Aerosol SARS-CoV-2 in hospitals and long-term care homes during the COVID-19 pandemic.

Gary Mallach[1¶*], Samantha B. Kasloff[2¶], Tom Kovesi[3¶], Anand Kumar[4¶], Ryan Kulka[1], Jay Krishnan[2], Benoit Robert[5], Michaeline McGuinty[6], Sophia den Otter-Moore[7], Bashour Yazji[6], Todd Cutts[2]

[1] Water and Air Quality Bureau, Health Canada, Ottawa, Canada.

[2] National Microbiology Laboratory, Public Health Agency of Canada, Winnipeg, Canada

[3] Children's Hospital of Eastern Ontario, University of Ottawa, Ottawa, Canada

[4] Sections of Critical Care Medicine and Infectious Diseases, Departments of Medicine, Medical Microbiology and Pharmacology, University of Manitoba, Winnipeg, Canada

[5] Department of Family Medicine, University of Ottawa, Ottawa, Canada

[6] Department of Medicine, Ottawa Hospital, University of Ottawa, Ottawa, Canada

[7] Faculty of Medicine, Queen's University, Kingston, Canada

[*] Corresponding author

E-mail: gary.mallach@canada.ca (GM)

[¶]These authors contributed equally to this work and are considered to be First Author

Abstract:

Background: Few studies have quantified aerosol concentrations of SARS-CoV-2 in hospitals and long-term care homes, and fewer still have examined samples for viability. This information is needed to clarify transmission risks beyond close contact.

Methods: We deployed particulate air samplers in rooms with COVID-19 positive patients in hospital ward and ICU rooms, rooms in long-term care homes experiencing outbreaks, and a correctional facility experiencing an outbreak. Samplers were placed between 2 and 3 meters from the patient. Aerosol (small liquid particles suspended in air) samples were collected onto gelatin filters by Ultrasonic Personal Air Samplers (UPAS) fitted with <2.5µm (micrometer) and <10 µm size-selective inlets operated for 16 hours (total 1.92m^3), and with a Coriolis Biosampler over 10 minutes (total 1.5m^3). Samples were assayed for viable SARS-CoV-2 virus and for the viral genome by multiplex PCR using the E and N protein target sequences. We validated the sampling methods by inoculating gelatin filters with viable vesicular stomatitis virus (VSV), and with three concentrations of viable SARS-CoV-2, operating personal samplers for 16hrs, and quantifying viable virus recovery by $TCID_{50}$ assay.

Results: In total, 138 samples were collected from 99 rooms. RNA samples were positive in 9.1% (6/66) of samples obtained with the UPAS 2.5µm samplers, 13.5% (7/52) with the UPAS 10µm samplers, and 10.0% (2/20) samples obtained with the Coriolis samplers. Culturable virus was not recovered in any samples. Viral RNA was detected in 10.9% of the rooms sampled. There was no significant difference in viral RNA recovery between the different room locations or samplers. Method development experiments indicated minimal loss of SARS-CoV-2 viability via the personal air sampler operation.

Key Findings: Although a subset of aerosol samples exhibited detectable SARS-CoV-2 RNA at low titres, the presence of viable SARS-CoV-2 virus in aerosols appears to be infrequent at >2m distance.

Background:

SARS-CoV-2, the virus that causes COVID-19, predominantly spreads during close contact between shedding individuals and susceptible persons. The virus spreads mainly by inhalation of small respiratory particles, including from asymptomatic or pre-symptomatic individuals.[1-3] Transmission is most likely to occur during close, sustained contact in indoor environments with a person who is in the early stages of infection, where viral concentrations in the air are highest.[4-6] Once expelled, larger respiratory droplets stay aloft for relatively short periods of time, and typically travel short distances (0 to 2m) while smaller particles (aerosols) stay aloft for longer and are able to cover larger distances.[7] Although transmission during close contact is believed to predominate, aerosol transmission has been reported to occur beyond close contact (e.g., greater than 2m), when infectious respiratory particles are able to accumulate to levels that can cause infection, such as in indoor environments with inadequate ventilation or filtration.[1,8] Actions such as coughing, talking and breathing generate respiratory particles of various sizes, including high numbers of particles smaller than 5-10µm in diameter.[5,9,10] Particles up to 100µm may remain suspended in aerosols, accumulating and spreading through an indoor space, again particularly in the absence of adequate ventilation or filtration.[7] Particles less than 5-10µm in diameter, which may remain airborne for extended periods,[11-13] have been shown to contain infectious particles of SARS, MERS, and H1N1.[14] Indeed, tiny aerosolized particles <1µm may remain airborne for upwards of 12 hours.[15] In addition to aerosols, fomites may contribute to transmission, as the virus can remain viable on various surfaces for prolonged periods.[16-18] Additional data specific to SARS-CoV-2 will help address uncertainties about viral concentrations in aerosols, and whether aerosolized virus is infectious.[13,15,19,20]

Evidence from outbreak investigations supports the view that aerosol transmission beyond close contact occurs in certain circumstances (e.g., when ventilation is inadequate); the frequency of this transmission

64 remains unclear, though it is likely to play a role in super-spreading events.[8,21,22] Moreover,
65 modelling studies show that even during close contact interactions, aerosols, rather than larger ballistic
66 droplets, drive viral exposures, as droplets are relatively unlikely to land on a mucus membrane,
67 compared to the higher likelihood of inhaling aerosols.[23]
68 Research studies mainly rely on molecular detection of the SARS-CoV-2 genome to determine viral
69 presence in aerosol samples. However, genome (RNA) presence alone is often seen as insufficient
70 evidence that aerosol transmission risk is present, as it does not indicate the presence of viable virus.
71 [24-26] In patient swabs, viable SARS-CoV-2 virus is generally detected only within eight days of
72 symptom onset, while viral RNA persists long beyond infectivity.[24,27] As such, to determine viral
73 infectivity, culturing samples in susceptible cells or animal hosts is needed. Persons that are infected
74 with variants such as B.1.1.7 may shed virus for longer, contributing to higher rates of
75 transmission.[28,29]

76 Although cellular assays are required to establish viral infectivity, air sampling campaigns using size-
77 selective inlets have rarely employed these methods for SARS-CoV-2, given technical challenges in viral
78 sampling.[13] Several hospital air monitoring studies found the genome of SARS-CoV-2, without
79 culturing the virus. [11,20,30] Sampling using a size selective inlet and outfitted with a gelatin filter, Liu
80 et al. found that the highest concentration of viral RNA was present in the size fraction <2.5µm, which
81 could remain suspended over long periods.[11] Likewise, SARS-CoV-2 RNA has been found on surfaces
82 far from infected individuals, including on exhaust outlets and ceiling fans where only fine, aerosolized
83 particles would be likely to reach.[31] These studies indicate that RNA is present in airborne
84 particles.[13,25] To determine infectiousness, Lednicky et. al. measured virus concentrations inside the
85 car of a person with COVID-19. They sampled in multiple size fractions and cultured for viability, finding
86 viable virus present only in the 0.25-0.5µm size fraction, which also had the highest concentration of

87 viral RNA.[12] It is possible that larger size fractions were preferentially filtered out by the vehicle's
88 ventilation system.

