

1 Misinterpretation of viral load in COVID-19.

2

3 Renan Lyra Miranda^{1#}, Alexandro Guterres^{1#*}, Carlos Henrique de Azeredo Lima¹, Paulo

4 Niemeyer Filho², Mônica R. Gadelha^{1,3}.

5

6 ¹Neuropathology and Molecular Genetics Laboratory, Instituto Estadual do Cérebro Paulo

7 Niemeyer, Rio de Janeiro, RJ, Brazil.

8 ²Instituto Estadual do Cérebro Paulo Niemeyer, Rio de Janeiro, RJ, Brazil.

9 ³Neuroendocrinology Research Center/ Endocrinology Division – Medical School and

10 Hospital Universitário Clementino Fraga Filho – Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro,

11 Rio de Janeiro, Brazil.

12 [#]Contributed equally

13 **Keywords:** SARS-CoV-2; COVID-19; viral load; clinical outcomes.

14

15 ***Corresponding author:** Alexandro Guterres

16 Neuropathology and Molecular Genetics Laboratory, Instituto Estadual do Cérebro Paulo

17 Niemeyer, Rio de Janeiro, RJ, Brazil

18 Rua do Resende, 156 – Centro

19 Rio de Janeiro, RJ, 20231-092, Brazil

20 e-mail: guterres_rj@yahoo.com.br

21

22

23

24

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

25 **Abstract**

26 Knowledge of viral load is essential for formulating strategies for antiviral
27 treatment, vaccination, and epidemiological control of COVID-19. Moreover, patients
28 identification with high viral load could also be useful to understand risk factors such as
29 age, comorbidities, severity of symptoms and hypoxia to decide the need for
30 hospitalization. Several studies are evaluating the importance of analyzing viral load in
31 different types of samples, clinical outcomes and viral transmission pathways. However,
32 in a great number of emerging studies cycle threshold (Ct) values by itself is often used
33 as a viral load indicator, which may be a mistake. In this study, we compared tracheal
34 aspirate with nasopharyngeal samples obtained from critically ill COVID-19 patients
35 and demonstrate how the raw Ct could lead to misinterpretation of results. Further, we
36 analyzed nasopharyngeal swabs positive samples and propose a method to reduce
37 evaluation error that could occur from using raw Ct. Based on these findings, we show
38 the impact that normalization of Ct values has on interpretation of viral load data from
39 different biological samples from patients with COVID-19, transmission and lastly in
40 relations with clinical outcomes.

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50 **Importance**

51 In a pandemic, prevention of disease transmission is key. Reliable data for
52 profiles of viral load are needed and important to guide antiviral treatment, infection
53 control and vaccination. The differential expression of SARS-CoV-2 viral RNA among
54 patient groups is a current topic of interest and viral load has been associated with a
55 diversity of outcomes. However, in a great number of emerging studies cycle threshold
56 (Ct) values by itself is often used as a viral load indicator, which may be a mistake. In
57 this study, we compared tracheal aspirate with nasopharyngeal samples obtained from
58 critically ill COVID-19 patients and demonstrate how the raw Ct could lead to
59 misinterpretation of results. Based on these findings, we show the impact that
60 normalization of Ct values has on interpretation of viral load data from different
61 biological samples from patients with COVID-19, transmission and lastly in relations
62 with clinical outcomes.

63

64

65

66

67

68

69

70

71

72

73

74 **Introduction**

75 Besides investigating risk factors for mortality in hospitalized patients with
76 coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19), such as older age, obesity, comorbidities, C-
77 reactive protein (CRP), inflammatory cytokines, the impact of SARS-CoV-2 viral load
78 in clinical outcomes could be extremely important(1–3). Moreover, reliable data for
79 profiles of viral load are needed to guide antiviral treatment, infection control,
80 epidemiological measures and vaccination. Several types of biological samples have
81 been analyzed for the presence of SARS-CoV-2 viral RNA, as nasal swab, throat swab,
82 sputum, rectal swab, vaginal swab, blood, placenta, human breastmilk, urine, among
83 others(4, 5). Although in most of these types of samples the SARS-CoV-2 RNA was
84 detectable, it's not clear yet what is the pattern of viral load in these samples.

