

1 **Article type:** Rapid Communication

2 **Title:** Monkeypox virus contamination in an office-based workplace environment, England
3 2022.

4 **Authors:** Barry Atkinson^{1*}, Susan Gould^{2*}, Antony Spencer¹, Okechukwu Onianwa¹, Jenna
5 Furneaux³, James Grieves¹, Sian Summers⁴, Tim Crocker-Buqué⁵, Tom Fletcher², Allan M
6 Bennett¹ and Jake Dunning⁶.

7 **Affiliated addresses:**

8 ¹Research and Evaluation, UK Health Security Agency, Porton Down, Salisbury, UK.

9 ²Department of Clinical Sciences, Liverpool School of Tropical Medicine, Liverpool, UK.

10 ³Rare and Imported Pathogens Laboratory, UK Health Security Agency, Porton Down,
11 Salisbury, UK.

12 ⁴High Containment Microbiology, UK Health Security Agency, Porton Down, Salisbury, UK.

13 ⁵Faculty of Public Health and Policy, London School Hygiene and Tropical Medicine, London,
14 UK.

15 ⁶NIHR Health Protection Research Unit in Emerging and Zoonotic Infections, Pandemic
16 Sciences Institute, University of Oxford, Oxford, UK.

17 * These authors contributed equally to this work and share first authorship.

18 **Correspondence:** Barry Atkinson (barry.atkinson@ukhsa.gov.uk).

19 **Key words:** Monkeypox; Monkeypox virus; Sampling Studies; Communicable Diseases,
20 Imported; Communicable Diseases, Emerging.

21

22 **Statements**

23 Funding: This work was funded by UKHSA Grant in Aid funding and the NIHR Health
24 Protection Research Unit in Emerging and Zoonotic Infections. The funding source had no
25 involvement in study design; in the collection, analysis and interpretation of data; in the
26 writing of the report; or in the decision to submit the article for publication. JD is supported
27 by the Moh Foundation.

28 Competing interests: None declared.

29 Ethical approval: The investigations performed were a component of the urgent public
30 health investigation performed as part of UKHSA's public health incident response to cases
31 of a high consequence infectious disease in the UK. UKHSA is the national health security
32 agency for England and an executive agency of the UK Government's Department of Health
33 and Social Care. The study protocol was subject to internal review by the Research Ethics
34 and Governance Group, which is the UKHSA Research Ethics Committee, and was granted
35 full approval.

36 **Word Count: Abstract = 49; Text = 995**

37 **Abstract**

38 In May 2022, an office worker attended their place of work while experiencing prodromal
39 symptoms of monkeypox infection. Environmental sampling performed four days later
40 identified only low levels of monkeypox virus DNA contamination of the worker's desk, and
41 no contamination elsewhere within the office. Replication-competent virus was not
42 identified.

43

44 **[Untitled Introduction]**

45 More than 16,000 cases of monkeypox have been reported globally in 2022, predominately
46 in non-endemic countries (1). Although transmission in the current outbreak is typically via
47 prolonged direct contact with confirmed cases (2), infection-competent monkeypox virus
48 (MPXV) has been recovered from contaminated environments multiple days after last
49 occupancy (3) raising the potential for fomite transmission. In addition, prolonged close
50 contact such as working in an open-plan office could result in respiratory droplet
51 transmission of MPXV (4,5).

52

53 **Sampling Location**

54 In May 2022, an individual working in a non-clinical role in an administrative office within a
55 hospital acquired MPXV infection following non-occupational exposure. The individual
56 worked in a 15-desk open-plan office for one working day following onset of a mild,
57 influenza-like illness, and took steps to reduce mixing and avoid close contact with others.

58 Several COVID-19 control measures were still implemented within this office including a
59 requirement to wear medical masks and regular hand hygiene. In addition, this office had
60 permanent partitions between desk spaces, approximately 1.2 metres high. The individual
61 reported that monkeypox skin lesions appeared two days after taking sickness absence and
62 at that point the office was closed to all staff, pending a risk assessment and risk
63 management plan. 17 staff contacts were identified, including six category 2 and four
64 category 1 contacts according to UKHSA contact categorisation (6); four of these individuals
65 accepted post-exposure prophylaxis with Imvanex[®] vaccine when it was offered according
66 to UKHSA guidelines. No contacts developed symptoms consistent with monkeypox during
67 their 21-day monitoring periods.

