

# Indoor dust as a matrix for surveillance of COVID-19 outbreaks

Nicole Renninger<sup>1</sup>, Nick Nastasi<sup>1,2,3</sup>, Ashleigh Bope<sup>1,2,3</sup>, Samuel J. Cochran<sup>1,2,3</sup>, Sarah R. Haines<sup>1,2,3</sup>, Neeraja Balasubrahmaniam<sup>1,2,3</sup>, Katelyn Stuart<sup>3</sup>, Aaron Bivins<sup>5</sup>, Kyle Bibby<sup>5</sup>, Natalie M. Hull<sup>1,4</sup>, Karen C. Dannemiller<sup>1,3,4\*</sup>

1. *Department of Civil, Environmental & Geodetic Engineering, College of Engineering, Ohio State University, Columbus, OH 43210*
2. *Environmental Sciences Graduate Program, Ohio State University, Columbus, OH 43210*
3. *Division of Environmental Health Sciences, College of Public Health, Ohio State University, Columbus, OH 43210*
4. *Sustainability Institute, Ohio State University, Columbus, OH 43210*
5. *Department of Civil & Environmental Engineering & Earth Sciences, College of Engineering, University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame, IN 46556*

\*Corresponding author: Karen C. Dannemiller, Department of Civil, Environmental & Geodetic Engineering, Environmental Health Sciences, Sustainability Institute, Ohio State University, 470 Hitchcock Hall, 2070 Neil Ave, Columbus, OH 43210, [Dannemiller.70@osu.edu](mailto:Dannemiller.70@osu.edu), Phone: 614-292-4031, Fax: 614-292-3780

**Keywords (up to 10):** SARS-CoV-2, COVID-19, dust, surveillance, virus, indoor environment, built environment, vacuum, outbreak, monitoring

41 **Abstract**

42 Ongoing disease surveillance is a critical tool to mitigate viral outbreaks, especially  
43 during a pandemic. Environmental monitoring has significant promise even following  
44 widespread vaccination among high-risk populations. The goal of this work is to demonstrate  
45 molecular SARS-CoV-2 monitoring in bulk floor dust and related samples as a proof-of-concept  
46 of a non-invasive environmental surveillance methodology for COVID-19 and potentially other  
47 viral diseases. Surface swab, passive sampler, and bulk floor dust samples were collected from  
48 rooms of individuals infected with COVID-19, and SARS-CoV-2 was measured with  
49 quantitative reverse transcription polymerase chain reaction (RT-qPCR) and two digital PCR  
50 (dPCR) methods. Bulk dust samples had geometric mean concentration of 159 copies/mg-dust  
51 and ranged from non-detects to 23,049 copies/mg-dust detected using ddPCR. An average of  
52 88% of bulk dust samples were positive for the virus among detection methods compared to 55%  
53 of surface swabs and fewer on the passive sampler (19% carpet, 29% polystyrene). In bulk dust,  
54 SARS-CoV-2 was detected in 76%, 93%, and 97% of samples measured by qPCR, chip-based  
55 dPCR, and droplet dPCR respectively. Detectable viral RNA in the bulk vacuum bags did not  
56 measurably decay over 4 weeks, despite the application of a disinfectant before room cleaning.  
57 Future monitoring efforts should further evaluate RNA persistence and heterogeneity in dust.  
58 This study did not measure virus viability in dust or potential transmission associated with dust.  
59 Overall, this work demonstrates that bulk floor dust is a potentially useful matrix for long-term  
60 monitoring of viral disease outbreaks in high-risk populations and buildings.

61

62

63

## 64 **Importance**

65 Environmental surveillance to assess pathogen presence within a community is proving  
66 to be a critical tool to protect public health, and it is especially relevant during the ongoing  
67 COVID-19 pandemic. Importantly, environmental surveillance tools also allow for the detection  
68 of asymptomatic disease carriers and for routine monitoring of a large number of people as has  
69 been shown for SARS-CoV-2 wastewater monitoring. However, additional monitoring  
70 techniques are needed to screen for outbreaks in high-risk settings such as congregate care  
71 facilities. Here, we demonstrate that SARS-CoV-2 can be detected in bulk floor dust collected  
72 from rooms housing infected individuals. This analysis suggests that dust may be a useful and  
73 efficient matrix for routine surveillance of viral disease outbreaks.

