background material and reagent contamination. All negative controls indicated no

183 presence of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in the materials or reagents used. The bovine respiratory
184 syncytial virus (BRSV) was utilized to evaluate viral recoveries from each of the matrices (swabs
185 and dust) collected in this study as is done in other environmental studies (Gonzalez et al., 2020).

186

187 **Home Data**

188 Both participants lived full-time in the case study home before the onset of COVID-19
189 symptoms, during the disease period, and after the recovery period when the samples were
190 collected. The two bedroom 93 m² (1,000 ft²) home located in Texas was built between 2008 and
191 2012, and had a central HVAC system with a Minimum Efficiency Reporting Value (MERV) 4
192 (fiberglass filament, Flanders E-Z Flow II) filter installed.

193

194 **Survey Data**

195 Information regarding COVID-19 symptoms, cleaning practices, and surface materials (Table 1)
196 were gathered via remote survey utilizing the Research Electronic Data Capture (REDCap)
197 platform (Harris et al., 2019; Harris et al., 2009). For surfaces such as carpet and hard flooring,
198 the frequency of vacuum and mopping were also reported. The survey was administered entirely
199 remotely via a survey link sent to the participant's phone, made possible with the REDCap
200 platform.

201

202 **Quantitative Filter Forensics**

203 The quantitative filter forensics approach by Haaland and Siegel (2017) was used in this work
204 (Table S2) to estimate the temporally and spatially integrated airborne concentration (C) of
205 SARS-CoV-2 over the viral collection time period. The following parameters were used for the
206 calculation: m was the mass of dust (g) collected in the HVAC filter, f was the concentration of
207 SARS-CoV-2 (N2 gene copies/g) in the dust collected on the filter, η was the integrated
208 particulate matter filtration efficiency of the MERV-4 filter, Q was the volumetric air flowrate
209 (m³/h) through the filter (median for the summer season for the same geographical
210 location, (Givehchi et al., 2019) and t was the runtime of the HVAC system (h) over the duration
211 of the SARS-CoV-2 collection time -approximately one month-, median for the summer season
212 for the same geographical location, (Givehchi et al., 2019). A few considerations that ought to be
213 taken into account are: (1) our estimate does not account for the attenuation of the signal over
214 time or the losses due to deposition, (2) it considers the estimate that approximately 5.5% of the
215 viral signal is recovered through RNA extraction from the dust matrix (as estimated in this work
216 via the spike and recovery tests for the surrogate BRSV virus), (3) the mass recovered by the
217 participants was estimated to be 68% of that recoverable by trained researcher (based on
218 previous experiments comparing researcher-collected samples to participant-collected samples),
219 and (4) that approximately 27% of the accumulated dust can be recovered from the filter
220 (Mahdavi and Siegel, 2020). Owing to the use of averaged parameters from a similar population
221 of homes and analysis approaches, our estimate should be considered a scaling approach rather
222 than a precise calculation of SARS-CoV-2 airborne concentration.

223

224 **Results**

225

226 Ventilation and Temperature Settings

227 The home was naturally ventilated one hour per day, in the early morning by opening one door.
228 The HVAC temperature setting was kept at 23.9°C (75°F) day and night with the air

229 conditioning system providing cooling during the summer months in this hot and humid region
 230 of Texas (average ambient temperature of 35°C (95°F) over the summer months). In our
 231 previous study in Texas (Bi et al., 2018), the average relative humidity in homes during the
 232 summer was 56.6% ± 5.2% (n=93, measured over one month). Even though indoor relative
 233 humidity varies as a function of temperature, outdoor relative humidity, occupancy and other
 234 building factors, this provides us with a reasonable estimate for homes in this study. Regarding
 235 the position of the HVAC filter, the low efficiency filter (MERV-4) was positioned vertically in
 236 the unit 3 feet above floor height. The HVAC unit was located inside a closet with a louvered
 237 door that was normally kept closed.

238

239 SARS-CoV-2 on Surfaces across the Home

240 A total of 24 surfaces distributed across six spaces in the home were swabbed on the same day
 241 approximately one month after the symptoms of both participants had resolved. A total of 46%
 242 of the samples were found to be positive (Table 1, Figure 1). In some cases, a specific area was
 243 sampled (HVAC filter, counters, floors, and highchair) and the results are reported in N2 gene
 244 copies/cm² (Fig. 2A), whereas in other cases when it was not feasible to normalize by area -or by
 245 weight- (e.g., swabbing doorknobs, handles, among others), the results are reported as N2 gene
 246 copies recovered per swab (Fig 2B).

247

248 Table 1. Locations sampled across the home, surface material type and cleaning regime

249


250

Location	Surface	Type of sample	Material	Cleaning product*	Cleaning Regime	Surface Area Sampled (cm ²)	Detection
Entrance	Interior Door knob	Swab	Metal	Cleaner 2	Once per day or more	Unknown	Negative
	Interior door trim	Swab	Wood	Not Cleaned	None	Unknown	Negative
	Exterior door trim	Swab	Wood	Not Cleaned	None	Unknown	Negative
Living Room	Floor	Swab	Vinyl	Cleaner 1	Once per day or more	929	Negative
	Tv top surface	Swab	Plastic	Not Cleaned	None	Unknown	Positive
	Couch	Swab	Vinyl	Not Cleaned	None	Unknown	Positive
Kitchen	Counters	Swab	Laminate	Cleaner 3	Once per day or more	929	Negative
	Dinner Table	Swab	Laminate	Cleaner 3	Once per day or more	929	Negative
	Refrigerator handle	Swab	Plastic	Cleaner 3	Once per day or more	Unknown	Negative
	Sink Handles	Swab	Plastic	Cleaner 3	Once per day or more	Unknown	Negative
Master bedroom	Door knob	Swab	Metal	Cleaner 2	Once per day or more	Unknown	Positive
	Floor	Swab	Carpet	Vacuum	Once per day or more	929	Positive
	Floor	Vacuumed dust	Carpet	Vacuum	Once per day or more	929	Positive
Second Bedroom	Door knob	Swab	Metal	Cleaner 2	Once per day or more	Unknown	Negative
	Floor	Swab	Carpet	Vacuum	Once per day or more	929	Positive
Bathroom	Floor	Swab	Vinyl	Cleaner 1	Once per day or more	929	Negative
	Sink handles	Swab	Metal	Cleaner 2	Once per day or more	Unknown	Negative
	Toilet seat	Swab	Plastic	Cleaner 2	Once per day or more	Unknown	Negative
	Toilet handle	Swab	Metal	Cleaner 2	Once per day or more	Unknown	Positive
Portable items	Phone screen 1	Swab	Glass	Cleaner 2	Once per day or more	Unknown	Negative
	Toy	Swab	Plastic	Cleaner 2	Less than once per day	Unknown	Positive
	Highchair	Swab	Plastic	Water	Once per day or more	929	Positive
HVAC	Filter	Swab	Fiberglass	Not Cleaned	None	32	Positive
	Filter	Vacuumed dust	Fiberglass	Not Cleaned	None	2064	Positive

