

1 **Title:** Exploring Integrated Environmental Viral Surveillance of Indoor Environments: A  
2 comparison of surface and bioaerosol environmental sampling in hospital rooms with COVID-19  
3 patients

4  
5 **Authors:**

6 Leslie Dietz<sup>1</sup>, David A. Constant<sup>2</sup>, Mark Fretz<sup>3,4</sup>, Patrick F. Horve<sup>1</sup>, Andreas Olsen-Martinez<sup>1</sup>,  
7 Jason Stenson<sup>3</sup>, Andrew Wilkes<sup>5</sup>, Robert G. Martindale<sup>6</sup>, William B. Messer<sup>2</sup>, Kevin G. Van Den  
8 Wymelenberg<sup>1,3,4</sup>

9  
10 **Affiliations:**

11 <sup>1</sup> Biology and the Built Environment Center, University of Oregon, Eugene, OR, 97403

12 <sup>2</sup> Department of Molecular Microbiology and Immunology, Oregon Health & Science  
13 University, Portland, Oregon, USA

14 <sup>3</sup> Energy Studies in Buildings Laboratory, University of Oregon, Eugene, OR, 97403

15 <sup>4</sup> Institute for Health and the Built Environment, University of Oregon, Portland, OR, 97209

16 <sup>5</sup> Healthcare Facilities, Oregon Health & Science University, Portland, Oregon, USA

17 <sup>6</sup> Division of Gastrointestinal and General Surgery, School of Medicine, Oregon Health &  
18 Science University, Portland, Oregon, USA

19  
20 **Corresponding Author(s)**

21 Kevin Van Den Wymelenberg, kevinvdw@uoregon.edu, (541) 346-5647, Biology and the Built  
22 Environment Center, University of Oregon, Eugene, OR, 97403, Energy Studies in Buildings

23 Laboratory, University of Oregon, Eugene, OR, 97403, Institute for Health and the Built  
24 Environment, University of Oregon, Portland, OR, 97209

25

26 **Author Contributions:**

27 KVDW, RM and WM conceived of the project scope and KVDW oversaw project and  
28 manuscript development. RM and KVDW oversaw the institutional review board process and  
29 WM and KVDW oversaw the biosafety committee review process. LD and PFH collected all  
30 samples. AW, JS, and MF verified supply and return air grille sampling locations. LD & DC  
31 processed all laboratory samples at OHSU's BSL-2+ laboratory, and PFH & LD processed all  
32 laboratory samples and conducted qRT-PCR at UO BSL-2 laboratory. PFH organized all data,  
33 performed all analyses, and developed all graphics. LD, AOM, PFH, and KVDW wrote the  
34 initial manuscript and DC and MF provided significant edits to the manuscript. All authors  
35 reviewed and approved the final manuscript.

36

37 **Funding:**

38 Funding for this research was partially provided by Thermo Fisher Scientific under award  
39 number 4133V0 to the University of Oregon and partially via the OHSU Foundation.

40

41 **Keywords:** SARS-CoV-2, COVID-19, Bioaerosols, Environmental Surveillance, Air Sampling

42

43

44

45

46 **Abstract:**

47 The outbreak of Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) has  
48 dramatically transformed policies and practices surrounding public health. One such shift is the  
49 expanded emphasis on environmental surveillance for pathogens. Environmental surveillance  
50 methods have primarily relied upon wastewater and indoor surface testing, and despite  
51 substantial evidence that SARS-CoV-2 commonly travels through space in aerosols, there has  
52 been limited indoor air surveillance. This study investigated the effectiveness of integrated  
53 surveillance including an active air sampler, surface swabs and passive settling plates to detect  
54 SARS-CoV-2 in hospital rooms with COVID-19 patients and compared detection efficacy  
55 among sampling methods. The AerosolSense active air sampler was found to detect SARS-CoV-  
56 2 in 53.8% of all samples collected compared to 12.1% detection by passive air sampling and  
57 14.8% detection by surface swabs. Approximately 69% of sampled rooms (22/32) returned a  
58 positive environmental sample of any type. Among positive rooms, ~32% had only active air  
59 samples that returned positive, while ~27% and ~9% had only one or more surface swabs or  
60 passive settling plates that returned a positive respectively, and ~32% had more than one sample  
61 type that returned a positive result. This study demonstrates the potential for the AerosolSense to  
62 detect SARS-CoV-2 RNA in real-world healthcare environments and suggests that integrated  
63 sampling that includes active air sampling is an important addition to environmental pathogen  
64 surveillance in support of public health.

65

66

67

68

## 69 **Introduction**

70 A global pandemic was declared 12 March 2020 and is ongoing<sup>1</sup>. Severe acute respiratory  
71 syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) causes a respiratory illness known as Coronavirus  
72 Disease 19 (COVID-19), which can present with a wide variety of symptoms. If symptomatic,  
73 the symptoms can mimic the common cold and be extremely mild, or be quite severe requiring  
74 medical attention and even hospitalization. In addition to the symptomatic individuals with  
75 COVID-19, it is estimated that more than half of all SARS-CoV-2 transmission is due to  
76 asymptomatic individuals<sup>2</sup>.

77  
78 Early in the pandemic, public health officials declared droplet spread as the main route of disease  
79 transmission<sup>3</sup>. However, evidence has increasingly implicated inhalation of aerosols in the  
80 spread of SARS-CoV-2<sup>4-7</sup>. Past epidemics of coronaviruses, severe acute Respiratory Syndrome-  
81 associated Coronavirus (SARS-CoV) and Middle Eastern Respiratory Syndrome-associated  
82 Coronavirus (MERS-CoV), demonstrated the ability of virions to spread in built environments  
83 via aerosols<sup>8-12</sup>. Previous work has also demonstrated that SARS-CoV-2 can be transported via  
84 aerosols and fomites and remain viable in the air and on surfaces<sup>13-15</sup>. Indoor environments with  
85 characteristics such as high occupant density, poor ventilation, or high aerosol generating activity  
86 have increased potential for transmission of COVID-19, including from pre-symptomatic or  
87 asymptomatic individuals<sup>16-19</sup>. Similarly, long-term care facilities (LTCF), hospital care systems,  
88 and several other settings that provide services to susceptible occupants are also vulnerable to  
89 disease transmission<sup>16,20-24</sup>. The ability to monitor indoor environments to detect potential  
90 shedding from infectious individuals is an important layer of control to prevent or contain  
91 outbreaks of highly infectious and deadly illnesses like COVID-19.