74

## 75 **Introduction**

76 The spread of the novel severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2)  
77 reached pandemic designation in March 2020 and has since resulted in more than 75 million  
78 cases of COVID-19 and 1.6 million deaths documented worldwide as of December 21, 2020 (1).  
79 Both symptomatic and asymptomatic carriers shed the virus into the environment (2–4). Viral  
80 particles are emitted primarily via respiratory droplets and aerosols, and persist on surfaces  
81 indoors (4–6). SARS-CoV-2 viability has been characterized after deposition onto several  
82 surface types (6). In one study, viable virus was detected on plastics and stainless steel up to 72  
83 hours after application (5). Other studies have demonstrated respiratory viruses can contaminate  
84 environmental dust near infected individuals (7–9). These viral shedding routes together with  
85 persistence indoors and in environmental dust implicate potential viral contamination of indoor  
86 dust near infected individuals (10).

87           There is a critical need for targeted, efficient, and inexpensive methods to monitor SARS-  
88   CoV-2 and other viruses long-term to identify potential viral outbreaks prior to extensive spread.  
89   Fecal shedding of SARS-CoV-2 provides the basis for large-scale viral monitoring in wastewater  
90   systems (11–14). However, more targeted monitoring efforts are needed for indoor  
91   environments, especially those housing vulnerable populations such as congregate care facilities.  
92   We propose that the detection of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in indoor dust can be used for continued  
93   environmental surveillance of novel coronavirus, SARS-CoV-2. Targeted monitoring of dust in  
94   high-concern buildings could complement broader population-level monitoring approaches. This  
95   strategy could then be extended to other viruses of concern. Our goal is to demonstrate that  
96   indoor dust can be used as a matrix for viral outbreak surveillance.

97

## 98   **Results**

99           We measured SARS-CoV-2 using quantitative reverse transcription polymerase chain  
100   reaction (RT-qPCR), chip-based digital PCR (dPCR), and droplet digital PCR (ddPCR) in  
101   samples of bulk dust, passive surface samples, and surface swabs from rooms of individuals with  
102   COVID-19. In bulk dust, the SARS-CoV-2 viral concentration had a geometric mean value of  
103   159 copies/mg-dust and ranged from non-detects to 23,049 copies/mg-dust (Figure 1A). We  
104   detected SARS-CoV-2 RNA in 89% of bulk dust, 55% of surface swabs, and 38% of passive  
105   surface sampler samples (average among all three detection methods used). The ddPCR method  
106   detected viral RNA in 97% of bulk dust samples compared to 93% for the chip-based dPCR and  
107   76% for RT-qPCR (Figure 1B).

108           The COVID-19 isolation rooms were treated with a chlorine-based disinfectant prior to  
109   dust collection as part of the normal cleaning process, and the disinfectant is expected to largely

110 inactivate the virus through reactions with the viral capsid (15). The bags were stored in the  
111 laboratory at room temperature after collection. Triplicate subsamples were extracted and viral  
112 RNA measured immediately upon collection and once per week for 4 weeks. Viral RNA did not  
113 measurably decay over 4 weeks in the vacuum bags (regression  $R^2=0.009$ ,  $p=0.47$ ) (Figure 2A).  
114 The coefficient of variance (CoV) for copies/mg-dust ranged from 73.5-313.4% within each  
115 vacuum bag when averaged across the three methods of viral detection. This large variation in  
116 viral concentration is likely due to the heterogeneous mixture in the bags (Figure 2B-D).

117

## 118 **Discussion**

119 The novel coronavirus and the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic have highlighted the need  
120 for sensitive and scalable viral surveillance within communities. In the long term, the threat of  
121 COVID-19 outbreaks will subside to a level where indefinite routine testing of asymptomatic  
122 individuals may be too cumbersome or expensive. However, there will continue to be a need to  
123 more broadly monitor vulnerable populations such as those in long-term care facilities or high-  
124 risk patients in hospitals for SARS-CoV-2, influenza, respiratory syncytial virus (RSV), and  
125 other emerging viral diseases. Novel pathogens can be targeted with adaptable PCR-based  
126 assays. After detection, outbreaks can then be addressed with more targeted resources such as  
127 direct patient testing.

128 Our results demonstrate that environmental dust collection may provide a convenient and  
129 useful matrix for ongoing viral monitoring. The process can provide monitoring for many high-  
130 risk individuals, and dust samples are already being collected through normal cleaning practices  
131 such as vacuuming. Our observations indicate SARS-CoV-2 RNA in dust can persist at least  
132 four weeks after dust collection and the measured concentration can vary in different dust

133 fractions within a vacuum bag. Therefore, multiple samples should be taken from a bag to more  
134 rigorously quantify the viral genetic signal or homogenization methods should be developed that  
135 comply with biosafety standards. Additionally, RNA and dust persistence in the environment  
136 should be considered when determining if the outbreak occurred recently or in the past.  
137 Previously, measurements of indoor environmental microbes have been used to detect infectious  
138 microbes such as *Aspergillus fumigatus* and *Legionella pneumophila* (16–18). However,  
139 nucleotide-based tests do not measure infectivity, meaning the detection of genetic material from  
140 these microbes may indicate that people in the area are infected, but would not necessarily  
141 substantiate the risk of infection due to contact with indoor surfaces.