85 The differential expression of SARS-CoV-2 viral RNA among patient groups is
86 a current topic of interest and viral load has been associated with a diversity of
87 outcomes(5–8). The gold standard method to detect SARS-CoV-2 infection is the
88 reverse-transcription quantitative PCR (RT-qPCR), which is based on the amplification
89 of regions of viral RNA that have been reverse transcribed on each cycle of the
90 reaction(9). The earlier the cycle that the fluorescence is detectable above a threshold,
91 cycle threshold (Ct), indicates that the samples have a higher concentration of the target
92 gene. In a great number of emerging studies Ct values by itself is often used as a viral
93 load indicator. For example, raw Ct values were used to correlate viral load with a
94 higher risk of intubation(6), to compare viral load between samples of nasopharyngeal
95 (NPS) and oropharyngeal swabs (OPS)(10) and to investigate the relationship between
96 Ct values and age range(8). Such application is common for the evaluation of viral loads
97 of different type of viruses but high variability have been reported, often due to different
98 equipment, PCR reagents, chemistry and standards used(11).

99 However, the amount of biological material retrieved by a swab could vary
100 depending on the quality of the collection, thus a normalization attempt could prove
101 useful when interpreting results(12). In the present work, we compared tracheal aspirate
102 (TA) with nasopharyngeal samples (NPS) obtained from critically ill COVID-19
103 patients. Comparison on the relation between raw Ct value and Δ Ct was used to
104 demonstrate how the raw Ct could lead to misinterpretation of results. Further, we
105 analyzed nasopharyngeal swabs positive samples and propose a method to reduce error
106 that could occur from using raw Ct. Based on these findings, we explored the impact
107 that Ct values normalization has on interpretation of obtained results of RT-qPCR data
108 from biological samples of COVID-19 patients.

109 **Methods**

110 **Samples:** In this study, RT-qPCR data were obtained from 138 patients that tested
111 positive for SARS-CoV-2. In total, there were 138 NPS samples, one from each patient,
112 and 21 TA samples from intubated patients that were admitted in the intensive care unit,
113 at Instituto Estadual do Cérebro Paulo Niemeyer, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil. TA samples
114 were collected at the same day as NPS samples from each patient. The studies involving
115 human participants were reviewed and approved by the ethical committee of Instituto
116 Estadual do Cérebro Paulo Niemeyer (file number 3.997.619).

117 **RT-qPCR:** The TaqMan™ RT-qPCR assays were performed in the QuantStudio 7™
118 Flex Real-Time PCR System (Applied Biosystems, Foster, CA, USA), directed to the
119 nucleocapsid N gene regions (N1 and N2) of SARS-CoV-2 viral RNA (CDC assays for
120 SARS-CoV-2 detection, manufactured by Integrated DNA Technologies – IDT, Iowa,
121 USA). Thermal cycling was performed at 45 °C for 15 min for reverse transcription,
122 followed by 95 °C for 2 min and then 45 cycles of 95 °C for 3 s and 55 °C for 30 s. A
123 cycle threshold value less than 40 is interpreted as positive for SARS-CoV-2 RNA. In

124 this assay, a RNase P gene region is used as an endogenous internal control for the
125 analysis of biological samples. It is normally used to ensure the quality of the test,
126 excluding the possibility of false negative due to the presence of eventual inhibitors or
127 the quality and integrity of RNA samples(12). However, all human cells have a single-
128 copy of the RNase P gene that encodes the mRNA moiety for the RNase P enzyme.
129 Therefore, their Ct values are associated with a range of input cell numbers in the RNA
130 extraction(13). Thus, in order to evaluate possible variability in the amount of material
131 retrieved from NPS and other specimen types we utilized RNase P as reference gene to
132 normalize the input data.

133 **RT-qPCR normalization:** When performing relative gene expression analysis of qPCR
134 data, the first step known as Delta Ct (ΔCt) obtained by subtracting the reference gene
135 Ct from target-gene Ct to account for input amount fluctuation that may occur(14). For
136 this statement to be true, one needs to assume that amplification efficiency (E) would be
137 ideally 100%. So we evaluated the E for both assays using standard curve analysis,
138 since even though reported E is close to 100% it is of utmost importance to validate it
139 with our laboratory setup(15). Then, we got ΔCt from our samples using RNaseP as a
140 reference gene ($\Delta Ct = Ct_{NI} - Ct_{RNaseP}$). When comparing different sample types, TA and
141 NPS, we used Ct and ΔCt on paired samples to check whether there was a difference in
142 viral RNA load or in the amount of biological material. When evaluating RT-qPCR data
143 of swabs we compared Ct and ΔCt and propose a method to reduce error that could
144 occur from using raw Ct. We applied a formula that corrects the Ct values to achieve the
145 closest relation to ΔCt values. This is a simple correction based on the formula proposed
146 by Duchamp et al., 2010(16). They used this formula to correct influenza A viral load
147 per sample, calculating a Ct value modified according to the ratio of sample RNase P

148 and mean RNase P Ct values ([sample influenza A Ct value x sample RNaseP Ct
149 value/mean RNaseP Ct value]).