92 As a result of the COVID-19 pandemic, there has been increased pressure to innovate current  
93 building operational practices, including enhanced air management, and increased motivation to  
94 elevate awareness of indoor environmental microbial presence and abundance in general, and  
95 specifically to implement ongoing viral surveillance. Environmental surveillance for biological  
96 agents is not a new practice. For example, specialized facilities such as military bases and mail  
97 distribution centers are monitored for biohazards and biological threat agents such as anthrax and  
98 smallpox<sup>25,26</sup> and water treatment plants monitor for select microorganisms as indicators for  
99 drinking water quality<sup>27-30</sup>. Additionally, built environments such as restaurants, food production  
100 facilities or hospitals are routinely inspected and sampled for microorganisms to ensure  
101 sanitation and cleanliness practices<sup>31,32</sup>. Environmental microbial samples from indoor surfaces  
102 are commonly obtained using swabs<sup>33,34</sup>. Aerosol particles can be detected through passive air  
103 sampling in settling plates (collection onto the surface of a petri dish)<sup>35,36</sup> or through active air  
104 sampling using a vacuum pump to move a known volume of air across a capture mechanism<sup>37</sup>.  
105 Active air samplers span a range of airflow rates, wet and dry media, and physical collection  
106 mechanisms including filters, cyclones, impingers and impactors<sup>38-40</sup>. Using any of these  
107 collection devices, the sampling media can be evaluated for a target pathogen using molecular  
108 techniques.

109  
110 SARS-CoV-2 environmental sampling is currently being implemented on college campuses  
111 (wastewater) and in LTCFs (surface swabs) to identify and prevent potential outbreaks in high  
112 density living situations<sup>20,41-44</sup>. Wastewater surveillance is suited to detect the presence of SARS-  
113 CoV-2 in a large geographic region, possibly down to the scale of a cluster of buildings or a  
114 single building, but less likely to provide spatial resolution down to specific zones or rooms

115 within a building<sup>45,46</sup>. Furthermore, not all occupants use restrooms while occupying public  
116 buildings, increasing the possibility of missing infected occupants. Surface swabs are suited to  
117 capture a time integrated exposure within a space, but effectiveness may vary depending on  
118 cleaning practices, and may not detect viral RNA that remained suspended in aerosols long  
119 enough for the room air to be exchanged from a space before settling could occur. Moreover,  
120 based on room air fluid dynamics, uneven spatial settling likely occurs<sup>47</sup> and depending on the  
121 number and spatial resolution of surface swab or settling plate samples collected, these methods  
122 may not reflect the dynamic aerosol viral load. Each method of sampling has strengths and  
123 limitations, and environmental surveillance may ultimately be most effective if implemented in  
124 an integrated fashion; however, at present, little surveillance has been routinely conducted via  
125 bioaerosol sampling. With the growing evidence that COVID-19 is spread through virus-  
126 containing aerosol emissions and the known limitations of other environmental surveillance  
127 techniques of SARS-CoV-2, it may be beneficial to supplement these with a sensitive and robust  
128 bioaerosol sampling platform. To explore this question, we initiated a field study within a  
129 healthcare environment including environmental sampling via surface swabs, settling plates, and  
130 an active air sampler to explore the relationships of these sampling approaches.

131  
132 As an environmental sampling testbed, healthcare facilities provide an excellent opportunity to  
133 identify surface and aerosol contamination in rooms where viral particles may be emitted from  
134 patients<sup>11,48–55</sup>, while also a suitable challenge due to enhanced decontamination protocols.

135 Among built environments, healthcare facilities have some of the most advanced strategies to  
136 reduce pathogen transmission risk indoors, including high air exchange rates<sup>56</sup>, high filtration  
137 efficiency, isolation environments and access to personal protective equipment (PPE), and

138 established hand hygiene practices<sup>57</sup>. Nonetheless, current literature suggests that transmission  
139 stemming from hospital-associated infections range from 14.1%-41% of in-house COVID-19  
140 cases<sup>58-60</sup>, further justifying healthcare facilities as an environmental surveillance testbed.  
141  
142 Horve et al. conducted benchtop and room-scale experiments to determine the feasibility of air  
143 sampling as an environmental surveillance tool<sup>61</sup>. Specifically, they reported that AerosolSense  
144 (Thermo Fisher Scientific, Catalog #2900-AA) had robust detection capability for heat-  
145 inactivated SARS-CoV-2 at aerosol viral concentrations of ~30 genome copies per liter (gc/L) of  
146 room air for 75 minute sampling periods and as little as ~0.01 gc/L of room air for >8 hour  
147 sampling periods<sup>61</sup>. From November to December 2020, we collected environmental surface  
148 swabs and passive air settling plates from COVID-19 patient rooms at Oregon Health & Science  
149 University (OHSU) Hospital in Portland, Oregon. Simultaneously, we collected air samples  
150 using the AerosolSense. The objective of this study was to determine effectiveness of the  
151 AerosolSense air sampler to detect SARS-CoV-2 and to better understand the relationship  
152 between air and surface sampling in the built environment.

153

## 154 **Methods**

155 Environmental samples were collected from COVID-19 patient rooms (n=32) at OHSU from  
156 November 2020 to December 2020. Factors for choosing patient rooms were severity of illness,  
157 type of oxygen support and planned or anticipated aerosol generating procedures. These COVID-  
158 19 positive patients were determined through either an initial rapid SARS-CoV-2 antigen test  
159 followed by a RT-PCR diagnostic test or a RT-PCR diagnostic test only. COVID-19 positive  
160 patients were housed in wards 5A (Acute Care), 5C (Family Medicine), 8D (Emergency

161 Department), 7A (MICU), 12C (Labor and Delivery), and 14C (Internal Medicine Inpatient). All  
162 OHSU PPE donning, doffing and safety procedures were strictly followed to prevent  
163 contamination and illness to healthcare workers (HCW) and/or researchers.