142       Indoor dust may also be used to complement other environmental surveillance methods,  
143 e.g. wastewater monitoring. Wastewater detection may be more beneficial at larger population  
144 scales covering thousands of individuals in a community, and one infected individual may be  
145 detectable among 100 to 2,000,000 individuals (19). Indoor dust may be useful in areas with  
146 smaller numbers of high-risk individuals where more specific outbreak identification is critical.  
147 Additionally, not all individuals secrete virus in stool (20). Indoor dust sampling may also be less  
148 expensive and be easier to implement, with simplified sample collection and no pre-  
149 concentration steps of samples required.

150       Limitations of this study include that we did not measure the viability of SARS-CoV-2 in  
151 the dust samples due to biosafety constraints, although this is not needed for surveillance. Also,  
152 our small sample size from rooms occupied by infected students may not be representative of  
153 other buildings and occupancy conditions, and samples were collected after a known infection as  
154 opposed to before. More information is needed on how representative each dust sample would  
155 be for a specific population and different occupancy levels. We were unable to sieve or

156 otherwise homogenize the dust due to biosafety concerns, which likely resulted in variability  
157 within vacuum bags (Figure 2B-D). Additionally, decay of viral RNA in dust on a floor may  
158 differ from decay of viral RNA in dust treated with disinfectant and stored in a vacuum bag.

159

## 160 **Conclusions**

161 Indoor dust provides an important matrix for environmental surveillance of viral disease  
162 outbreaks. Infected humans shed virus into their surrounding environment, which becomes  
163 integrated into the dust. In many cases, dust is already being collected during routine cleaning  
164 and can easily be submitted for analysis. Overall, dust may be a useful and efficient matrix to  
165 provide identification of viral disease outbreaks in high-risk settings, such as congregate care  
166 facilities. Future research can validate these results on a broader scale and in different building  
167 types to better inform use of this technique to mitigate viral transmission.

168

## 169 **Materials and Methods**

### 170 **Overview**

171 Samples were collected from two different homes, as well as isolation rooms used to  
172 quarantine individuals who tested positive for SARS-COV-2. Bulk dust was collected from both  
173 homes and from student isolation rooms. Surface swabs and a passive sampler collection were  
174 completed in one home. Viral RNA was measured using RT-qPCR, chip-based digital PCR, and  
175 droplet digital PCR.

176

### 177 **House surface swabs and passive sampler collection**

178           Surface and passive samples were collected at the end of the 10 day quarantine period  
179 from two bedrooms of individuals who tested positive for SARS-CoV-2 in House 1. Surfaces  
180 were swabbed using sterile flocked swabs (Puritan, Maine, USA) and passive samplers  
181 consisting of carpet coupons and polystyrene coupons were placed on the floors of their isolation  
182 rooms. The passive samplers consisted of 3 cut pile carpet squares (fiber length 10 mm), 3 loop  
183 pile carpet squares (fiber length 7.5 mm), and 3 polystyrene squares attached to a template. All  
184 squares were 5 cm x 5 cm each. Both carpet types used were made of 100% polyethylene  
185 terephthalate (PET) fibers and a synthetic jute backing material. Fibers were specifically  
186 manufactured to contain no antimicrobial, stain, or soil resistance coatings. Swabs were dipped  
187 in autoclaved phosphate-buffered saline (PBS) and each was used on a different 10cm x 10cm  
188 surface area. Each wetted swab was wiped left and right across the 10cm x 10cm surface area,  
189 then rotated  $\frac{1}{3}$  turn and wiped to cover the surface area up and down, then rotated a final  $\frac{1}{3}$  turn  
190 and wiped in circular motions across the surface area. Swabs were placed back in the  
191 corresponding tube and resealed until extraction.

192           In Room 1, two swabs were used for the desk, two for a bedside table, and two for a  
193 computer. A passive sampler was placed on the floor by the bed for four days. In Room 2, two  
194 swabs were used for 100 cm<sup>2</sup> areas on a computer, two for the same areas on a desk, two for the  
195 same areas on a second desk, one for the doorknob of the bedroom, two for 100 cm<sup>2</sup> areas on the  
196 bathroom counter, and two on the bathroom doorknob, one for each side of the door. A passive  
197 sampler was placed on the floor between the desk and bed for two days, and another was placed  
198 on the open space in the bedroom for four days.

