

1 **The detection of SARS-CoV-2 in autolysed samples from an exhumed decomposed**
2 **body: Implications to virus survival, genome stability and**
3 **spatial distribution in tissues**

4
5 Mahadeshwara Prasad^{a*}, Somanna Ajjamada Nachappa^{b*}, Niveditha Anand^b, Deepika Udayawara Rudresh^b,
6 Yashika Singh^b, Surabhi P. Gangani, Forum K. Bhansali, Basista Rabina Sharma^b, Deep Nithun Senathipathi,
7 Shashidhar H. Byrappa^c, Prakash M. Halami^{b**}, Ravindra P. Veeranna^{***}

8 CSIR^d-CFTRI^e COVID-19 Testing Centre,
9 CSIR-Central Food Technological Research Institute,
10 KRS Road, Mysuru-570020

11
12
13 * Equal contribution

14 ^a Senior Specialist, Department of Forensic Medicine, District Hospital, Metagalgi, Mysuru- 570016.

15 ^{**} Nodal Officer, CSIR-CFTRI COVID-19 Testing Centre. Chief Scientist and Head, Department of
16 Microbiology & Fermentation Technology, CSIR-CFTRI.

17 ^{***} In-Charge Coordinator, CSIR-CFTRI COVID-19 Testing Centre, DBT Ramalingaswami Fellow,
18 Department of Biochemistry, CSIR-CFTRI, Corresponding Author. Email: raviravindra1@gmail.com

19 ^b: Department of Microbiology & Fermentation Technology, CSIR-CFTRI.

20 Council of Scientific and Industrial Research

21 ^c: Professor, Department of Pathology, Mysore Medical College & Research Institute (MMC&RI), Irvin
22 Road, 570001.

23 ^d: Council of Scientific & Industrial Research, New Delhi 110001.

24 ^e: Central Food Technological Research Institute, KRS Road, Mysuru 570020.

25
26
27 **Abstract**

28 Here we report for the first time the SARS-CoV-2 detection in autolysed samples from an exhumed
29 decomposed body post-thirty six days after death. Both naso-oropharyngeal swabs and visceral
30 samples from the lung, intestine, liver, and kidney were collected from the body exhumed post-fifteen
31 days after burial, stored in viral transport medium and in saturated salt solution respectively. Naso-
32 oropharyngeal swabs showed the presence of the SARS-CoV-2 genome as identified by the
33 amplification of viral E, N, RdRP, or ORF1ab genes by RT-PCR. Subsequent examination of tissues
34 reveal the detection of the virus genome in the intestine and liver, while no detection in the kidney and
35 lung. These results signify the genome stability and implicate the virus survival in decomposed swab
36 samples and in tissues and thereafter in storage solution. Further results also indicate spatial
37 distribution of the virus in tissues during the early stage of infection in the subject with no respiratory
38 distress. Considering the presence of cool, humid, and moist location of the exhumation, the presence
39 of virus genome might also indicate that SARS-CoV-2 can persist for more than seven days on the
40 surface of dead bodies similar to the Ebola virus, confirming that transmission from deceased subjects
41 is possible for an extended period after death. These results further reaffirm the robustness of the RT-
42 PCR aiding in the detection of viruses or their genome in decomposed samples when other methods of
43 detection could not be useful.

44
45 **Key Words:** SARS-CoV-2, Virus survival, Genome stability, Autolysis, RT-PCR.