164

#### 165 *Bioaerosol sampling*

166 AerosolSense instruments were calibrated to sample 200 liters per minute (L/min) of room air  
167 across AerosolSense Capture Media (ACM) using the Streamline Pro MultiCal System (Chinook  
168 Engineering, Wyoming). The air sampling devices were deployed in COVID-19 patient rooms  
169 and allowed to run for at least one hour, with the majority of sampling events lasting in excess of  
170 two hours. After sampling, the ACM was placed into a lysis/preservative buffer (DNA/RNA  
171 Shield, Zymo Research #R1100) for immediate preservation of nucleic acids, and the sampling  
172 run time was recorded. After each sampling event, the device was decontaminated using  
173 Cavicide (Metrex), allowing a 2 minute period for the Cavicide to inactivate microorganisms,  
174 and then removed from the patient room. The device was then cleaned again using Sani-Cloth  
175 Bleach Germicidal Wipes (PDI #U26595).

176

#### 177 *Surface Swab and Settling Plate Sampling*

178 At the end of the air sampling duration, surface swab samples were taken from multiple surfaces  
179 in COVID-19 patient rooms using 15mL conical tubes (Cole-Parmer UX-06336-89) and  
180 polyester flocked swabs (Puritan #25-3060-H) pre-moistened with Viral Transport Media (VTM)  
181 (Rocky Mountain Biologicals) from the tube. A predesignated sampling area was swabbed in an  
182 overlapping “S” pattern, first horizontally then vertically, to ensure complete coverage of the  
183 area. The moistened swab was also rotated during collection so that optimal surface area of the



184 swab was used for sample collection and then returned to the conical tube with the remaining  
185 VTM. The sampling area was approximately 20 cm by 30 cm on patient room surfaces and  
186 included: work counter, return air grille, supply air grille, hopper sink, floor patient left, floor  
187 patient right, floor patient foot, floor patient head (when possible), lavatory floor, lavatory  
188 exhaust air grille and hallway floor immediately outside patient room. In ICU rooms, there is no  
189 designated lavatory, and the sluice sink was swabbed instead. After taking a sample, the swab  
190 was then returned to the 15mL conical tube containing the remainder of VTM. Sample tubes  
191 were placed on ice in a designated sample cooler until processing. Settling plate samples were  
192 collected from work counters, windowsills, supply carts, nurses stations, under the patient's bed,  
193 and various locations on the floor of the occupied rooms. Standard petri dishes (100 mm x 15  
194 mm) were set out with both halves open for the entire active air sampling duration. At sample  
195 collection, the inside surface of both halves of the petri dish were swabbed as described above.

196

### 197 *Sample processing*

198 The sample cooler was hand carried to a BSL-2+ lab on the OHSU campus for processing. All  
199 sample processing was conducted in a class-2 biosafety cabinet (BSC). The environmental  
200 surface samples (flocked swabs and passive settling plates) previously placed in 15 ml conical  
201 tubes were vortexed briefly and then incubated at room temperature for five minutes. A 200  $\mu$ L  
202 aliquot of the supernatant was removed and placed into a microcentrifuge tube (Thomas  
203 Scientific #1223K29) containing 600  $\mu$ L of lysis/preservative buffer (DNA/RNA Shield, Zymo  
204 Research #2100). Samples were then transported by automobile to a BSL-2 laboratory on the  
205 University of Oregon campus in Eugene, Oregon, USA. Total RNA was extracted from all  
206 samples using Zymo Quick-DNA/RNA Viral MagBead kit (Zymo Research #R2141) and stored

207 at -80°C until analysis. Successful RNA extraction was confirmed using a 5 uL spike-in of  
208 *Escherichia coli* MS2 bacteriophage that was added to each reaction mixture.

209

### 210 *Molecular Analysis*

211 SARS-CoV-2 RNA presence and abundance was determined by qRT-PCR. The TaqPath  
212 COVID-19 Combo Kit (Thermo Fisher Scientific, Catalog #A47814) targeting the N, S, and  
213 ORF1ab (RdRP) gene regions was used to prepare qRT-PCR reactions for processing. Each  
214 reaction mixture contained 5 µL TaqPath 1-Step Multiplex Mastermix without ROX (Thermo  
215 Fisher Scientific, Catalog #A28521), 9 µL nuclease-free water (Invitrogen, Catalog #4387936), 1  
216 µL COVID-19 Real Time PCR Assay Multiplex Mix (Thermo Fisher Scientific, Catalog  
217 #A47814), and 5 µL of extracted RNA. Thermocycling was performed with the QuantStudio5  
218 (Applied Biosystems) using the following cycling conditions: 25°C for 2 minutes, 53°C for 10  
219 minutes, 95°C for 2 minutes, and 40 cycles of 95°C for 3 seconds and 60°C for 30 seconds. If the  
220 presence of SARS-CoV-2 RNA was detected, and the cycle threshold ( $C_t$ ) was less than 35, with  
221 observed amplification in two out of the three genome targets, then a sample was considered  
222 positive. This follows the FDA Emergency-Use Authorization guidelines in the assay  
223 instructions for use<sup>62</sup>. Two control samples were included in the qRT-PCR reaction. These  
224 consisted of an extraction control from the RNA extraction process and a non-template control  
225 (NTC) to account for possible laboratory contamination. Reagent controls were processed  
226 concurrently with environmental samples. All controls tested negative for the presence of SARS-  
227 CoV-2 RNA.

228

229

230 *Institutional Approval and Data Availability*

231 The research described was determined to be IRB exempt and granted an IRB exemption. This  
232 work was reviewed by the OHSU Institutional Biosafety Committee and approved under  
233 PROTO202000016. Data and analysis scripts are available on GitHub  
234 (<https://github.com/BioBE/AerosolSense-FieldTrials>).