199

200   **House bulk dust**

201 Bulk floor dust was collected from occupant vacuum bags of two different houses that  
202 had individuals infected with COVID-19. House 1 had floor dust collected 27 days after  
203 quarantine ended. House 2 had floor dust collected in the middle of the quarantine period.

204

### 205 **Isolation room bulk dust**

206 Bulk dust samples were retrieved from four different vacuum bags used to clean the  
207 isolation rooms for students with COVID-19 at Ohio State University in Columbus, OH, USA  
208 and extracted over 4 weeks. Vacuum bags were collected by cleaning staff from rooms that were  
209 used to house students who tested positive for SARS-COV-2. One to two students would isolate  
210 in the rooms for 10 days after a positive diagnosis. The cleaning staff would vacuum and clean  
211 the rooms after the quarantine period was over and within 18 hours of the students leaving the  
212 rooms. Cleaning staff would spray the room with an electrostatic sprayer containing a  
213 disinfectant (sodium dichloro-s-triazinetrione, CAS 2893-78-9) and wait at least 20 minutes.  
214 This disinfectant provides free chlorine (stabilized by cyanuric acid), which non-selectively  
215 oxidizes biomolecules to inactivate pathogens. It is possible the disinfectant may be depleted by  
216 reacting with other organic material and biomolecules (dead skin, etc) and viral capsids in dust  
217 samples before impacting viral RNA (15). Cleaning staff used a Windsor Sensor XP12 vacuum  
218 (Kärcher, Denver, CO) to collect dust over a 3-4 week period. Each vacuum bag contained dust  
219 from approximately 30-50 isolation rooms as well as hallways, and potentially from surfaces in  
220 the isolation rooms if considered dusty. Isolation room flooring was vinyl composite tile and  
221 hallway flooring was wall to wall carpet.

222

### 223 **RNA Extraction**

224 Viral RNA was extracted from dust and surface samples. Bulk dust samples and surface  
225 swabs were extracted using a Qiagen RNeasy Powermicrobiome extraction kit procedure  
226 (Qiagen, Hilden, Germany) modified to include 10x the recommended concentration of 2-  
227 mercaptoethanol and phenol based lysis. Triplicates of approximately 50 mg of dust were  
228 removed from bulk dust samples using an autoclaved spatula and each replicate extracted  
229 individually in a laminar flow biosafety cabinet. The spatula was flame sterilized between  
230 removing replicates. Bulk dust from student isolation rooms was stored in sealed bags and kept  
231 at a room temperature of approximately 22.8°C with a room relative humidity that fluctuated  
232 from 15-30%. Dust was not sieved due to biosafety concerns. Swabs were placed directly into  
233 the lysis tubes for extraction. Carpet samples from the passive sampler were extracted using the  
234 QIAmp DSP Viral RNA Mini Kit (Qiagen, Hilden, Germany). A 3cm x 1cm area was cut out of  
235 the middle of each carpet to reduce potential edge effects and vortexed for 1 minute in 4000 µL  
236 of autoclaved PBS. A total of 140 µL of this wash liquid was used in the RNA extraction. Swabs  
237 were dipped in autoclaved PBS and wiped horizontally and vertically across the polystyrene  
238 pieces on the passive sampler. All extraction sets included a blank to detect potential  
239 contamination. The RNA extract of a pre-pandemic dust sample collected in September 2019  
240 was also tested and shown to be negative for SARS-CoV-2 on RT-qPCR with no amplification.

241

## 242 **Viral Detection**

### 243 *RT-qPCR*

244 The viral detection assay targeted the N1 gene using the IDT SARS-CoV-2 (2019-nCoV)  
245 CDC qPCR Probe Assay (Integrated DNA Technologies, Inc., Coralville, IA, USA). This assay  
246 uses the 2019-nCoV\_N1 forward primer (GAC CCC AAA ATC AGC GAA AT), the 2019-

247 nCov\_N1 reverse primer (TCT GGT TAC TGC CAG TTG AAT CTG) and the 2019-nCoV\_N1  
248 probe (FAM-ACC CCG CAT /ZEN/ TAC GTT TGG TGG ACC-3IABkFQ). Direct one-step  
249 real time qPCR amplification of cDNA was performed using qScript XLT One-Step RT-qPCR  
250 ToughMix (Quanta BioSciences, Gaithersburg, MD, USA). Each well contained 5 $\mu$ L of RNA  
251 template, 10  $\mu$ L of qScript XLT One-Step RT-qPCR ToughMix, 1.5  $\mu$ L of the IDT SARS-CoV-  
252 2 forward and reverse primers at 500 nM and probe at 125 nM, and 3.5  $\mu$ L of sterile DI water.  
253 The 2019-nCoV plasmid control tenfold serial dilutions were used as a standard curve to  
254 calculate copies per  $\mu$ L of RNA template, based on plasmid quantification determined by dPCR  
255 (see below) (Integrated DNA Technologies, Inc., Coralville, IA, USA). Cycling parameters were  
256 set following the instructions supplied by the CDC for qScript XLT One-Step RT-qPCR  
257 ToughMix (21). Cycling parameters consisted of 10 min at 50°C for 1 cycle, 3 min at 95°C for 1  
258 cycle, and 3 seconds at 95°C followed by 30 seconds at 55°C for 50 cycles. Seven no template  
259 controls were tested and no amplification occurred.