150 **Statistical analysis:** All data analysis was performed with the GraphPad Prism 6
151 (GraphPad Software Inc., USA). Data were expressed as mean \pm standard deviation.
152 The Student t-test was used for comparison between two groups. Spearman correlation
153 was used to compare the relationship between N1 Ct and Δ Ct. Differences were
154 considered to be significant at a level of $P < 0.05$.

155 **Results**

156 **Uncorrected Ct values and misinterpretation of viral load.** Before analyzing
157 results, we evaluated E of the TaqMan™ assay from CDC kit: E of 100.177% for the
158 N1 assay ($R^2 = 0.999$, slope = -3318, error = 0.03); 98.322% for the N2 assay ($R^2 =$
159 0.997 , slope = -3363, error = 0.045); and 107.274% ($R^2 = 0.997$, slope = -3159, error =
160 0.045) for the RNase P assay. Then, we performed the following tests using only N1 as
161 a viral target since it had a better E. When comparing 21 paired samples of TA and
162 NPS: TA samples have a lower N1 Ct value than NPS samples ($P < 0.001$), meanwhile
163 having lower RNase P Ct values as well ($P < 0.05$) (Figure 1A); however, if we
164 compare the Δ Ct values from the paired samples we get that there is no difference
165 between TA and NP samples ($P = 0.859$) (Figure 1B). It is important to note that for one
166 patient the NP sample was negative for SARS-CoV-2 and the TA sample was positive
167 (N1 Ct = 34). The difference in Ct values having similar Δ Ct values indicates that the
168 higher concentration of viral RNA in TA samples is a consequence of a higher
169 concentration of total RNA.

170 **Discrepancy between uncorrected Ct values and Δ Ct values.** In order to
171 demonstrate the discrepancy that can arise when comparing results of N1 Ct and Δ Ct we

172 plotted those values obtained from 138 NPS positive samples. The summary of statistics
173 is as follows: N1, mean = 25.31/ StdD = 5.47; RP, mean = 24.99/ StdD = 2.10; ΔCt ,
174 mean = 0.32/ StdD = 5.31. Even though we do have a correlation between those values
175 ($R = 0.94$) it could provide a misleading result. On the X axis a variation of 1 ΔCt from
176 -3 to -2 includes 11 samples that have N1 Ct values ranging from 18.61 to 25.5.
177 Interestingly, if we look at the ΔCt of these min and max N1 Ct values within this range
178 we get -2.1 and -2.21, respectively (Figure 2A). If uncorrected Ct values were to be
179 used as a measure of viral load difference between those samples we would get a
180 difference of 6.89 cycles, which would correspond roughly for a difference of 118 times
181 more viral RNA present in the sample with lower Ct, meanwhile if we apply the fold
182 change formula ($2^{-\Delta Ct}$) to compare the same samples we would get a fold change of
183 1.08.

184 **Reducing the discrepancy between Ct and ΔCt .** We then applied a formula to
185 correct Ct values based on the RNase P mean Ct ($Ct_{N1} * \text{sample } Ct_{RNaseP} / \text{mean } Ct_{RNaseP}$),
186 as proposed by Duchamp et al., 2010(16), however as can be observed on Fig. 2B this
187 method further increase the distance in Ct values of samples that had similar ΔCt values
188 (a difference of cut-off cycle threshold values of 12.70), which is an undesirable effect.
189 We also observed a decrease in the correlation between those values ($R=0.76$). We
190 modified this formula trying to decrease the discrepancy of original Ct values of
191 samples with similar ΔCt values, since the discrepancy Ct values in similar ΔCt values
192 are result of differences in the amount of biological material used in the input. A
193 modification of the formula was used ($Ct_{N1} * \text{mean } Ct_{RNaseP} / \text{sample } Ct_{RNaseP}$). After the
194 adjustment the Ct value of the min goes from 18.61 to 22.9 and max from 25.5 to 23.7,
195 now they have a difference of 0.8 cycles that would be somewhere around 1.74 times

196 more viral RNA. This adjusted Ct has even stronger correlation to the original Δ Ct
197 value achieving a spearman rank of 0.99 (Figure 2C).