235

236 *Statistical Analyses*

237 All analyses were performed using the statistical computing environment, R<sup>63</sup>. Differences  
238 between samples from the same room were computed using paired t-tests. Differences were  
239 considered significant with  $P < 0.05$ .

240

241 **Results**


242 The overall objective of this investigation was to explore integrated environmental surveillance  
243 and to determine the potential efficacy of the AerosolSense active air sampler for the detection of  
244 SARS-CoV-2-containing aerosols in a real-world setting. To this end, 39 aerosol samples  
245 collected, 132 passive air samples were collected in settling plates, and 317 surface samples were  
246 collected with flocked swabs from 32 COVID-19 patient rooms at OHSU over a two month  
247 sampling period. All sampling locations were assessed for the percent of samples that returned a  
248 positive result for the presence of SARS-CoV-2 (Figure 1). Positive samples were returned for  
249 53.8% of air samples, 12.1% of passive settling plates, and 14.8% of room surface swabs. After  
250 the active air samples (53.8% positive), the most frequent positive sample locations were swabs  
251 taken from the floor to left side of the patient bed (25.0%), the hallway floor directly outside the

252 patient room (~21.4%), settling plates in the hallway outside the patient rooms (20.0%), and the  
253 lavatory exhaust air grille (20.0%).


254

255 Overall, all three sampling types (active air, swabs, settling plates) were able to successfully  
256 isolate SARS-CoV-2 RNA (Figure 2). In order to assess the potential for genomic material  
257 capture differences, and ultimately to better understand sampling methods for environmental  
258 viral surveillance, sampling method was compared for all rooms that returned any positive result  
259 whatsoever. In total, about 69% (22/32) of sampled rooms had a positive environmental sample  
260 of any type. Among these rooms, 32% (7/22) had only the air samples that returned positive,  
261 27% (6/22) had only one or more surface swabs that returned positive, 9% (2/22) had only  
262 passive settling plates return a positive result, and 32% (7/32) had multiple sample types that  
263 returned positive. Additionally, among the 7 rooms that returned positive for both air and surface  
264 swab(s), positive samples collected by the air sampler were found to have significantly lower  $C_t$   
265 values (Paired t-test;  $P < 0.05$ ) than positive environmental surface swabs (Figure 3).

266




267  
 268 **Figure 1. Percent of samples found to be positive for the presence of SARS-CoV-2 RNA at**  
 269 **each location sampled. The number of total samples collected are listed at the top of each**  
 270 **bar. A full description of each sampling location can be found in the supplementary data.**  
 271 **Pink indicates the active air sampler, blue indicates the passive air settling plates, and**  
 272 **green indicates surface swabs. Sampling locations with fewer than seven (n=7) were**  
 273 **excluded from this figure.**  
 274



275

276

277 **Figure 2. Room plan of one sampled patient room indicating sampling type, number and**  
278 **location. Cycle threshold (Ct) values from qRT-PCR test results are included, with lower**  
279 **values indicating higher abundances of SARS-CoV-2 RNA. Rectangles indicate**  
280 **AerosolSense samplers, blue circles indicate passive air settling plates, and red circles**  
281 **indicate surface swab locations. Filled circles indicate a positive result and open circles**  
282 **indicate a negative result. This room had a positive active air sample, charting computer**  
283 **swab, and windowsill settling plate.**



284  
285 **Figure 3. Box and whisker plot demonstrating the minimum, maximum, median, and**  
286 **quartiles  $C_t$  values observed in samples recovered from the AerosolSense sampler or**  
287 **environmental swabs, among rooms that returned positive for both sampling types. Lines**  
288 **connect the mean  $C_t$  value of positive samples taken from the same patient room at the**  
289 **same sampling time. Positively sloped lines indicate a lower  $C_t$  value (higher abundance) of**  
290 **SARS-CoV-2 RNA in air samples. Pink points are the mean (if applicable) of the  $C_t$  values**  
291 **of samples collected with the air sampler and green points are the mean of all the positive**  
292 **surface swabs from a given room.**

293

294

## 295 Discussion

296 This study contains a few important limitations. Aerosol sampling durations were variable (1-  
297 12.75 hours) in order to prioritize the schedule and activities of the care team providing patient  
298 care. Approximately 81% of study rooms (26/32) had one air sampler while approximately 19%  
299 of the rooms (6/32) had two air samplers during the sampling period. All rooms with two air  
300 samplers returned the same result for both samplers. Verified hospital room air exchange rate  
301 was not available for every patient room studied. The analysis methods cannot ensure that RNA  
302 detected in any room came solely from the patient occupying the room. Finally, our results report  
303 the presence of SARS-CoV-2 RNA, and do not address viability, since qRT-PCR does not  
304 distinguish viable virions from RNA from non-viable cells.

305  
306 Overall, we sought to identify the potential utility of the AerosolSense device for active air  
307 environmental surveillance and used a healthcare setting as the testbed. The active air samples  
308 recovered were compared to the current standard for indoor environmental surveillance, flocked  
309 environmental swabs and passive air settling plates<sup>64-67</sup>. We confirmed the results of previous  
310 studies that demonstrated significant environmental contamination by SARS-CoV-2 in rooms  
311 occupied by COVID-19 positive patients<sup>14,50,54,64,68</sup>. While one may expect more consistent  
312 detection of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in rooms occupied by COVID-19 positive patients, shedding  
313 has been shown to vary by individual and decrease, even as symptoms and disease progresses<sup>69</sup>  
314 and our results are consistent with other investigations<sup>14,54</sup>. Furthermore, at this facility patient  
315 rooms maintain at least six air changes per hour (sometimes much higher), COVID-19 patients  
316 are placed into negative pressure isolation rooms whenever possible, and all COVID-19 patient



317 rooms undergo rigorous daily cleaning protocols, all with the intention of reducing overall  
318 environmental contamination.