48

49 **Background**

50 Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome-Corona Virus (SARS-CoV)-2 causes coronavirus disease
51 (COVID)-19 characterized by fever, dry cough, body pain, loss of smell, taste, respiratory distress,
52 multi-organ failure, and death[1].The case fatality rate (CFR) of the disease varies between 2%-13%,
53 majority of people aged over 60 years and people with impaired immune function, and those with
54 underlying medical conditions including diabetes, cardiovascular diseases, etc., or are most affected
55 [2],[3],[4]. So far, 90 M people were found positive, 50 M people recovered, while 2 M have died
56 globally[5]. The incubation period of the disease varies between 2-14 days[6]. The transmission mode
57 includes surface contact of aerosol droplets from infected persons, followed by touching the nose,
58 eyes, and mouth. Evidence also points towards vertical transmission to new-borns and faecal
59 transmission[7],[8]. The efforts to mitigate the spread of the virus infection depend on high testing-to-
60 case ratio, contact tracing, quarantine or isolation, and treatment strategies of positives[9], vaccination
61 and following the COVID-19 appropriate behaviour such as frequent hand sanitization, face masking,
62 social distancing[10].

63 Detection of viral RNA by the real-time reverse transcription-polymerase chain reaction (RT-PCR)
64 remains the gold-standard technique of confirmation of COVID-19. The RT-PCR method is very
65 sensitive and specific in detecting the SARS-CoV-2 virus genome[11]. The interpretation of results
66 depends on the accuracy of the test and the pre-test probability or estimated risk of disease before
67 testing[12],[13]. Since RT-PCR detection of the virus is based on the viral genome amplification, the
68 presence of the viral RNA alone, irrespective of the virus's viability or infectivity, could show
69 positive[13]. There are reports that recovered people without clinical disease showing positive by RT-
70 PCR due to traces of fragmented RNA in the naso-oropharyngeal region[14]. Further, there are reports
71 that suggest differential sensitivity rate in the detection of the virus for specimens obtained from
72 different sites indicating potential diversity in the distribution of virus in different mucosal surfaces
73 and parts of the tissues such as the lung, intestine, liver, kidney etc.[15]. The dynamics of virus
74 shedding, viral load from other sites, and time of infection have been thought to account for this
75 variation in detection of the virus, for example, the virus being present in deeper respiratory specimens
76 with the advanced disease[16]. However, more studies are required to understand the significance of
77 sampling at different sites in the context of temporal and spatial distribution of virus in the body. A
78 negative PCR result needs to be interpreted in the context of this variability in viral shedding. A
79 negative PCR assay could be due to a true negative that people have not been infected with the SARS-
80 CoV-2 or due to sampling error, sampling timing, the viral load, viral shedding, and the virus's
81 presence in deeper respiratory tissues as noted under the advanced stage[17],[18]. Current practice is to
82 repeat further naso-oropharyngeal swabs or, if possible, to take deep respiratory samples if the first
83 naso-oropharyngeal swab is negative. When a patient is suspected of having COVID-19, the current
84 recommendation is to take two swabs each from upper and lower respiratory tracts[19].

85 The degree to which live viruses can survive in various environments and dead human tissue has been
86 the subject of intense debate since the beginning of this pandemic[20],[21]. This critical piece of
87 information can substantially impact a broad spectrum of areas, from the safe handling of laboratory
88 specimens to disease mitigation procedures and the disposal of the dead body[19]. The RNA has been
89 recovered from the 1918 influenza epidemic using pathology museum samples and lung tissue samples
90 obtained from exhumed bodies from a mass grave in Alaska as late as 1997, though its viability is
91 debatable[22]. Further, the oldest viral genome extracted and sequenced belongs to the hepatitis B
92 virus[23]. To date, there has been no published data on the persistence of SARS-CoV-2 or its genomic
93 RNA in the naso-oropharyngeal swabs, and in various tissues such as the lung, intestine, liver and
94 kidney from the exhumed decomposed body, and we believe this is the first report to illustrate that
95 SARS-CoV-2 was detected in decomposed naso- oropharyngeal swabs and tissue samples. This novel

96 finding signifies the fact that SARS-CoV-2 can be detected in decomposed samples and swabbing
97 upper respiratory mucosa is sufficient for obtaining samples for diagnosis. In addition, the findings
98 also implicate virus survival and genome stability, and spatial distribution of virus in tissues in early
99 infection. Furthermore, results also suggests that SARS-CoV-2 similar to other enveloped viruses such
100 as Ebola virus[24] can persist for more than seven days on the surface of dead bodies and in body
101 tissues, confirming that transmission from deceased subjects is possible for an extended period after
102 death. These results further reaffirm the robustness of the RT-PCR aiding in the detection of viruses in
103 exhumed, decomposed samples when other methods of detection could not be useful.