89 Lab-based studies generated viable aerosols of <5µm of SARS-CoV-2 that had a half-life of greater than
90 one hour while airborne.[18] Once airborne, virus viability is reduced by several environmental
91 pressures, including sunlight, temperature, and relative humidity, while ventilation and filtration reduce
92 risks of transmission beyond close contact.[32]

93 The size of a virus-containing particle may also affect infectivity. One study demonstrated that
94 macaques infected by the aerosol route had more severe disease compared to the
95 intratracheal/intranasal route.[33] Submicron particles are able to penetrate more deeply into the lungs,
96 depositing in the alveolar region where immune responses may be evaded.[15] Also, in the alveolar
97 region the ACE-2 receptors that the SARS-CoV-2 virus binds to are more accessible, possibly increasing
98 the likelihood of infection.[15,19] This underlines the importance of sampling for viable virus in fine size
99 fractions.

100 Organizations including the WHO, REHVA (the Federation of European Heating, Ventilation and Air
101 Conditioning Associations) and ASHRAE (the American Society of Heating, Ventilating, and Air-
102 Conditioning Engineers) have recognized the potential hazard of aerosol transmission indoors.[4,5,34]
103 As such, expert organizations are recommending COVID-19 specific control measures, including
104 increased ventilation rates, avoiding air recirculation, using air cleaning and disinfection devices, and
105 reducing the number of occupants.[4,34,35]

106 Our study objective was to quantify the concentration of SARS-CoV-2 RNA and viable virus in aerosols
107 collected greater than two meters from patients with COVID-19 infection, specifically in the <2.5um and
108 <10um size fractions. In order to examine the presence of SARS-CoV-2 in a wide range of high-risk
109 environments, we conducted air monitoring in hospital rooms, long-term care facility rooms,

110 penitentiary cells and personal residences housing people with recently diagnosed, active COVID-19
111 disease.

112 Methods and Materials:

113 Aerosol field sampling:

114 Sampling was conducted adjacent to COVID-19 confirmed-positive patients in hospital rooms (ICU and
115 medical ward beds), residential homes, exhaust (return) air ducts drawing air from inside penitentiary
116 cells and living areas, and in long term care home resident rooms. Respiratory particle samples were
117 collected using Ultrasonic Personal Aerosol Samplers (UPAS, Access Sensor Technologies, Fort Collins,
118 USA) operated at 2LPM (Liters per minute)(filter face velocity of 0.031 m/s), with either a 2.5µm or
119 10µm size selective inlet to exclude larger particles or droplets. The UPAS filter cartridge was loaded
120 with a sterile 37mm gelatin filter (12602-37-ALK, Sartorius, Göttingen, DE) to preserve the integrity and
121 viability of virus containing particles. UPAS samplers were placed 2 to 3 m from the patient's head for a
122 16-hour period sampling a total of 1.92m^3 of air. Prior laboratory testing indicated that longer sampling
123 duration (larger air sample volumes) could lead to cracking of the gelatin filter membrane. Filters were
124 pre-loaded into the samplers in a HEPA filtered biological safety cabinet and sealed in a Ziploc bag prior
125 to sampling. Field and laboratory blanks were deployed to ensure that samples were not contaminated.
126 Within 2 hours post-collection, gelatin filters were removed from sampler inlets with sterile forceps,
127 dissolved into 2mL of pre-warmed (37°C) Viral Transport Medium (VTM) (HBSS, FBS, Gentamycin and
128 Amphoteracin B) to maintain viability, and kept at 4°C until analyzed.[36,37]
129 In a subset of locations, we also deployed a Coriolis µ Biosampler (Montigny-le-Bretonneux, France) at
130 an inlet velocity of 150 LPM for 10 minutes (1.5m^3 sample volume). Coriolis air samples were collected
131 into sterile cones containing 5mL of VTM, which was reduced to 3mL by evaporation during sample
132 collection. The Coriolis sampler collects particles larger than 0.5µm in size, with no specified cutoff.

133 Clinician partners working in the respective institutions deployed instruments, pre-programmed to run
134 at a convenient time, when patients would remain in their rooms.
135 To ensure that no contaminated instrumentation was re-deployed, after sampling the UPAS and filter
136 cartridges were thoroughly cleaned and sterilized with 70% ethanol and wiped before being used again.
137 Prior to loading the gelatin filters, the UPAS filter cartridges and size selective inlets were washed in D.I.
138 water, dipped in 70% ethanol, and air-dried before assembly. All samples were collected between
139 September 22, 2020 and January 25, 2021.

140 Aerosol sample processing

141 Samples taken within the Winnipeg region were taken to the NML (National Microbiology Laboratory,
142 Winnipeg) within 2 hours post sampling, while samples from the Ottawa area were shipped overnight to
143 the NML in 2mLs of VTM at 4°C. VTM was pre-warmed at 37°C and incubated for 10 minutes to dissolve
144 the gelatin filters. Of the resulting solution, 500ul was aspirated into 6 well tissue culture plates for
145 safety testing to detect viable virus, and 140ul supernatant was used for viral genome detection using
146 the QIAmp Viral RNA minikit, as per the manufactures protocol. In control trials, we found that keeping
147 the dissolved filter at 4°C overnight did not reduce viability or nucleic acid detection, compared with
148 immediate processing.

149 Cell culture

150 African green monkey VeroE6 cells (ATCC CRL 1586; American Type Culture Collection, Manassas, VA,
151 United States) were maintained at 37°C+5% CO_2 in Cell Culture Medium (CCM) consisting of Dulbecco's
152 modified Eagle cell culture medium (DMEM; Hyclone SH3024302) supplemented with 10% Fetal Bovine
153 serum (FBS; Gibco 12484028) and 10 units per ml of Penicillin/Streptomycin (PS, Gibco 10378016).
154 Medium for virus cultures (VCM) consisted of DMEM supplemented with 2% FBS and 10 units per ml of
155 PS.

156 ## Virus viability and titration

157 VeroE6 cells were seeded the day prior in 96-well plates to attain 80% confluence on the day of
158 titrations.[38] Media from the previously seeded plates was aspirated and replaced with 150ul of fresh
159 VCM prior to the addition of the sample inoculum. VTM containing dissolved sample filters was added to
160 dilution blocks and 10-fold serially diluted in VCM where 50 ul was added to plates in replicates of 5 per
161 dilution series. Plates were incubated at 37°C +5% CO_2 for 5-7 days and examined for CPE where virus
162 titers were calculated.[38]

163 For qualitative detection of viable virus present (safety testing), media from previously seeded 6-well
164 plates was aspirated and 4 mls of fresh VCM was added. To this, 500ul of sample was added and
165 incubated at 37°C +5% CO_2 for 5-7 days. Wells were examined, compared to a negative control for CPE,
166 and scored positive or negative based on evident CPE in the cell monolayer.