198 Even reducing the discrepancy and increasing the correlation, we observed that
199 Ct values <20 and >30 were not adjusted in a similar way to intermediate values. We
200 apply a third formula, where we get the difference between sample RNase P Ct and
201 mean RNase P Ct, and then subtract it from sample N1 Ct ($Ct_{N1} - (\text{Sample } Ct_{RNaseP} -$
202 $\text{mean } Ct_{RNaseP})$). With this, all Ct values become directly related with Δ Ct values,
203 yielding a correlation value of $R=1$ (Figure 2D).

204 Discussion

205 The impact of the pandemic on our society has increased the demand for quick
206 responses and solutions, pushing the adaptation of sample collection due to shortage of
207 materials like the use of nasopharyngeal swabs or oropharyngeal swabs(17). However,
208 the importance of systematic validation remains, although the potentially misleading
209 effects of using raw data, inappropriate references for normalization or even non-
210 standardization are being widely considered. Consequently, real-time RT-qPCR data
211 obtained in diagnostic of COVID-19 are being used in many molecular analyzes
212 especially for viral load determination. Due to the diversity of sample types, variations
213 in the quantities of imputing material, commercial detection kits and experimental
214 conditions, it becomes impossible to control all parameters involved in COVID-19
215 diagnosis. Therefore, reference data, normalization, quantification process efficiency
216 must be considered when we use data from real-time RT-qPCR analysis.

217 In our study, we demonstrated that considering the Ct values without any
218 correction, TA samples have significantly ($P < 0.001$) more SARS-CoV-2 viral RNA
219 than the NP samples. However, we can clearly see that RNase P Ct values are

220 significantly different ($P < 0.05$), indicating that tracheal aspirates have higher amounts
221 of biological material when compared to swabs. In short, when we perform the
222 extraction of total RNA from, for example, 200 μL tracheal aspirate, it does not
223 correspond to 200 μL swab. Even though this method would not provide actual viral
224 RNA quantification it would be enough to show how the use of raw Ct can be
225 misleading, and it is easy to apply even on a diagnostic setup. The study by Liu and
226 colleagues(7) is one of the few that uses ΔCt . They observed that the ΔCt values of
227 severe cases were significantly lower than those of mild cases at the time of admission.
228 They indicated that mean viral load of severe cases was around 60 times higher than
229 that of mild cases, suggesting that higher viral loads might be associated with severe
230 clinical outcomes. However, one of the most cited studies on viral load (>860 citations)
231 used only raw data of Ct values (18).

232 Pujadas and collaborators(19) showed an independent relation between high
233 viral load and mortality. These authors reinforced the importance of transforming
234 qualitative testing into a quantitative measurement of viral load will assist clinicians in
235 risk-stratifying patients and choosing among available therapies and trials. However,
236 Wang and collaborators(10) evaluated nasopharyngeal (NPS) and oropharyngeal swabs
237 (OPS) specimens collected from 120 patients with confirmed COVID-19. They found
238 mean Ct value (uncorrected) for NPS of 37.8 that was significantly lower than that of
239 OPS 39.4, indicating that the SARS-CoV-2 load was significantly higher in NPS
240 specimens than OPS. If sample concentration were to be taken into account a different
241 conclusion could have been drawn from such comparison. Thus, it is extremely
242 important to have an internal control for a human reference gene when comparing
243 samples.

244 Heald-Sargent et al.(5) describe that levels of viral nucleic acid in NPS are
245 significantly greater in children younger than 5 years, when compared with older
246 children. Authors report that young children younger than 5 years and older children
247 aged 5 to 17 years, had median cut-off cycle threshold (Ct) values (uncorrected) of 6.5
248 and 11 respectively. We demonstrated that within a range as far as 7 cycles in Ct for a
249 viral marker samples could actually have a difference of only 0.1 cycles when ΔCt is
250 taken into consideration. A multicentric study has demonstrated that viral load
251 estimations for several viruses can vary considerably between different laboratories
252 since there is no standardized required resources(11). Fernandes-Monteiro and
253 collaborators demonstrated that serum samples tested for yellow fever had small
254 variation in RNase P, even though there was significant difference in viral load between
255 samples(13). For other sample types, like NPS, RNase P Ct could vary depending on the
256 quality of sample and efficiency of acquisition(12).

