

1 **Detection of Air and Surface Contamination by Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome**
2 **Coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) in Hospital Rooms of Infected Patients**

3 Po Ying Chia, MBBS^{1,2,3*}; Kristen Kelli Coleman, PhD^{4*}; Yian Kim Tan, PhD^{5*}; Sean Wei
4 Xiang Ong, MBBS^{1,2*}; Marcus Gum, BSc⁵; Sok Kiang Lau, PhD⁵; Stephanie Sutjipto,
5 MBBS^{1,2}; Pei Hua Lee, MBBS^{1,2}; Than The Son, DVM⁴; Barnaby Edward Young, MB
6 Bchir^{1,2,3}; Donald K. Milton, MD, DrPH⁶; Gregory C. Gray, MD, MPH^{4,7,8}; Stephan Schuster,
7 PhD⁹; Timothy Barkham, MBBS^{2,10}; Partha Prathim De, MBBS^{2,3}; Shawn Vasoo, MBBS^{1,2,3};
8 Monica Chan, MBBS^{1,2}; Brenda Sze Peng Ang, MBBS, MPH^{1,2,3,10}; Boon Huan Tan, PhD⁵;
9 Yee-Sin Leo, MBBS, MPH^{1,2,3,10}; Oon-Tek Ng, MBBS, MPH^{1,2,3}#; Michelle Su Yen Wong,
10 PhD⁵#; and Kalisvar Marimuthu, MBBS^{1,2,10}#

11 * These four first authors contributed equally.

12 # These three senior authors contributed equally.

13 **Author Affiliations:**

14 ¹ National Centre for Infectious Diseases, Singapore

15 ² Tan Tock Seng Hospital, Singapore

16 ³ Lee Kong Chian School of Medicine, Nanyang Technological University, Singapore

17 ⁴ Duke-NUS Medical School, National University of Singapore

18 ⁵ DSO National Laboratories, Singapore

19 ⁶ Maryland Institute for Applied Environmental Health, University of Maryland School of
20 Public Health, USA

21 ⁷ School of Medicine and Global Health Institute, Duke University, USA

22 ⁸ Global Health Research Center, Duke Kunshan University, Kunshan, China

23 ⁹ Singapore Centre for Environmental Life Sciences Engineering, Nanyang Technological
24 University, Singapore

25 ¹⁰ Yong Loo Lin School of Medicine, National University of Singapore

26 **Corresponding Authors:**

27 Kalisvar Marimuthu, National Centre for Infectious Diseases, 16 Jln Tan Tock Seng, Singapore
28 308442; (kalisvar_marimuthu@ncid.sg) (+65) 6357 7924)

29 Oon-Tek Ng, National Centre for Infectious Diseases, 16 Jln Tan Tock Seng, Singapore
30 308442; (Oon_Tek_Ng@ncid.sg) (+65) 6357 7924)

31 **Running Title:** Air and surface contamination by SARS-CoV-2

32 **Word Count:** 125 (abstract), 2255 (manuscript)

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

33 **Abstract:**

34 Understanding the particle size distribution in the air and patterns of environmental
35 contamination of SARS-CoV-2 is essential for infection prevention policies. We aimed to
36 detect SARS-CoV-2 surface and air contamination and study associated patient-level factors.
37 245 surface samples were collected from 30 airborne infection isolation rooms of COVID-19
38 patients, and air sampling was conducted in 3 rooms.

39 Air sampling detected SARS-CoV-2 PCR-positive particles of sizes $>4 \mu\text{m}$ and $1\text{-}4 \mu\text{m}$ in
40 two rooms, which warrants further study of the airborne transmission potential of SARS-
41 CoV-2. 56.7% of rooms had at least one environmental surface contaminated. High touch
42 surface contamination was shown in ten (66.7%) out of 15 patients in the first week of illness,
43 and three (20%) beyond the first week of illness ($p = 0.010$).