260 A subset of 10% of samples were tested for inhibition. RNA template was spiked with  
261 positive plasmid control to test for a reduction in signal due to the presence of inhibitors. The  
262 spike concentration was 100 times the highest sample concentration determined by qPCR.  
263 Inhibition was indicated if there was a delay in expected amplification. Each sample type was  
264 tested for inhibition: bulk dust, swab, and passive sampler. No inhibition was detected in any of  
265 the sample types except for the carpet wash from the passive sampler, where the inhibition  
266 delayed amplification by 1.45 cycles. Diluting these samples by 10 fold to reduce inhibition  
267 would place these samples below the detection limit of 2.3 copies per  $\mu$ L RNA.

268

269 *Chip-based dPCR*

270 Digital PCR was performed using the QuantStudio 3D Digital (QS3D) PCR System  
271 (Applied Biosystems, Forest City, CA) that utilizes a chip-based technology. This system uses a  
272 QuantStudio 3D Digital PCR Chip Adapter Kit for the ProFlex Flat Block Thermal Cycler  
273 equipped with a tilt base, which holds the chips (version 2) in place during thermocycling. cDNA  
274 was first reverse transcribed from RNA samples using the iScript cDNA Synthesis Kit (Biorad,  
275 Hercules, CA) according to the recommended reaction protocol on the ProFlex PCR System  
276 (Applied Biosystems, Forest City, CA). RNA was detected and quantified using the N1 assay  
277 described above. Each reaction was prepared as a 15  $\mu$ L volume consisting of 2.00  $\mu$ L water,  
278 7.25  $\mu$ L of QuantStudio 3D Digital PCR Master Mix v2 (Applied Biosystems, Forest City, CA),  
279 forward and reverse primers at 500 nM, probe at 125 nM, and 5  $\mu$ L of RNA extract. 14.5  $\mu$ L of  
280 the solution was transferred into the sample loading port of the loading blade and then loaded  
281 onto the chip. Immersion fluid was used to cover the surface of the chip. The chip was then  
282 sealed and additional immersion fluid was added to fill the chip case. Thermal cycling consisted  
283 of 10 minutes at 96°C, 39 cycles of 60°C for two minutes followed by 98°C for 30 seconds, and  
284 finally 60°C for 2 minutes. The cover temperature was set at 70°C and the reaction volume was  
285 set to 1 nL. Each experiment included one negative control and one N1 positive control (2019-  
286 nCoV\_N\_Positive Control, Integrated DNA Technologies, Inc., Coralville, IA, USA). Chips  
287 were then removed and imaged using the QuantStudio 3D Digital PCR Instrument following  
288 thermal cycling. Manual thresholding and quantification was performed using the QuantStudio  
289 3D AnalysisSuit Software. The 95% limit of blank for the N1 assay was determined to be 1.45  
290 gene copies per  $\mu$ L of reaction mixture using seven replicates of negative controls. Inhibition  
291 was not assessed for dPCR.  
292