257 Previously, Wang and collaborators (4) investigated the biodistribution of RNA
258 viral among different types of biological samples, including bronchoalveolar lavage
259 fluid, fibrobronchoscope brush biopsy, sputum, feces, blood, urine, among others. They
260 evaluated 1070 specimens collected from 205 patients with COVID-19 and observed
261 that Ct values (uncorrected) of all specimen types were higher than 30, except for nasal
262 swabs with a mean Ct values of 24.3 (range of 16.9 to 38.4). However, without a
263 correction in the Ct values it is not possible to confirm these differences. Recently,
264 Vivanti and collaborators(5) demonstrated the transplacental transmission of SARS-
265 CoV-2 in a neonate born to a mother infected in the last trimester and presenting with
266 neurological compromise. In this study the authors detected SARS-CoV-2 RNA in
267 amniotic fluid, vaginal and rectal swab, blood and NPS and call attention for a very high
268 viral load in placenta. However, an important point is that different types of biological

269 samples have different concentrations in number of cells and particles. For example, the
270 human placenta is composed by a complex of fetal cells and is characterized by a close
271 association between fetal-derived trophoblasts and the maternal tissues that they come
272 into contact(20). Moreover, the complex composition of some samples types include
273 proteins, fats, humic acid, phytic acid, Immunoglobulin G, bile, calcium chloride,
274 EDTA, heparin and ferric chloride, and many of them have been recognized as PCR
275 inhibitors(21).

276 Real-time RT-PCR has become a common technique, it is in many cases the
277 main method for measuring the presence of viral RNA due to its sensitivity and a high
278 potential for accurate quantification. Despite RT-qPCR inability to differentiate between
279 infective and non-infective (antibody-neutralized or dead) viruses, using an estimative
280 of viral RNA load remains plausible for clinical hypotheses formulation. The evaluation
281 of infectiveness of a sample is not a simple procedure since virus isolation in cell
282 culture of SARS-CoV-2 should be conducted in a Biosafety Level 3 (BSL-3)
283 laboratory(9). To achieve this, however, appropriate normalization strategies are
284 required to control for experimental error introduced during the multistage process
285 required to extract and process the viral RNA. We agree that the ideal approach is to use
286 Standard Curve Method using an endogenous control. In this method, for quantification
287 normalized to an endogenous control, standard curves are prepared for both the target
288 and the endogenous reference. For each experimental sample, the amount of target and
289 endogenous reference is determined from the appropriate standard curve. However, this
290 method has a high cost since standard curves need to be in all experiments.

291 Lastly, we are proposing a formula that is able to perform a perfect correlation
292 between the corrected Ct values and Δ Ct values, allowing new studies to use these
293 corrected Ct values to calculate the number of viral copies. In conclusion, we have

294 demonstrated that, overall, TA samples have more total RNA than NPS, even though
295 there was no difference in viral load. Thus, if a reference gene is taken into
296 consideration when analyzing NPS, samples that initially would be considered to have
297 different viral loads by raw Ct comparison would actually have the same viral load.
298 Thus, when comparing samples the use of reference gene is extremely important before
299 drawing conclusions related COVID-19 viral load.

300 **Acknowledgements**

301 This work was supported by grants from Fundação de Amparo a Pesquisa do
302 Estado do Rio de Janeiro (FAPERJ).

303 **Author contributions**

304 In terms of contributions authors RLM, AG and CHAL, worked directly with
305 samples, performed the literature search, prepared the figures, interpreted the data and
306 wrote the manuscript draft; MG and PNF participated in this work design, discussion of
307 results and manuscript preparation. All authors critically reviewed the manuscript for
308 important intellectual content and approved it in its final version.

309 **Figure 1. Comparison between nasopharyngeal swabs and tracheal aspirates for**
310 **SARS-CoV-2 detection. (A)** N1 and RP Ct values of NPS X TA samples (N1: $P <$
311 0.05 , TA = 25.6 (17.04 – 36.11) / 26.13 ± 4.99 and NPS = 27.87 (21.37 – 31.36) / 28.22
312 ± 4.54 ; RP: $P^* < 0.001$, TA = 19.94 (18.02 – 24.98) / 20.49 ± 1.76 and NPS = 22.47
313 (20.11-29.16) / 22.61 ± 2.09). (B) ΔCt (N1 – RP) of NPS X TA samples ($P = 0.859$, TA
314 = 4.90 (-3.71 – 16.59) / 5.64 ± 5.65 and NPS = 3.74 (-1.21 – 14.21) / 5.06 ± 3.91). Data
315 are expressed as media (min – max)/ mean \pm standard deviation, statistical difference
316 was evaluated by paired T test. (RP = RNase P, NPS = nasopharyngeal samples, TA =
317 tracheal aspirate).