251


* See Table S1 for active ingredient

252



253
254
255
256
257

Figure 1. N2 gene copies recovered from samples. For visualization purposes only, results are illustrated on a generic two-bedroom floor plan that is typical of homes in the study area.



258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273

Figure 2. N2 gene copies recovered per swab across the fomites sampled. Left) Fomites sampled by area, allowing the results to be expressed in N2 gene copies/cm². Right) Fomites sampled with no known areas, results presented in recovered copies per swab, red line represents the effective LOD. N.D.=Non-detects.

In the case of fomites where it was feasible to sample a specific area, the highest number of N2 gene copies/cm² were recovered from the filter, whereas the floor in the master bedroom and the highchair yielded several order magnitude fewer copies/cm². Samples gathered from the bathroom floor, living room floor and second bedroom floor, dinner table and kitchen counter yielded non-detects. In the carpet of the master bedroom, which was used as the primary bedroom by both occupants, a concentration of approximately 20 copies/cm² was found. The highchair yielded concentrations one order of magnitude higher than the floor in the master bedroom. Interestingly, a concentration of 4.8 N2 gene copies/cm² was measured in the second bedroom (not in use from the onset of symptoms through the sampling event). It is worth noting that vinyl flooring (bathroom and living room), cleaned with Cleaner 1 on a regular basis did not


274 yield any signal, and neither did surfaces that were cleaned with Cleaner 3 such as the kitchen
275 counter and the dinner table.

276
277 In the case of the results not normalized by area, the highest SARS-CoV-2 RNA signal was
278 observed on the top of the television surface. The vinyl couch as well as the child's toy, the toilet
279 handle, and the doorknob to the master bedroom showed similar viral signal strengths (~100 N2
280 gene copies recovered per swab). The surfaces in the bathroom did not yield any SARS-CoV-2
281 signal, except for the toilet handle. The remaining doorknobs (second bedroom and main door)
282 and handles tested, including the kitchen sink handle and refrigerator handle, as well as the cell
283 phone screen, did not yield any signal. Fig. S1 shows all swab samples as recovered copies per
284 swab for direct comparison among all the samples without area normalization.

285 286 Cleaning regime, products utilized and surface materials

287 Five methods for cleaning the home environment were used in the home (Table 1, Fig. 3). For
288 vinyl flooring in the living room and kitchen, Cleaner 1 (active ingredient: glycolic acid) was
289 used once per day, except in the case of the bathroom floor, where Cleaner 2 (active ingredient:
290 alkyl dimethyl benzyl ammonium chloride) was generally utilized. For doorknobs, Cleaner 1 was
291 utilized once per day. The rest of flooring in both bedrooms was carpeted. The floor in the main
292 bedroom (the only one occupied at the time) was vacuumed once per day. In the kitchen, Cleaner
293 3 (active ingredient: sodium laureth sulfate) was employed to clean surfaces such as the counters,
294 the dinner table, as well as the refrigerator and sink handles. In the bathroom, Cleaner 2 was used
295 on all surfaces including the sink, toilet handle and toilet seat. Some portable objects were
296 cleaned with Cleaner 2, including the participant's phone, and the child's toys, cleaned daily and
297 2-3 times per week respectively. The highchair was cleaned three times per day with water.
298 Other surfaces, such as door trims, the couch, the TV, or the HVAC filter were not cleaned
299 routinely.

300



301
302 Figure 3. N2 gene copies recovered per swab from the fomites sampled as a function of surface
303 material and cleaning product used on the surfaces. Red dashed line represents the effective
304 LOD. Non-detects (N.D.) are represented by 1/2 of the LOD to facilitate interpretation of the
305 figure.

306


307 The highest signal was recovered from the filter, made of fiberglass and never cleaned/disturbed
308 by the participant until the sampling event, followed by the plastic materials (TV top and
309 highchair), and carpet floor. Among the fomites that can be cleaned frequently, those that were
310 vacuumed, not cleaned at all, or cleaned with water only, yielded higher SARS-CoV-2 signal
311 than those cleaned with commercial cleaning products. Another factor that may affect the signal
312 is the cleaning regime (Table 1, Fig. S2) with frequent cleaning of surfaces expected to deplete
313 the signal.

314
315

316 SARS-CoV-2 in vacuumed dust samples

317
318 The viral signal ranged from 10^5 to 10^6 N2 gene copies/g in the floor dust samples collected via
319 the handheld vacuum (Fig. 4). The viral signal in the HVAC filter dust ranged from 10^4 to 10^5
320 copies/g of dust. The concentrations found in the dust from the carpeted master bedroom floor
321 were significantly higher than those in the HVAC filter dust (Mann-Whitney, p -val <0.001). In
322 both cases, the SARS-CoV-2 signal varied by at least an order of magnitude in the dust samples.
323 As a negative control, vacuum HVAC filter dust samples collected a year prior to the COVID-19
324 pandemic were also tested and yielded no signal.

325



326
327

328 Fig 4. Concentration of N2 gene copies detected in vacuumed dust samples. Dust samples were
329 aliquoted and replicates were measured to study the variability in the signal.