104 **Case presentation and qualitative multiplex one-step RT-PCR**

105 Medical history reveals of a subject with age in 40's, had fever, cough, body pain with no other
106 apparent health issues was earlier tested COVID-19 negative by rapid antigen test (RAT) and positive
107 by RT-PCR. Two days post-detection, the subject died under mysterious circumstances and the body
108 was buried in an eight feet deep pit under a tree surrounded by a cool, humid location with paddy
109 fields around. To ascertain the cause, mode and manner of the death, fifteen days post-burial; the body
110 was exhumed and post-mortem examination was conducted as per the law by the forensic medicine
111 specialist. The ethical approval for the testing of samples was obtained from the Mysore Medical
112 College & Research Institute (MMC&RI), Mysuru (MMCEC24/20). The body showed all features of
113 decomposition. The relaxed joints, flabby muscles, fallen and easily pluckable hairs, protruded
114 eyeballs, swollen tongue, abdomen, and genitals. The whole body was moist and foul-smelling with
115 flies flying around it. The superficial skin layer of the body was peeled entirely and destroyed.
116 Internal examination of the body revealed that the brain was liquified, foul-smelling, lungs, liver, and
117 spleen, stomach, small and large intestine were filled with gas. The mucosa of the larynx and trachea
118 was disintegrated with intact cartilage. The oropharyngeal and nasopharyngeal swab samples were
119 collected in viral transport medium (VTM) and tissues such as lung, intestine, liver, kidney were
120 collected in saturated solution of sodium chloride and stored in -80°C freezer. Post-twenty one days
121 after collection of samples, following completion of legal procedures, samples were sent for the
122 detection of SARS-CoV-2.

123 The RNA was extracted from naso-oropharyngeal samples and from tissues using RNA spin columns
124 manually (HiMedia, Mumbai) as well as using automated RNA extractor (Genetix Biotech Asia Pvt.
125 Ltd., New Delhi) as per the protocol described by each kit. The extracted RNA was reconstituted in
126 RNase free water and stored in -80°C deep freezer until the RT-PCR assay was set up. The real-time
127 one-step multiplex RT-PCR was done using TaqMan probes designed to target genes coding for
128 envelope (E), nucleoprotein (N), open reading frame 1ab (ORF1ab) and or RNA dependent RNA
129 polymerase (RdRP) with RNase P or actin as internal control as specified by each kit [(Genes2Me
130 (Genes2Me Pvt. Ltd., Gurugram), Q-Line molecular (POCT Services, New Delhi), and Meril (Meril
131 Diagnostics Pvt. Ltd., Vapi)]. All these kits have been approved by the Indian Council of Medical
132 Research (ICMR, New Delhi) for detection of SARS-CoV-2 in clinical samples. The RNase free water
133 as template for negative controls, extracted RNA as template for the test, and respective template
134 provided with the kit for positive controls were included for the detection. The PCR cycle conditions
135 were set as determined by each kit. The total number of cycles fixed to forty. The cycle threshold (CT)
136 values and the amplification curve were recorded. Mean CT values were used for the interpretation of
137 results.