318

319 **Figure 2. N1 Ct X ΔCt using different corrections. (A)** No correction. (B) Correction
320 proposed by Duchamp et al., 2010: $Ct = Ct_{N1} * \text{Sample } Ct_{RNaseP} / \text{mean}$
321 Ct_{RNaseP} . (C) Modification on method proposed in B: $Ct = Ct_{N1} * \text{mean } Ct_{RNaseP} / \text{Sample}$
322 Ct_{RNaseP} . (D) Method with direct relation to ΔCt variation $Ct = Ct_{N1} - (\text{Sample } Ct_{RNaseP} -$
323 $\text{mean } Ct_{RNaseP})$.

324

325

326 **References**

- 327 1. Huang C, Wang Y, Li X, Ren L, Zhao J, Hu Y, Zhang L, Fan G, Xu J, Gu X,
328 Cheng Z, Yu T, Xia J, Wei Y, Wu W, Xie X, Yin W, Li H, Liu M, Xiao Y, Gao
329 H, Guo L, Xie J, Wang G, Jiang R, Gao Z, Jin Q, Wang J, Cao B. 2020. Clinical
330 features of patients infected with 2019 novel coronavirus in Wuhan, China.
331 Lancet [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(20\)30183-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(20)30183-5).
- 332 2. Dietz W, Santos-Burgoa C. 2020. Obesity and its Implications for COVID-19
333 Mortality. Obesity (Silver Spring).
- 334 3. Wang T, Du Z, Zhu F, Cao Z, An Y, Gao Y, Jiang B. 2020. Comorbidities and
335 multi-organ injuries in the treatment of COVID-19. Lancet.
- 336 4. Wang W, Xu Y, Gao R, Lu R, Han K, Wu G, Tan W. 2020. Detection of SARS-
337 CoV-2 in Different Types of Clinical Specimens. JAMA
338 <https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.2020.3786>.
- 339 5. Vivanti AJ, Vauloup-Fellous C, Prevot S, Zupan V, Suffee C, Do Cao J, Benachi
340 A, De Luca D. 2020. Transplacental transmission of SARS-CoV-2 infection. Nat
341 Commun 11:3572.
- 342 6. Magleby R, Westblade LF, Trzebucki A, Simon MS, Rajan M, Park J, Goyal P,
343 Safford MM, Satlin MJ. 2020. Impact of SARS-CoV-2 Viral Load on Risk of
344 Intubation and Mortality Among Hospitalized Patients with Coronavirus Disease
345 2019. Clin Infect Dis <https://doi.org/10.1093/cid/ciaa851>.
- 346 7. Liu Y, Yan LM, Wan L, Xiang TX, Le A, Liu JM, Peiris M, Poon LLM, Zhang
347 W. 2020. Viral dynamics in mild and severe cases of COVID-19. Lancet Infect
348 Dis 20:656–657.
- 349 8. Heald-Sargent T, Muller WJ, Zheng X, Rippe J, Patel AB, Kociolek LK. 2020.

