1 2 2	Nasopharyngeal Angiotensin Converting Enzyme 2 (ACE2) Expression as a Risk-Factor for SARS-CoV-2 Transmission in Concurrent Hospital Associated Outbreaks				
3 4 5 6	Aidan M. Nikiforuk ^{1,4} , Kevin S. Kuchinski ^{1,2} , Katy Short ³ , Susan Roman ³ , Mike A. Irvine ¹ , Natalie Prystajecky ^{1,2} , Agatha N. Jassem ^{1,2} , David M. Patrick ^{1,4} and Inna Sekirov ^{1,2}				
7	¹ British Columbia Centre for Disease Control, Vancouver, BC V5Z 4R4, Canada				
8	² Department of Pathology and Laboratory Medicine, University of British Columbia,				
9	Vancouver, BC V6T 1Z4, Canada				
10	³ Fraser Health Authority, New Westminster, BC V3L 3C2, Canada				
11	⁴ School of Population and Public Health, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, BC V6T				
12	1Z4, Canada				
13	⁵ Faculty of Health Sciences, Simon Fraser University, Burnaby, BC V5A 1S6, Canada				
14 15	Abstract:				
16	Background: Widespread human-to-human transmission of the severe acute respiratory				
17	syndrome coronavirus two (SARS-CoV-2) stems from a strong affinity for the cellular receptor				
18	angiotensin converting enzyme two (ACE2). We investigate the relationship between a patient's				
19	nasopharyngeal ACE2 transcription and secondary transmission within a series of concurrent				
20	hospital associated SARS-CoV-2 outbreaks in British Columbia, Canada.				
21	Methods: Epidemiological case data from the outbreak investigations was merged with public				
22	health laboratory records and viral lineage calls, from whole genome sequencing, to reconstruct				
23	the concurrent outbreaks using infection tracing transmission network analysis. ACE2				
24	transcription and RNA viral load were measured by quantitative real-time polymerase chain				
25	reaction. The transmission network was resolved to calculate the number of potential secondary				
26	cases. Bivariate and multivariable analyses using Poisson and Negative Binomial regression				
27	models was performed to estimate the association between ACE2 transcription the number of				

28 SARS-CoV-2 secondary cases.

29	<i>Results</i> : The infection tracing transmission network provided $n = 76$ potential transmission
30	events across $n = 103$ cases. Bivariate comparisons found that on average ACE2 transcription did
31	not differ between patients and healthcare workers (P = 0.86). High ACE2 transcription was
32	observed in 98.6% of transmission events, either the primary or secondary case had above
33	average ACE2. Multivariable analysis found that the association between ACE2 transcription and
34	the number of secondary transmission events differs between patients and healthcare workers. In
35	health care workers Negative Binomial regression estimated that a one unit change in ACE2
36	transcription decreases the number of secondary cases ($B = -0.132$ (95%CI: -0.255 to -0.0181)
37	adjusting for RNA viral load. Conversely, in patients a one unit change in ACE2 transcription
38	increases the number of secondary cases ($B = 0.187$ (95% CI: 0.0101 to 0.370) adjusting for
39	RNA viral load. Sensitivity analysis found no significant relationship between ACE2 and
40	secondary transmission in health care workers and confirmed the positive association among
41	patients.
42	Conclusion: Our study suggests that ACE2 transcription has a positive association with SARS-
43	CoV-2 secondary transmission in admitted inpatients, but not health care workers in concurrent
44	hospital associated outbreaks, and it should be further investigated as a risk-factor for viral
45	transmission.
46 47 48 49	Keywords: ACE2, SARS-CoV-2, Infection Tracing, Transmission Network, Outbreak Investigation, Multivariable Analysis, Poisson Regression Model, Negative Binomial Regression
50 51	Introduction: The severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) causes potentially
52	life threatening lower respiratory and systemic inflammatory disease defined as COVID-19[1–3].
53	SARS-CoV-2 has spread widely since late 2019 causing a global pandemic. Two previous public

54 health emergencies have provided the opportunity to study human-to-human transmission of 55 pathogenic coronaviruses. In 2003, the severe acute respiratory syndrome emerged infecting 56 eight-thousand four-hundred and twenty-two people [4]. In 2012 and 2015 the Middle East 57 respiratory syndrome coronavirus (MERS-CoV) caused epidemics in the Kingdom of Saudi 58 Arabia and South Korea with two-thousand five hundred and sixty-two laboratory confirmed 59 cases reported to the World Health Organization [5]. SARS- and MERS-CoV spread 60 predominately in health care settings and community spread was controlled by public health 61 interventions or self-limited [4,5]. The transmission pattern of SARS-CoV-2 contrasts that of the 62 other pathogenic coronaviruses (SARS-CoV and MERS-CoV). SARS-CoV-2 has predominately 63 spread within the community, the virus has evolved to become more infectious over time and 64 vaccination does not protect against re-infection or transmission of newer strains [6]. 65 Transmission of respiratory viruses like SARS-CoV-2 involves a complex interplay of social, 66 environmental, and biological variables[7]. Numerous observational studies have described risk 67 factors of SARS-CoV-2 transmission across a variety of settings including hospitals[8], 68 households[9], and schools[10,11]. Cumulative evidence suggests that the increased human-to-69 human transmissibility of SARS-CoV-2 in comparison to SARS-CoV stems from stronger 70 affinity for the primary host receptor angiotensin converting enzyme 2 (ACE2)[12–14]. SARS-71 CoV-2 binds to ACE2 through its spike glycoprotein, the spike protein undergoes proteolytic 72 cleavage before binding with ACE2 prompting endocytosis and membrane fusion[13]. The 73 Omicron variant of SARS-CoV-2 has a stronger affinity for ACE2 and less reliance on host 74 proteases biasing cell entry towards endocytosis, consequently less cell fusion and syncytia 75 formation occurs[15]. ACE2 is highly expressed in the upper and lower respiratory tract, 76 upregulation may occur in response to stimulation with interferon [16]. SARS-CoV-2 exploits

77 upregulation of ACE2 in an interferon rich environment (like the early stages of an innate 78 immune response) to spread from cell-to-cell producing a high viral titre[17]. In the later stages 79 of replication, SARS-CoV-2 downregulates ACE2, preventing any benefits to the host mediated 80 by interferon stimulated upregulation[18,19]. SARS-CoV-2 has a shifting relationship with 81 ACE2 and like viral load, ACE2 expression fluctuates through the course of viral infection[20– 82 22]. Regardless, SARS-CoV-2 replicates most efficiently in tissues rich with ACE2, the strong 83 positive association between viral load and ACE2 expression at the time of diagnostic testing 84 increase the degree of viral shedding and thereby, the risk of ongoing transmission [23]. 85 To understand the role of ACE2 expression in SARS-CoV-2 transmission, we conducted 86 an infection tracing network analysis of positive testers in concurrent, single-site, hospital 87 associated COVID-19 outbreaks in British Columbia during late 2020 and early 2021. The study 88 aims to: (i) describe the outbreaks in context of person, place, and time, (ii) visualize an infection 89 tracing transmission network to infer the number of secondary cases per primary case and (iii) 90 quantify the relationship between the number of potential secondary cases (outcome) and 91 nasopharyngeal transcription of transmembrane ACE2 (exposure) while adjusting for viral RNA 92 load, and interaction by case designation (patient or healthcare worker). We build from previous 93 work which demonstrated no relationship between transmembrane nasopharyngeal ACE2 94 transcription and age, biological sex or TMPRSS2 transcription in a sample of COVID-19 95 negative persons[23]. This study contributes novel evidence of how nasopharyngeal ACE2 96 transcription may drive SARS-CoV-2 transmission and highlights the potential role of 97 respiratory masks and infection prevention and control measures in limiting the viruses' 98 nosocomial spread.