44 **Introduction**

45 Severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) causing coronavirus disease
46 2019 (COVID-19) has spread globally and many countries are experiencing ongoing local
47 transmission despite varying levels of control efforts. Understanding the different
48 transmission routes of SARS-CoV-2 is crucial in planning effective interventions to break the
49 chain of transmission. Although extensive surface contamination with SARS-CoV-2 by a
50 symptomatic patient has been demonstrated ¹, little is known about airborne transmission of
51 SARS-CoV-2. It is also unknown if asymptomatic individuals pose the same environmental
52 contamination risk as symptomatic ones, although viral shedding has been demonstrated to
53 continue even after clinical recovery of COVID-19 patients ². There are multiple reports of
54 asymptomatic patients testing positive for SARS-CoV-2 ^{3,4}, and the potential transmission of
55 the virus by an asymptomatic person has been described ⁵. Therefore, viral contamination of
56 the air and surfaces surrounding asymptomatic or recovering COVID-19 patients could have
57 serious implications for outbreak control strategies. This knowledge gap is recognized in the
58 Report of the WHO-China Joint Mission on Coronavirus 2019 ⁶.

59 The primary objective of our study was to identify potential patient-level risk factors for
60 environmental contamination by SARS-CoV-2 by sampling the air and surfaces surrounding
61 hospitalized COVID-19 patients at different stages of illness.

62 **Methods**

63 **Study design, patient selection and data collection**

64 We conducted this cross-sectional study in airborne infection isolation rooms (AIIRs) at the
65 National Centre for Infectious Diseases, Singapore. These rooms had 12 air changes per hour,
66 an average temperature of 23°C, relative humidity of 53 – 59%, and exhaust flow of 579.6
67 m³/h.

68 Patients with a SARS-CoV-2 infection confirmed by a polymerase chain reaction (PCR)-
69 positive respiratory sample within the prior 72 hours were included. Clinical characteristics,
70 including the presence of symptoms, day of illness, day of stay in the room, supplemental
71 oxygen requirement, and baseline characteristics, were collected. One patient from a
72 previously published pilot study on environmental sampling in the same facility (Patient 30;
73 Supplemental Table 1) was also included in the current analysis ¹.

74 **Air sampling**

75 Six NIOSH BC 251 bioaerosol samplers were placed in each of three AIIRs in the general
76 ward to collect air samples. Particles collected with the NIOSH sampler are distributed into
77 three size fractions. Particles >4 μm in diameter are collected in a 15 mL centrifuge tube,
78 particles 1-4 μm in diameter are collected in a 1.5 mL centrifuge tube, and particles <1 μm in
79 diameter are collected in a self-assembled filter cassette containing a 37-mm diameter,
80 polytetrafluoroethylene (PTFE) filter with 3 μm pores. All NIOSH samplers were connected
81 to either SKC AirCheck TOUCH Pumps or SKC Universal air sampling pumps set at a flow-
82 rate of 3.5 L/min and run for four hours, collecting a total of 5,040 L of air from each
83 patient's room.

84 In the room of Patient 1, three NIOSH samplers were attached to each of two tripod stands
85 and situated at different heights from the ground (1.2m, 0.9m, and 0.7m) near the air exhaust
86 to capture particles from the unidirectional airflow in the room. Throughout the four-hour
87 sampling period, Patient 1 was intermittently facing the NIOSH samplers while seated one
88 meter from the first tripod and 2.1 meters from the second tripod. Four SKC 37mm PTFE
89 filter (0.3 μm pore size) cassettes were also distributed throughout the room and connected to
90 SKC Universal air sampling pumps set at a flow-rate of 5 L/min, each collecting an
91 additional 1,200 L of air from the room.

92 In the rooms of Patients 2 and 3, three NIOSH samplers were attached to each of two tripod
93 stands and situated at different heights from the ground (1.2m, 0.9m, and 0.7m). Throughout
94 the four-hour sampling period, Patients 2 and 3 remained in bed within 1 meter from all 6
95 NIOSH samplers (Supplementary Figure 1). Patient 3 was also talking on the phone for a
96 significant proportion of time during sampling. Additional SKC pumps with PTFE filter
97 cassettes were not used in the rooms of Patient 2 and 3.

98 The 6 NIOSH samples from each room were pooled prior to analysis, but the particle size
99 fractions remained separated. Each sample pool was representative of 5,040 L air.