138

139

140

141

142

143

144 **Results and discussion**

145 **Naso-oropharyngeal swabs showed positive for SARS-CoV-2 by RT-PCR**

146 Naso-oropharyngeal swab samples were processed and the extracted RNA examined for the presence
147 of SARS-CoV-2 by RT-PCR. Results show that mean CT values for E, N, RdRP, and RNase P genes
148 were 27.1, 25.3, 25.8, and 34.0, respectively using the Genes2Me kit. The viral gene amplification was
149 further examined using the other kit (Q-line), that adopts the dual-target gene design, which targets
150 specific conserved sequence encoding the ORF1ab gene and the N gene. The mean CT values of N,
151 ORF1ab, and that of the internal control were 29.4, 28.8, 30.4, respectively. Furthermore, results were
152 additionally verified by using another kit (Meril) which also utilizes dual gene amplification for
153 detection. The mean CT values observed were 31 for N gene, 31.5 for ORF1ab gene and 34.5 for the
154 RNase P internal control gene. Fig. 1 shows the linear amplification plot of the above genes using all
155 three kits for the negative control (left panel), test (mid panel), and that of the positive control (right
156 panel). These results confirm the presence of the SARS-CoV-2 RNA in the naso-oropharyngeal
157 samples from the exhumed decomposed body post-thirty six days after death.

158 **Intestine, liver tissues showed positive while the kidney and lung tissues showed negative for** 159 **SARS-CoV-2**

160 Microscopy examination of the lung and kidney revealed autolytic changes (data not shown).
161 Therefore, to examine if SARS-CoV-2 RNA could be detected in tissues, the lung, intestine, liver and
162 kidney tissues were processed and examined by RT-PCR. As shown in the figure 2, the intestine, liver
163 showed amplification however, the kidney and the lung did not show the amplification of SARS-CoV-
164 2 specific E, N, RdRP or ORF1ab genes as verified using all three kits. The mean CT values of the
165 above genes are shown in the table 1.

166 These results indicate stability of the SARS-CoV-2 genome as well as virus survival in decomposed
167 samples. Further, it also suggests temporal and spatial distribution of the virus in tissues. Additionally,
168 it also confirms the utility of the PCR for the detection of viruses in samples from decomposed tissues
169 where other techniques are not useful. Morkotter et al. (2015)[25] utilized RT-PCR assay to diagnose
170 rabies infection in exhumed dog carcasses when other methods were unsuccessful because of the state
171 of decomposition of the brain material. Further, they observed that the RT-PCR method was useful for
172 forensic examination of decomposed tissue and to obtain the epidemiological information which
173 otherwise would not have known with other conventional methods. In this context, RT-PCR assay was
174 useful for the detection of SARS-CoV-2 in these decomposed samples while other methods including
175 histopathology, and high-resolution computed tomography (HRCT), blood examination etc., have
176 limitations. However, RT-PCR, being a very sensitive and genome-based technique can show positive
177 with the mere presence of traces of fragmented genome, which is observed in samples of
178 asymptomatic and recovered subjects[26]. Additionally, findings from this assay might not reveal if
179 the virus was viable or dead in the decomposed tissue but demonstrate the stability of the SARS-CoV-
180 2 genome in the decomposed tissue. Though there is no data yet as it relates to the detection of SARS-
181 CoV-2 by RT-PCR in dead and decomposed tissues from the exhumed body, based on information
182 from other viruses, typically, if an infectious virus is detected for days to weeks after the death, the
183 genome of the virus can be detected for months to years.

184 The ability of the SARS-CoV-2 to survive in different environmental conditions like soil, varying
185 humidity and temperature is not adequately documented. Further, there are no specific studies relating
186 to the stability of SARS-CoV-2 in decomposed tissues. A few studies show that in aerosolized form,
187 the virus can survive at relative humidity (RH) of 40-60% at a temperature of 19-22 °C for 90 mins,