293 *ddPCR*

294 Droplet digital PCR was performed using the Bio-Rad QX200 system along with a  
295 C1000 Touch Thermal Cycler (Biorad, Hercules, CA). SARS-CoV-2 RNA was detected and  
296 quantified using the N1 assay previously described. Inhibition was assessed by spiking a subset  
297 of sample extracts (n=17) with bovine respiratory syncytial virus (BRSV) RNA extracted  
298 directly from a live attenuated bovine vaccine (Inforce 3 Cattle Vaccine, Zoetis, Parsippany-Troy  
299 Hills, NJ) using a Qiagen PowerViral AllPrep DNA/RNA kit (Hilden, Germany). BRSV RNA  
300 was detected and quantified using an assay targeting the nucleoprotein gene with forward primer  
301 (GCA ATG CTG CAG GAC TAG GTA TAA T), reverse primer (ACA CTG TAA TTG ATG  
302 ACC CCA TTC T), and probe (FAM-ACC AAG ACT/ZEN/TGT ATG ATG CTG CCA AAG  
303 CA-3IABkFQ) (Integrated DNA Technologies, Inc., Coralville, IA, USA) (22). Each N1 ddPCR  
304 reaction was prepared as a 22  $\mu$ L volume consisting of 5.45  $\mu$ L water, 5.45  $\mu$ L of One-Step RT-  
305 ddPCR Supermix (Bio-Rad, Hercules, CA), 2.1  $\mu$ L of Reverse Transcriptase, 1.05  $\mu$ L  
306 Dithiothreitol, forward and reverse primers at 1000 nM, probe at 250 nM, and 5  $\mu$ L of RNA  
307 extract. BRSV wells were prepared in the same manner except forward and reverse primers at  
308 900 nM and probe at 250 nM. A volume of 20  $\mu$ L of each reaction mixture was passed into  
309 droplet generation. Thermal cycling was performed with reverse transcription for 60 minutes at  
310 50°C, followed by 10 minutes at 95°C, forty cycles of 95°C for 30 seconds followed by 59°C for  
311 1 minute, and finally 98°C for 10 minutes. Each ddPCR experiment included two no-template  
312 controls each for BRSV and N1 and two positive controls each for BRSV (RNA and molecular  
313 water) and N1 (2019-nCoV\_N\_Positive Control, Integrated DNA Technologies, Inc., Coralville,  
314 IA, USA). Manual thresholding and quantification was performed in QuantaSoft Version 1.7.4  
315 (Bio-Rad, Hercules, CA) such that no-template controls yielded no positive droplets.

316 The 95% limit of detection for the N1 assay was determined to be 3.3 gene copies per  
317 ddPCR reaction using a ten-replicate dilution series of synthetic SARS-CoV-2 RNA control  
318 material (MT188340, Twist Bioscience, San Francisco, CA) with a cumulative Gaussian  
319 distribution fit to the observed proportion of the replicates positive along the dilution gradient.  
320 There was no evidence of inhibition as no difference was observed in the quantification of BRSV  
321 RNA in sample extracts compared to the BRSV positive controls (two-tailed t-test,  $p=0.19$ ).

322

### 323 **Statistical and data analysis**

324 Our goal was to compare measurement of SARS-CoV-2 in bulk dust, on surface swabs,  
325 and on a passive sampler using three different measurement methods. Each vacuum bag of dust  
326 was sampled and extracted in triplicate at each time point (immediately after collection and 1,2,3  
327 and 4 weeks post collection). All three detection methods (qPCR, dPCR and ddPCR) analyzed  
328 the same sample extractions for all sample types. Detection limit information is described above  
329 for each detection method. The geometric mean was reported for quantification of SARS-CoV-2  
330 RNA present in samples using each method due to the logarithmic nature of PCR-based data.  
331 Potential RNA decay over the 4 week time period was evaluated in bulk dust with a regression  
332 analysis on the ddPCR data transformed with the natural logarithm. The dataset is available at  
333 <https://doi.org/10.5061/dryad.3n5tb2rg1>.

334

### 335 **Acknowledgements**

336 We are grateful to the isolation room coordinator/manager and staff, as well as the occupants for  
337 donation of the samples. We would also like to thank the carpet manufacturer for donation of

338 well-characterized carpet samples for the passive sampler.

339

### 340 **Conflict of interest**

341 All authors declare no conflicts of interest.

342

### 343 **References**

344 1. WHO Coronavirus Disease (COVID-19) Dashboard. World Health Organization. 2020.  
345 <https://covid19.who.int>. Accessed 21 Dec 2020.

346 2. He X, Lau EHY, Wu P, Deng X, Wang J, Hao X, Lau YC, Wong JY, Guan Y, Tan X, Mo  
347 X, Chen Y, Liao B, Chen W, Hu F, Zhang Q, Zhong M, Wu Y, Zhao L, Zhang F, Cowling  
348 BJ, Li F, Leung GM. 2020. Temporal dynamics in viral shedding and transmissibility of  
349 COVID-19. *Nat Med* 26:672–675. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41591-020-0869-5>.

350 3. Rothe C, Schunk M, Sothmann P, Bretzel G, Froeschl G, Wallrauch C, Zimmer T, Thiel V,  
351 Janke C, Guggemos W, Seilmaier M, Drosten C, Vollmar P, Zwirgmaier K, Zange S,  
352 Wölfel R, Hoelscher M. 2020. Transmission of 2019-nCoV Infection from an  
353 Asymptomatic Contact in Germany. *N Engl J Med* 382(10):970–971. DOI:  
354 [10.1056/NEJMc2001468](https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMc2001468).