100 **Surface sampling**

101 Surface samples were collected with Puritan® EnviroMax Plus pre-moistened macrofoam
102 sterile swabs (25-88060). Eight to 20 surface samples were collected from each room. Five
103 surfaces were designated high-touch surfaces, including the cardiac table, entire length of the
104 bed rails including bed control panel and call bell, bedside locker, electrical switches on top
105 of the beds, and chair in general ward rooms (Supplemental Figure 1). In ICU rooms, the
106 ventilator and infusion pumps were sampled instead of the electrical switches on top of the
107 beds and chair (Supplemental Figure 2). Air exhaust outlets and glass window surfaces were
108 sampled in five rooms, including the three rooms in which air sampling was performed.
109 Toilet seat and automatic flush button (one combined swab) were sampled in AIIR rooms in
110 the general ward.

111 **Sample transfer and processing**

112 All samples were immediately stored at 4°C in the hospital prior to transfer to a BSL-3
113 laboratory where samples were immediately processed and stored at -80°C unless directly
114 analyzed. Prior to RNA extraction, NIOSH aerosol sample tubes and filters were processed as
115 previously described ⁷, with slight modification due to the pooling of samples.

116 **Laboratory methods**

117 The QIAamp viral RNA mini kit (Qiagen Hilden, Germany) was used for sample RNA
118 extraction. Real-time PCR assays targeting the envelope (E) genes ⁸ and an in house orf1ab
119 assay were used to detect SARS-CoV-2 in the samples ⁹. All samples were run in duplicate
120 and with both assays. Positive detection was recorded as long as amplification was observed
121 in at least 1 assay.

122 **Statistical analysis**

123 Statistical analysis was performed using Stata version 15.1 (StataCorp, College Station,
124 Texas) and GraphPad Prism 8.0 (GraphPad Software, Inc., San Diego). $P < 0.05$ was
125 considered statistically significant, and all tests were 2-tailed. For the surface environment,
126 outcome measures analyzed were any positivity by room and pooled percentage positivity by
127 day of illness and respiratory viral load (represented by clinical cycle threshold (Ct) value).
128 We analyzed the factors associated with environmental contamination using the Student t-
129 test, or the nonparametric Wilcoxon rank-sum test was used for continuous variables
130 depending on their distribution. The χ^2 or Fisher exact test was used to compare categorical
131 variables. We plotted the best fit curve by least-square method to study the environmental
132 contamination distribution across various the days of illness and clinical Ct value.

133 **Results**

134 Environmental sampling was conducted in three AIIRs in the ICU and 27 AIIRs in the
135 general ward. Air sampling was performed in three of the 27 AIIRs in the general ward. All
136 patients reported COVID-19 symptoms. Seven patients (23%) were asymptomatic at the time
137 of environmental sampling. Of the 23 symptomatic patients, 18 (78%) had respiratory
138 symptoms, one had gastrointestinal symptoms, one had both respiratory and gastrointestinal
139 symptoms, and three patients (10%) had fever or myalgia only (Supplemental Table 1).

140 Air samples from two (66.7%) of three AIIRs tested positive for SARS-CoV-2, in particle
141 sizes $>4 \mu\text{m}$ and $1\text{-}4 \mu\text{m}$ in diameter (Table 1). Total SARS-CoV-2 concentrations in air
142 ranged from 1.84×10^3 to 3.38×10^3 RNA copies per m^3 air sampled. Rooms with viral
143 particles detected in the air also had surface contamination detected.

144 There were no baseline differences between patients with environmental surface
145 contamination and those without, in terms of age, comorbidities, and positive clinical sample
146 on the day of sampling. Median cycle threshold (Ct) values of the clinical specimens for
147 patients with and without environmental surface contamination were 25.69 (IQR 20.37 to
148 34.48) and 33.04 (28.45 to 35.66) respectively (Table 2).

149 Of the rooms with environmental contamination, the floor was most likely to be contaminated
150 (65%), followed by the bed rail (59%), and bedside locker (42%) (Figure 1). Contamination
151 of toilet seat and automatic toilet flush button was detected in five out of 27 rooms, and all
152 five occupants had reported gastrointestinal symptoms within the preceding one week of
153 sampling. We did not detect surface contamination in any of the three ICU rooms.