330
331

332 N1-N2 Recovery comparison and estimation of viral recovery with BRSV virus

333

334 A subset of positive samples for the N2 assay were tested with the N1 assay to corroborate the
335 results. In each case, all samples yielded positive signals, that were highly correlated (Pearson's

336 product-moment correlation, p -value = 0.002, ρ = 0.825), although N2 consistently yielded
337 higher copies recovered than N1 (Figure S4).

338
339 It has been established that microbial RNA/DNA can be lost during the process of extraction
340 (Iker et al., 2013) and by the matrix within which it is embedded (Zuo et al., 2013). To estimate
341 the effect that matrix can have on viral recoveries (Gonzalez et al., 2020), the BRSV was used to
342 estimate the viral recovery from swab and dust samples. In this work, when the RNA of a known
343 amount of virus was extracted with no matrix-, approximately 30% of the signal was recovered
344 (Fig. S3). When the same quantity of virus was spiked onto a swab (the same kind used in the
345 current study), approximately 25% of the signal was recovered. However, in the case of BRSV
346 spikes into dust samples, a median of approximately 6% was recovered from the filter dust and
347 approximately 8% from the floor dust. As a reference, 7.6% recovery was observed for BRSV in
348 wastewater samples and fungal recoveries from wipe samples have been reported to range from
349 10% to 25% Gonzalez et al., 2020; Yamamoto et al., 2011). Similarly, Yang et al. (2011)
350 reported 50% recovery of the virus H1N1 spiked onto PTFE filters while Brown et al. (2020)
351 could recover between 1% and 10% the foot-and-mouth disease virus in their liquid control with
352 generally lower recoveries reported from surfaces, suggesting non-negligible losses. While it is
353 known that different microorganisms, matrices, surface materials, and virus concentrations
354 (Brown et al., 2020; Fabian et al., 2009; Zuo et al., 2013) can behave differently, the recovery
355 values determined in the present work are within the range reported in other studies of viruses
356 and other microorganisms. Still, the actual recovery of SARS-CoV-2 from many environmental
357 matrices remains largely unknown.

358 359 **Discussion**

360
361 Secondary SARS-CoV-2 infections can occur within households when a COVID-19 individual
362 isolates at home (Grijalva et al., 2020; Lewis et al., 2020; Wang et al., 2020a; Wu et al., 2020).
363 In fact, home related outbreaks can be common as evidenced in the study by Qian et al. (2020)
364 where 254 of 318 outbreaks (79.9%) were found to have originated in the home indoor
365 environment. Wang et al. (2020a) found that measures such as home ventilation and frequent
366 cleaning of surfaces were protective against secondary infections. In this work, we detected
367 SARS-CoV-2 (confirmed via N2 and N1 gene assays) across several locations within a home one
368 month after the symptoms of the two COVID-19 positive occupants had subsided. The SARS-
369 CoV-2 signal was found in at least one fomite in every room sampled, including in rooms not in
370 active use. In addition, SARS-CoV-2 was detected in dust from floors and from the HVAC filter
371 installed in the home. We found that 46% of the surfaces had detectable SARS-CoV-2 signal. In
372 other studies (Chia et al., 2020), similar detection rates (~40%) were found in rooms with
373 patients in their first week of disease but the rates declined below 20% as the disease progressed.
374 Many factors could have contributed to these observed differences. In our study, the strength of
375 the viral signal seemed to vary with sample location, fomite surface material, occupant contact
376 level, and cleaning practices.

377
378 Some of the SARS-CoV-2 positive surfaces, such as HVAC filters, floors, and the top of the TV,
379 are common reservoirs for dust build-up and might be infrequently touched; however, others are
380 high-touch surfaces such as doorknobs, tables and, handles. The viral signals recovered in the
381 current study (median= 966 N2 gene copies recovered per swab sample) were lower than the

382 median value of approximately 3500 N2 gene copies recovered per swab reported in
383 biocontainment and quarantine units (Santarpia et al., 2020) although there was wide variability
384 among sample types. Several relevant factors could explain these differences. First, it is possible
385 that the viral signal in the study house attenuated as time passed after symptoms disappeared
386 whereas the studies in hospitals and quarantine units were normally conducted in or near rooms
387 with active COVID-19 cases. In the quarantine unit study by Santarpia et al. (2020), the rooms
388 were negatively pressurized with >12 ACH whereas in homes, these ventilation levels are
389 unlikely to be present in air conditioned homes that are closed most of the time. In the present
390 study, the ACH during cooling was not measured although the home was naturally ventilated one
391 hour per day. Finally, the home was cleaned frequently whereas in Santarpia et al. (2020), the
392 authors mentioned frequent environmental cleaning but many details were not specified
393 (cleaning regime, products), making the comparison difficult.

394
395 In some cases, the SARS-CoV-2 RNA signal can be normalized by sampling area, which may be
396 a useful metric to compare to other studies. The highest concentrations of N2 gene copies/cm²
397 were recovered from the HVAC filter (average 43,000 N2 gene copies/cm²), which was in place
398 throughout the period of illness and recovery. Other surfaces, such as the floor in the master
399 bedroom and the second room, both carpeted and vacuum-cleaned, and the child's highchair,
400 cleaned with water, yielded signal but at lower concentrations (~5, ~20 and ~125 copies/cm²,
401 respectively). Comparing to samples gathered in hospitals, in Feng et al. (2021) 38 copies/cm²
402 were found at the patient's bedside wall surface but lower concentrations in the toilet bowl and
403 floor drainage (4 and 2 copies/cm², respectively). In this study, samples gathered from the vinyl
404 bathroom floor and living room floor, both cleaned with Cleaner 1, as well as the dinner table
405 and kitchen counter (cleaned with Cleaner 3), yielded non-detects. It is noteworthy that 4.8 N2
406 gene copies/cm² (nearly 100 N2 gene copies recovered per swab) were recovered in the
407 unoccupied second bedroom. Many explanations are possible, including the possibility of
408 tracking the virus in via walking, redistribution of viral particles via the HVAC system, or
409 penetration of the virus from the occupied portion to the unoccupied bedroom via cracks and
410 gaps in the doorframe. Evidence is mounting supporting the possibility of long travel distance of
411 SARS-CoV-2 virus-laden particles in the built environment (Allen and Marr, 2020; Chen et al.,
412 2020a; Morawska and Cao, 2020). Tang et al. (2020) found that aerosols released indoors
413 dispersed and deposited across the open spaces, even within closets and cabinets with closed
414 doors and drawers. Thus, the presence of viral signal in the not-in-use room carpeted floor is not
415 unreasonable. Among the samples not normalized by area, the signal observed on the top of the
416 television (nearly 10,000 N2 gene copies/swab) was significantly higher than the other samples.
417 The static charge and lack of cleaning at this location leads to an accumulation of dust,
418 suggesting that it could be a good reservoir to sample in home environmental studies, as reported
419 elsewhere (Dunn et al., 2013).