167 ## Method validation using surrogate virus (VSV):

168 We evaluated the ability of the gelatin filters to maintain virus viability following a 16-hour sampling
169 period. Vesicular stomatitis virus (VSV) was diluted to 10^5-$10^6$$TCID_{50}$ /ml in a tripartite soil load and
170 spotted onto gelatin filters over 5 different spots in 2ul volumes.[39] Three filters were used as a
171 positive control and processed immediately, three others were kept overnight in the Biosafety Cabinet
172 (BSC), and three gelatin filters were placed in a UPAS sampler where it was left running for 16 hours. The
173 following morning, we inoculated an additional 3 gelatin filters and set a sampling time for 4 hours.
174 After sampling times were complete, 2mLs of pre-warmed VCM was added to gelatin filters and
175 incubated for 10 minutes, centrifuged and tittered.

176 # Method validation using SARS-C0V-2

177 To determine technical limits of detection of viable SARS-CoV-2 using UPAS sampling, and to correlate
178 viable particles with genomic detection, we spiked gelatin filters with 10ul of SARS-CoV-2 diluted to 10^3,
179 10^4, or 10^5 $TCID_{50}$ units/mL over five different spots as described above (3 filters per each of the three
180 dilutions). After a brief drying period under a biosafety cabinet, filters were loaded into the UPAS and
181 run under typical conditions (16hrs at 2 LPM). The third corresponding filter for each solution was
182 processed at time of UPAS run start, to be compared with the sampled filters to determine the degree
183 that viability decreases during sampling. Filters were then dissolved into 2 mL of pre-warmed DMEM,
184 and qualitative isolation and quantitative end-point titration was determined in Vero E6 cells.
185 Concentrations were selected to reflect the range of viable aerosol SARS-CoV-2 concentrations
186 previously reported in a hospital room in Florida.[40]

187 # Molecular viral load (qRT-PCR)

188 Molecular viral load was determined by qRT-PCR (QuantStudio 5, Applied Biosytems, USA) using the Taq
189 Path One-Step multiplex mix (Applied Biosystems A28522) with primers and probes targeting the SARS-
190 CoV-2 nucleocapsid (N)[41] gene and envelope (E) protein (table 1).[42] Thermal cycling conditions were
191 53°C for 10 min for reverse transcription, followed by 95°C for 2 min and then 40 cycles of 95 °C for 2s,
192 60°C for 30s. Values are reported as log genome equivalents per mL based on cycle threshold (Ct) values
193 obtained with a standard curve of known concentration of viral RNA genome containing both the E and
194 N region.

Oligonucleotide	Sequence 5’ to 3’	Volume
E_Sarbeco_F	ACAGGTACGTTAATAGTTAATAGCGT	20uM
E_Sarbeco_P1	ACACTAGCCATCCTTACTGCGCTTCG (FAM)	10uM
E_Sarbeco_R	ATATTGCAGCAGTACGCACACA	20uM
2019-nCoV_N1-F	GAC CCC AAA ATC AGC GAA AT	25uM
2019-nCoV_N1-R	TCT GGT TAC TGC CAG TTG AAT CTG	25uM

2019-nCoV_N1-P	ACC CCG CAT TAC GTT TGG TGG ACC-(VIC)	6.25uM

Table 1: SARS-CoV-2 qRT-PCR primers and probes.

We considered the E protein concentrations as more reliable than N, because the primer probe set is much more sensitive than the N. Samples with a Ct values below 36 for either gene were deemed to be RNA positive. If Ct values were above 36, samples were deemed positive only if detection was confirmed on both the E and N protein target PCRs, with Ct values up to 40.

Statistical analysis

Data was tabulated in Excel spreadsheets and analyzed using SPSS version 27 (IBM corporation). One sample had a borderline Ct, and was included as a “positive” sample in the analyses. Descriptive statistics were performed. Differences in proportions between groups were evaluated using Chi-square for large tables. Predictors of viral RNA detection were analyzed using Binomial Logistic Regression. As it was unclear which sized particles were most likely to contain viral or viral RNA, if any sampler in a given room was positive for virus, the room was considered to have aerosol virus/viral RNA. Differences between room types for continuous variables were evaluated using One-Way Analysis of Variance. Probability values (p) less than 0.05 were considered statistically significant.

Ethics

The following Research Ethics Boards were engaged prior to sampling: Health Canada/Public Health Agency of Canada, Children’s Hospital of Eastern Ontario; The Ottawa Hospital; and the Winnipeg Hospital. The boards each determined that formal approval was not required for this study, because sampling was environmental in nature, we did not propose to collect personal information such as time of symptom onset or current symptomatology, and given the urgent need for this data. Moreover, as personal information was not being collected, the boards felt that patient consent was not required.

Results

Method Validation Experiments

VSV method validation

Results of the VSV experiment are shown in figure 1. Of 5 logs of viable VSV inoculated onto the surface of the gelatin filters, 3 logs of viable virus remained after both 4 hours and 16 hours of drying without any air movement. For the filters that underwent 16 hours of air sampling, 3.5 logs of viable VSV remained, demonstrating that drawing air through the filter did not further reduce viability. It was thus determined that 16 hours would be the optimal sample duration, reflecting the maximum volume of air that could be drawn through the gelatin filter without leading to excessive drying and cracking, or other damage to the gelatin filter.



227 Figure 1: Impact of air sampling on VSV recovery from gelatin filters.

228 SARS-CoV-2 method validation

229 Figure 2 shows that the amount of viable SARS-CoV-2 virus recovered from the gelatin filters was only
230 minimally impacted by sampling in the UPAS for 16 hours (~2m^3 sample volume). Similarly, there was
231 minimal loss of viable SARS-CoV-2 when comparing filters processed immediately after inoculation
232 versus those held in VTM at 4°C overnight (Figure 2). Therefore, we are confident in the ability of the
233 UPAS to maintain viability of SARS-CoV-2 once collected into the sampler even at low titers of virus.
234 Furthermore, we compared recovery from samples either processed immediately after dissolving or
235 after dissolved media was placed at 4°C overnight and found no substantial difference.

236 Interestingly, SARS-CoV-2 maintained much more viability in the experiments compared to VSV, with the
237 latter undergoing a reduction of over 90% over the sampling period. As such, method development
238 experiments are required to quantify the ability of this sampling method to maintain viability for other
239 viruses of concern.