355 4. Jing Q-L, Liu M-J, Zhang Z-B, Fang L-Q, Yuan J, Zhang A-R, Dean NE, Luo L, Ma M-M,  
356 Longini I, Kenah E, Lu Y, Ma Y, Jalali N, Yang Z-C, Yang Y. 2020. Household secondary  
357 attack rate of COVID-19 and associated determinants in Guangzhou, China: a retrospective  
358 cohort study. *Lancet Infect Dis* 20:1141-1150. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1473-](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1473-3099(20)30471-0)  
359 [3099\(20\)30471-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1473-3099(20)30471-0).

- 360 5. van Doremalen N, Bushmaker T, Morris DH, Holbrook MG, Gamble A, Williamson BN,  
361 Tamin A, Harcourt JL, Thornburg NJ, Gerber SI, Lloyd-Smith JO, de Wit E, Munster VJ.  
362 2020. Aerosol and Surface Stability of SARS-CoV-2 as Compared with SARS-CoV-1. *N*  
363 *Engl J Med* 382(16):1564–1567. DOI: 10.1056/NEJMc2004973.
- 364 6. Aboubakr HA, Sharafeldin TA, Goyal SM. 2020. Stability of SARS-CoV-2 and other  
365 coronaviruses in the environment and on common touch surfaces and the influence of  
366 climatic conditions: A review. *Transbound Emerg Dis* 00:1-17.  
367 <https://doi.org/10.1111/tbed.13707>.
- 368 7. Zhao Y, Richardson B, Takle E, Chai L, Schmitt D, Xin H. 2019. Airborne transmission  
369 may have played a role in the spread of 2015 highly pathogenic avian influenza outbreaks in  
370 the United States. *Sci Rep* 9:11755. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-019-47788-z>.
- 371 8. Asadi S, Gaaloul Ben Hnia N, Barre RS, Wexler AS, Ristenpart WD, Bouvier NM. 2020.  
372 Influenza A virus is transmissible via aerosolized fomites. *Nat Commun* 11(1):4062. DOI:  
373 10.1038/s41467-020-17888-w.
- 374 9. Maestre JP, Jarma D, Yu C, Siegel J, Horner S, Kinney KA. 2020. Distribution of SARS-  
375 CoV-2 RNA Signal in a Home with COVID-19 Positive Occupants. *medRxiv*  
376 11.30.20234393. <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.11.30.20234393>.
- 377 10. Bin SY, Heo JY, Song M-S, Lee J, Kim E-H, Park S-J, Kwon H-I, Kim SM, Kim Y-I, Si Y-  
378 J, Lee I-W, Baek YH, Choi W-S, Min J, Jeong HW, Choi YK. 2016. Environmental  
379 Contamination and Viral Shedding in MERS Patients During MERS-CoV Outbreak in  
380 South Korea. *Clin Infect Dis* 62(6):755–760. <https://doi.org/10.1093/cid/civ1020>.

- 381 11. Larsen DA, Wigginton KR. 2020. Tracking COVID-19 with wastewater. *Nat Biotechnol*  
382 38:1151–1153. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41587-020-0690-1>.
- 383 12. Ahmed W, Angel N, Edson J, Bibby K, Bivins A, O'Brien JW, Choi PM, Kitajima M,  
384 Simpson SL, Li J, Tschärke B, Verhagen R, Smith WJM, Zaugg J, Dierens L, Hugenholtz  
385 P, Thomas KV, Mueller JF. 2020. First confirmed detection of SARS-CoV-2 in untreated  
386 wastewater in Australia: A proof of concept for the wastewater surveillance of COVID-19  
387 in the community. *Sci Total Environ* 728:138764.  
388 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.138764>.
- 389 13. Bivins A, North D, Ahmad A, Ahmed W, Alm E, Been F, Bhattacharya P, Bijlsma L,  
390 Boehm AB, Brown J, Buttiglieri G, Calabro V, Carducci A, Castiglioni S, Cetecioglu Gurol  
391 Z, Chakraborty S, Costa F, Curcio S, de Los Reyes FL 3rd, Delgado Vela J, Farkas K,  
392 Fernandez-Casi X, Gerba C, Gerrity D, Girones R, Gonzalez R, Haramoto E, Harris A,  
393 Holden PA, Islam MT, Jones DL, Kasprzyk-Hordern B, Kitajima M, Kotlarz N, Kumar M,  
394 Kuroda K, La Rosa G, Malpei F, Mautus M, McLellan SL, Medema G, Meschke JS,  
395 Mueller J, Newton RJ, Nilsson D, Noble RT, van Nuijs A, Peccia J, Perkins TA, Pickering  
396 AJ, Rose J, Sanchez G, Smith A, Stadler L, Stauber C, Thomas K, van der Voorn T,  
397 Wigginton K, Zhu K, Bibby K. 2020. Wastewater-Based Epidemiology: Global  
398 Collaborative to Maximize Contributions in the Fight Against COVID-19. *Environ Sci*  
399 *Technol* 54(13):7754–7757. <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.0c02388>.
- 400 14. Gonzalez R, Curtis K, Bivins A, Bibby K, Weir MH, Yetka K, Thompson H, Keeling D,  
401 Mitchell J, Gonzalez D. 2020. COVID-19 surveillance in Southeastern Virginia using  
402 wastewater-based epidemiology. *Water Res* 186:116296.