420
421 Of particular note, the SARS-CoV-2 signal recovered by swabbing the HVAC filter in this study
422 yielded an average viral signal of 38,815 N2 gene copies recovered per swab, higher than those
423 recovered in the biocontainment and quarantine unit study. Horve et al. (2020) found SARS-
424 CoV-2 viral copies in hospital HVAC pre-filters and filters at lower levels (~ 450 cumulative
425 copies across the pre-filters and two filters that were positive). Even though the levels found in
426 the present work are higher, the direct comparison is difficult due to several aspects. First, home
427 and hospital HVAC systems differ in their in their function; home systems provide greater air

428 recirculation, whereas in hospital systems, outdoor air is mixed in to provide higher air exchange
429 rates. The second main difference is the total volume of filtered air per surface sampled. Finally,
430 the cumulative time the filters were in use may be different between the two systems. With the
431 current available information, we are unable to determine the full influence of these significant
432 factors. Nissen et al. (2020) found viral signal in air vents and filters 50 meters away from
433 patients in a low relative humidity environment (approximately 30%), but they could not detect
434 growth or infectivity, and hypothesized that the virus may have been inactive due to desiccation
435 of the pathogen in the vents.

436
437 Recent studies have shown a variability in the survivability of the virus in surfaces, depending on
438 the material, temperature, relative humidity, and light, with all of these factors playing an
439 important role (Riddell et al., 2020; Van Doremalen et al., 2020; Wolff et al., 2005). Whereas
440 one study showed that SARS-CoV-2 survives for up to 7 days in some materials (Aboubakr et
441 al., 2020; Chin and Poon, 2020), other studies have shown longer survivability times up to 28
442 days (Riddell et al., 2020) in the dark, at 20 °C and 50% RH. Considering the time that had
443 passed after the participants' symptoms disappeared, the RH average estimate from our previous
444 study in Texas ($56.6\% \pm 5.2\%$, (Bi et al., 2018)), and the temperature setting for the study house
445 ($23.9\text{ }^{\circ}\text{C}$, $75\text{ }^{\circ}\text{F}$), we hypothesize that the viral signal detected may have been from inactive
446 virus. However, additional studies that address infectivity of SARS-CoV-2 recovered from
447 home surface and dust samples as a function of time, material properties and cleaning practices
448 would be required to address this question.

449
450 Another factor that may affect the signal recovered from the built environment is the cleaning
451 regime (Fig. S2) and the cleaning products used (Table 1, Table S1). In the present study, the
452 frequent cleaning of floors and many of the high touch surfaces with cleaning products may
453 explain the low to no signal found on many surfaces. Surfactants from household cleaners can
454 break the viral membrane of the enveloped SARS-CoV-2 virus (Jahromi et al. 2020). For
455 example, all surfaces in the bathroom cleaned regularly with Cleaner 2 (sink handle, toilet seat,
456 and floor) did not yield any SARS-COV-2 signal, except in the case of the toilet handle
457 suggesting that viral shedding in stool could have happened. Studies have found SARS-CoV-2
458 presence in stool samples up to 28 days after hospital admission (Xu et al., 2020), 6-10 days after
459 negative nasopharyngeal swabs (Chen et al., 2020b). However, it is important to recognize that
460 the viral signal detected in the toilet handle could also have settled there via transport from
461 another area of the home. The persistence of the SARS-CoV-2 RNA signal on surfaces likely
462 varies widely due to the active ingredient within the cleaner used. Quaternary ammonium, a
463 compound found in Cleaner 2 in this study as well as in a majority of EPA recommended
464 cleaners, has been shown to be effective against viruses (Shirai et al., 2000; Tuladhar et al.,
465 2012a) such as the enveloped murine norovirus (MNV-1) and feline calicivirus (FCV) (Kennedy
466 et al. 1995).

467
468 Ma et al. (2020) found that COVID-19 positive patients in early stages had breath emission rates
469 estimated to range from 1.03×10^5 to 2.25×10^7 viruses per hour. It is likely that the concentrations
470 would be lower towards the end of the recovery period as reported in sputum samples elsewhere
471 (Wölfel et al., 2020). Taking into account the two COVID-19 positive dwellers, the length of
472 their quarantine and ventilation mode (a door opened during one hour per day plus infiltration), it
473 is reasonable that viral particles accumulated in the case study home. In this study, significant

474 viral signals were recovered from the dust from both the main bedroom floor and the HVAC
475 filter. Even though the floors of the study home were vacuumed frequently, the viral signal in the
476 carpeted floor from the master bedroom was above 10^5 N2 gene copies/ gram of dust, suggesting
477 that the viral signal may be difficult to remove just by vacuuming. As indicated in Staudt et al.
478 (2020), the highest viral loads can be found on floors and airborne aerosols can be formed from
479 resuspension of settled dust or aerosols. In the present work, the signal found in the HVAC filter
480 dust was an order of magnitude lower than that recovered from the floors. In both cases, the viral
481 concentration in each dust sample type varied by at least an order of magnitude indicating that
482 replicate analyses are needed to represent the heterogeneity of the dust. Solely for context,
483 having not found other works providing SARS-COV-2 concentrations per gram of dust, the
484 concentrations measured in this work are on the same order of magnitude or even higher than
485 those found in stool from COVID-19 positive patients at the peak of their symptoms (Wölfel et
486 al., 2020) but lower than those found in other cases (Lescure et al., 2020).