240

241 Figure 2: Impact of air sampling on SARS-CoV-2 recovery from gelatin filters. Inocula (A), (B) and (C) were
242 intended to consist of approximately 3.5, 2.5, and 1.5 Log TCID50 of SARS-CoV-2/mL, respectively, with
243 (A) undiluted (neat), and (B) and (C) diluted from the initial Liquid Inoculum. Following one hour of
244 drying, inoculated filters were either placed in UPAS units for 16 hours (Air Sampler), dissolved in VTM
245 and processed immediately (Control), or dissolved at placed at 4°C overnight prior to processing (4°C).
246 Results represent viable virus recovered in VeroE6 cells by $TCID_{50}$ assay. Whiskers represent standard
247 deviation of replicate samples.

248 Air sampling for SARS-CoV-2

249 Samples were collected from 99 rooms located in ICUs, hospital ward rooms, rooms in long-term care
250 facilities and at a correctional institute, and a total of 138 samples were obtained. Of the samples, 23
251 (16.7%) were obtained in ICU rooms, 92 (66.7%) from hospital ward rooms, 15 (10.9%) from rooms in

252 long-term care facilities, and 8 (5.8%) in the correctional institute. 66 samples (47.8%) were obtained
253 using the UPAS 2.5µm sampler, 52 (37.7%) using the UPAS 10µm sampler, and 20 (14.5%) with the
254 Coriolis sampler. In accordance with our procedure, data on patient demographics was not obtained,
255 beyond the fact that all had SARS-CoV-2 infection confirmed by qRT-PCR. Given that symptoms in
256 COVID-19 patients take time to develop and worsen, we expect that symptom duration was shortest in
257 patients in long-term care home and correctional facilities, longer in patients admitted to hospital ward
258 rooms, and longest in patients residing in intensive care. Actual or approximate air change rates were
259 available in 85 rooms. The mean air change rate/hour was 12.6 in ICU rooms, 7.5 on ward rooms, and
260 3.8 in long term care rooms. Estimated air change rate varied from 2 to 16 air changes/hour (mean 8.4,
261 standard deviation [SD] 4.4).

262 In all, samples were positive for viral RNA in 15 (10.9%) of rooms sampled, though no viable virus was
263 detected in any air samples. Among samples we considered positive for our analyses, Ct values for N
264 protein ranged between 30.17 and 37.96, with a mean of 35.53 (n = 11, SD 2.06) (supplemental Table 1).
265 For the E protein, Ct ranged from 27.03 to 36.89, with a mean of 33.61 (n = 15, SD 2.33) (Table 2). Mean
266 RNA copy numbers for the E protein was 941.6 copy numbers/mL (range 61.3 – 11,462; standard error
267 [SE] 752.4) and mean RNA concentration in the air was 1202.4 copy numbers/m^3 (range 63.8 – 11939.9;
268 SE 977.2). The highest concentration was observed in a long-term care room, though positive samples
269 generally showed low air concentrations.

270 RNA samples were positive in 17.4% of ICU rooms (4/23), 7.6% of ward rooms (7/92), 20% of long-term
271 care rooms (3/15) and 12.5% of correctional facility rooms (1/8). There was no significant difference in
272 positivity rates between the different locations (Pearson Chi-Square 3.33; p = 0.34). The mean
273 concentration of the E protein in the air was 234.2 (SD 219.0; range 74.6 – 551.8) copies/m^3 in ICU
274 rooms, 139.9 (SD 93.4; range 63.8 – 287.5) copies/m^3 in ward rooms, 4133.7 (SD 6761.8; range 92.7 –
275 11939.9) copies/m^3 in long-term care rooms, and 394.6 copies/m^3 in one correctional facility return

276 duct. We also sampled the cold air return that serviced all the inmate's cells and living areas twice, and
277 did not find viral RNA.

278 RNA samples were positive in 9.1% (6/66) of samples obtained with the UPAS 2.5 samplers, 13.5% (7/52)
279 with the UPAS 10 samplers, and 10.0% (2/20) samples obtained with the Coriolis samplers (Table 3).
280 There was no significant difference in positivity rates with the different samplers (Pearson Chi-Square
281 0.59, $p = 0.74$). However, sampling results should not be directly compared between the UPAS and
282 Coriolis, because they were deployed for very different durations. A logistic regression was performed to
283 ascertain the effects of room and sampler type and estimated air change rate on the likelihood that a
284 positive RNA result would be observed. The logistic regression model was not statistically significant
285 (Table 4; p value for each independent variable > 0.15). There was no significant different in E protein
286 copy number, Ct value, or copy aerosol concentration in the various room types (data not presented).

287 Discussion:

288 COVID-19 infection due to the novel SARS-CoV-2 virus has caused a global pandemic, with over 165
289 million cases reported worldwide, and over 3.4 million deaths at the time of this writing.[43]
290 Furthermore, respiratory morbidity, activity limitation, and mental health conditions are prevalent,
291 among other complications.[44] Previous studies have suggested aerosol transmission is occurring
292 beyond close contact, as per evidence from super spreading events, transmission occurrences between
293 adjacent rooms, viable virus measurements in air, and animal studies.[8] Our data suggests that SARS-
294 CoV-2 RNA virus may be present at low levels in aerosols <10um in diameter, >2 m from COVID-19
295 patients in a variety of settings, but viable virus appears to be uncommon, as has been described
296 elsewhere.[6]
297

298 In classical terms, respiratory viruses have been considered to be spread by droplets. Large droplets
299 (e.g., > 5 microns in diameter) were believed to contaminate the immediate environment of an
300 infectious patient, including the air within 2m, leading to infection by direct deposition of virus onto
301 mucosal surfaces. In addition, large droplets settle in the proximal (within 2m) environment, leading to
302 fomite transmission where contaminated surfaces are contacted by another person prior to touching
303 their face thereby acquiring infection. In classical terms, aerosol (or "airborne") spread occurs via small
304 droplets (e.g., < 5µm) that can remain suspended in air more than 2m from a patient, leading to
305 infection of susceptible people, via inhalation at a distance.[45] Historically, most respiratory pathogens
306 are thought to be spread through larger droplets and fomites, with the exceptions of tuberculosis and
307 the measles and varicella viruses, which are known to exhibit distal aerosol spread.[46] There is also
308 evidence that influenza virus may be spread through the aerosol route.[19,46] However, the distinction
309 between droplet and aerosol spread is fairly artificial, whereas in actuality, aerosols and droplets may
310 both cause transmission within close contact where they are in highest concentrations, and particles
311 many times larger than the presumed > 5µm cut-off, and perhaps up to 100µm, remain suspended in air
312 for longer durations and distances.[25] Moreover, inhalation of aerosols may be an important, even
313 dominant transmission mode both within and beyond close contact.[8,23]