100 Methods:

101 Study Design and Participants:

102 We conducted surveillance for COVID-19 cases in a British Columbian hospital over a 103 series of outbreaks, from declaration of the first facility associated outbreak on 07-11-2020 to the 104 date the last outbreak was declared over on 04-01-2021 (dd-mm-yyyy). Participants included 105 patients and health care workers who tested positive for COVID-19 upon self-reporting or 106 showing indicative symptoms (e.g. fever, fatigue, cough and loss of taste or smell) or through 107 asymptomatic point prevalence testing during the outbreak investigations. Inclusion criteria were 108 applied to select study participants whose diagnostic specimens were tested centrally at the 109 British Columbia Center for Disease Control Public Health Laboratory, underwent SARS-CoV-2 110 whole genome sequencing, and had adequate remaining volume of nucleic acid extract to assay 111 ACE2 transcription. In the case that a participant was tested for COVID-19 more than once, their 112 first diagnostic specimen from the study period was sampled. Participants who met the inclusion 113 criteria (n = 202) were excluded from the study if their specimen collection container was not 114 identifiable (n = 22), whole genome sequencing failed and was not able to classify the viral 115 lineage (n = 63) or ACE2 transcription was unmeasurable (n = 14) (Figure S1). An analytic 116 dataset of n = 103 participants was used for analysis. Demographic variables of age, biological 117 sex, case description (patient or health care worker) and site of infection/ site of transmission 118 (hospital unit) were drawn from public health laboratory data or the outbreak report of the 119 investigating epidemiologist. Outbreaks were defined by the presence of one or more confirmed 120 cases of COVID-19 which were epidemiologically linked within hospital units (Table S3). The 121 laboratory procedures were performed in a laboratory accredited by the College of American

Pathologists and BC's Diagnostic Accreditation Program using validated RT-qPCR and wholegenome sequencing protocols[24–26].

124

125 *Ethics Statement:*

Ethical approval for the study was sought from the University of British Columbia human ethics board (#H20-01110) which was harmonized with the Fraser Health Authority. Written informed consent was not required. All data was de-identified prior to analysis and the results were not linked back to any identifying records. This study was deemed as minimal risk to the participants involved. To ensure privacy the site of the outbreak series will not be disclosed.

131

132 *Procedures:*

Participant's diagnostic specimens were collected by nasopharyngeal swab and stored in 133 Universal Transport MediumTM (UTM[®]) (COPAN) and stored at $4 \square C$ before RNA extraction. 134 RNA extraction was performed on the MagMAX-96TM platform with the Viral RNA isolation kit 135 136 (ThermoFisher). Host and viral gene transcription was assayed by quantitative real-time polymerase chain reaction (RT-qPCR) on the Applied Biosystems 7500 Real-Time PCR 137 138 platform using TaqMan FastVirus 1-step polymerase (ThermoFisher). Reaction volumes were 20 139 μ , with 5 μ of RNA template, 1 μ of 20X primer/probe, 5 μ FastVirus and 9 μ of nuclease free 140 water. Cycling conditions were set to: $50 \square C$ for 5min, $95 \square C$ for 20s followed by 40 cycles of 141 $95 \square C$ for 15s and $60 \square C$ for 1 min. As previously described, multiplex RT-qPCR reactions were 142 used to detect host (ACE2, GAPDH, RNaseP) and viral (E gene) transcription[27]. Participants 143 were diagnosed COVID-19 positive with an E gene cycle threshold value < 38 and a RNaseP 144 gene cycle threshold value < 40. The E gene Ct values were transformed to genome equivalents

145	per millilitre using a standard curve of SARS-CoV-2 synthetic RNA (MN908947.3) (Twist
146	Bioscience)[23]. Relative gene transcription for ACE2 was calculated in proportion to the
147	control gene <i>GAPDH</i> using the $2^{-\Delta\Delta Ct}$ method[28]. SARS-CoV-2 whole genome sequencing was
148	performed on all diagnostic specimens which tested positive for SARS-CoV-2 by RT-qPCR.
149	Viral genomes were amplified using a 1200bp amplicon scheme and sequenced on an Illumina
150	NextSeq instrument[24]. Genome assembly was performed via a modified ARTIC Nextflow
151	pipeline[29]. Quality control did not pass any genomes with < 85% completeness or < 10X depth
152	of coverage. Viral lineages were assigned using the PANGOLIN tool (Version 1.15.1)[30]. All
153	molecular and genomic testing was performed at the BCCDC-PHL.
154	
155	Variable Definition:
156	Demographic variables of interest were drawn from public health laboratory data, or the
157	outbreak reports provided by the investigating epidemiologist. The measures included in the
158	study are age, biological sex, case description, diagnostic specimen collection date (dd-mm-
159	yyyy), SARS-CoV-2 E gene cycle-threshold (Ct) value, ACE2 gene transcription, SARS-CoV-2
160	lineage (PANGO lineage), site of transmission (hospital unit) and site of infection (hospital unit).
161	Age, <i>E</i> gene Ct value (transformed to log10 GE/mL[23]) and <i>ACE2</i> gene transcription are
162	continuous numeric variables. Biological sex, case description, viral lineage, collection date and
163	site of transmission/infections are categorical variables. We assumed that collection date equals
164	date of symptom onset for this study because once the hospital declared an outbreak, patients and
165	health care workers were required to be tested at the onset of symptoms. ACE2 gene
166	transcription was transformed to a categorical value using the mean transcription value (X \square =
167	0.00, $SD = 1.08$) of COVID-19 negative testers, from a previous study which collected a random

168 sample of n = 212 nasopharyngeal specimens in British Columbia during 2020[23]. The number 169 of potential secondary cases per primary case was determined by infection tracing transmission 170 network analysis. ACE2 gene transcription and number of potential secondary cases are the 171 exposure and outcome of interest. Viral load and case description were included in multivariable 172 analysis because, they meet the definition of a confounder and are a common cause of the 173 exposure (ACE2 gene transcription) and outcome (number of secondary cases)[31]. Viral load 174 and ACE2 gene transcription share a strong positive association, people with high ACE2 gene 175 transcription were found to have high viral loads[32]. Viral load relates to transmission in that 176 people with high viral loads may shed more infectious virus[33,34]. Case description (patient or 177 healthcare worker) relates to ACE2 gene transcription because patients may have comorbidities 178 or receive medications which affect ACE2 transcription[35]. Health care workers have additional 179 social connections relative to in-patients, as they can leave work and be exposed to SARS-CoV-2 180 outside of clinical areas or in the community[8].

181

182 Statistical Analysis:

183

184 <u>Descriptive Statistics:</u>

The analytic data (n = 103) was used for bivariate analysis. The variables of interest were stratified by case description and categorical *ACE2* transcription. An epidemiological curve was visualized for the series of concurrent hospital outbreaks from 07-11-2020 to 04-01-2021 (ddmm-yyyy). Parametric statistical tests were used given the large sample size of our study[36].

191 Infection Tracing Network Analysis:

192 A matrix of all possible transmission pairs was permuted using SARS-CoV-2 lineage 193 classifications, for two cases to form a pair they had to share the same lineage. SARS-CoV-2 194 lineages circulating in the hospital were diverse enough that the minimal difference of single 195 nucleotide polymorphisms between them was unlikely to have occurred by mutation during a 196 single transmission event, suggestion multiple independent introductions (Table S4). Four 197 assumptions (i-iv) were used to select potential transmission pairs from all possible 198 permutations. The first assumption (i) stipulated that specimen collection date (symptom onset 199 date) of the primary case was before that of the secondary case. The second assumption (ii) 200 affirms that the primary case's unit of transmission equals the secondary case's unit of infection. 201 The third assumption (ii) holds that the collection date of the secondary case is at least one-serial 202 interval (5 days) from that of the primary case[37]. The fourth assumption (iv) dictates that the 203 collection date of the secondary case is not more than three-serial intervals (15 days) from the 204 primary case[38]. Potential transmission pairs, which met the four-assumptions, were stratified 205 by categorical ACE2 transcription (High/Low) or viral lineage and plotted overtime.