487
488 The virus is not expelled naked but attached to larger respiratory fluid particles, forming both
489 droplets and aerosols that can be involved in transmission (Prather et al., 2020). Filters can
490 remove airborne viruses, but their efficiency varies significantly. Low MERV filters are not very
491 efficient at removing smaller particles with, for example, filters rated MERV 5 and below are
492 reported to remove less than 25% of particles smaller than $10\ \mu\text{m}$ (Azimi et al., 2014). As a
493 result, only a fraction of viral aerosols may be retained in the filter in a single pass although our
494 results suggest removal and accumulation can occur over time. Notably, we found a strong viral
495 signal in the HVAC filter dust, located inside a closet with a closed louvered door. This indicates
496 the viral-laden particles were at some point airborne (either after being expelled or after being
497 resuspended). Low efficiency filters, frequently used because of their low cost, primarily act as a
498 ‘roughing filter’, removing large particulate matter to protect the HVAC system. In order to
499 enhance capture of viral-laden particles in a home (and potentially diminish the redistribution of
500 viruses across the home), high MERV filters could be used.

501
502 This work indicates that it is possible to detect the previous presence of a viral shedding
503 individual in the built environment via HVAC filter forensics and suggest this approach may be
504 useful for SARS-CoV-2 monitoring in home environments. In addition, using the
505 QFF methodology (Haaland and Siegel, 2017), we estimated an average integrated airborne
506 SARS-CoV-2 concentration of 90 copies/ m^3 (see Table S2 for more details). This value can serve
507 for future comparisons of concentrations of SARS-CoV-2 in the built environment and help
508 building scientists and engineers as they strive to develop best practices in homes with COVID-
509 19 positive occupants. Studies of the viral signal decay and infectivity in HVAC filter dust are
510 warranted to further determine the usability and limits of this approach, and future work should
511 include direct measurements of HVAC and extraction parameters to better characterize the
512 integrated SARS-CoV-2 concentrations. Because HVAC filter dust represents a pooled sample,
513 contributed to by all occupants in a building over an extended period of time, repeated
514 monitoring could be used to identify spikes in measured viral concentrations in the dust. These
515 spikes could indicate new or active infections and be used to guide additional isolation or
516 ventilation practices to minimize the spread of the virus.

517
518 As the body of literature increases, it seems clear that in order to diminish viral loads and
519 decrease the probability of in-home secondary transmission in the built environment, efficient

520 ventilation, high-efficiency filtration and frequent cleaning are important (Allen and Marr, 2020).
521 While detection of viral RNA does not imply infectivity, this study confirms that the SARS-
522 CoV-2 RNA signal can persist in a COVID-19 quarantine household for nearly a month
523 following resolution of COVID-19 symptoms. In addition, several factors that may affect the
524 distribution of SARS-CoV-2 across a home have been identified. The results indicate that
525 cleaning can greatly reduce or eliminate the SARS-CoV-2 signal on surfaces. Also, even a low
526 efficiency home filter is capable of capturing and retaining SARS-CoV-2. The detection of the
527 SARS-CoV-2 RNA signal on infrequently touched surfaces indicates that airborne particles
528 settle out of the air, potentially contaminating surfaces not in direct contact with COVID-19
529 positive individuals. As the COVID-19 pandemic continues, the SARS-CoV-2 transmission
530 pathways continue to be widely debated. Homes are essential environments that warrant further
531 study to better understand SARS-CoV-2 aerosols and fomites in the home environment where
532 many COVID-19 individuals recover.

533

534 **Limitations of the Study**

535 This study has several limitations. First, the distribution of the SARS-CoV-2 RNA signal across
536 a single quarantine household was investigated at one time point two months after COVID-19
537 symptom onset. Additional quarantine homes during and after COVID-19 infections should be
538 studied to determine the temporal course of SARS-CoV-2 distribution within homes as well as to
539 investigate how different household factors affect this distribution across a wide variety of home
540 types. Second, viral culturing was not performed to determine virus viability/infectivity; thus,
541 this work only reports SARS-CoV-2 viral signal found independently of its viability. Future
542 studies are needed to establish whether there are infective viruses in samples obtained from
543 home environments. Finally, the current study is based on the recovery of SARS-CoV-2 RNA
544 from a range of sample types. It is well established that recovery of RNA from environmental
545 samples is often attenuated by losses during the extraction process or retention within the sample
546 matrix. Thus, future studies are warranted to investigate these effects as the recovery of SARS-
547 CoV-2 from many complex sample matrices such as dust have not been established.

548

549

550 **Acknowledgements**

551

552 This work was supported by Whole Communities—Whole Health, a research grand challenge at
553 the University of Texas at Austin. In addition, the work that provided the basis for this
554 publication was also supported by funding under an award TXHHU0046-18 with the U.S.
555 Department of Housing and Urban Development. The substance and findings of the work are
556 dedicated to the public. The authors and publisher are solely responsible for the accuracy of the
557 statements and interpretations contained in this publication. Such interpretations do not
558 necessarily reflect the views of the Government.

559

560

561 **References**

562

563 Aboubakr HA, Sharafeldin TA, Goyal SM. Stability of SARS-CoV-2 and other coronaviruses in
564 the environment and on common touch surfaces and the influence of climatic conditions:
565 A review. *Transboundary and Emerging Diseases* 2020: 1-17.