314 We sampled indoor air for viral RNA and viable SARS-CoV-2 virus in a large number of rooms in a variety
315 of settings and with a variety of room air change rates. We were careful to always sample two or more
316 meters from COVID-19 patients, to ensure that we were detecting virus only at distances traditionally
317 considered to be consistent with airborne transmission. Despite this variety of indoor environments,
318 viral RNA was detected infrequently. Only 10.9% of rooms contained viral RNA, and while detection
319 rates were highest in ICU rooms and rooms in long-term care facilities, the differences between room
320 types were not statistically significant. Differences in detection rates likely reflect a multiplicity of
321 factors, including each patient's infectivity and duration of illness, room size, and ventilation rates.[24]

322 No viable virus was found. This likely reflects the same factors. In addition, Ct values were low, and
323 there is good evidence that detection of viable virus is unlikely when the Ct value is greater than 24.[27]
324 Our mean Ct values were just over and under 34 for the N and E proteins, respectively. The Ct value was
325 under 34 for the N protein in only one room, and under 34 for the E protein in eight rooms. We did not
326 observe a significant difference of RNA positivity rates using samplers capturing larger (10µm) or smaller
327 particles (2.5µm) or non-sized particles, suggesting viral RNA may be present in a range of particle sizes.
328 Within the potential limitations of our methodology, our results suggest that aerosol transmission risk
329 beyond 2m was low in hospital rooms, at the time of our sampling. While hospitalization is more likely
330 to occur later in the disease course, when infectivity is lower, caution is still warranted.
331 Expert groups have examined the plausibility of aerosol spread of SARS-CoV-2 virus to beyond 2m, with
332 some groups reporting that such spread was likely or occurring.[5,8,45,46] However, air sampling data
333 supporting this assertion is limited, and as such, a recent WHO-funded panel maintains that additional
334 air sampling data is needed to draw conclusions, due to the lack of viable SARS-CoV-2 detected in
335 air.[26] Reports in the literature present contradicting data points but all agree that there is detectable
336 virus within aerosol samples. Liu and colleagues reported finding SARS-CoV-2 RNA in several aerosol
337 samples in hospitals in China, including a patient toilet room and isolation anterooms where personal
338 protective equipment was doffed, although resuspension of contaminated surfaces can't be
339 excluded.[11] In contrast, Cheng and colleagues did not detect viral RNA very close to patients in
340 isolation rooms with an air change rate of 12 air changes per hour.[47] Razzini and coworkers obtained
341 five air samples and detected viral RNA in converted negative pressure operating room air and a
342 corridor.[48] Chia found viral RNA in two of three air samples from airborne isolation rooms in a hospital
343 in Singapore, including particles 1 to 4 and > 4 microns in size.[30] An air exhaust vent and many room
344 surfaces had RNA present.[30] Santarpia detected viral RNA in a biocontainment unit in Nebraska, USA
345 in an air handling grate, 58.3% of corridor samples, and a sample at a doorway over 2m from a patient

346 receiving oxygen by nasal cannula. Some evidence for viable virus was detected.[49] Numerous room
347 surfaces also had viral RNA. However, in a small study of 6 hospital patient rooms in this unit, viral RNA
348 was detected at the foot of each patient's bed, and 3/18 samples had culturable virus, including 2 of the
349 1-4 micron samples.[50] Similarly, in a small study of 2 patients in hospital in Florida, USA where
350 sampling was designed to prevent any damage to virions, Lednicky and coworkers observed viral RNA
351 and viable virus 2 to 4.8 m away from both patients. The air change rate was 6 air changes per hour. [40]
352 Lednicky also reported finding viable virus in particles 0.25 – 0.5 microns about 1 m from a patient with
353 minimal symptoms, inside her car.[12] In a larger study of 20 patient rooms in North Carolina, USA
354 where the air change rate was about 14 air changes per hour, viral RNA was found in three rooms (15%):
355 particles < 4 microns about 1.4 and 2.2 meters from the head of the bed, and over 4 microns 2.2 meters
356 from the head of the bed, respectively. No viable virus was detected. Hallway and clinician work stations
357 did not have detectable virus.[51] Similarly, a study of 22 patient rooms in Quebec, Canada found viral
358 RNA in six rooms (27.2%), but no viable virus. Rooms had a mean air change rate of 4.85 air changes per
359 hour, and samplers were located at a window, an unspecified distance from the patient's head.[52]
360 These studies were generally limited by small sample sizes, inadequate description of the distance
361 between the patient and the sampler, inconsistent methodologies and reporting, and lack of
362 determination whether viable virus was present.[26]
363
364 The UPAS sampler was appropriate for use in this study, and provided flexibility for collecting aerosol
365 samples in multiple environments. It is compact, lightweight and quiet, so it is easily deployable and
366 suitable for personal monitoring. In addition, its internal pump, internal battery, and lack of protruding
367 pieces or external tubing made it more acceptable for sampling in clinical environments, where clinicians
368 have limited time, and would be averse to deploying samplers that may increase contamination risks or
369 disturb patients. Its main benefit for this study was that it can be fitted with validated size-selective

370 inlets, which allowed us to collect only respiratory particles in the size fractions conventionally defined
371 as aerosols.

372 It is worth noting that aerosol sampling, and subsequent culturing, may not be a necessary indicator of
373 whether or not a virus is spread through aerosols. Infectious and non-infectious virus are expelled by the
374 respiratory tract via similar mechanisms, so the presence of RNA in air may indicate that aerosol
375 transmission is possible. Indeed, recognized airborne diseases such as measles and tuberculosis have
376 never been successfully cultured from indoor air.[8]

377 Our study had several limitations, which may have affected our ability to detect airborne viral RNA and
378 viable virus. In accordance with REB requirements, no direct sampling of patients was performed to
379 determine their infectiousness, and we did not have access to patient history, including demographics or
380 symptoms, or illness duration. Almost all hospitalized patients were admitted at least five days after
381 symptom onset, when they are less likely to be shedding infectious virus, though they may still shed
382 non-infectious RNA. [24] Studies have shown that patients shed viable virus for a fairly short period of
383 time (on average for several days before the onset of symptoms, and for 8 days or less after symptom
384 onset), and it is possible that sampling earlier in the course of these patients' illness would have had a
385 higher positivity rate.[53] Also, viral shedding may not be a continuous event, even during the infectious
386 stage. It is possible that shedding is intermittent, and our 16hr sampling may have missed these events.
387 Furthermore, the amount of shedding varies substantially between people, and we may not have
388 sampled near high-emitters.[6,54] Our data is consistent with observations that the window of time
389 where infectious aerosol may be present is generally short.[53] While no viable virus was detected, we
390 believe that if sampling was conducted earlier in the course of infection, it would be more likely that
391 viable virus would be detected, as viable virus is present in the same size fraction as the non-infectious
392 virus we detected, occasionally in high concentrations.[12] However, sampling was also conducted near
393 penitentiary prisoners many of whom were asymptomatic when diagnosed or were within a day or two

394 of symptoms; and in LTC and ward patient rooms identified through routine testing as part of an
395 outbreak. Viable virus was not detected in those samples. Unexpectedly, higher rates of viral RNA
396 detection did not occur during sampling in rooms in several long-term care facilities and in penitentiary
397 cells during institutional outbreaks, despite these patients being in early stages of infection, when they
398 were asymptomatic or had likely only recently developed symptoms. Moreover, these sampling events
399 took place in locations where room air changes rates were either known or presumed to be lower than
400 hospital settings. Room ventilation data was obtained by hospital facilities management departments; in
401 many cases, these were measured directly in study rooms, but in other cases, only data from "typical" or
402 similar rooms in the facility were available.