319

320 Our data demonstrated significantly lower  $C_t$  values in samples collected from the air sampler  
321 compared to environmental swabs, among rooms where both sampling methods returned a  
322 positive result. The lower paired  $C_t$  values observed in the air sampler and the higher percentage  
323 of positive air samples (~54%) when compared to other sampling methods, along with its ability  
324 to detect SARS-CoV-2 in some rooms where other methods did not (32%), suggests that  
325 bioaerosol surveillance of SARS-CoV-2 makes an important contribution to environmental viral  
326 surveillance techniques. Nonetheless, there was reasonable concordance between active air  
327 samples and surface swabs, with both sampling methods signaling room contamination for 32%  
328 of rooms that tested positive. As stated, there was a meaningful additional percentage (32%) of  
329 positive rooms were only detected via active air sampling, while 27% of positive rooms were  
330 only detected via surface swabs, thus supporting the value of integrated surveillance. Surface  
331 swabs and settling plate collection methods benefitted from greater number and spatial resolution  
332 and sample number, while the active air sampler benefitted from continuous sampling and spatial  
333 integration via mixing of room air. Furthermore, surface swab samples capture a time-integrated  
334 history of direct contact and particle deposition that occurred since previous decontamination,  
335 while active air samples represent a specific sampling duration, volume of air, and have an  
336 opportunity to capture particles that do not deposit onto surfaces.

337

338 Overall, the air samples had the most prevalence (by percentage) of detecting SARS-CoV-2. The  
339 patient room sampling locations that had the second most prevalence of detecting SARS-CoV-2

340 were surface swabs that were collected near the patient (floor adjacent to bed and mayo stand)  
341 and from areas where SARS-CoV-2 was likely sourced through aerosols (patient room return air  
342 grille and lavatory exhaust air grille). It is expected that areas nearer the patient (such as the  
343 mayo stand, bedside table, and floor samples) would exhibit surface contamination, however the  
344 prevalence of return and exhaust air grilles is less commonly reported<sup>54,70</sup>. The contamination  
345 observed in hallways (swabs 21.4% and settling plates 20.0%) was possibly sourced from within  
346 the adjacent patient room and further spread by airflow, HCW foot traffic, or the movement of  
347 equipment carts necessary for care<sup>71,72</sup>, or may have been sourced from outside the patient room.  
348 We observed viral contamination on low-touch surfaces (return air grilles, supply air grilles, and  
349 windowsills). These locations are beyond the expected range of routine droplet transport, rarely  
350 come into contact with individuals, and may not be routinely decontaminated. The supply air  
351 grilles that tested positive (16.7%) may have been contaminated with SARS-CoV-2 from  
352 recirculation of building ventilation air<sup>73</sup>, from non-laminar flow of supply air out of the grille, or  
353 potentially form within-room surface deposition or impaction sourced from high velocity  
354 droplet generating events.

355  
356 The presence of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in the active air samples and upon surfaces that are  
357 commingled with active room airflow (supply, return, and exhaust air grilles), combined with the  
358 growing evidence of the potential for aerosol-based disease transmission<sup>16,20,53,66,73–81</sup>, presents a  
359 compelling argument for the merit of indoor air microbial surveillance. Moreover, due to the  
360 spatially integrated nature of indoor aerosols, continuous air sampling techniques with sufficient  
361 sensitivity can be incredibly useful to increase situational awareness and guide building  
362 operational improvements to reduce indoor disease transmission risk<sup>82</sup>.

363

364 When encountered with a possible infectious disease outbreak, epidemic or pandemic, healthcare  
365 facilities and government public health agencies respond with containment strategies. This  
366 response strategy is well documented by most global governing bodies with a structured  
367 healthcare system. The steps of infectious agent containment include: 1) identification of agent  
368 2) infection control assessment 3) health screenings where appropriate 4) coordinated response  
369 efforts and 5) continued assessments and health screenings until containment is achieved<sup>83</sup>. Built  
370 environment surveillance in general, and active air monitoring in specific, should be an integral  
371 and proactive component of a comprehensive infectious disease management strategy. By  
372 pairing these surveillance data with appropriate building operations layered risk reduction  
373 strategies, the transmission of disease indoors can be minimized and potentially avoided.

374

### 375 **Conclusion**

376 Currently, the majority of environmental surveillance for microorganisms utilize wastewater and  
377 surface sampling. Wastewater, surface swabs, and aerosol surveillance methods each have  
378 strengths and limitations, and are best implemented in an integrated manner. Wastewater  
379 sampling provides excellent insight to larger geographic scales disease prevalence but has  
380 limitations for guiding actions within a specific facility. Surface samples are time-integrated and  
381 are influenced by decontamination protocols, as well as spatial resolution and room air  
382 dynamics. This research demonstrates the added detection capability of bioaerosol sampling in  
383 environmental viral surveillance. Specifically, this research demonstrates that the AerosolSense  
384 active bioaerosol sampling platform effectively detects SARS-CoV-2 RNA in a real-world  
385 healthcare environment with high air exchange rates.

386

## 387 **Acknowledgements**

388 Gratitude for the Biology and the Built Environment Laboratory students Liliana Barnata and  
389 Vincent Moore, who assisted with sample collection on-site. A special thanks to staff Georgia  
390 MacCrone and Surbhi Nahata, who assisted with the lab work. The authors would like to thank  
391 Siqi Tan, Arunava Dutta, and Geoffrey Gonzalez for their review of the manuscript.  
392 Lastly, special recognition for the many frontline health care workers, who provide tireless and  
393 compassionate care for their patients.

394

## 395 **References**

- 396 1. Cucinotta, D. & Vanelli, M. WHO Declares COVID-19 a Pandemic. *Acta Biomed.* **91**, 157–  
397 160 (2020).
- 398 2. Johansson, M. A. *et al.* SARS-CoV-2 Transmission From People Without COVID-19  
399 Symptoms. *JAMA Netw Open* **4**, e2035057 (2021).
- 400 3. Stadnytskyi, V., Bax, C. E., Bax, A. & Anfinrud, P. The airborne lifetime of small speech  
401 droplets and their potential importance in SARS-CoV-2 transmission. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.*  
402 *U. S. A.* **117**, 11875–11877 (2020).
- 403 4. CDC. COVID-19 and Your Health. [https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/prevent-](https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/prevent-getting-sick/how-covid-spreads.html)  
404 [getting-sick/how-covid-spreads.html](https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/prevent-getting-sick/how-covid-spreads.html) (2021).
- 405 5. Organization, W. H. & Others. *Modes of transmission of virus causing COVID-19:*  
406 *implications for IPC precaution recommendations: scientific brief, 27 March 2020.*  
407 [https://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/handle/10665/331601/WHO-2019-nCoV-Sci\\_Brief-](https://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/handle/10665/331601/WHO-2019-nCoV-Sci_Brief-Transmission_modes-2020.1-eng.pdf)  
408 [Transmission\\_modes-2020.1-eng.pdf](https://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/handle/10665/331601/WHO-2019-nCoV-Sci_Brief-Transmission_modes-2020.1-eng.pdf) (2020).