- 566 Allen JG, Marr LC. Recognizing and controlling airborne transmission of SARS-CoV-2 in
567 indoor environments. *Indoor Air* 2020; 30: 557-558.
- 568 Asadi S, Gaaloul ben Hnia N, Barre RS, Wexler AS, Ristenpart WD, Bouvier NM. Influenza A
569 virus is transmissible via aerosolized fomites. *Nature Communications* 2020; 11: 4062.
- 570 Augenbraun BL, Lasner ZD, Mitra D, Prabhu S, Raval S, Sawaoka H, et al. Assessment and
571 mitigation of aerosol airborne SARS-CoV-2 transmission in laboratory and office
572 environments. *Journal of Occupational and Environmental Hygiene* 2020: 1-10.
- 573 Azimi P, Zhao D, Stephens B. Estimates of HVAC filtration efficiency for fine and ultrafine
574 particles of outdoor origin. *Atmospheric Environment* 2014; 98: 337-346.
- 575 Bekö G, Gustavsen S, Frederiksen M, Bergsøe NC, Kolarik B, Gunnarsen L, et al. Diurnal and
576 seasonal variation in air exchange rates and interzonal airflows measured by active and
577 passive tracer gas in homes. *Building and Environment* 2016; 104: 178-187.
- 578 Bi C, Maestre JP, Li H, Zhang G, Givehchi R, Mahdavi A, et al. Phthalates and
579 organophosphates in settled dust and HVAC filter dust of U.S. low-income homes:
580 Association with season, building characteristics, and childhood asthma. *Environment*
581 *International* 2018; 121: 916-930.
- 582 Biryukov J, Boydston JA, Dunning RA, Yeager JJ, Wood S, Reese AL, et al. Increasing
583 temperature and relative humidity accelerates inactivation of SARS-CoV-2 on surfaces.
584 *MSphere* 2020; 5.
- 585 Brown E, Nelson N, Gubbins S, Colenutt C. Environmental and air sampling are efficient
586 methods for the detection and quantification of foot-and-mouth disease virus. *Journal of*
587 *Virological Methods* 2020: 113988.
- 588 Chen W, Zhang N, Wei J, Yen HL, Li Y. Short-range airborne route dominates exposure of
589 respiratory infection during close contact. *Building and Environment* 2020a; 176:
590 106859-106859.
- 591 Chen Y, Chen L, Deng Q, Zhang G, Wu K, Ni L, et al. The presence of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in
592 the feces of COVID-19 patients. *Journal of medical virology* 2020b.
- 593 Chia PY, Coleman KK, Tan YK, Ong SWX, Gum M, Lau SK, et al. Detection of air and surface
594 contamination by SARS-CoV-2 in hospital rooms of infected patients. *Nature*
595 *Communications* 2020; 11.
- 596 Chin AW, Poon LL. Stability of SARS-CoV-2 in different environmental conditions—Authors'
597 reply. *The Lancet Microbe* 2020; 1: e146.
- 598 Dunn RR, Fierer N, Henley JB, Leff JW, Menninger HL. Home life: factors structuring the
599 bacterial diversity found within and between homes. *PloS one* 2013; 8: e64133.
- 600 Elsamadony M, Fujii M, Miura T, Watanabe T. Possible transmission of viruses from
601 contaminated human feces and sewage: Implications for SARS-CoV-2. *Science of the*
602 *Total Environment* 2021; 755: 142575-142575.
- 603 Fabian P, McDevitt JJ, Lee WM, Houseman EA, Milton DK. An optimized method to detect
604 influenza virus and human rhinovirus from exhaled breath and the airborne environment.
605 *Journal of Environmental Monitoring* 2009; 11: 314-317.
- 606 Feng B, Xu K, Gu S, Zheng S, Zou Q, Xu Y, et al. Multi-route transmission potential of SARS-
607 CoV-2 in healthcare facilities. *Journal of Hazardous Materials* 2021; 402: 123771-
608 123771.
- 609 Givehchi R, Maestre JP, Bi C, Wylie D, Xu Y, Kinney KA, et al. Quantitative filter forensics
610 with residential HVAC filters to assess indoor concentrations. *Indoor air* 2019; 29: 390-
611 402.

- 612 Gonzalez R, Curtis K, Bivins A, Bibby K, Weir MH, Yetka K, et al. COVID-19 surveillance in
613 Southeastern Virginia using wastewater-based epidemiology. *Water Research* 2020; 186:
614 116296-116296.
- 615 Goyal SM, Anantharaman S, Ramakrishnan M, Sajja S, Kim SW, Stanley NJ, et al. Detection of
616 viruses in used ventilation filters from two large public buildings. *American journal of*
617 *infection control* 2011; 39: e30-e38.
- 618 Grijalva C, Rolfes M, Zhu Y, McLean H, Hanson K, Belongia E, et al. Transmission of SARS-
619 COV-2 Infections in Households — Tennessee and Wisconsin. *MMWR Morb Mortal*
620 *Wkly Rep.* 2020.
- 621 Guillier L, Martin-Latil S, Chaix E, Thébault A, Pavio N, Le Poder S, et al. Modeling the
622 inactivation of viruses from the coronaviridae family in response to temperature and
623 relative humidity in suspensions or on surfaces. *Applied and environmental microbiology*
624 2020; 86.
- 625 Guo Z-D, Wang Z-Y, Zhang S-F, Li X, Li L, Li C, et al. Aerosol and Surface Distribution of
626 Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 in Hospital Wards, Wuhan, China,
627 2020. *Emerging Infectious Diseases* 2020; 26.
- 628 Haaland D, Siegel J. Quantitative filter forensics for indoor particle sampling. *Indoor Air* 2017;
629 27: 364-376.
- 630 Harris PA, Taylor R, Minor BL, Elliott V, Fernandez M, O'Neal L, et al. The REDCap
631 consortium: Building an international community of software platform partners. *Journal*
632 *of Biomedical Informatics* 2019; 95: 103208-103208.
- 633 Harris PA, Taylor R, Thielke R, Payne J, Gonzalez N, Conde JG. Research electronic data
634 capture (REDCap)-A metadata-driven methodology and workflow process for providing
635 translational research informatics support. *Journal of Biomedical Informatics* 2009; 42:
636 377-381.
- 637 Hirotsu Y, Maejima M, Nakajima M, Mochizuki H, Omata M. Environmental cleaning is
638 effective for the eradication of severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-
639 CoV-2) in contaminated hospital rooms: A patient from the Diamond Princess cruise
640 ship. *Infection Control and Hospital Epidemiology* 2020: 0-2.
- 641 Horve PF, Dietz L, Fretz M, Constant DA, Wilkes A, Townes JM, et al. Identification of SARS-
642 CoV-2 RNA in Healthcare Heating, Ventilation, and Air Conditioning Units. *medRxiv*
643 2020.
- 644 Iker BC, Bright KR, Pepper IL, Gerba CP, Kitajima M. Evaluation of commercial kits for the
645 extraction and purification of viral nucleic acids from environmental and fecal samples.
646 *Journal of virological methods* 2013; 191: 24-30.
- 647 Kampf G, Todt D, Pfaender S, Steinmann E. Persistence of coronaviruses on inanimate surfaces
648 and their inactivation with biocidal agents. *Journal of Hospital Infection* 2020; 104: 246-
649 251.
- 650 Lescure F-X, Bouadma L, Nguyen D, Parisey M, Wicky P-H, Behillil S, et al. Clinical and
651 virological data of the first cases of COVID-19 in Europe: a case series. *The Lancet*
652 *Infectious Diseases* 2020.
- 653 Lewis NM, Chu VT, Ye D, Connors EE, Gharpure R, Laws RL, et al. Household Transmission
654 of SARS-CoV-2 in the United States. *Clinical Infectious Diseases* 2020.
- 655 Li W, Zhang B, Lu J, Liu S, Chang Z, Cao P, et al. The characteristics of household transmission
656 of COVID-19. *Clinical Infectious Diseases* 2020.