206

207 Primary Analysis:

Multivariable analysis was performed to estimate the relationship between *ACE2* transcription and number of secondary cases using a Poisson generalized linear regression model. Variable importance was assessed conceptually using the common cause criterion and statistically by the partial F-test. Collinearity was measured using the variable inflation factor, variables with a value greater than five were excluded[39]. Effect modification terms were included if they were statistically significant and supported conceptually. The two assumptions

214	of Poisson models; overdispersion and zero inflation were checked using a ratio of residual				
215	deviance to degrees of freedom (theta)[40] and the score test[41], respectively. If the specified				
216	Poisson model failed to meet either of these assumptions than an alternative quasi-Poisson or				
217	Negative Binomial (NB) model was tested, and the assumptions re-examined. Model fit was				
218	measured by the Akaike information criterion[42].				
219					
220	Sensitivity Analysis:				
221	Sensitivity analysis was performed to measure the impact of assumptions (ii, iii and iv)				
222	used to construct the transmission network on the relationship between ACE2 transcription and				
223	number of secondary cases. The assumptions were excluded independently, and the transmission				
224	network was iteratively reconstructed with (n-1) assumptions. Additionally, the fourth				
225	assumption (iv) was challenged by changing the infectious period from 15 days (three serial				
226	intervals) to 10 days (two serial intervals). The number of secondary cases was computed for				
227	each transmission network and used in multivariable analysis.				
228	Statistical analysis was performed in R version 4.04 using the packages: readxl,				
229	tidyverse, dataexplorer, ggpubr, car, ggsci, stringr, tableone, rio, remotes, lubridate, dplyr,				
230	epicontacts, AER, devtools, rlang, DHARMa, MASS, pscl, epiR, EpiCurve[43].				
231					
232	Results:				
233	Descriptive Statistics:				
234	The analytic dataset contains ($n = 103$) cases of COVID-19 associated with a single-site				
235	concurrent series of hospital outbreaks from 07-11-2020 to 04-01-2021 (dd-mm-yyyy) in British				
236	Columbia, Canada. Participant characteristics are displayed in Table 1, where the variables of				

237	interest are stratified by case description (Patients or Health Care Workers) (Table 1). The
238	bivariate relationship between variables and categorical ACE2 transcription was also investigated
239	(Table S1). Most cases occurred in patients $n = 57$ (55%), while $n = 48$ infections were observed
240	in health care workers (45%). The mean age of patients associated with the hospital outbreaks
241	was 78.61 years, health care workers were significantly younger with a mean age of 41.11 years
242	(P < 0.001). Most of the healthcare workers $(n = 41, 89%)$ and patients were biologic females $(n = 41, 89%)$
243	= 33, 58%). ACE2 transcription and viral load did not differ between case descriptions ($P = 0.86$,
244	P = 0.30). Six SARS-CoV-2 lineages were characterized by whole genome sequencing, two of
245	which did not have more than one case (B.1.128 and B.1.36.38). The highest proportion of
246	observed SARS-CoV-2 infections were either SARS-CoV-2 lineage AL.1 ($n = 56$) or B.1.2 ($n = 66$) or B.1.
247	40) (Table 1), these two lineages have at least a five SNP difference between them (Table S4).
248	
249	An epidemiological curve was made to show the incidence of positive testers per week
250	over the course of the hospital associate outbreaks. The outbreaks spanned ten epidemiological
251	weeks (Week-#45-2020 to Week-#1-2021) and possesses a non-normal distribution (Figure 1A

control practices implemented during the outbreaks (like point prevalence testing and stoppage

& B). We are cautious to directly interpret the incidence curve as infection prevention and

252

of admissions) likely biases the observed incidence of SARS-CoV-2 cases overtime. A first peak

in cases occurred on Week #46-2020 and a second on Week #52-2020. In the first phase of the

256 outbreaks, many cases occurred on the second floor of the hospital in units 2A, 2B and 2C. Later

- transmission was predominately observed on floors four or five in units 4B, 4C, 4D and 5A
- 258 (Figure 1A). Multiple introductions of SARS-CoV-2 into the hospital environment occurred over
- the surveillance period; however, timely and effective infection prevention and control measures

limited transmission of several variants like B.1.36.38, B.1.128 and B.1.279 (Table S3, FigureS2).

262

263 <u>Transmission Network:</u>

264	Permuting all possible transmission pairs in which the primary and secondary case share
265	the same SARS-CoV-2 lineage yielded $n = 9389$ combinations. Applying the first assumption (i)
266	filtered the possible transmission pairs to $n = 2167$. The second assumption (ii) eliminated
267	another $n = 1480$ possible pairs for a total of $n = 687$. The third and fourth assumptions restricted
268	the possible pairs to $n = 382$ and $n = 76$, respectively. A directed transmission network was
269	constructed from $n = 103$ cases with $n = 76$ contacts. The network captures $n = 55$ transmission
270	events for viral lineage AL.1 and $n = 39$ for B.1.2; transmission of the other viral lineages was
271	either too low (only one case reported) or did not meet the assumption criteria (Figure 2B). The
272	nodes of the transmission network are shown stratified by categorical ACE2 transcription level
273	(Low or High) (Figure 2A). The distribution of ACE2 transcription among hospital associated
274	cases was tested with a single sample proportion test, 82% of cases had above average ACE2
275	transcription (84/103, P<0.001). Transmission pairs were further stratified into primary ($n = 34$)
276	and secondary cases (n = 28). Primary cases possessed predominately high $ACE2$ transcription
277	(29/34, P< 0.001). ACE2 transcription was similarly enriched in secondary cases (23/28,
278	P<0.01). Overall, 98.6% of transmission events involved at least one case with high ACE2
279	transcription (Table S2).
280	

282 <u>Primary Analysis:</u>

283	Multivariable NB regression estimated that a one-unit change in ACE2 transcription
284	decreases the number of secondary cases in health care workers by -0.13 (95%CI: -0.255 to -
285	0.0181) adjusting for RNA viral load and case description (Table 2). Effect modification was
286	observed between ACE2 transcription and case description; in patients, a one-unit change in
287	ACE2 increased the number of secondary cases by 0.187 (95% CI: 0.0101 to 0.370). Therefore, a
288	5 unit increase in ACE2 transcription may lead to approximately one more SARS-CoV-2
289	secondary case per primary patient case. Poisson and quasi-Poisson regression models were
290	constructed using the same variables, neither provided a better fit to the NB option (Table 2).
291	
292	Sensitivity Analysis:
293	A sensitivity analysis was performed to measure the impact of assumptions ii, iii and iv
294	on construction of the transmission network and number of secondary cases. The first
295	assumption- that the symptom onset date of the primary case occurs before the secondary case-
296	was not included in the sensitivity analysis, as breaking this assumption would make the
297	secondary case the primary case. Omission of the second assumption (ii), so that the primary
298	case did not share a hospital unit with the secondary case, increased the number of possible
299	transmission pairs to $n = 538$ (Figure S3). The network was not clearly resolved and no
300	significant relationship between ACE2 transcription and the number of secondary cases was
301	estimated using a Poisson (B= -0.17 [95%CI: -0.903 to 0.558], $P = 0.64$) or NB regression model
302	(B = -0.01 [95%CI: -0.082 to 0.0613], P = 0.8) (Figure 3). Both models had a worse fit then
303	when used in the primary analysis (Poisson _{AIC} = 705 and NB _{AIC} = 691). Leaving out the third
304	assumption (iii), to appreciate that the secondary case could have been infected in less time than