- 409 6. Prather, K. A. *et al.* Airborne transmission of SARS-CoV-2. *Science* **370**, 303–304 (2020).
- 410 7. Allen, J. G. & Marr, L. C. Recognizing and controlling airborne transmission of SARS-  
411 CoV-2 in indoor environments. *Indoor Air* vol. 30 557–558 (2020).
- 412 8. Adhikari, U. *et al.* A case study evaluating the risk of infection from Middle Eastern  
413 Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus (MERS-CoV) in a Hospital Setting Through  
414 Bioaerosols. *Risk Anal.* **39**, 2608–2624 (2019).
- 415 9. Riley, S. *et al.* Transmission dynamics of the etiological agent of SARS in Hong Kong:  
416 impact of public health interventions. *Science* **300**, 1961–1966 (2003).
- 417 10. Tran, K., Cimon, K., Severn, M., Pessoa-Silva, C. L. & Conly, J. Aerosol generating  
418 procedures and risk of transmission of acute respiratory infections to healthcare workers: a  
419 systematic review. *PLoS One* **7**, e35797 (2012).
- 420 11. Yu, I. T. *et al.* Why did outbreaks of severe acute respiratory syndrome occur in some  
421 hospital wards but not in others? *Clin. Infect. Dis.* **44**, 1017–1025 (2007).
- 422 12. Morawska, L. & Cao, J. Airborne transmission of SARS-CoV-2: The world should face the  
423 reality. *Environ. Int.* **139**, 105730 (2020).
- 424 13. van Doremalen, N. *et al.* Aerosol and Surface Stability of SARS-CoV-2 as Compared with  
425 SARS-CoV-1. *N. Engl. J. Med.* **382**, 1564–1567 (2020).
- 426 14. Ong, S. W. X. *et al.* Air, Surface Environmental, and Personal Protective Equipment  
427 Contamination by Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) From  
428 a Symptomatic Patient. *JAMA* (2020) doi:10.1001/jama.2020.3227.
- 429 15. Wu, S. *et al.* Environmental contamination by SARS-CoV-2 in a designated hospital for  
430 coronavirus disease 2019. *Am. J. Infect. Control* **48**, 910–914 (2020).
- 431 16. Wang, J. *et al.* Prevention and control of COVID-19 in nursing homes, orphanages, and

- 432           prisons. *Environ. Pollut.* **266**, 115161 (2020).
- 433   17. Nabarro, D., DeLand, K. & Lasbennes, F. COVID in cold environments: risks in meat  
434           processing plants. *iuf.org*.
- 435   18. Leclerc, Q. J. *et al.* What settings have been linked to SARS-CoV-2 transmission clusters?  
436           *Wellcome Open Res.* **5**, 83 (2020).
- 437   19. Qian, H. *et al.* Indoor transmission of SARS-CoV-2. *Indoor Air* (2020)  
438           doi:10.1111/ina.12766.
- 439   20. Dumont-Leblond, N. *et al.* Positive no-touch surfaces and undetectable SARS-CoV-2  
440           aerosols in long-term care facilities: An attempt to understand the contributing factors and  
441           the importance of timing in air sampling campaigns. *Am. J. Infect. Control* (2021)  
442           doi:10.1016/j.ajic.2021.02.004.
- 443   21. *Mays v. Dart. F. Supp. 3d* vol. 453 1074 (2020).
- 444   22. Yang, H. & Thompson, J. R. Fighting covid-19 outbreaks in prisons. *BMJ* vol. 369 m1362  
445           (2020).
- 446   23. The-COVID-Jungle.pdf.
- 447   24. Sun, Y., Wang, Z., Zhang, Y. & Sundell, J. In China, students in crowded dormitories with  
448           a low ventilation rate have more common colds: evidence for airborne transmission. *PLoS*  
449           *One* **6**, e27140 (2011).
- 450   25. Killian, J., Meyer, E. A., Chang, J., Dressen, S. & Eyring, G. *Sensor Systems for Biological*  
451           *Agent Attacks: Protecting Buildings and Military Bases.*  
452           <https://apps.dtic.mil/sti/pdfs/ADA457006.pdf> (2004).
- 453   26. Walper, S. A. *et al.* Detecting Biothreat Agents: From Current Diagnostics to Developing  
454           Sensor Technologies. *ACS Sens* **3**, 1894–2024 (2018).