403 Several issues could have affected our ability to capture viable virus beyond close contact. The vast
404 majority of our collections took place in well-ventilated environments, where it is less likely to find
405 aerosols. It remains possible that the act of sample collection (i.e., initial path of virus through size-
406 selective inlet and into sampler) could reduce virus viability, as we could not test this experimentally.
407 However, Lednicky et. al., successfully captured viable SARS-CoV-2 using a similar size selective inlet in
408 similar conditions.[12] Also, if the samplers led to fragmentation of virus, we should have observed
409 relatively large quantities of fragmented RNA, which was not the case. To mitigate this risk, we chose a
410 gelatin filter to collect any virus drawn into the samplers, to maximize viability of the virus. We
411 confirmed through method validation experiments that SARS-CoV-2 viability would be preserved on the
412 gelatin media. Given the low Ct values of viral RNA we observed, it was unlikely we would observe viable
413 virus, as has been observed elsewhere.[13,55] Specifically, Bullard et al. reported that no viral growth
414 was observed when the Ct was greater than 24.[24] It is possible that our airborne sampling degraded
415 virus making the detection of viable virus unlikely, but we confirmed that our samplers preserved the
416 viability of a surrogate virus, and if we captured viable virus that had disintegrated during capture in our
417 samplers, we would expect low Ct values reflecting large amount of fragmented viral RNA.

418 # Conclusions:

419 This study carefully assessed whether infectious SARS-CoV-2 virus is present in indoor air at distances
420 felt to be compatible with aerosol transmission of virus. In generally well-ventilated spaces, we found
421 only low concentrations of viral RNA at >2m distance, and we did not detect viable virus. Concentrations
422 in the air averaged 1202 copies/m^3 and ranged up to 11939 copies/m^3. Previous studies found viable
423 SARS-CoV-2 aerosols in samples with similar RNA concentrations.[12,40]

424 Restricting the sampling to the <2.5µm and <10µm size fractions ensured that only viruses present in
425 aerosols were captured, and provided additional information on the size fractions containing the virus.
426 Together with the field data collection, our method development experiments demonstrate that
427 conventional air sampling equipment (i.e., personal air sampling equipment) may be used for the
428 purpose of virus sampling, with the support and expertise on particle capture from the aerosol sciences,
429 and lab analysis and interpretation from virology and medicine.

430 The information present here on levels of virus in respiratory particles, their presence in aerosols >2
431 metres from patients, and their size, may support infection control measures and PPE guidelines in
432 buildings preparing for re-occupancy, medical facilities, long term care facilities, and other common
433 spaces. Our data are consistent with existing public health guidance to maintain physical distance, wash
434 hands, wear high quality and well-fitted masks, avoid crowded and confined indoor spaces, and ensure
435 indoor spaces are well-ventilated.

436 # Acknowledgements

437 We would like to thank Dr. Kathryn Suh from The Ottawa Hospital, and Lynn Kyte from the Children's
438 Hospital of Eastern Ontario Research Institute for their support, and Health Canada and the Public
439 Health Agency of Canada for funding support.

440 # References

441 (1) Morawska L, Cao J. Airborne transmission of SARS-CoV-2: The world should face the reality. Environ
442 Int 2020:105730.

443 (2) Anderson EL, Turnham P, Griffin JR, Clarke CC. Consideration of the Aerosol Transmission for COVID-
444 19 and Public Health. Risk Analysis 2020.

445 (3) Asadi S, Bouvier N, Wexler A, Ristenpart W. The coronavirus pandemic and aerosols: Does COVID-19
446 transmit via expiratory particles? Aerosol Science and Technology 2020:1-4.

447 (4) World Health Organization (WHO). Roadmap to improve and ensure good indoor ventilation in the
448 context of COVID-19. Geneva: World Health Organization; 2021. Licence: CC BY-NC-SA 3.0 IGO.
449 2021;ISBN 978-92-4-002128-0.

450 (5) World Health Organization (WHO). **Coronavirus disease (COVID-19): How is it transmitted?**. 2020;
451 Available at: https://www.who.int/news-room/q-a-detail/coronavirus-disease-covid-19-how-is-it-
452 transmitted. Accessed May/, 2021.

453 (6) Yang Q, Saldi TK, Lasda E, Decker CJ, Paige CL, Muhlrad DG, et al. Just 2% of SARS-CoV-2-positive
454 individuals carry 90% of the virus circulating in communities. medRxiv 2021.

455 (7) Wells WF. On air-borne infection. Study II. Droplets and droplet nuclei. American Journal of Hygiene
456 1934;20:611-618.

457 (8) Greenhalgh T, Jimenez JL, Prather KA, Tufekci Z, Fisman D, Schooley R. Ten scientific reasons in
458 support of airborne transmission of SARS-CoV-2. The Lancet 2021.

459 (9) Miller SL, Nazaroff WW, Jimenez JL, Boerstra A, Buonanno G, Dancer SJ, et al. Transmission of SARS-
460 CoV-2 by inhalation of respiratory aerosol in the Skagit Valley Chorale superspreading event. Indoor Air
461 2021;31(2):314-323.

462 (10) Fennelly K. Particle sizes of infectious aerosols: implications for infection control.Lancet Respir
463 Med.2020; 8 (9): 914-24 .

464 (11) Liu Y, Ning Z, Chen Y, Guo M, Liu Y, Gali NK, et al. Aerodynamic analysis of SARS-CoV-2 in two
465 Wuhan hospitals. Nature 2020:1-6.

466 (12) Lednicky JA, Lauzardo M, Alam MM, Elbadry MA, Stephenson CJ, C.Gibson J, et al. Isolation of SARS-
467 CoV-2 from the air in a car driven by a COVID patient with mild illness. medRxiv 2021 Cold Spring Harbor
468 Laboratory Press:2021.01.12.21249603.

469 (13) Birgand G, Peiffer-Smadja N, Fournier S, Kerneis S, Lescure F, Lucet J. Assessment of Air
470 Contamination by SARS-CoV-2 in Hospital Settings. JAMA network open 2020;3(12):e2033232-
471 e2033232.