- 657 Liu F, Cai Z-b, Huang J-s, Niu H-y, Yu W-y, Zhang Y, et al. Repeated COVID-19 relapse during
658 post-discharge surveillance with viral shedding lasting for 67 days in a recovered patient
659 infected with SARS-CoV-2. *Journal of Microbiology, Immunology and Infection* 2020.
- 660 Lopez AS, Hill M, Antezano J, Vilven D, Rutner T, Bogdanow L, et al. Transmission dynamics
661 of COVID-19 outbreaks associated with child care facilities—Salt Lake City, Utah,
662 April–July 2020. *Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report* 2020; 69: 1319.
- 663 Lu X, Wang L, Sakthivel SK, Whitaker B, Murray J, Kamili S, et al. US CDC real-time reverse
664 transcription PCR panel for detection of severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2.
665 *Emerging infectious diseases* 2020; 26: 1654.
- 666 Ma J, Qi X, Chen H, Li X, Zhang Z, Wang H, et al. COVID-19 patients in earlier stages exhaled
667 millions of SARS-CoV-2 per hour. *Clinical Infectious Diseases* 2020.
- 668 Madewell ZJ, Yang Y, Longini Jr IM, Halloran ME, Dean NE. Household transmission of
669 SARS-CoV-2: a systematic review and meta-analysis of secondary attack rate. *medRxiv*
670 2020.
- 671 Maestre JP, Jennings W, Wylie D, Horner SD, Siegel J, Kinney KA. Filter forensics: microbiota
672 recovery from residential HVAC filters. *Microbiome* 2018; 6: 1-14.
- 673 Mahdavi A, Siegel JA. Extraction of Dust Collected in HVAC Filters for Quantitative Filter
674 Forensics. *Aerosol Science and Technology* 2020: 1-15.
- 675 Matson MJ, Yinda CK, Seifert SN, Bushmaker T, Fischer RJ, van Doremalen N, et al. Effect of
676 environmental conditions on SARS-CoV-2 stability in human nasal mucus and sputum.
677 *Emerging infectious diseases* 2020; 26: 2276.
- 678 Miller SL, Nazaroff WW, Jimenez JL, Boerstra A, Buonanno G, Dancer SJ, et al. Transmission
679 of SARS-CoV-2 by inhalation of respiratory aerosol in the Skagit Valley Chorale
680 superspreading event. *Indoor air* 2020.
- 681 Morawska L, Cao J. Airborne transmission of SARS-CoV-2: The world should face the reality.
682 *Environment International* 2020: 105730.
- 683 Mouchtouri VA, Koureas M, Kyritsi M, Vontas A, Kourentis L, Sapounas S, et al.
684 Environmental contamination of SARS-CoV-2 on surfaces, air-conditioner and
685 ventilation systems. *International journal of hygiene and environmental health* 2020; 230:
686 113599.
- 687 Nissen K, Krambrich J, Akaberi D, Hoffman T, Ling J, Lundkvist Å, et al. Long-distance
688 airborne dispersal of SARS-CoV-2 in COVID-19 wards. *Scientific Reports* 2020; 10:
689 19589.
- 690 Noris F, Siegel JA, Kinney KA. Evaluation of HVAC filters as a sampling mechanism for indoor
691 microbial communities. *Atmospheric Environment* 2011; 45: 338-346.
- 692 Ong SWX, Tan YK, Chia PY, Lee TH, Ng OT, Wong MSY, et al. Air, Surface Environmental,
693 and Personal Protective Equipment Contamination by Severe Acute Respiratory
694 Syndrome Coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) from a Symptomatic Patient. *JAMA - Journal*
695 *of the American Medical Association* 2020; 323: 1610-1612.
- 696 Pan Y, Zhang D, Yang P, Poon LL, Wang Q. Viral load of SARS-CoV-2 in clinical samples.
697 *The Lancet Infectious Diseases* 2020; 20: 411-412.
- 698 Prather KA, Marr LC, Schooley RT, McDiarmid MA, Wilson ME, Milton DK. Airborne
699 transmission of SARS-CoV-2. *Science (New York, NY)* 2020: eabf0521.
- 700 Prussin AJ, Vikram A, Bibby KJ, Marr LC. Seasonal dynamics of the airborne bacterial
701 community and selected viruses in a children's daycare center. *PloS one* 2016; 11:
702 e0151004.