305 the average serial interval, increased the number of possible transmission pairs to n = 246 (Figure 306 S4). A significant relationship between ACE2 transcription and the number of secondary cases 307 was estimated using a Poisson (B = -0.60 [95%CI: -1.08 to -0.125], P = 0.015) and NB 308 regression model (B = -0.11 [95%CI: -0.215 to -0.0189], P = 0.03) (Figure 3). However, neither 309 model fit better then when used in the primary analysis (Poisson_{AIC} = 618 and NB_{AIC} = 551). Re-310 analysis without the fourth assumption that the infectious period of SARS-CoV-2 does not 311 eclipse 15 days increased the possible transmission pairs to n = 158 (Figure S5), no significant 312 relationship between ACE2 transcription and the number of secondary cases was estimated using 313 a Poisson (B = 0.0143 [95%CI: -0.284 to 0.313], P = 0.64) or NB regression model (B = 3.90 x 314 10^{-3} [95%CI: -0.0849 to 0.0911], P = 0.8) (Figure 3). Additionally, assumption four (iv) was 315 challenged by decreasing the infectious period to 9.5 days or ~ 2 serial intervals (Figure S6, 316 transmission pairs n = 48). Applying a shorter infectious period provided the following estimates 317 using a Poisson (B = -0.270 [95% CI: -0.454 to -0.0852], P = 0.00) and NB regression model (B 318 = -0.160 [95% CI: -0.324 to -0.0118], P = 0.09) (Figure 3). Importantly, the effect modification 319 term was significant in the NB model, and it provided a better fit than when used in the primary 320 analysis (AIC = 269). In patients a one-unit change in ACE2 transcription increases the number 321 of secondary cases by 0.268 (95% CI: 0.0315 to 0.518, P = 0.04), when adjusting for RNA viral 322 load (Figure 3).

323

324 Discussion:

This study describes case-to-case transmission within a series of hospital associated SARS-CoV-2 outbreaks in British Columbia during late 2020 and early 2021. We used a combination of epidemiological data from outbreak reports, laboratory measurements of ACE2,

328 and SARS-CoV-2 lineages derived from whole genome sequencing to recreate the outbreaks 329 using infection tracing transmission network analysis[44]. The transmission network was 330 resolved to provide the possible number of transmission events (secondary cases) per primary 331 case. Bivariate and multivariable analysis was employed to estimate the relationship between 332 nasopharyngeal ACE2 transcription and the number of potential secondary cases. 333 Bivariate analysis found that nasopharyngeal ACE2 transcription did not differ between 334 patients and health care workers. However, ACE2 transcription was enriched in cases, more than 335 fifty percent of the cases had 'High' ACE2. The transmission network constructed with all four 336 assumptions provided n = 76 transmission events for analysis. The simplest recreation of the 337 outbreaks was provided by a sensitivity analysis where the fourth assumption (iv) was changed 338 to stipulate an infectious period of 9.5 days (~2 serial intervals), which yielded n = 48339 transmission events. Multivariable analysis with Poisson regression models was inferior to NB 340 regression as the number of secondary cases was over dispersed. In the primary analysis, NB 341 regression estimated that a one-unit change in nasopharyngeal ACE2 transcription decreases the 342 number of secondary cases in health care workers by B = -0.132 (95%CI: -0.255 to -0.0181, P =343 (0.04) and increases transmission in patients by B = 0.187 (95% CI: 0.0101 to 0.370, P = 0.04). 344 Sensitivity analysis using a shorter infectious period of 9.5 days, provided comparable results, no 345 association was found between nasopharyngeal ACE2 transcription and SARS-CoV-2 346 transmission from health care workers (P = 0.09). In patients, nasopharyngeal ACE2 expression 347 was associated with secondary transmission B = 0.27 (95% CI: 0.0315 to 0.518, P = 0.04) 348 adjusting for RNA viral load (Figure 3A & B). 349 Viral transmission exemplifies a complex system where understanding the mechanism of

transmission requires deeper analysis than observing the sum of its components. This

351 observational study describes nasopharyngeal ACE2 transcription as a component of SARS-352 CoV-2 transmission. In a series of hospital associated outbreaks in British Columbia 353 nasopharyngeal ACE2 transcription was positively associated with the number of secondary 354 cases (ongoing transmission) in patients but not health care workers. The reason for this 355 difference may stem from health care workers wearing personal protective equipment while 356 providing care. The Public Health Agency of Canada recommends that health care workers 357 providing care to COVID-19 positive patients, as a minimum, adhere to droplet and contact 358 precautions [47][45]. If care requires aerosol generating procedures, then the health care worker 359 dons a N95 respirator with a gown, gloves, and eye protection [45]. Surgical masks and N95 360 respirators provide a physical barrier between the mucosal membrane of the nasopharyngeal 361 passage and virus carrying droplets or particles suspended in the air. The design and intended use 362 of respirators and surgical masks differ. Respirators are designed to prevent inhalation of 363 airborne particles and must fit tightly to the user's face. Surgical masks are designed to protect 364 others from aerosolized droplet production from the wearer's upper respiratory system [46]. In 365 either case, physical barrier provided by a mask can prevent SARS-CoV-2 viral particles from 366 binding to ACE2 proteins on the surface of host cells and initiating the viral replication cycle. 367 Masking may not completely prevent exposure to SARS-CoV-2 yet still decreases the infectious 368 dose below the level necessary for infection [47]. Various studies have demonstrated the utility of 369 surgical masks and N95 respirators at preventing COVID-19 or infection with other respiratory 370 pathogens[47–49]. Use of surgical masks and social distancing was associated with a reduction 371 of 44.9 COVID-19 cases per 1000 students and staff in Boston area school districts. This 372 reduction represents a 4.49% decrease in the incidence of SARS-CoV-2[50]. A clinical trial 373 investigating the use of surgical masks or N95 respirators to prevent SARS-CoV-2 infection in

health care workers found no difference in the masks' efficacy to protect from infection[51]. 374 375 This suggests that when worn by health care workers, surgical masks and N95 respirators have 376 comparable efficacy to reduce respiratory infections transmitted by small, aerosolized particles 377 $<5 \,\mu$ m. Taken together, this evidence supports the hypothesis that health care workers in our 378 study were sufficiently protected by their personal protective equipment to negate the association 379 between nasopharyngeal ACE2 transcription and secondary transmission. In contrast, 380 hospitalized patients did not wear PPE while receiving care and nasopharyngeal ACE2 381 transcription possessed a positive association with secondary transmission. The principle of a 382 mask protecting the wearer from causing transmission instead of protecting contacts from 383 acquiring infection parallels how high nasopharyngeal ACE2 transcription in an infected person 384 may produce more secondary cases. High nasopharyngeal ACE2 transcription may promote 385 viral shedding in the upper airway and thus the production of finer aerosols from talking, 386 singing, or sneezing. Fine aerosols can spread further than the large ones, produced lower in the 387 respiratory tract, and pose an increased risk of infection to contacts [52]. As PPE use was not 388 measured in our study competing hypotheses could explain the apparent difference in the 389 relationship between ACE2 transcription and transmission among health care workers and 390 patients. An unmeasured confounding variable present for health care workers but not patients 391 could bias the relationship between ACE2 transcription and secondary transmission. For 392 example, health care workers have variable shift lengths and leave the hospital daily after work; 393 therefore, their contact time with an infected patient differs from that of an inpatient who shares 394 the same hospital unit. This example also serves to demonstrate the complexity of measuring 395 SARS-CoV-2 and other respiratory pathogen's transmission. We acknowledge that SARS-CoV-