- 350 Age-Related Differences in Nasopharyngeal Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome
351 Coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) Levels in Patients With Mild to Moderate
352 Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19). *JAMA Pediatr*
353 <https://doi.org/10.1001/jamapediatrics.2020.3651>.
- 354 9. WHO. 2020. Laboratory testing for 2019 novel coronavirus (2019-nCoV) in
355 suspected human cases.
- 356 10. Wang H, Liu Q, Hu J, Zhou M, Yu MQ, Li KY, Xu D, Xiao Y, Yang JY, Lu YJ,
357 Wang F, Yin P, Xu SY. 2020. Nasopharyngeal Swabs Are More Sensitive Than
358 Oropharyngeal Swabs for COVID-19 Diagnosis and Monitoring the SARS-CoV-
359 2 Load. *Front Med* 7:1–8.
- 360 11. Hayden RT, Yan X, Wick MT, Rodriguez AB, Xiong X, Ginocchio CC, Mitchell
361 MJ, Caliendo AM. 2012. Factors contributing to variability of quantitative viral
362 PCR results in proficiency testing samples: A multivariate analysis. *J Clin*
363 *Microbiol* 50:337–345.
- 364 12. Guest JL, Sullivan PS, Valentine-Graves M, Valencia R, Adam E, Luisi N,
365 Nakano M, Guarner J, del Rio C, Sailey C, Goedecke Z, Siegler AJ, Sanchez TH.
366 2020. Suitability and Sufficiency of Telehealth Clinician-Observed, Participant-
367 Collected Samples for SARS-CoV-2 Testing: The iCollect Cohort Pilot Study.
368 *JMIR Public Heal Surveill* 6:e19731.
- 369 13. Fernandes-Monteiro AG, Trindade GF, Yamamura AMY, Moreira OC, de Paula
370 VS, Duarte ACM, Britto C, Lima SMB. 2015. New approaches for the
371 standardization and validation of a real-time qPCR assay using TaqMan probes
372 for quantification of yellow fever virus on clinical samples with high quality
373 parameters. *Hum Vaccines Immunother* 11:1865–1871.

- 374 14. Livak KJ, Schmittgen TD. 2001. Analysis of Relative Gene Expression Data
375 Using Real-Time Quantitative PCR and the $2^{-\Delta\Delta CT}$ Method. *Methods* 25:402–
376 408.
- 377 15. Vogels CBF, Brito AF, Wyllie AL, Fauver JR, Ott IM, Kalinich CC, Petrone
378 ME, Casanovas-Massana A, Catherine Muenker M, Moore AJ, Klein J, Lu P, Lu-
379 Culligan A, Jiang X, Kim DJ, Kudo E, Mao T, Moriyama M, Oh JE, Park A,
380 Silva J, Song E, Takahashi T, Taura M, Tokuyama M, Venkataraman A,
381 Weizman O-E, Wong P, Yang Y, Cheemarla NR, White EB, Lapidus S, Earnest
382 R, Geng B, Vijayakumar P, Odio C, Fournier J, Bermejo S, Farhadian S, Dela
383 Cruz CS, Iwasaki A, Ko AI, Landry ML, Foxman EF, Grubaugh ND. 2020.
384 Analytical sensitivity and efficiency comparisons of SARS-CoV-2 RT-qPCR
385 primer–probe sets. *Nat Microbiol* <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41564-020-0761-6>.
- 386 16. Duchamp MB, Casalegno JS, Gillet Y, Frobert E, Bernard E, Escuret V, Billaud
387 G, Valette M, Javouhey E, Lina B, Floret D, Morfin F. 2010. Pandemic
388 A(H1N1)2009 influenza virus detection by real time RT-PCR: is viral
389 quantification useful? *Clin Microbiol Infect* 16:317–321.
- 390 17. LeBlanc JJ, Heinsteinst C, MacDonald J, Pettipas J, Hatchette TF, Patriquin G.
391 2020. A combined oropharyngeal/nares swab is a suitable alternative to
392 nasopharyngeal swabs for the detection of SARS-CoV-2. *J Clin Virol*
393 128:104442.
- 394 18. Zou L, Ruan F, Huang M, Liang L, Huang H, Hong Z, Yu J, Kang M, Song Y,
395 Xia J, Guo Q, Song T, He J, Yen H-L, Peiris M, Wu J. 2020. SARS-CoV-2 Viral
396 Load in Upper Respiratory Specimens of Infected Patients. *N Engl J Med*
397 382:1177–1179.

- 398 19. Pujadas E, Chaudhry F, McBride R, Richter F, Zhao S, Wajnberg A, Nadkarni G,
399 Glicksberg BS, Houldsworth J, Cordon-Cardo C. 2020. SARS-CoV-2 viral load
400 predicts COVID-19 mortality. *Lancet Respir Med* <https://doi.org/10.1016/S2213->
401 2600(20)30354-4.
- 402 20. Arora N, Sadovsky Y, Dermody TS, Coyne CB. 2017. Microbial Vertical
403 Transmission during Human Pregnancy. *Cell Host Microbe*.
- 404 21. Nolan T, Hands RE, Bustin SA. 2006. Quantification of mRNA using real-time
405 RT-PCR. *Nat Protoc* 1:1559–1582.
- 406