188 which is twice as longer as Influenza virus[27],[28]. The virus inoculated on various surfaces survived
189 up to 28 days at 20 °C at 50% RH[29], pointing to the environmental stability of the SARS-CoV-2
190 virus under favourable temperature and humid conditions. Further, studies done on similar enveloped
191 viruses such as influenza may also provide indication on the stability of SARS-CoV-2 in decomposed
192 tissue. It was found that 90% of the virus gets inactivated in around fifteen days in the muscle, ten days
193 in feather, and less than a day in the liver tissue when the carcass of the dead bird was left at room
194 temperature. But if the carcass was preserved at refrigeration (4°C), the viability of the virus lasted 4.5
195 times longer, that is, more than two months[30]. Therefore, the stability of the virus in dead tissues
196 depends on the localization of the virus in tissues at the time of death, temperature, humidity, number
197 of copies of the virus, etc. In general, virus survival in dead tissue may not be longer as microbes will
198 start to decompose the body and produce heat, which will limit the virus viability further. Considering
199 the presence of cool, humid and moist location surrounded by the paddy fields, the presence of virus
200 genome might also indicate the virus survival in decomposed tissues. However, culturing of the virus
201 from swab or tissue samples and subsequent detection of viral proteins could confirm the virus
202 viability in tissues after death.

203 Our findings also reveal implications to spatial and temporal distribution of SARS-CoV-2 in tissues at
204 the time of death. Studies have shown that SARS-CoV-2 localizes in the lung and in other tissues
205 including the kidney during advances stages of the disease[31]. However, it is not clear the factors that
206 determine the spread of the virus to extrapulmonary tissues. Several studies correlate to higher
207 expression levels of angiotensin converting enzyme (ACE)-2 receptors in some organs than in
208 others[32]. Similarly, the presence of virus genome in the decomposed intestine and the liver in our
209 study might correlate with higher expression of ACE2 receptors in them however, the absence of virus
210 genome in the kidney and the lung might be attributed to the early infection stage. Further, subject had
211 died without any apparent COVID-19 associated complications two days post-detection of the virus
212 genome in naso- oropharyngeal sample by RT-PCR. Therefore, it is possible that at the time of death
213 virus infection might be in the early stages with lesser viral load and without respiratory distress.
214 Following swallowing of sputum, infection might have spread to the intestine that has substantial
215 number of ACE-2 receptors, then to the liver through portal circulation. Further studies such as virus
216 culture, detection of virus titre, and expression levels of other viral proteins are required to evaluate the
217 virus survival in these samples.

218 In summary, we demonstrate for the first time that SARS-CoV-2 was detected in autolysed naso-
219 oropharyngeal swabs and in tissues from an exhumed decomposed body. This report signifies the
220 genome stability and also implicates survival stability of the SARS-CoV-2 in decomposed tissues, and
221 swabbing upper respiratory mucosa is sufficient for obtaining samples for diagnosis. Further, results
222 suggest the spatial distribution of the virus in tissues during early stage of infection with no respiratory
223 distress. Additionally, findings also suggest that SARS-CoV-2, similar to other viruses such as Ebola
224 virus[24], can persist for more than seven days on the surface of dead bodies, confirming that
225 transmission from deceased subjects is possible for an extended period after death. These results
226 further reaffirm the robustness of the RT-PCR aiding in the detection of viruses or their genome in
227 exhumed, decomposed samples when other methods of detection could not be useful.

228 **Declaration of Interests**

229 We declare no competing interests.

230 **Data Sharing**

231 We declare we no objection to sharing and dissemination of this research findings.

232 **Acknowledgements**

233 This study was supported by the financial support from the CSIR-CFTRI, Bharatiya Reserve Bank
234 Note Mudran (P) Limited, Mysuru and Govt. of Karnataka. The corresponding author acknowledges,
235 Department of Biotechnology (DBT), Govt. of India, for providing the Ramalingaswami Fellowship.
236 All authors are thankful to the Director, CSIR-CFTRI for providing facilities to carry out this study.
237