154 Presence of environmental surface contamination was higher in week 1 of illness (Figure 2)
155 and showed association with the clinical cyclical threshold ($P=0.06$). Surface environment
156 contamination was not associated with the presence of symptoms or supplementary oxygen
157 (Table 2). In a subgroup analysis, the presence and extent of high-touch surface
158 contamination were significantly higher in rooms of patients in their first week of illness
159 (Figure 2). The best fit curve with the least-squares fit (Figure 3) showed that the extent of
160 high-touch surface contamination declined with increasing duration of illness and Ct values.
161 There was also no correlation between the Ct values of clinical samples and the Ct values of
162 environmental samples across the days of illness (Supplemental Figure 3).

163 **Discussion**

164 Surface sampling revealed that the PCR-positivity high-touch surfaces was associated with
165 nasopharyngeal viral loads and peaked at approximately day four to five of symptoms. Air
166 sampling of the AIIR environments of two COVID-19 patients (both day five of illness with
167 high nasopharyngeal swab viral loads) detected the presence of SARS-CoV-2 particles sized
168 1-4 μm and $> 4 \mu\text{m}$. The absence of any detection of SARS-CoV-2 in air samples of the third
169 patient (day nine of illness with lower nasopharyngeal viral load concentration) suggests that
170 the presence of SARS-CoV-2 in the air is possibly highest in the first week of illness.

171 Recent aggregated environmental sampling and laboratory experiments have examined the
172 particle size distribution of SARS-CoV-2 in the air. A study from Wuhan, China sampled
173 three different environmental settings and detected aerosol size range particles ¹⁰.
174 Additionally, a recent laboratory study demonstrated the ability of SARS-CoV-2 to remain
175 viable in aerosols for up to 3 hours ¹¹. While limited in subject numbers, our study examined
176 this issue at the individual patient-level, thus enabling correlation of particle size distribution
177 in the air with symptoms duration and nasopharyngeal viral loads. The absence of aerosol-
178 generating procedures or intranasal oxygen supplementation reduces the possibility of our
179 current findings being iatrogenic in nature. Larger individual patient-level studies examining
180 the droplet and aerosolizing potential of SARS-CoV-2 over different distances and under
181 different patient and environmental conditions are rapidly needed to determine the
182 generalizability of our current findings.

183 In the current analysis the presence and concentration of SARS-CoV-2 in air and high-touch
184 surface samples correlated with the day of illness and nasopharyngeal viral loads of COVID-
185 19 patients. This finding is supported by multiple observational clinical studies have
186 demonstrated that SARS-CoV-2 viral loads peak in the first week among COVID-19 patients
187 ^{2,12,13}, with active viral replication in the upper respiratory tract in the first five days of
188 illness¹⁴. This finding could help inform public health and infection prevention measures in

189 prioritizing resources by risk stratifying COVID-19 patients by their potential to directly or
190 indirectly transmit the SARS-CoV-2 virus to others.

191 Our study was limited in that it did not determine the ability of SARS-CoV-2 to be cultured
192 from the environmental swabs and the differentially-sized air particles which would be vital
193 to determining the infectiousness of the detected particles. Another study from Nebraska
194 attempted virus culture on SARS-CoV-2 PCR-positive air samples, however could not isolate
195 viable virus ¹⁵. The difficulty in culturing virus from air samples arises from low virus
196 concentrations, as well as the compromised integrity of the virus due to air sampling
197 stressors. Future studies using enhanced virus culture techniques could be considered ¹⁶, and
198 efforts to design a culture method to isolate virus from our samples is underway. Second,
199 sampling in an AIIR environment may not be representative of community settings and
200 further work is needed to generalize our current findings. Third, we sampled each room at a
201 single timepoint during the course of illness and did not track environmental contamination
202 over the course of illness for individual patients. Fourth, as clinical results were within 72
203 hours of environmental testing, it is plausible that during the day of testing, viral load was
204 actually low or negligible, hence limiting environmental contamination.

205 Current evidence does not seem to point to aerosolization as the key route of transmission of
206 SARS-CoV-2, and there have been reports of healthcare workers not being infected after
207 exposure to confirmed patients despite not using airborne precautions¹⁷. Detailed
208 epidemiologic studies of outbreaks, in both healthcare and non-healthcare settings, should be
209 carried out to determine the relative contribution of various routes of transmission and their
210 correlation with patient-level factors.