- 703 Qian H, Miao T, Liu L, Zheng X, Luo D, Li Y. Indoor transmission of SARS-CoV-2. *Indoor Air*
704 2020; n/a.
- 705 Riddell S, Goldie S, Hill A, Eagles D, Drew TW. The effect of temperature on persistence of
706 SARS-CoV-2 on common surfaces. *Virology Journal* 2020; 17: 145-145.
- 707 Sanekata T, Fukuda T, Miura T, Morino H, Lee C, Maeda K, et al. Evaluation of the antiviral
708 activity of chlorine dioxide and sodium hypochlorite against feline calicivirus, human
709 influenza virus, measles virus, canine distemper virus, human herpesvirus, human
710 adenovirus, canine adenovirus and canine parvovirus. *Biocontrol science* 2010; 15: 45-
711 49.
- 712 Santarpia JL, Rivera DN, Herrera VL, Morwitzer MJ, Creager HM, Santarpia GW, et al. Aerosol
713 and surface contamination of SARS-CoV-2 observed in quarantine and isolation care.
714 *Scientific Reports* 2020; 10: 1-8.
- 715 Shirai J, Kanno T, Tsuchiya Y, Mitsubayashi S, Seki R. Effects of chlorine, iodine, and
716 quaternary ammonium compound disinfectants on several exotic disease viruses. *Journal*
717 *of Veterinary Medical Science* 2000; 62: 85-92.
- 718 Shrestha PM, Humphrey JL, Barton KE, Carlton EJ, Adgate JL, Root ED, et al. Impact of Low-
719 Income Home Energy-Efficiency Retrofits on Building Air Tightness and Healthy Home
720 Indicators. *Sustainability* 2019; 11: 2667.
- 721 Staudt A, Saunders J, Pavlin J, Shelton-Davenport M. Airborne Transmission of SARS-CoV-2:
722 Proceedings of a Workshop—in Brief. 2020.
- 723 Tang M, Zhu N, Kinney K, Novoselac A. Transport of indoor aerosols to hidden interior spaces.
724 *Aerosol Science and Technology* 2020; 54: 94-110.
- 725 To KK-W, Tsang OT-Y, Leung W-S, Tam AR, Wu T-C, Lung DC, et al. Temporal profiles of
726 viral load in posterior oropharyngeal saliva samples and serum antibody responses during
727 infection by SARS-CoV-2: an observational cohort study. *The Lancet Infectious Diseases*
728 2020.
- 729 Tuladhar E, de Koning MC, Fundeanu I, Beumer R, Duizer E. Different virucidal activities of
730 hyperbranched quaternary ammonium coatings on poliovirus and influenza virus.
731 *Applied and environmental microbiology* 2012a; 78: 2456-2458.
- 732 Tuladhar E, Terpstra P, Koopmans M, Duizer E. Virucidal efficacy of hydrogen peroxide vapour
733 disinfection. *Journal of Hospital Infection* 2012b; 80: 110-115.
- 734 Van Doremalen N, Bushmaker T, Morris DH, Holbrook MG, Gamble A, Williamson BN, et al.
735 Aerosol and surface stability of SARS-CoV-2 as compared with SARS-CoV-1. *New*
736 *England Journal of Medicine* 2020; 382: 1564-1567.
- 737 Wang Y, Tian H, Zhang L, Zhang M, Guo D, Wu W, et al. Reduction of secondary transmission
738 of SARS-CoV-2 in households by face mask use, disinfection and social distancing: a
739 cohort study in Beijing, China. *BMJ Global Health* 2020a; 5: e002794.
- 740 Wang Z, Ma W, Zheng X, Wu G, Zhang R. Household transmission of SARS-CoV-2. *Journal of*
741 *Infection* 2020b.
- 742 Wölfel R, Corman VM, Guggemos W, Seilmaier M, Zange S, Müller MA, et al. Virological
743 assessment of hospitalized patients with COVID-2019. *Nature* 2020; 581: 465-469.
- 744 Wolff MH, Sattar SA, Adegbonrin O, Tetro J. Environmental survival and microbicide
745 inactivation of coronaviruses. *Coronaviruses with special emphasis on first insights*
746 concerning SARS. Springer, 2005, pp. 201-212.
- 747 Wu J, Huang Y, Tu C, Bi C, Chen Z, Luo L, et al. Household Transmission of SARS-CoV-2,
748 Zhuhai, China, 2020. *Clinical Infectious Diseases* 2020.

- 749 Xu Y, Li X, Zhu B, Liang H, Fang C, Gong Y, et al. Characteristics of pediatric SARS-CoV-2
750 infection and potential evidence for persistent fecal viral shedding. *Nature Medicine*
751 2020; 26: 502-505.
- 752 Yamagishi T, Ohnishi M, Matsunaga N, Kakimoto K, Kamiya H, Okamoto K, et al.
753 Environmental sampling for severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 during a
754 COVID-19 outbreak on the diamond princess cruise ship. *The Journal of infectious*
755 *diseases* 2020; 222: 1098-1102.
- 756 Yamamoto N, Shendell DG, Winer AM, Zhang J. Residential air exchange rates in three major
757 US metropolitan areas: results from the Relationship Among Indoor, Outdoor, and
758 Personal Air Study 1999–2001. *Indoor Air* 2010; 20: 85-90.
- 759 Yang W, Elankumaran S, Marr LC. Concentrations and size distributions of airborne influenza A
760 viruses measured indoors at a health centre, a day-care centre and on aeroplanes. *Journal*
761 *of the Royal Society Interface* 2011; 8: 1176-1184.
- 762 Ye G, Lin H, Chen S, Wang S, Zeng Z, Wang W, et al. Environmental contamination of SARS-
763 CoV-2 in healthcare premises. *Journal of Infection* 2020: 2-6.
- 764 Zuo Z, de Abin M, Chander Y, Kuehn TH, Goyal SM, Pui DYH. Comparison of spike and
765 aerosol challenge tests for the recovery of viable influenza virus from non-woven fabrics.
766 *Influenza and other Respiratory Viruses* 2013; 7: 637-644.
767