238

239 Bibliography

- 240 1 Wang D, Hu B, Hu C, *et al.* Clinical Characteristics of 138 Hospitalized Patients With 2019 Novel
241 Coronavirus-Infected Pneumonia in Wuhan, China. *JAMA* 2020;**323**:1061–9. doi:10.1001/jama.2020.1585
- 242 2 Erener S. Diabetes, infection risk and COVID-19. *Mol Metab* 2020;**39**:101044.
243 doi:10.1016/j.molmet.2020.101044
- 244 3 Wang T, Du Z, Zhu F, *et al.* Comorbidities and multi-organ injuries in the treatment of COVID-19. *Lancet*
245 2020;**395**:e52. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(20)30558-4
- 246 4 Miller LE, Bhattacharyya R, Miller AL. Data regarding country-specific variability in Covid-19 prevalence,
247 incidence, and case fatality rate. *Data Brief* 2020;**32**. doi:10.1016/j.dib.2020.106276
- 248 5 Coronavirus (COVID-19). Google News. [https://news.google.com/covid19/map?hl=en-](https://news.google.com/covid19/map?hl=en-SG&gl=SG&ceid=SG:en)
249 [SG&gl=SG&ceid=SG:en](https://news.google.com/covid19/map?hl=en-SG&gl=SG&ceid=SG:en) (accessed 13 Dec 2020).
- 250 6 Backer JA, Klinkenberg D, Wallinga J. Incubation period of 2019 novel coronavirus (2019-nCoV)
251 infections among travellers from Wuhan, China, 20-28 January 2020. *Euro Surveill* 2020;**25**.
252 doi:10.2807/1560-7917.ES.2020.25.5.2000062
- 253 7 Lu C-W, Liu X-F, Jia Z-F. 2019-nCoV transmission through the ocular surface must not be ignored. *Lancet*
254 2020;**395**:e39. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(20)30313-5
- 255 8 Li Q, Guan X, Wu P, *et al.* Early Transmission Dynamics in Wuhan, China, of Novel Coronavirus-Infected
256 Pneumonia. *N Engl J Med* 2020;**382**:1199–207. doi:10.1056/NEJMoa2001316
- 257 9 CDC. CDC COVID-19 Global Response. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.
258 2020.<https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/global-covid-19/community-mitigation-measures.html>
259 (accessed 13 Dec 2020).
- 260 10 MHA extends the Guidelines for Re-opening. pib.gov.in/Pressreleaseshare.aspx?PRID=1667821 (accessed
261 13 Dec 2020).
- 262 11 A P-S, D B, F F, *et al.* Laboratory findings in COVID-19 diagnosis and prognosis. *Clinica chimica acta;*
263 *international journal of clinical chemistry.* 2020;**510**. doi:10.1016/j.cca.2020.08.019
- 264 12 Bullis SSM, Crothers JW, Wayne S, *et al.* A cautionary tale of false-negative nasopharyngeal COVID-19
265 testing. *IDCases* 2020;**20**:e00791. doi:10.1016/j.idcr.2020.e00791
- 266 13 Watson J, Whiting PF, Brush JE. Interpreting a covid-19 test result. *BMJ* 2020;**369**:m1808.
267 doi:10.1136/bmj.m1808
- 268 14 Landi F, Gremese E, Rota E, *et al.* Positive RT-PCR nasopharyngeal swab in patients recovered from
269 COVID-19 disease: When does quarantine really end? *J Infect* 2020;**81**:e1–3.
270 doi:10.1016/j.jinf.2020.08.034