396 2 transmission occurs due to an intricate balance of social, biological, and environmental risk-397 factors of which nasopharyngeal ACE2 transcription may contribute a singular role[7]. 398 Regulators of ACE2 transcription in the lower respiratory tract are well documented a 399 lesser evidence base exists for the upper respiratory tract. Importantly, upper, and lower airway 400 ACE2 transcription are not strongly corelated indicating that they may occur independently of 401 each other [53]. In previous work we found that nasopharyngeal transcription of ACE2 did not 402 differ by age (within adults over the age of eighteen) or biological sex[27], a finding which was further supported by this study. High nasopharyngeal ACE2 expression has been associated with 403 404 long term inhaled corticosteroid use and exposure to fine particulate matter $PM_{2.5}$. Below 405 average, low nasopharyngeal ACE2 transcription is associated with type 2 inflammation 406 mediated by the cytokines IL-4, IL-5, and IL-13[54,55]. Therefore, individuals with asthma or 407 allergic rhinitis may have lower upper airway ACE2 expression than those that do not. Further 408 studies are required to understand additional predictors of upper airway ACE2 expression and if 409 it relates to that of the lower airway.

410

411 Strengths and limitations:

The described study has several limitations in design, data collection and analysis. Sampling cases of SARS-CoV-2 but not their contacts prevented us from constructing a more robust transmission network[44]. Contact tracing data would benefit our analysis by increasing power of the study and allow estimation of the relationship between nasopharyngeal *ACE2* transcription and lack of transmission. Estimating the relationship between nasopharyngeal *ACE2* transcription and secondary transmission in only confirmed cases may have resulted in selection bias, where we selected for *ACE2* measurements in persons that had been exposed and

419 infected by SARS-CoV-2[56]. Sampling from a population of hospitalized patients may also 420 have introduced Berkson's bias (admission rate bias) into the study and restricts our ability to 421 generalize the results to other sub-groups or the community[56]. The hospitalized patients could 422 share an unmeasured exposure, comorbidity or drug treatment which unknowingly affected their 423 nasopharyngeal ACE2 transcription. Performing a sensitivity analysis helped us understand the 424 importance of our assumptions in building the infection tracing transmission network. The 425 assumption that the primary and secondary case shared the same hospital unit, proved the most 426 important. Without knowing the place of exposure, the transmission network would not have 427 resolved transmission pairs. Whole genome sequencing provided limited specificity of 428 transmission events when the SARS-CoV-2 outbreak was short and genomes were classified by 429 lineage and not at the resolution of single nucleotide polymorphisms (SNPs). Incorporating SNPs 430 into the analysis may increase resolution of the transmission network by more accurately 431 determining transmission pairs. Using RT-qPCR to measure ACE2 transcription and RNA viral 432 load overapproximates available ACE2 protein and viral particles [23]. Future work should aim 433 to re-estimate the association between nasopharyngeal ACE2 transcription and secondary cases 434 using data from a SARS-CoV-2 household transmission study. The design of a household 435 transmission study has the benefits of selecting participants from a non-hospitalized population, 436 observing secondary infections and contacts within family clusters in a context with limited use 437 of personal protective equipment.

438

439 **Conclusion:**

We estimate the association between nasopharyngeal *ACE2* transcription and secondary
SARS-CoV-2 transmission in a series of hospital associated outbreaks in British Columbia from

442	late 2020 to early 2021. Analysis shows that 98.6% of transmission pairs and 85% of primary
443	cases had high nasopharyngeal ACE2 transcription. Multivariable analysis adjusting for RNA
444	viral load and interaction by case description found that nasopharyngeal ACE2 transcription was
445	positively associated with SARS-CoV-2 transmission in hospital patients but not health care
446	workers. We postulate that use of masks among health care workers explains this difference,
447	transmission from health care workers with high ACE2 was interrupted by barrier protection.
448	SARS-CoV-2 transmission remains a complex and unresolved phenomenon driven by biological,
449	environmental, and social risk factors. Differential nasopharyngeal ACE2 transcription has been
450	observed in COVID-19 negative persons and having high- above average- expression of ACE2
451	may serve as a risk factor for transmission of SARS-CoV-2.
452	
453	
454	
455	
456	
457	
458	
459	
460	
461	
462	
405 464	
465	
466	
467	
468	
469	
470	
4/1	
472 172	
474	
475	
476	

477 **References:**

- 479 1. Long, B.; Brady, W.J.; Koyfman, A.; Gottlieb, M. Cardiovascular Complications in 480 COVID-19. Am J Emerg Med **2020**, 38, 1504–1507, doi:10.1016/j.ajem.2020.04.048. 481 2. Dhar, D.; Dey, T.; Samin, M.M.; Padmanabha, H.; Chatterjee, A.; Naznin, P.; Chandra, 482 S.R.; Mallesh, K.; Shah, R.; Siddiqui, S.; et al. Systemic Inflammatory Syndrome in 483 COVID-19–SISCoV Study: Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. Pediatr Res 2022, 91, 484 1334-1349, doi:10.1038/s41390-021-01545-z. 485 Guo, T.; Fan, Y.; Chen, M.; Wu, X.; Zhang, L.; He, T.; Wang, H.; Wan, J.; Wang, X.; Lu, 3. 486 Z. Cardiovascular Implications of Fatal Outcomes of Patients With Coronavirus Disease 487 2019 (COVID-19). JAMA Cardiol 2020, 5, 811, doi:10.1001/jamacardio.2020.1017. 488 4. CHAN-YEUNG, M.; XU, R.-H. SARS: Epidemiology. Respirology 2003, 8, S9-S14, 489 doi:10.1046/j.1440-1843.2003.00518.x. 490 5. Zhang, A.-R.; Shi, W.-Q.; Liu, K.; Li, X.-L.; Liu, M.-J.; Zhang, W.-H.; Zhao, G.-P.; Chen, 491 J.-J.; Zhang, X.-A.; Miao, D.; et al. Epidemiology and Evolution of Middle East 492 Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus, 2012–2020. Infect Dis Poverty 2021, 10, 66, 493 doi:10.1186/s40249-021-00853-0. 494 Singanayagam, A.; Hakki, S.; Dunning, J.; Madon, K.J.; Crone, M.A.; Koycheva, A.; 6. 495 Derqui-Fernandez, N.; Barnett, J.L.; Whitfield, M.G.; Varro, R.; et al. Community 496 Transmission and Viral Load Kinetics of the SARS-CoV-2 Delta (B.1.617.2) Variant in
- 497 Vaccinated and Unvaccinated Individuals in the UK: A Prospective, Longitudinal, Cohort
 498 Study. *Lancet Infect Dis* 2022, 22, 183–195, doi:10.1016/S1473-3099(21)00648-4.
- 499 7. Leung, N.H.L. Transmissibility and Transmission of Respiratory Viruses. *Nat Rev*500 *Microbiol* 2021, *19*, 528–545, doi:10.1038/s41579-021-00535-6.
- 501 8. Lindsey, B.B.; Villabona-Arenas, Ch.J.; Campbell, F.; Keeley, A.J.; Parker, M.D.; Shah,
- D.R.; Parsons, H.; Zhang, P.; Kakkar, N.; Gallis, M.; et al. Characterising Within-Hospital
 SARS-CoV-2 Transmission Events Using Epidemiological and Viral Genomic Data
 across Two Pandemic Waves. *Nat Commun* 2022, *13*, 671, doi:10.1038/s41467-02228291-y.
- Madewell, Z.J.; Yang, Y.; Longini, I.M.; Halloran, M.E.; Dean, N.E. Household
 Transmission of SARS-CoV-2. *JAMA Netw Open* 2020, *3*, e2031756,
 doi:10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2020.31756.
- 509 10. Cowger, T.L.; Murray, E.J.; Clarke, J.; Bassett, M.T.; Ojikutu, B.O.; Sánchez, S.M.;
 510 Linos, N.; Hall, K.T. Lifting Universal Masking in Schools Covid-19 Incidence among
 511 Students and Staff. *New England Journal of Medicine* 2022,
 512 doi:10.1056/NEJMoa2211029.
- 513 11. Cordery, R.; Reeves, L.; Zhou, J.; Rowan, A.; Watber, P.; Rosadas, C.; Crone, M.; Storch,
 514 M.; Freemont, P.; Mosscrop, L.; et al. Transmission of SARS-CoV-2 by Children to
- 515 Contacts in Schools and Households: A Prospective Cohort and Environmental Sampling
 516 Study in London. *Lancet Microbe* 2022, *3*, e814–e823, doi:10.1016/S2666517 5247(22)00124-0.
- Li, F.; Li, W.; Farzan, M.; Harrison, S.C. Structure of SARS Coronavirus Spike ReceptorBinding Domain Complexed with Receptor. *Science (1979)* 2005, *309*, 1864–1868,
 doi:10.1126/science.1116480.
- Mannar, D.; Saville, J.W.; Zhu, X.; Srivastava, S.S.; Berezuk, A.M.; Tuttle, K.S.;
 Marquez, A.C.; Sekirov, I.; Subramaniam, S. SARS-CoV-2 Omicron Variant: Antibody