472 (14) Wu Z, Harrich D, Li Z, Hu D, Li D. The unique features of SARS-CoV-2 transmission: Comparison with
473 SARS-CoV, MERS-CoV and 2009 H1N1 pandemic influenza virus. Rev Med Virol 2020:e2171.

474 (15) Prather KA, Wang CC, Schooley RT. Reducing transmission of SARS-CoV-2. Science 2020.

475 (16) Kasloff SB, Leung A, Strong JE, Funk D, Cutts T. Stability of SARS-CoV-2 on critical personal protective
476 equipment. Scientific reports 2021;11(1):1-7.

477 (17) Riddell S, Goldie S, Hill A, Eagles D, Drew TW. The effect of temperature on persistence of SARS-
478 CoV-2 on common surfaces. Virology journal 2020;17(1):1-7.

479 (18) van Doremalen N, Bushmaker T, Morris DH, Holbrook MG, Gamble A, Williamson BN, et al. Aerosol
480 and surface stability of SARS-CoV-2 as compared with SARS-CoV-1. N Engl J Med 2020;382(16):1564-
481 1567.

482 (19) Tellier R, Li Y, Cowling BJ, Tang JW. Recognition of aerosol transmission of infectious agents: a
483 commentary. BMC infectious diseases 2019;19(1):101.

484 (20) Santarpia JL, Rivera DN, Herrera V, Morwitzer MJ, Creager H, Santarpia GW, et al. Transmission
485 potential of SARS-CoV-2 in viral shedding observed at the University of Nebraska Medical Center.
486 MedRxIV 2020.

487 (21) Fang FC, Benson CA, Del Rio C, Edwards KM, Fowler VG, Fredricks DN, et al. COVID-19—Lessons
488 Learned and Questions Remaining. Clinical Infectious Diseases 2020.

489 (22) Miller SL, Nazaroff WW, Jimenez JL, Boerstra A, Buonanno G, Dancer SJ, et al. Transmission of SARS-
490 CoV-2 by inhalation of respiratory aerosol in the Skagit Valley Chorale superspreading event. Indoor Air
491 2020.

492 (23) Gao CX, Li Y, Wei J, Cotton S, Hamilton M, Wang L, et al. Multi-route respiratory infection: when a
493 transmission route may dominate. Sci Total Environ 2021;752:141856.

494 (24) Bullard J, Dust K, Funk D, Strong JE, Alexander D, Garnett L, et al. Predicting infectious SARS-CoV-2
495 from diagnostic samples. Clinical Infectious Diseases 2020.

496 (25) Wilson N, Norton A, Young F, Collins D. Airborne transmission of severe acute respiratory syndrome
497 coronavirusâ€2 to healthcare workers: a narrative review. Anaesthesia 2020.

498 (26) Heneghan C, Spencer EA, Brassey J, Plüddemann A, Onakpoya IJ, Evans D, et al. SARS-CoV-2 and the
499 role of airborne transmission: a systematic review. F1000Research 2021;10(232):232.

500 (27) Engelmann I, Alidjinou EK, Ogiez J, Pagneux Q, Miloudi S, Benhalima I, et al. Preanalytical issues and
501 cycle threshold values in SARS-CoV-2 real-time RT-PCR testing: should test results include these? ACS
502 omega 2021;6(10):6528-6536.

503 (28) Calistri P, Amato L, Puglia I, Cito F, Di Giuseppe A, Danzetta ML, et al. Infection sustained by lineage
504 B. 1.1. 7 of SARS-CoV-2 is characterised by longer persistence and higher viral RNA loads in
505 nasopharyngeal swabs. International Journal of Infectious Diseases 2021;105:753-755.

506 (29) Kissler SM, Fauver JR, Mack C, Tai C, Breban M, Watkins AE, et al. Densely sampled viral trajectories
507 suggest longer duration of acute infection with B. 1.1. 7 variant relative to non-B. 1.1. 7 SARS-CoV-2.
508 medRxiv 2021.

509 (30) Chia PY, Coleman KK, Tan YK, Ong SWX, Gum M, Lau SK, et al. Detection of Air and Surface
510 Contamination by Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) in Hospital Rooms of
511 Infected Patients. medRxiv 2020.

512 (31) Ong SWX, Tan YK, Chia PY, Lee TH, Ng OT, Wong MSY, et al. Air, surface environmental, and
513 personal protective equipment contamination by severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2
514 (SARS-CoV-2) from a symptomatic patient. JAMA 2020;323(16):1610-1612.

515 (32) Dabisch P, Schuit M, Herzog A, Beck K, Wood S, Krause M, et al. The influence of temperature,
516 humidity, and simulated sunlight on the infectivity of SARS-CoV-2 in aerosols. Aerosol Science and
517 Technology 2021;55(2):142-153.

518 (33) Bixler SL, Stefan CP, Jay A, Rossi FD, Ricks KM, Shoemaker CJ, et al. Aerosol Exposure of Cynomolgus
519 Macaques to SARS-CoV-2 Results in More Severe Pathology than Existing Models. bioRxiv 2021.

520 (34) Morawska L, Tang JW, Bahnfleth W, Bluyssen PM, Boerstra A, Buonanno G, et al. How can airborne
521 transmission of COVID-19 indoors be minimised? Environ Int 2020:105832.

522 (35) American Society for Heating, Refrigeration, and Air-Conditioning Engineers. ASHRAE position
523 document on infectious aerosols. 2020.

524 (36) Rogers AA, Baumann RE, Borillo GA, Kagan RM, Batterman HJ, Galdzicka MM, et al. Evaluation of
525 Transport Media and Specimen Transport Conditions for the Detection of SARS-CoV-2 by Use of Real-
526 Time Reverse Transcription-PCR. J Clin Microbiol 2020 Jul 23;58(8):10.1128/JCM.00708-20. Print 2020
527 Jul 23.

528 (37) Chin AWH, Chu JTS, Perera MRA, Hui KPY, Yen HL, Chan MCW, et al. Stability of SARS-CoV-2 in
529 different environmental conditions. Lancet Microbe 2020 May;1(1):e10-5247(20)30003-3. Epub 2020
530 Apr 2.

531 (38) Reed LJ, Muench H. A simple method of estimating fifty per cent endpoints. Am J Epidemiol
532 1938;27(3):493-497.

533 (39) American Society for Testing and Materials. Standard quantitative disk carrier test method for
534 determining the bactericidal, virucidal, fungicidal, mycobactericidal and sporicidal activities of liquid
535 chemical germicides. : ASTM International; 2002.

536 (40) Lednicky JA, Lauzard M, Fan ZH, Jutla A, Tilly TB, Gangwar M, et al. Viable SARS-CoV-2 in the air of a
537 hospital room with COVID-19 patients. International Journal of Infectious Diseases 2020;100:476-482.