- 271 15 Wang W, Xu Y, Gao R, *et al.* Detection of SARS-CoV-2 in Different Types of Clinical Specimens. *JAMA*
272 Published Online First: 11 March 2020. doi:10.1001/jama.2020.3786
- 273 16 Zou L, Ruan F, Huang M, *et al.* SARS-CoV-2 Viral Load in Upper Respiratory Specimens of Infected
274 Patients. *New England Journal of Medicine*. 2020. doi:10.1056/NEJMc2001737
- 275 17 Zhang W, Du R-H, Li B, *et al.* Molecular and serological investigation of 2019-nCoV infected patients:
276 implication of multiple shedding routes. *Emerg Microbes Infect* 2020;**9**:386–9.
277 doi:10.1080/22221751.2020.1729071
- 278 18 Surkova E, Nikolayevskyy V, Drobniewski F. False-positive COVID-19 results: hidden problems and costs.
279 *The Lancet Respiratory Medicine* 2020;**8**:1167–8. doi:10.1016/S2213-2600(20)30453-7
- 280 19 Hanley B, Lucas SB, Youd E, *et al.* Autopsy in suspected COVID-19 cases. *Journal of Clinical Pathology*
281 2020;**73**:239–42. doi:10.1136/jclinpath-2020-206522
- 282 20 Chin AWH, Chu JTS, Perera MRA, *et al.* Stability of SARS-CoV-2 in different environmental conditions.
283 *The Lancet Microbe* 2020;**1**:e10. doi:10.1016/S2666-5247(20)30003-3
- 284 21 Chan K-H, Sridhar S, Zhang RR, *et al.* Factors affecting stability and infectivity of SARS-CoV-2. *Journal*
285 *of Hospital Infection* 2020;**106**:226–31. doi:10.1016/j.jhin.2020.07.009
- 286 22 Taubenberger JK, Reid AH, Krafft AE, *et al.* Initial Genetic Characterization of the 1918 “Spanish”
287 Influenza Virus. *Science* 1997;**275**:1793–6. doi:10.1126/science.275.5307.1793
- 288 23 Zhang S. The Oldest Virus Ever Sequenced Comes From a 7,000-Year-Old Man’s Tooth. *The Atlantic*.
289 2018.[https://www.theatlantic.com/science/archive/2018/05/a-7000-year-old-virus-sequenced-from-a-](https://www.theatlantic.com/science/archive/2018/05/a-7000-year-old-virus-sequenced-from-a-neolithic-mans-tooth/559862/)
290 [neolithic-mans-tooth/559862/](https://www.theatlantic.com/science/archive/2018/05/a-7000-year-old-virus-sequenced-from-a-neolithic-mans-tooth/559862/) (accessed 12 Dec 2020).
- 291 24 Prescott J, Bushmaker T, Fischer R, *et al.* Postmortem Stability of Ebola Virus. *Emerg Infect Dis*
292 2015;**21**:856–9. doi:10.3201/eid2105.150041
- 293 25 Markotter W, Coertse J, le Roux K, *et al.* Utility of forensic detection of rabies virus in decomposed
294 exhumed dog carcasses. *J S Afr Vet Assoc* 2015;**86**. doi:10.4102/jsava.v86i1.1220
- 295 26 Song K-H, Kim D-M, Lee H, *et al.* Dynamics of viral load and anti-SARS-CoV-2 antibodies in patients
296 with positive RT-PCR results after recovery from COVID-19. *Korean J Intern Med* Published Online First:
297 25 November 2020. doi:10.3904/kjim.2020.325
- 298 27 The Influence of Simulated Sunlight on the Inactivation of Influenza Virus in Aerosols - PubMed.
299 <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/31778532/> (accessed 13 Jan 2021).
- 300 28 Smither SJ, Eastaugh LS, Findlay JS, *et al.* Experimental aerosol survival of SARS-CoV-2 in artificial
301 saliva and tissue culture media at medium and high humidity. *Emerg Microbes Infect* 2020;**9**:1415–7.
302 doi:10.1080/22221751.2020.1777906
- 303 29 Riddell S, Goldie S, Hill A, *et al.* The effect of temperature on persistence of SARS-CoV-2 on common
304 surfaces. *Virol J* 2020;**17**:145. doi:10.1186/s12985-020-01418-7
- 305 30 Yamamoto Y, Nakamura K, Mase M. Survival of Highly Pathogenic Avian Influenza H5N1 Virus in
306 Tissues Derived from Experimentally Infected Chickens. *Appl Environ Microbiol* 2017;**83**.
307 doi:10.1128/AEM.00604-17