- 403 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.watres.2020.116296>.
- 404 15. Torrey J, von Gunten U, Kohn T. 2019. Differences in Viral Disinfection Mechanisms as  
405 Revealed by Quantitative Transfection of Echovirus 11 Genomes. *Appl Environ Microbiol*  
406 85(14):e00961-19. <https://doi.org/10.1128/AEM.00961-19>.
- 407 16. Curtis L, Cali S, Conroy L, Baker K, Ou C-H, Hershov R, Norlock-Cruz F, Scheff P. 2005.  
408 *Aspergillus* surveillance project at a large tertiary-care hospital. *J Hosp Infect* 59(3):188-  
409 196. DOI: 10.1016/j.jhin.2004.05.017.
- 410 17. Faure O, Fricker-Hidalgo H, Lebeau B, Mallaret MR, Ambroise-Thomas P, Grillot R. 2002.  
411 Eight-year surveillance of environmental fungal contamination in hospital operating rooms  
412 and haematological units. *J Hosp Infect* 50(2):155–160.  
413 <https://doi.org/10.1053/jhin.2001.1148>.
- 414 18. Zhang BY, Liu F, Chen XD. 2015. The Effect of Legionella Pneumophila Contamination in  
415 the Surface Dust of the Air Ducts of Central Air Conditioning Systemson Indoor Air  
416 Quality. *Int J Vent* 14(3):231–240. DOI: 10.1080/14733315.2015.11684083.
- 417 19. Hart OE, Halden RU. 2020. Computational analysis of SARS-CoV-2/COVID-19  
418 surveillance by wastewater-based epidemiology locally and globally: Feasibility, economy,  
419 opportunities and challenges. *Sci Total Environ* 730:138875.  
420 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.138875>.
- 421 20. Wang X, Zheng J, Guo L, Yao H, Wang L, Xia X, Zhang W. 2020. Fecal viral shedding in  
422 COVID-19 patients: Clinical significance, viral load dynamics and survival analysis. *Virus*  
423 *Res* 289:198147. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.virusres.2020.198147>.

424 21. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. 2020. CDC 2019-Novel Coronavirus (2019-  
425 nCoV) Real-Time RT-PCR Diagnostic Panel. CDC-006-00019, Revision: 06.

426 22. Boxus M, Letellier C, Kerkhofs P. 2005. Real Time RT-PCR for the detection and  
427 quantitation of bovine respiratory syncytial virus. J Virol Methods 125(2):125–130.  
428 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jviromet.2005.01.008>.

429



430 **Figure Legends**

431

432 Figure 1: Heatmap displaying (A) the geometric mean copies/ $\mu$ L RNA template of samples  
433 above detection limit (samples below detection limit were excluded) and (B) the proportion of  
434 samples positive (%) for bulk dust, surface swabs, and passive sampler as observed with three  
435 PCR-based methods. The variable n is the number of samples used to calculate the geometric  
436 mean (positive detects) in (A) or proportion of samples positive in (B). Items in white on the  
437 room diagram were not sampled, and items in white with a slash on the lower heatmaps were not  
438 detected. Colors on the room diagrams represent the average value among all three measurement  
439 methods.

440

441 Figure 2: (A) RNA concentration of bulk dust samples (average of 4 bags) from initial collection  
442 to 4 weeks as measured by ddPCR, dPCR, and qPCR. Error bars shown represent the 95%  
443 confidence interval of each measurement. (B-D) Cumulative normal probability plots for each  
444 measurement method show variability of RNA concentration values for each bulk bag collected.



Sample types	n (RT-qPCR, dPCR, ddPCR)	RT-qPCR	dPCR	ddPCR	Average
Floor Dust	51,63,65				
Bathroom Counter	1,2,2				
Door Knobs	2,2,3				
Laptop	1,4,2				
Polystyrene	1,5,2				
Desk	0,4,2				
Bedside Table	0,2,1				
Carpet	0,9,1				

Sample types	n	RT-qPCR	dPCR	ddPCR	Average
Floor Dust	67				
Bathroom Counter	2				
Door Knobs	3				
Laptop	4				
Desk	6				
Bedside Table	2				
Polystyrene	7				
Carpet	18				