68 A decision was made to perform cleaning and decontamination of the office given its
69 location within a healthcare facility and due to the environmental stability of orthopox
70 viruses. This was performed by professional decontamination staff following a protocol used
71 during previous monkeypox outbreaks (7). All papers, disposable items, and anything that
72 could not be decontaminated per protocol were removed as waste. Surface activator was
73 applied to all hard surfaces followed by 1000ppm hypochlorite solution that was allowed to
74 air dry. Soft surfaces were decontaminated by mechanical vacuuming with HEPA filtration,
75 followed by steam cleaning. The hospital performed a final decontamination of the office
76 using hydrogen peroxide vapour (Bioquell BQ-50 with 35% hydrogen peroxide solution).

77

78 **Environmental Sampling**

79 Prior to decontamination, environmental sampling was performed to identify MPXV
80 contamination. Sampling was performed four days after the case was last in the office and
81 two days after the office was closed to all staff. Surface samples were collected from non-
82 porous surfaces such as desks and telephones using Copan UTM® swabs, and from porous
83 surfaces such as carpets and chair seats using the Sartorius MD8 Airport with gelatine filters.
84 In addition, SKC wearable samplers were utilised during the sample collection process to
85 measure any re-aerosolisation of MPXV. All samples were processed as previously described
86 (8) and analysed for the presence of MPXV DNA using rRT-PCR as previously reported (3,9).

87

88 **Monkeypox Virus Contamination**

89 Only 3/34 surface samples were positive for the presence of MPXV DNA with all positive
90 samples returning crossing threshold (Ct) values above 34 cycles indicating low-level
91 contamination (Figure 1). All three positive samples were from the case's desk area
92 including their telephone (Ct 37.7), keyboard (Ct 36.9) and a 10x10cm area of their desk (Ct
93 34.3). Five other surface samples collected from the case's desk were negative for MPXV
94 DNA including chair armrest, desk partition and computer mouse, as were 26 surface
95 samples collected from other desks and high-touch areas throughout the office. All non-
96 porous samples were negative for MPXV DNA, as were both wearable air samples.

97 Virus isolation was attempted on the Ct 34.3 positive desk sample using a previously
98 described method (8); no evidence of replicating virus or cytopathic effect was observed
99 after 10 days of monitoring.

100

101 **Conclusions**

102 Environmental sampling performed in an open-plan office that had been occupied by a
103 person with monkeypox during their first 24 hours of illness identified low-level MPXV DNA
104 contamination localised to their immediate desk area. Attempts to isolate virus from the
105 most positive sample (Ct 34.4) were unsuccessful, suggesting the absence of replication-
106 competent virus. As sampling was performed four days after occupancy by the infected
107 individual, it is possible that some level of DNA or viral degradation occurred prior to
108 sampling, although the office was windowless (minimising UV light degradation), the office
109 was not cleaned prior to sampling, and MPXV is known to be environmentally stable.

110 It is notable that the patient reported their skin lesions only emerged after they had taken
111 leave from work due to illness, raising the possibility that the MPXV DNA detected on their
112 desk may have come from respiratory secretions through droplets or contaminated hands. If
113 so, and while we do not know the amount of time that the individual's medical mask
114 remained in place, it is possible that the use of the medical mask may have reduced
115 environmental contamination by respiratory droplets containing virus. Unfortunately, the
116 individual's disposable medical mask was not retained and therefore could not be tested for
117 the presence of MPXV DNA.

118 Although this office may be similar to other offices in design, our findings should be seen as
119 context-specific, including the fact that the individual worked only during the early
120 'prodromal' phase of their monkeypox illness, several COVID-19 measures were still in place
121 including a requirement to wear medical masks, and physical partitions were present
122 between desk spaces. The limited detection of MPXV DNA and absence of secondary cases
123 do not demonstrate that cleaning is unnecessary in an office where an infected person has

124 worked, or that focussed cleaning of an infected person’s desk area is all that is required. In
125 the absence of reliable, real-time environmental sampling to inform decontamination, and
126 the fact that the office was within a hospital, our detection of environmental MPXV DNA
127 supports the decision made to remediate the entire office. These data confirm that MPXV
128 contamination can occur in workplace environments occupied by a person with early
129 monkeypox illness and, accordingly, appropriate cleaning and decontamination measures
130 should be considered in such situations.