538 (41) Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC). Research use only 2019-novel coronavirus (2019-
539 nCoV) real-time rt-pcr primer and probe information. 2020; Available at:
540 https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/lab/rt-pcr-panel-primer-probes.html. Accessed March/25,
541 2021.

542 (42) Corman VM, Landt O, Kaiser M, Molenkamp R, Meijer A, Chu DK, et al. Detection of 2019 novel
543 coronavirus (2019-nCoV) by real-time RT-PCR. Eurosurveillance 2020;25(3):2000045.

544 (43) Worldometers. COVID-19 Coronavirus Pandemic. 2021; Available at:
545 https://www.worldometers.info/coronavirus/. Accessed May/19, 2021.

546 (44) Huang C, Huang L, Wang Y, Li X, Ren L, Gu X, et al. 6-month consequences of COVID-19 in patients
547 discharged from hospital: a cohort study. The Lancet 2021.

548 (45) Tang S, Mao Y, Jones RM, Tan Q, Ji JS, Li N, et al. Aerosol transmission of SARS-CoV-2? Evidence,
549 prevention and control. Environ Int 2020 Nov;144:106039.

550 (46) MacIntyre CR, Ananda-Rajah MR. Scientific evidence supports aerosol transmission of SARS-COV-2.
551 Antimicrobial Resistance & Infection Control 2020;9(1):1-3.

552 (47) Cheng VC, Wong S, Chan VW, So SY, Chen JH, Yip CC, et al. Air and environmental sampling for
553 SARS-CoV-2 around hospitalized patients with coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19). Infection Control &
554 Hospital Epidemiology 2020;41(11):1258-1265.

555 (48) Razzini K, Castrica M, Menchetti L, Maggi L, Negroni L, Orfeo NV, et al. SARS-CoV-2 RNA detection in
556 the air and on surfaces in the COVID-19 ward of a hospital in Milan, Italy. Sci Total Environ
557 2020;742:140540.

558 (49) Santarpia JL, Rivera DN, Herrera VL, Morwitzer MJ, Creager HM, Santarpia GW, et al. Aerosol and
559 surface contamination of SARS-CoV-2 observed in quarantine and isolation care. Scientific reports
560 2020;10(1):1-8.

561 (50) Santarpia JL, Herrera VL, Rivera DN, Ratnesar-Shumate S, Denton PW, Martens JW, et al. The
562 infectious nature of patient-generated SARS-CoV-2 aerosol. MedRxiv 2020.

563 (51) Binder RA, Alarja NA, Robie ER, Kochek KE, Xiu L, Rocha-Melogno L, et al. Environmental and
564 aerosolized severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 among hospitalized coronavirus disease
565 2019 patients. J Infect Dis 2020;222(11):1798-1806.

566 (52) Dumont-Leblond N, Veillette M, Mubareka S, Yip L, Longtin Y, Jouvet P, et al. Low incidence of
567 airborne SARS-CoV-2 in acute care hospital rooms with optimized ventilation. Emerging microbes &
568 infections 2020;9(1):2597-2605.

569 (53) Singanayagam A, Patel M, Charlett A, Bernal JL, Saliba V, Ellis J, et al. Duration of infectiousness and
570 correlation with RT-PCR cycle threshold values in cases of COVID-19, England, January to May 2020.
571 Eurosurveillance 2020;25(32):2001483.

572 (54) Fisman DN, Bogoch I, Lapointe-Shaw L, McCready J, Tuite AR. Risk factors associated with mortality
573 among residents with coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) in long-term care facilities in Ontario,
574 Canada. JAMA network open 2020;3(7):e2015957-e2015957.

575 (55) Bullard J, Funk D, Dust K, Garnett L, Tran K, Bello A, et al. Infectivity of severe acute respiratory
576 syndrome coronavirus 2 in children compared with adults. CMAJ 2021 Apr 26;193(17):E601-E606.

Location	Number of Samples	Mean Air Exchange Rate	Number (%) positive	Mean (SD) Air concentration (copies/M^3) (E target)	Range of air concentrations (copies/M^3) (E target)	Mean (SD) copy number (E target):	Range of copy numbers/mL (E target):	Mean (SD) of Ct value (E target):	Range of Ct values (E target)
ICU	23	12.8	4 (17%)	234.2 (219.0)	74.6 – 551.8	224.8 (210.2)	71.6-529.7	33.0 (1.4)	31.2-34.3
Ward	92	8.4	7 (8%)	139.9 (93.4)	63.8 – 287.5	134.3 (89.6)	61.3-276.0	35.0 (1.2)	33.3-36.89
Long-term care	15	3.85	3 (20%)	4133.7 (6761.8)	92.7 – 11939.9	3968.3 (6491.3)	89.0-11462.3	31.6 (4.1)	27.0-35.0
Correctional Facility	8	n/a	1 (13%)	394.6	n/a	378.9	378.9	32.4	32.4

Table 2a. Positive SARS-CoV-2 RNA samples by room type, including Ct values for E target.

Location	Number of Samples	N target: mean Ct (SD) for positive samples	N target: Ct range for positive samples
ICU	23	35.7 (1.4)	34.3-37.1
Ward	92	36.4 (0.4)	36.0-37.0
Long-term care	15	34.3 (3.9)	30.2-38.0
Correctional Facility	8	35.5	35.5

Table 2b. Positive SARS-CoV-2 RNA samples by room type, including Ct values for N target.

Location	Total number of Collection events	Sampler	Number of samples by sampler type (n)	Number (%) Positive by sampler	Mean Ct for positive samples (E target)	Range of Ct for positive samples (E target):	Mean Ct for positive samples (N target):
ICU		2.5 Micron	11	2 (18%)	32.75	32.75	37.06
	12	10 Micron	1	0	n/a	n/a	n/a
		Coriolis	11	2 (18%)	32.5	31.23-33.77	34.96
Ward		2.5 Micron	49	4 (8%)	35.29	33.71-36.89	36.48
	51	10 Micron	34	3 (9%)	34.60	33.30-35.61	36.23
		Coriolis	9	0	n/a	n/a	n/a
Long-term Care		2.5 Micron	2	0	n/a	n/a	n/a
	15	10 Micron	13	3 (23%)	31.59	27.03-35	34.30
		Coriolis	0	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Correctional		2.5 Micron	4	0	n/a	n/a	n/a a
Facility	8	10 Micron	4	1 (25%)	32.44	32.44	35.47
		Coriolis	0	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

Table 3. SARS-CoV-2 RNA sample results by location, sampler type

	B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)
Air Change Rate	-.039	.128	.090	1	.764	.962
Room Type			3.749	2	.153	
Sampler Type			.238	2	.888	
Constant	-1.096	1.141	.922	1	.337	.334

Table 4. Logistic Regression results showing likelihood of positive RNA by air exchange rate, room type, and sample type.