- 455 27. Microbial analysis. [https://ww2.health.wa.gov.au/Articles/J\\_M/Microbial-analysis](https://ww2.health.wa.gov.au/Articles/J_M/Microbial-analysis).
- 456 28. CDC. Performing Facility-wide SARS-CoV-2 Testing in Nursing Homes.  
457 <https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/hcp/nursing-homes-facility-wide-testing.html>  
458 (2020).
- 459 29. Legionnaires Disease Outbreak Considerations. [https://www.cdc.gov/legionella/health-](https://www.cdc.gov/legionella/health-depts/epi-resources/outbreak-investigations.html)  
460 [depts/epi-resources/outbreak-investigations.html](https://www.cdc.gov/legionella/health-depts/epi-resources/outbreak-investigations.html) (2021).
- 461 30. National Academy of Science, Engineering and Medicine. *Management of Legionella in*  
462 *Water Systems*. (The National Academies Press, 2020).
- 463 31. Sogin, J. H. *et al.* Implementation of ATP and Microbial Indicator Testing for Hygiene  
464 Monitoring in a Tofu Production Facility Improves Product Quality and Hygienic  
465 Conditions of Food Contact Surfaces: A Case Study. *Appl. Environ. Microbiol.* (2020)  
466 doi:10.1128/AEM.02278-20.
- 467 32. Cooper, R. A., Griffith, C. J., Malik, R. E., Obee, P. & Looker, N. Monitoring the  
468 effectiveness of cleaning in four British hospitals. *Am. J. Infect. Control* **35**, 338–341  
469 (2007).
- 470 33. Scherer, K. *et al.* Application of a Swab Sampling Method for the Detection of Norovirus  
471 and Rotavirus on Artificially Contaminated Food and Environmental Surfaces. *Food*  
472 *Environ. Virol.* **1**, 42 (2009).
- 473 34. McCarthy, A. *et al.* Ultra-absorptive Nanofiber Swabs for Improved Collection and Test  
474 Sensitivity of SARS-CoV-2 and other Biological Specimens. *Nano Lett.* **21**, 1508–1516  
475 (2021).
- 476 35. Fan, Z.-H. T. Passive Air Sampling: Advantages, Limitations, and Challenges.  
477 *Epidemiology* **22**, S132 (2011).

- 478 36. Pasquarella, C., Pitzurra, O. & Savino, A. The index of microbial air contamination. *J.*  
479 *Hosp. Infect.* **46**, 241–256 (2000).
- 480 37. Napoli, C., Marcotrigiano, V. & Montagna, M. T. Air sampling procedures to evaluate  
481 microbial contamination: a comparison between active and passive methods in operating  
482 theatres. *BMC Public Health* **12**, 594 (2012).
- 483 38. Li, K. Molecular comparison of the sampling efficiency of four types of airborne bacterial  
484 samplers. *Sci. Total Environ.* **409**, 5493–5498 (2011).
- 485 39. Sandle, T. Selection of active air samplers. *European Journal of Parenteral and*  
486 *Pharmaceutical Sciences* **15**, 119–124 (2010).
- 487 40. Raynor, P. C. Toward Identifying the Most Effective Samplers for Airborne Viruses.  
488 (2018).
- 489 41. Denny, T. N. *et al.* Implementation of a Pooled Surveillance Testing Program for  
490 Asymptomatic SARS-CoV-2 Infections on a College Campus - Duke University, Durham,  
491 North Carolina, August 2-October 11, 2020. *MMWR Morb. Mortal. Wkly. Rep.* **69**, 1743–  
492 1747 (2020).
- 493 42. Case study-whitepaper - enviral tech - COVID surface testing. [https://enviraltech.com/case-](https://enviraltech.com/case-study-whitepaper/)  
494 [study-whitepaper/](https://enviraltech.com/case-study-whitepaper/) (2020).
- 495 43. Harris-Lovett, S. *et al.* Wastewater surveillance for SARS-CoV-2 on college campuses:  
496 Initial efforts, lessons learned and research needs. *medRxiv* (2021)  
497 doi:10.1101/2021.02.01.21250952.
- 498 44. Betancourt, W. W. *et al.* Wastewater-based epidemiology for averting COVID-19 outbreaks  
499 on the University of Arizona campus. *bioRxiv* (2020) doi:10.1101/2020.11.13.20231340.
- 500 45. Peccia, J. *et al.* Measurement of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in wastewater tracks community



- 501 infection dynamics. *Nat. Biotechnol.* **38**, 1164–1167 (2020).
- 502 46. Randazzo, W. *et al.* SARS-CoV-2 RNA in wastewater anticipated COVID-19 occurrence in  
503 a low prevalence area. *Water Res.* **181**, 115942 (2020).
- 504 47. Nazaroff, W. W. Indoor particle dynamics. *Indoor Air* **14 Suppl 7**, 175–183 (2004).
- 505 48. Guo, Z.-D. *et al.* Aerosol and Surface Distribution of Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome  
506 Coronavirus 2 in Hospital Wards, Wuhan, China, 2020. *Emerg. Infect. Dis.* **26**, 1583–1591  
507 (2020).
- 508 49. Coil, D. A. *et al.* SARS-CoV-2 detection and genomic sequencing from hospital surface  
509 samples collected at UC Davis. *bioRxiv* (2021) doi:10.1101/2021.02.23.21252022.
- 510 50. Ye, G. *et al.* Environmental contamination of SARS-CoV-2 in healthcare premises. *J.*  
511 *Infect.* **81**, e1–e5 (2020).
- 512 51. Zhou, J. *et al.* Investigating SARS-CoV-2 surface and air contamination in an acute  
513 healthcare setting during the peak of the COVID-19 pandemic in London. *Clin. Infect. Dis.*  
514 (2020) doi:10.1093/cid/ciaa905.
- 515 52. Redmond, S. N. *et al.* Severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2)  
516 nucleic acid contamination of surfaces on a coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) ward  
517 and intensive care unit. *Infect. Control Hosp. Epidemiol.* **42**, 215–217 (2021).
- 518 53. Lednicky, J. A. *et al.* Viable SARS-CoV-2 in the air of a hospital room with COVID-19  
519 patients. *Int. J. Infect. Dis.* **100**, 476–482 (2020).
- 520 54. Santarpia, J. L. *et al.* Aerosol and surface contamination of SARS-CoV-2 observed in  
521 quarantine and isolation care. *Sci. Rep.* **10**, 12732 (2020).
- 522 55. Liu, Y. *et al.* Aerodynamic analysis of SARS-CoV-2 in two Wuhan hospitals. *Nature* **582**,  
523 557–560 (2020).