211 In conclusion, in a limited number of AIIR environments, our current study involving
212 individual COVID-19 patients not undergoing aerosol-generating procedures or oxygen

213 supplementation suggest that SARS-CoV-2 can be shed in the air from a patient in particles
214 sized between 1 to 4 microns. Even though particles in this size range have the potential to
215 linger longer in the air, more data on viability and infectiousness of the virus would be
216 required to confirm the potential airborne spread of SARS-CoV-2. Additionally, the
217 concentrations of SARS-CoV-2 in the air and high-touch surfaces could be highest during the
218 first week of COVID-19 illness. Further work is urgently needed to examine these findings in
219 larger numbers and different settings to better understand the factors affecting air and surface
220 spread of SARS-CoV-2 and inform effective infection prevention policies.

221 **Acknowledgements**

222 We thank Dr Bill Lindsley (National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health, NIOSH)
223 for loaning us aerosol samplers and guiding us in their use; Dr. Raquel Binder and Emily
224 Robie from the Duke One Health team for quickly providing us equipment for use in this
225 study; Dr Hsu Li Yang (Saw Swee Hock School of Public Health, National University of
226 Singapore) for facilitating the air sampling; and Dr Ding Ying (National Centre for Infectious
227 Diseases, Singapore) for helping with project coordination. No compensation was received
228 for their roles in the study.

229 We further thank the colleagues in DSO National Laboratories in the environmental detection
230 team and clinical diagnostics team for BSL3 sample processing and analysis as well as the
231 logistics and repository team for transport of biohazard material, inventory and safekeeping
232 of received items.

233

234 **Conflict of Interest Disclosures**

235 None reported.

236

237 **Funding**

238 This study is funded by NMRC Seed Funding Program (TR19NMR119SD), NMRC COVID-
239 19 Research Fund (COVID19RF-001) and internal funds from DSO National Laboratories.

240 This study is funded by NMRC Seed Funding Program (TR19NMR119SD), NMRC COVID-
241 19 Research Fund (COVID19RF-001), and internal funds from DSO National Laboratories.

242 Ng OT is supported by NMRC Clinician Scientist Award (MOH-000276). K Marimuthu is
243 supported by NMRC CS-IRG (CIRG18Nov-0034). Chia PY is supported by NMRC

244 Research Training Fellowship (NMRC/Fellowship/0056/2018).

245

246 **Role of Funder/Sponsors**

247 The funders had no role in the design and conduct of the study; collection, management,
248 analysis and interpretation of the data; preparation, review or approval of the manuscript; and
249 decision to submit the manuscript for publication.

250 References

- 251 1. Ong, S.W.X., *et al.* Air, Surface Environmental, and Personal Protective Equipment
252 Contamination by Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2)
253 From a Symptomatic Patient. *JAMA* (2020).
- 254 2. Young, B.E., *et al.* Epidemiologic Features and Clinical Course of Patients Infected
255 With SARS-CoV-2 in Singapore. *JAMA* (2020).
- 256 3. Chan, J.F.-W., *et al.* A familial cluster of pneumonia associated with the 2019 novel
257 coronavirus indicating person-to-person transmission: a study of a family cluster. *The*
258 *Lancet* (2020).
- 259 4. Pan, X., *et al.* Asymptomatic cases in a family cluster with SARS-CoV-2 infection.
260 *Lancet Infect Dis* (2020).
- 261 5. Bai, Y., *et al.* Presumed Asymptomatic Carrier Transmission of COVID-19. *JAMA*
262 (2020).
- 263 6. WHO. Report of the WHO-China Joint Mission on Coronavirus Disease 2019
264 (COVID-19). (2020).
- 265 7. Coleman, K.K. & Sigler, W.V. Airborne Influenza A Virus Exposure in an
266 Elementary School. *Scientific Reports* **10**, 1859 (2020).
- 267 8. Corman, V.M., *et al.* Detection of 2019 novel coronavirus (2019-nCoV) by real-time
268 RT-PCR. *Eurosurveillance* **25**, 2000045 (2020).
- 269 9. Young, B.E., *et al.* Epidemiologic Features and Clinical Course of Patients Infected
270 With SARS-CoV-2 in Singapore. *JAMA* (2020).
- 271 10. Liu, Y., *et al.* Aerodynamic Characteristics and RNA Concentration of SARS-CoV-2
272 Aerosol in Wuhan Hospitals during COVID-19 Outbreak. *BioRxiv* (2020).
- 273 11. van Doremalen, N., *et al.* Aerosol and Surface Stability of SARS-CoV-2 as Compared
274 with SARS-CoV-1. *New England Journal of Medicine* (2020).
- 275 12. Zou, L., *et al.* SARS-CoV-2 Viral Load in Upper Respiratory Specimens of Infected
276 Patients. *N Engl J Med* (2020).
- 277 13. Wang, W., *et al.* Detection of SARS-CoV-2 in Different Types of Clinical Specimens.
278 *JAMA* (2020).
- 279 14. Wölfel, R., *et al.* Virological assessment of hospitalized patients with COVID-2019.
280 *Nature* (2020).
- 281 15. Santarpia, J.L., *et al.* Transmission Potential of SARS-CoV-2 in Viral Shedding
282 Observed at the University of Nebraska Medical Center. *medRxiv* (2020).
- 283 16. Cao, G., Noti, J., Blachere, F., Lindsley, W. & Beezhold, D. Development of an
284 improved methodology to detect infectious airborne influenza virus using the NIOSH
285 bioaerosol sampler. *Journal of Environmental Monitoring* **13**, 3321-3328 (2011).
- 286 17. Ng, K., *et al.* COVID-19 and the Risk to Health Care Workers: A Case Report. *Ann*
287 *Intern Med* (2020).