131

132 **Acknowledgments**

133 The authors wish to acknowledge Ambipar Response Ltd for providing information on their
134 decontamination process.

135

136 **Authors’ contributions:**

137 Conceptualisation and methodology: BA, SG, TF, AMB and JD.

138 Investigation: BA, SG, T-CB and JD.

139 Formal analysis: BA, AS, OO, JF, JG and SS.

140 Writing – original draft: BA, SG, TF, AMB and JD.

141 Writing – review and editing: All authors.

142

143 **Disclosure Statement**

144 This report contains work supported by UKHSA Grant-in-Aid. The contents of this paper,
145 including any opinions and/or conclusions expressed, are those of the authors alone and do
146 not necessarily reflect UK Health Security Agency policy.

147

148 **Figure legend**

149 **Figure 1:** Diagrammatic representation of the office environment associated with a
150 confirmed case of monkeypox. Blue lines represent permanent office structures such as
151 walls and office door; purple lines represent desk partitions (wooden partitions
152 approximately 1.2 metres high enclosing work desks). Ct = crossing threshold value of MPXV
153 DNA detected in sample.

154

155 **References**

- 156 1. WHO. Multi-country outbreak of monkeypox, External situation report #2 - 25 July 2022
157 [Internet]. 2022 [cited 2022 Jul 26]. Available from:
158 [https://www.who.int/publications/m/item/multi-country-outbreak-of-monkeypox--](https://www.who.int/publications/m/item/multi-country-outbreak-of-monkeypox--external-situation-report--2---25-july-2022)
159 [external-situation-report--2---25-july-2022](https://www.who.int/publications/m/item/multi-country-outbreak-of-monkeypox--external-situation-report--2---25-july-2022)
- 160 2. Cohen. Monkeypox outbreak questions intensify as cases soar | Science | AAAS
161 [Internet]. 2022 [cited 2022 Jun 1]. Available from:
162 [https://www.science.org/content/article/monkeypox-outbreak-questions-intensify-](https://www.science.org/content/article/monkeypox-outbreak-questions-intensify-cases-soar)
163 [cases-soar](https://www.science.org/content/article/monkeypox-outbreak-questions-intensify-cases-soar)
- 164 3. Atkinson B, Burton C, Pottage T, Thompson K-A, Ngabo D, Crook A, et al. Infection-
165 competent monkeypox virus contamination identified in domestic settings following an
166 imported case of monkeypox into the UK. *Environ Microbiol*. 2022 Jul 15;
- 167 4. Ježek Z, Grab B, Szczeniowski MV, Paluku KM, Mutombo M. Human monkeypox:
168 secondary attack rates. *Bull World Health Organ*. 1988;66(4):465–70.
- 169 5. Hutson CL, Carroll DS, Gallardo-Romero N, Weiss S, Clemmons C, Hughes CM, et al.
170 Monkeypox disease transmission in an experimental setting: prairie dog animal model.
171 *PLoS One*. 2011;6(12):e28295.
- 172 6. UKHSA. Monkeypox: contact tracing [Internet]. GOV.UK. [cited 2022 Jul 26]. Available
173 from: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/monkeypox-contact-tracing>
- 174 7. Public Health England. Monkeypox: Guidance for environmental cleaning and
175 decontamination - version 4.
176 [https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachm](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/746086/Monkeypox_Guidance__cleaning_decontamination.pdf)
177 [ent_data/file/746086/Monkeypox_Guidance__cleaning_decontamination.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/746086/Monkeypox_Guidance__cleaning_decontamination.pdf)
178 [Internet]. Public Health England; 2018. Available from:
179 [https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachm](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/746086/Monkeypox_Guidance__cleaning_decontamination.pdf)
180 [ent_data/file/746086/Monkeypox_Guidance__cleaning_decontamination.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/746086/Monkeypox_Guidance__cleaning_decontamination.pdf)
- 181 8. Gould S, Atkinson B, Onianwa O, Spencer A, Furneaux J, Grieves J, et al. Air and surface
182 sampling for monkeypox virus in UK hospitals. *medRxiv*. 2022 Jul
183 21;2022.07.21.22277864.
- 184 9. Li Y, Zhao H, Wilkins K, Hughes C, Damon IK. Real-time PCR assays for the specific
185 detection of monkeypox virus West African and Congo Basin strain DNA. *J Virol*
186 *Methods*. 2010 Oct;169(1):223–7.

187

188