523 Evasion and Cryo-EM Structure of Spike Protein–ACE2 Complex. Science (1979) 2022, 524 375, 760-764, doi:10.1126/science.abn7760. 525 14. Shang, J.; Ye, G.; Shi, K.; Wan, Y.; Luo, C.; Aihara, H.; Geng, Q.; Auerbach, A.; Li, F. 526 Structural Basis of Receptor Recognition by SARS-CoV-2. Nature 2020, 581, 221–224, 527 doi:10.1038/s41586-020-2179-y. 528 15. Meng, B.; Abdullahi, A.; Ferreira, I.A.T.M.; Goonawardane, N.; Saito, A.; Kimura, I.; 529 Yamasoba, D.; Gerber, P.P.; Fatihi, S.; Rathore, S.; et al. Altered TMPRSS2 Usage by 530 SARS-CoV-2 Omicron Impacts Infectivity and Fusogenicity. Nature 2022, 603, 706–714, 531 doi:10.1038/s41586-022-04474-x. 532 16. Ziegler, C.G.K.; Allon, S.J.; Nyquist, S.K.; Mbano, I.M.; Miao, V.N.; Tzouanas, C.N.; Cao, Y.; Yousif, A.S.; Bals, J.; Hauser, B.M.; et al. SARS-CoV-2 Receptor ACE2 Is an 533 534 Interferon-Stimulated Gene in Human Airway Epithelial Cells and Is Detected in Specific 535 Cell Subsets across Tissues. Cell 2020, 181, 1016-1035.e19, 536 doi:10.1016/j.cell.2020.04.035. 537 17. Sui, Y.; Li, J.; Venzon, D.J.; Berzofsky, J.A. SARS-CoV-2 Spike Protein Suppresses 538 ACE2 and Type I Interferon Expression in Primary Cells From Macaque Lung 539 Bronchoalveolar Lavage. Front Immunol 2021, 12, doi:10.3389/fimmu.2021.658428. 540 Verdecchia, P.; Cavallini, C.; Spanevello, A.; Angeli, F. The Pivotal Link between ACE2 18. 541 Deficiency and SARS-CoV-2 Infection. Eur J Intern Med 2020, 76, 14-20, 542 doi:10.1016/j.ejim.2020.04.037. 543 19. Groß, S.; Jahn, C.; Cushman, S.; Bär, C.; Thum, T. SARS-CoV-2 Receptor ACE2-544 Dependent Implications on the Cardiovascular System: From Basic Science to Clinical 545 Implications. J Mol Cell Cardiol 2020, 144, 47–53, doi:10.1016/j.vjmcc.2020.04.031. 546 20. Jia, H.P.; Look, D.C.; Shi, L.; Hickey, M.; Pewe, L.; Netland, J.; Farzan, M.; Wohlford-547 Lenane, C.; Perlman, S.; McCray, P.B. ACE2 Receptor Expression and Severe Acute 548 Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus Infection Depend on Differentiation of Human 549 Airway Epithelia. J Virol 2005, 79, 14614-14621, doi:10.1128/JVI.79.23.14614-550 14621.2005. 551 21. Ni, W.; Yang, X.; Yang, D.; Bao, J.; Li, R.; Xiao, Y.; Hou, C.; Wang, H.; Liu, J.; Yang, 552 D.; et al. Role of Angiotensin-Converting Enzyme 2 (ACE2) in COVID-19. Crit Care 553 2020, 24, 422, doi:10.1186/s13054-020-03120-0. 554 22. Ziegler, C.G.K.; Allon, S.J.; Nyquist, S.K.; Mbano, I.M.; Miao, V.N.; Tzouanas, C.N.; 555 Cao, Y.; Yousif, A.S.; Bals, J.; Hauser, B.M.; et al. SARS-CoV-2 Receptor ACE2 Is an 556 Interferon-Stimulated Gene in Human Airway Epithelial Cells and Is Detected in Specific 557 Cell Subsets across Tissues. Cell 2020, 181, 1016-1035.e19, 558 doi:10.1016/j.cell.2020.04.035. 559 Nikiforuk, A.M.; Kuchinski, K.S.; Twa, D.D.W.; Lukac, C.D.; Sbihi, H.; Basham, C.A.; 23. 560 Steidl, C.; Prystajecky, N.A.; Jassem, A.N.; Krajden, M.; et al. The Contrasting Role of 561 Nasopharyngeal Angiotensin Converting Enzyme 2 (ACE2) Transcription in SARS-CoV-562 2 Infection: A Cross-Sectional Study of People Tested for COVID-19 in British 563 Columbia, Canada. EBioMedicine 2021, 66, 103316, doi:10.1016/j.ebiom.2021.103316. 564 Freed, N.E.; Vlková, M.; Faisal, M.B.; Silander, O.K. Rapid and Inexpensive Whole-24. 565 Genome Sequencing of SARS-CoV-2 Using 1200 Bp Tiled Amplicons and Oxford 566 Nanopore Rapid Barcoding. Biol Methods Protoc 2020, 5, 567 doi:10.1093/biomethods/bpaa014.