- 308 31 Nicholls JM, Butany J, Poon LLM, *et al.* Time Course and Cellular Localization of SARS-CoV
309 Nucleoprotein and RNA in Lungs from Fatal Cases of SARS. *PLOS Medicine* 2006;**3**:e27.
310 doi:10.1371/journal.pmed.0030027
- 311 32 Li M-Y, Li L, Zhang Y, *et al.* Expression of the SARS-CoV-2 cell receptor gene ACE2 in a wide variety of
312 human tissues. *Infect Dis Poverty* 2020;**9**:45. doi:10.1186/s40249-020-00662-x
- 313
- 314

315 **Figure Legend**

316

317 **Fig. 1: A:** The linear plot of amplification curves showing change in fluorescence (ΔR_n) Vs. cycle
318 number following RT-PCR of naso-oropharyngeal swab samples using three different RT-PCR kits. **B:**
319 Table showing the cycle threshold (CT) of samples in triplicate set.

320

321 **Fig. 2:** The linear plot of amplification curves showing change in fluorescence (ΔR_n) Vs. cycle
322 number following RT-PCR of autolysed tissue samples lung, intestine, liver and kidney) using three
323 different RT-PCR kits.

324 **Table 1:** Table showing the cycle threshold (CT) values of tissue samples in triplicate set.

325


326

327

328

329

330



B

Genes2Me	E	N	RdRP	RNaseP
	28.4	27.1	28	33.7
	27.9	26.8	27.4	33.4
	28.4	27.2	27.9	33.9
Mean	28.2	27	27.8	33.7
Q-line	N	ORF1ab	IC	
		29.3	29	30.6
		29.7	29	30.6
		29.2	28.6	30.1
Mean	29.4	28.9	30.4	
Meril	N	ORF1ab	RNaseP	
		32	32	35
		30	31	34
Mean	31	31.5	34.5	

Fig. 1.




Fig. 2

Kit	Lung				Intestine				Liver				Kidney			
	E	N	RdRP	RNaseP	E	N	RdRP	RNaseP	E	N	RdRP	RNaseP	E	N	RdRP	RNaseP
Genes2Me	-	-	-	21	24.2	25.1	22.9	22.8	24.6	27.8	29.7	19.5	-	-	-	20.8
	-	-	-	22.5	24.8	23.1	23.8	23.7	26.1	-	33.9	20.4	-	-	-	21.9
	-	-	-	23.2	25	24.5	24.3	25	20.7	20.9	35.8	19.6	-	-	-	21.9
Mean				22.2	24.7	24.2	23.7	23.9	23.8	24.4	33.1	19.8				21.5

Q-line	N	ORF1ab	IC	-	N	ORF1ab	IC	N	ORF1ab	IC	N	ORF1ab	IC
		-	-	36.7	-	29	28.2	23.1	24	26.9	19.2	-	-
	-	-	36.9	-	23.8	27.6	21	16.2	20.5	18.6	-	-	20
	-	-	37	-	25.7	27.7	24.6	11.5	18.3	17.6	-	-	20.6
Mean			36.9		26.2	27.8	22.9	17.2	21.9	18.5			20.6

Meril	N	ORF1ab	RNaseP	N	ORF1ab	RNaseP	N	ORF1ab	RNaseP	N	ORF1ab	RNaseP
		-	-	33.8	27.4	28	22.7	25.4	27.2	18.6	-	-
	-	-	36.7	27.3	28.4	21	19.2	20.6	18.2	-	-	20.8
	-	-	35.8	27.4	27.4	25	18.3	23.5	18.3	-	-	20.9
Mean			35.4	27.4	27.9	22.9	21	23.8	18.4			20.8

Table. 1