288

289 **Tables & Figures**

290 **Table 1. Severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) detections in**
 291 **the air of hospital rooms of infected patients**

Patient	Day of illness	Symptoms reported on day of air sampling	Clinical Ct value*	Airborne SARS-CoV-2 concentrations (RNA copies m⁻³ air)	Aerosol particle size	Samplers used
1	9	Cough, nausea, dyspnea	33.22	ND ND	-- --	NIOSH SKC Filters
2	5	Cough, dyspnea	18.45	2,000 1,384	>4 μm 1-4 μm	NIOSH
3	5	Asymptomatic [†]	20.11	927 916	>4 μm 1-4 μm	NIOSH

ND = none detected

*PCR cycle threshold value from patient's clinical sample

[†]Patient reported fever, cough, and sore throat until the day before the sampling. Patient reported no symptoms on the day of sampling, however was observed to be coughing during sampling

292


293

294 **Table 2: Baseline clinical characteristics of COVID-19 patients with environmental**
 295 **contamination**

Characteristics of COVID-19 patients	Rooms with surface environment contamination (n=17)	Rooms without surface environment contamination (n=13)	P-value
Median age (IQR)	52 (42 to 62)	44 (36 to 55)	0.75
Male Sex (%)	6 (46%)	8 (47%)	0.96
Median Age Adjusted Charlson's Comorbidity Index (IQR)	1 (0 to 2)	1 (0 to 1)	0.69
Median day of Illness (IQR)	5 (4 to 9)	13 (5 to 20)	0.17
Median day of stay in room (IQR)	3 (3 to 8)	4 (2 to 16)	0.95
Oxygen requirement (%)	0	4 (31)	0.03
Symptomatic (%)	12 (71)	11 (85)	0.43
Respiratory symptoms (%)	11 (65)	7 (54)	0.55
Gastrointestinal symptoms (%)	1 (6)	1 (8)	>0.99
Clinical Cycle threshold value, median (IQR)*	25.69 (20.37 to 34.48)	33.04 (28.45 to 35.66)	0.06

296 *PCR cycle threshold value from patient's clinical sample

297 **Figure 1: Percentage of contaminated swabs from surface samples, in rooms with any**
298 **contamination**



299 All other sites were n=17, except for air exhaust vents where n=5

300

301

302

303


304

305

306

307

308 **Figure 2: 2a. Percentage of patients with contamination of high touch surfaces in in the**
309 **first week of illness compared with more than first week of illness. 2b. Percentage of**
310 **surfaces contaminated across weeks of illness. 2c. Percentage of high-touch surfaces**
311 **contaminated across weeks of illness**



312

313 **Figure 3: 3a. Mean percentage of high touch surface contaminated by day of illness with**
314 **95% confidence interval with best fit curve. 3b. Mean percentage of high touch surfaces**
315 **contaminated by clinical cycle threshold values with 95% confidence interval with best fit**
316 **curve. 3c. Mean percentage of high touch surface contaminated by day of illness with**
317 **95% confidence interval grouped by symptoms**