25. 568 Messmann, R.; Dietl, A.; Wagner, S.; Domenig, O.; Jungbauer, C.; Luchner, A.; Maier, 569 L.S.; Schopka, S.; Hirt, S.; Schmid, C.; et al. Alterations of the Renin Angiotensin System 570 in Human End-Stage Heart Failure before and after Mechanical Cardiac Unloading by 571 LVAD Support. Mol Cell Biochem 2020, 472, 79-94, doi:10.1007/s11010-020-03787-7. 572 26. LeBlanc, J.J.; Gubbay, J.B.; Li, Y.; Needle, R.; Arneson, S.R.; Marcino, D.; Charest, H.; 573 Desnoyers, G.; Dust, K.; Fattouh, R.; et al. Real-Time PCR-Based SARS-CoV-2 574 Detection in Canadian Laboratories. Journal of Clinical Virology 2020, 128, 104433, 575 doi:10.1016/j.jcv.2020.104433. 576 27. Nikiforuk, A.M.; Kuchinski, K.S.; Twa, D.D.W.; Lukac, C.D.; Sbihi, H.; Basham, C.A.; 577 Steidl, C.; Prystajecky, N.A.; Jassem, A.N.; Krajden, M.; et al. The Contrasting Role of 578 Nasopharyngeal Angiotensin Converting Enzyme 2 (ACE2) Transcription in SARS-CoV-579 2 Infection: A Cross-Sectional Study of People Tested for COVID-19 in British 580 Columbia, Canada. *EBioMedicine* **2021**, *66*, 103316, doi:10.1016/j.ebiom.2021.103316. 581 28. Livak, K.J.; Schmittgen, T.D. Analysis of Relative Gene Expression Data Using Real-582 Time Quantitative PCR and the $2-\Delta\Delta CT$ Method. Methods 2001, 25, 402–408, 583 doi:10.1006/meth.2001.1262. 584 29. British Columbia Centre for Disease Control Ncov2019-Artic-Nf (accessed on 22 585 November 2022). 586 30. O'Toole, Á.; Scher, E.; Underwood, A.; Jackson, B.; Hill, V.; McCrone, J.T.; Colquhoun, 587 R.; Ruis, C.; Abu-Dahab, K.; Taylor, B.; et al. Assignment of Epidemiological Lineages in an Emerging Pandemic Using the Pangolin Tool. Virus Evol 2021, 588 589 doi:10.1093/ve/veab064. VanderWeele, T.J. Principles of Confounder Selection. Eur J Epidemiol 2019, 34, 211-590 31. 591 219, doi:10.1007/s10654-019-00494-6. 592 32. Gutiérrez-Chamorro, L.; Riveira-Muñoz, E.; Barrios, C.; Palau, V.; Nevot, M.; Pedreño-593 López, S.; Senserrich, J.; Massanella, M.; Clotet, B.; Cabrera, C.; et al. SARS-CoV-2 594 Infection Modulates ACE2 Function and Subsequent Inflammatory Responses in Swabs 595 and Plasma of COVID-19 Patients. Viruses 2021, 13, 1715, doi:10.3390/v13091715. 596 33. Marc, A.; Kerioui, M.; Blanquart, F.; Bertrand, J.; Mitjà, O.; Corbacho-Monné, M.; 597 Marks, M.; Guedi, J. Quantifying the Relationship between SARS-CoV-2 Viral Load and 598 Infectiousness. Elife 2021, 10, doi:10.7554/eLife.69302. 599 Carraturo, F.; del Giudice, C.; Morelli, M.; Cerullo, V.; Libralato, G.; Galdiero, E.; Guida, 34. 600 M. Persistence of SARS-CoV-2 in the Environment and COVID-19 Transmission Risk 601 from Environmental Matrices and Surfaces. Environmental Pollution 2020, 265, 115010, 602 doi:10.1016/j.envpol.2020.115010. 603 35. Onweni, C.L.; Zhang, Y.S.; Caulfield, T.; Hopkins, C.E.; Fairweather, D.L.; Freeman, 604 W.D. ACEI/ARB Therapy in COVID-19: The Double-Edged Sword of ACE2 and SARS-605 CoV-2 Viral Docking. Crit Care 2020, 24, 475, doi:10.1186/s13054-020-03195-9. 606 Kwak, S.G.; Kim, J.H. Central Limit Theorem: The Cornerstone of Modern Statistics. 36. 607 Korean J Anesthesiol 2017, 70, 144, doi:10.4097/kjae.2017.70.2.144. 608 Alene, M.; Yismaw, L.; Assemie, M.A.; Ketema, D.B.; Gietaneh, W.; Birhan, T.Y. Serial 37. 609 Interval and Incubation Period of COVID-19: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. 610 BMC Infect Dis 2021, 21, 257, doi:10.1186/s12879-021-05950-x. 611 Byrne, A.W.; McEvoy, D.; Collins, A.B.; Hunt, K.; Casey, M.; Barber, A.; Butler, F.; 38. 612 Griffin, J.; Lane, E.A.; McAloon, C.; et al. Inferred Duration of Infectious Period of 613 SARS-CoV-2: Rapid Scoping Review and Analysis of Available Evidence for

614 Asymptomatic and Symptomatic COVID-19 Cases. BMJ Open 2020, 10, e039856, 615 doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2020-039856. 616 39. Craney, T.A.; Surles, J.G. Model-Dependent Variance Inflation Factor Cutoff Values. 617 Qual Eng 2002, 14, 391–403, doi:10.1081/QEN-120001878. 618 40. Cameron, A.C.; Trivedi, P.K. Regression-Based Tests for Overdispersion in the Poisson 619 Model. J Econom 1990, 46, 347-364, doi:10.1016/0304-4076(90)90014-K. 620 41. van den Broek, J. A Score Test for Zero Inflation in a Poisson Distribution. Biometrics 621 **1995**, *51*, 738–743. 622 42. Portet, S. A Primer on Model Selection Using the Akaike Information Criterion. Infect Dis 623 Model 2020, 5, 111–128, doi:10.1016/j.idm.2019.12.010. 624 R Core Team R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing, 2013. 43. 625 44. Keeling, M.J.; Eames, K.T.D. Networks and Epidemic Models. J R Soc Interface 2005, 2, 626 295-307, doi:10.1098/rsif.2005.0051. 627 45. Public Health Agency of Canada Infection Prevention and Control for COVID-19: Interim 628 Guidance for Acute Healthcare Settings. 629 46. Vincent, M.; Edwards, P. Disposable Surgical Face Masks for Preventing Surgical Wound 630 Infection in Clean Surgery. Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews 2016, 2016, 631 doi:10.1002/14651858.CD002929.pub3. 632 47. Leung, N.H.L.; Chu, D.K.W.; Shiu, E.Y.C.; Chan, K.-H.; McDevitt, J.J.; Hau, B.J.P.; 633 Yen, H.-L.; Li, Y.; Ip, D.K.M.; Peiris, J.S.M.; et al. Respiratory Virus Shedding in 634 Exhaled Breath and Efficacy of Face Masks. Nat Med 2020, 26, 676–680, 635 doi:10.1038/s41591-020-0843-2. Andrejko, K.L.; Pry, J.; Myers, J.F.; Openshaw, J.; Watt, J.; Birkett, N.; DeGuzman, J.L.; 636 48. 637 Barbaduomo, C.M.; Dong, Z.N.; Fang, A.T.; et al. Predictors of Severe Acute Respiratory 638 Syndrome Coronavirus 2 Infection Following High-Risk Exposure. Clinical Infectious 639 Diseases 2022, 75, e276–e288, doi:10.1093/cid/ciab1040. Fennelly, K.P. Particle Sizes of Infectious Aerosols: Implications for Infection Control. 640 49. 641 Lancet Respir Med 2020, 8, 914–924, doi:10.1016/S2213-2600(20)30323-4. 642 50. Cowger, T.L.; Murray, E.J.; Clarke, J.; Bassett, M.T.; Ojikutu, B.O.; Sánchez, S.M.; 643 Linos, N.; Hall, K.T. Lifting Universal Masking in Schools — Covid-19 Incidence among 644 Students and Staff. New England Journal of Medicine 2022, 387, 1935–1946, 645 doi:10.1056/NEJMoa2211029. 646 51. Loeb, M.; Bartholomew, A.; Hashmi, M.; Tarhuni, W.; Hassany, M.; Youngster, I.; 647 Somayaji, R.; Larios, O.; Kim, J.; Missaghi, B.; et al. Medical Masks Versus N95 648 Respirators for Preventing COVID-19 Among Health Care Workers. Ann Intern Med 649 2022, 175, 1629–1638, doi:10.7326/M22-1966. 650 Wang, C.C.; Prather, K.A.; Sznitman, J.; Jimenez, J.L.; Lakdawala, S.S.; Tufekci, Z.; 52. 651 Marr, L.C. Airborne Transmission of Respiratory Viruses. Science (1979) 2021, 373, 652 doi:10.1126/science.abd9149. 653 Hou, Y.J.; Okuda, K.; Edwards, C.E.; Martinez, D.R.; Asakura, T.; Dinnon, K.H.; Kato, 53. 654 T.; Lee, R.E.; Yount, B.L.; Mascenik, T.M.; et al. SARS-CoV-2 Reverse Genetics Reveals 655 a Variable Infection Gradient in the Respiratory Tract. Cell 2020, 182, 429-446.e14, 656 doi:10.1016/j.cell.2020.05.042. 657 54. Kimura, H.; Francisco, D.; Conway, M.; Martinez, F.D.; Vercelli, D.; Polverino, F.; 658 Billheimer, D.; Kraft, M. Type 2 Inflammation Modulates ACE2 and TMPRSS2 in