- 524 56. ANSI/ASHRAE/ASHE Standard 170-2017, Ventilation of Health Care Facilities.  
525 [https://www.ashrae.org/technical-resources/standards-and-guidelines/standards-  
526 addenda/ansi-ashrae-ashe-standard-170-2017-ventilation-of-health-care-facilities](https://www.ashrae.org/technical-resources/standards-and-guidelines/standards-<br/>526 addenda/ansi-ashrae-ashe-standard-170-2017-ventilation-of-health-care-facilities).
- 527 57. Hor, S.-Y. *et al.* Beyond hand hygiene: a qualitative study of the everyday work of  
528 preventing cross-contamination on hospital wards. *BMJ Qual. Saf.* **26**, 552–558 (2017).
- 529 58. Meredith, L. W. *et al.* Rapid implementation of real-time SARS-CoV-2 sequencing to  
530 investigate healthcare-associated COVID-19 infections. *MedRxiv* (2020).
- 531 59. Van Praet, J. T., Claeys, B., Coene, A.-S., Floré, K. & Reynders, M. Prevention of  
532 nosocomial COVID-19: Another challenge of the pandemic. *Infect. Control Hosp.*  
533 *Epidemiol.* **41**, 1355–1356 (2020).
- 534 60. Wang, X. *et al.* Nosocomial outbreak of COVID-19 pneumonia in Wuhan, China. *Eur.*  
535 *Respir. J.* **55**, (2020).
- 536 61. Horve, P. F., Dietz, L., Northcutt, D., Stenson, J. & Van Den Wymelenberg, K. G.  
537 Evaluation of a Bioaerosol Sampler for Indoor Environmental Surveillance of Severe Acute  
538 Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2. (2021) doi:10.20944/preprints202103.0609.v1.
- 539 62. TaqPath COVID-19 Combo Kit Instructions for Use (Pub.No. MAN0019181 A.0).
- 540 63. Core, R. Team. *R: a language and environment for statistical computing* **3**, 2 (2015).
- 541 64. Hermes, A. C. *et al.* Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2)  
542 Environmental Contamination and Childbirth. *Obstet. Gynecol.* **136**, 827–829 (2020).
- 543 65. Horve, P. F. *et al.* Viable bacterial communities on hospital window components in patient  
544 rooms. *PeerJ* **8**, e9580 (2020).
- 545 66. Santarpia, J. L. *et al.* Transmission potential of SARS-CoV-2 in viral shedding observed at  
546 the University of Nebraska Medical Center. *MedRxiv* (2020).

- 547 67. Rönqvist, M., Rättö, M., Tuominen, P., Salo, S. & Maunula, L. Swabs as a tool for  
548 monitoring the presence of norovirus on environmental surfaces in the food industry. *J.*  
549 *Food Prot.* **76**, 1421–1428 (2013).
- 550 68. Chia, P. Y. *et al.* Detection of air and surface contamination by SARS-CoV-2 in hospital  
551 rooms of infected patients. *Nat. Commun.* **11**, 2800 (2020).
- 552 69. van Kampen, J. J. A. *et al.* Duration and key determinants of infectious virus shedding in  
553 hospitalized patients with coronavirus disease-2019 (COVID-19). *Nat. Commun.* **12**, 267  
554 (2021).
- 555 70. Mouchtouri, V. A. *et al.* Environmental contamination of SARS-CoV-2 on surfaces, air-  
556 conditioner and ventilation systems. *Int. J. Hyg. Environ. Health* **230**, 113599 (2020).
- 557 71. Wang, J., Zhou, M. & Liu, F. Reasons for healthcare workers becoming infected with novel  
558 coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) in China. *J. Hosp. Infect.* **105**, 100–101 (2020).
- 559 72. Kuy, S., Gupta, R., Correa, R., Tsai, R. & Vohra, S. Best practices for a Covid-19  
560 preparedness plan for health systems. *NEJM Catalyst Innovations in Care Delivery* **1**,  
561 (2020).
- 562 73. Horve, P. F. *et al.* Identification of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in Healthcare Heating, Ventilation,  
563 and Air Conditioning Units. *Infectious Diseases (except HIV/AIDS)* (2020)  
564 doi:10.1101/2020.06.26.20141085.
- 565 74. Miller, S. L. *et al.* Transmission of SARS-CoV-2 by inhalation of respiratory aerosol in the  
566 Skagit Valley Chorale superspreading event. *Infectious Diseases (except HIV/AIDS)* (2020)  
567 doi:10.1101/2020.06.15.20132027.
- 568 75. Tang, J. W. *et al.* Dismantling myths on the airborne transmission of severe acute  
569 respiratory syndrome coronavirus-2 (SARS-CoV-2). *J. Hosp. Infect.* **110**, 89–96 (2021).

- 570 76. Tang, S. *et al.* Aerosol transmission of SARS-CoV-2? Evidence, prevention and control.  
571 *Environ. Int.* **144**, 106039 (2020).
- 572 77. Gregson, F. K. A. *et al.* Comparing aerosol concentrations and particle size distributions  
573 generated by singing, speaking and breathing. *Aerosol Sci. Technol.* 1–15 (2021)  
574 doi:10.1080/02786826.2021.1883544.
- 575 78. Klompas, M., Baker, M. A. & Rhee, C. Airborne Transmission of SARS-CoV-2:  
576 Theoretical Considerations and Available Evidence. *JAMA* **324**, 441–442 (2020).
- 577 79. Nissen, K. *et al.* Long-distance airborne dispersal of SARS-CoV-2 in COVID-19 wards.  
578 *Sci. Rep.* **10**, 19589 (2020).
- 579 80. Hamner, L. *et al.* High SARS-CoV-2 Attack Rate Following Exposure at a Choir Practice -  
580 Skagit County, Washington, March 2020. *MMWR Morb. Mortal. Wkly. Rep.* **69**, 606–610  
581 (2020).
- 582 81. Majra, D., Benson, J., Pitts, J. & Stebbing, J. SARS-CoV-2 (COVID-19) superspreader  
583 events. *J. Infect.* **82**, 36–40 (2021).
- 584 82. Parhizkar, H., Van Den Wymelenberg, K., Haas, C. & Corsi, R. A quantitative risk  
585 estimation platform for indoor aerosol transmission of COVID-19. *medRxiv*  
586 2021.03.05.21252990 (2021) doi:10.1101/2021.03.05.21252990.
- 587 83. Containment Strategy. <https://www.cdc.gov/hai/containment/index.html> (2021).  
588  
589