659 660 661 662 663	 Airway Epithelial Cells. <i>Journal of Allergy and Clinical Immunology</i> 2020, <i>146</i>, 80-88.e8, doi:10.1016/j.jaci.2020.05.004. 55. Takabayashi, T.; Yoshida, K.; Imoto, Y.; Schleimer, R.P.; Fujieda, S. Regulation of the Expression of SARS-CoV-2 Receptor Angiotensin-Converting Enzyme 2 in Nasal Mucosa Am L Rhinol Allergy 2022, <i>36</i>, 115–122, doi:10.1177/19458924211027798 					
664 665 666 667	 56. Westreich, D. Berkson's Bias, Selection Bias, and Missing Data. <i>Epidemiology</i> 2012, 23, 159–164, doi:10.1097/EDE.0b013e31823b6296. 					
668 660	Ethical Approval:					
670	Ethical approval for the study was sought from the University of British Columbia human					
671	ethics board (#H20-01110) which was harmonized with the Fraser Health Authority. Written					
672	informed consent was not required. All data was de-identified prior to analysis and the results					
673	were not linked back to any identifying records. This study was deemed as minimal risk to the					
674	participants involved. To ensure privacy the site of the outbreak series will not be disclosed.					
675						
676	Funding:					
677	This work was funded by the Canadian Institutes of Health Research (#434951) and					
678	Genome British Columbia (COV-55).					
679						
680	Competing Interests:					
681	The authors have no conflicts of interest to declare.					
682						
683	Author Contributions:					
684	A.M.N., K.S.K., K.S. and I.S. conceived and designed the study. Epidemiological					
685	reporting, data recording and stewardship was performed by K.S. and S.R. Laboratory data					
686	reporting and stewardship was performed by N.P. and A.N.J. Laboratory measurements were					
687	taken by A.M.N and K.S.K. Data analysis was performed by A.M.N and K.S.K., D.M.P and					

- 688 M.A.I assisted in interpretation of the results. The manuscript was written by A.M.N, all authors
- 689 helped with editing and provided their approval for publication.

		Health Care Worker	Patient	P-Value
Variable	Level	n = 46	n = 57	
Age (mean (SD))		41.1 (10.3)	78.6 (12.1)	< 0.001
Biological Sex (%)	Female	41.0 (89.1)	33.0 (57.9)	0.001
	Male	5.00 (10.9)	24.0 (42.1)	
ACE2 Transcription (mean (SD))		2.11 (2.88)	2.00 (3.06)	0.861
RNA Viral Load (mean (SD))		6.94 (1.79)	7.33 (1.98)	0.300
Viral Lineage (%)				0.385
	AL.1	28.0 (60.9)	27.0 (47.4)	
	B.1.128	0.00 (0.00)	1.00 (1.80)	
	B.1.2	14.0 (30.4)	25 (43.9)	
	B.1.279	0.00 (0.00)	2.00 (3.50)	
	B.1.36	2.00 (4.30)	1.00 (1.80)	
	B.1.36.36	1.00 (2.20)	0.00 (0.00)	
	B.1.36.38	1.00 (2.20)	0.00 (0.00)	

Table 1: Characteristics of analytic data stratified by case designation (n = 103).

731 Variables included in the study are stratified by case designation health care worker or patient. P-values for 732 parametric statistical test performed on continuous (t-test) or categorical data (X^2 test) are reported. Viral lineage

reported via parameter of continuous (r test) of categorical data (r test) are reported. Via mage
 calls are from whole genome sequencing data classified using the PANGOLIN tool (Version 1.15.1). Data is also
 available stratified by 'High' or 'Low' nasopharyngeal ACE2 transcription (Table S1).

- 735
- 736
- 737
- 738
- 739 740
- 741
- / - - -
- 742
- 743

Table 2: Multivariable analysis of the relationship between ACE2 transcription and the number

- 745 of SARS-CoV-2 secondary cases.
- 746

Multivariable Regression Models

(Secondary Cases ~ ACE2 Transcription + RNA Viral Load + Case Description + ACE2 Transcription : Case Description)

Beta Coefficients (95% CI)	Poisson	Quasi-Poisson	Negative Binomial (NB)
ACE2 Transcription	-0.164	-0.164	-0.132
in HCW	(-0.236- [-0.0919])	(-0.273-[-0.0528])	(-0.255- [-0.0181])
RNA Viral Load	2.73*10^-3	2.73*10^-3	-0.0197
	(5.34*10^-3 - 0.0976)	(-0.141-0.150)	(-0.164- [0.123])
Case (Patient)	-0.808	-0.808	-0.782
	(-1.20- [-0.421])	(-1.43- [-0.235])	(-1.42- [-0.162])
ACE2 Transcription	0.208	0.208	0.187
in Patients	(0.0958-0.320)	(0.0382-0.382)	(0.01011-0.370)
AIC	394		346
Theta	2.44	2.44	0.922
Score Test (P Value)	P < 0.001		P = 0.976

747



748

749 750

Figure 1: Incidence curve of several hospital associated SARS-CoV-2 outbreaks in British Columbia by epidemiological week from 07-11-2020 to 04-01-2021 (n = 103 laboratory confirmed cases). SARS-CoV-2

ros abor active communed cases. SARS-Cov-2
 incidence follows a non-normal distribution where an initial peak caseload was observed in W46-2020 and a second

lesser case surge occurred in W52-2020. A) SARS-CoV-2 cases are stratified by hospital floor, early in the
 surveillance period transmission occurred mostly on floor number two and later moved to floors four and five. If the

756 floor where transmission occurred was not determined by the investigating epidemiologist, then it was coded as

⁷⁵⁷ 'unknown' for our analysis. **B**) SARS-CoV-2 cases are stratified by viral variant, n = 7 unique SARS-CoV-2

variants were identified by whole genome sequencing participants diagnostic specimens. SARS-CoV-2 variants

759 AL.1 and B.1.2 caused the highest percentage of cases: AL.1, 55/103, 53% and B.1.2, 39/103, 38%.

760





765 **confirmed cases).** Nodes represent confirmed cases while the edge show the direction of outgoing transmission, link

766 a primary case with at least one secondary case. A) Nodes in the transmission network are stratified by ACE2

transcription (high or low), 82% of cases (84/103) had above average, high ACE2 transcription (P < 0.001). **B**)

768 Nodes in the transmission network are classified by SARS-CoV-2 viral variant. The viral variants AL.1 and B.1.2

caused multiple secondary infections thorough the outbreaks, in the first phase (before Dec.15th, 2020) of the study

period most cases were AL.1 and later transitioned to B.1.2 in phase two (after Dec.15th, 2020).



