

1 Contamination of personal protective equipment 2 during COVID-19 autopsies

3 Johanna M. Brandner^{1,2,8}, Peter Boor³, Lukas Borchering⁴, Carolin Edler^{5,8}, Sven Gerber^{1,8}, Axel
4 Heinemann^{5,8}, Julia Hilsenbeck^{6,8}, Atsuko Kasajima⁷, Larissa Lohner^{5,8}, Bruno Märkl^{4,8#}, Jessica
5 Pablik^{6,8}, Ann Sophie Schröder^{5,8}, Linna Sommer^{6,8}, Julia Slotta-Huspenina^{7,8}, Jan-Peter Sperhake^{5,8},
6 Saskia von Stillfried^{3,8}, Sebastian Dintner⁴

7

8 **Affiliations**

9 ¹ Business Division of Safety, Security and Compliance, University Medical Center Hamburg-
10 Eppendorf, Hamburg, Germany

11 ² Department of Dermatology and Venerology, University Medical Center Hamburg-Eppendorf,
12 Hamburg, Germany

13 ³Institute of Pathology, Rheinisch Westfaelische Technische Hochschule, Aachen University Hospital,
14 Aachen, Germany

15 ⁴General Pathology and Molecular Diagnostics, Medical Faculty, University Augsburg, Germany

16 ⁵Department of Legal Medicine, University Medical Center Hamburg-Eppendorf, Hamburg, Germany

17 ⁶Institute of Pathology, University Hospital Carl Gustav Carus Dresden, Technical University of
18 Dresden, Dresden, Germany

19 ⁷Institute of Pathology, School of Medicine, Klinikum rechts der Isar, Technical University of Munich,
20 Munich, Germany

21 ⁸DEFEAT PANDEMIcs working group

22

23 **Competing Interests Statement:**

24 The authors have nothing to disclose.

25

26

27 **#Corresponding author:**

28 Prof. Bruno Märkl

29 General Pathology and Molecular Diagnostics, Medical Faculty, University Augsburg, Germany

30 Full postal address: Stenglinstrasse 2, 86156 Augsburg

31 Telephone number: +49 821 4002150

32 e-mail address: Bruno.maerkl@uka-science.de

33

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

34

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

Abstract

Confronted with an emerging infectious disease, the medical community faced relevant concerns regarding the performance of autopsies of COVID-19 deceased at the beginning of the pandemic. This attitude has changed, and autopsies are now recognized as indispensable tools for elucidating COVID-19; despite this, the true risk of infection for autopsy staff is still debated. To elucidate the rate of SARS-CoV-2 contamination in personal protective equipment (PPE), swabs were taken at nine locations of the PPE of one physician and an assistant each from 11 full autopsies performed at four different centers. Further samples were obtained for three minimally invasive autopsies (MIA) conducted at a fifth center. Lung/bronchus swabs of the deceased served as positive controls. SARS-CoV-2 RNA was detected by RT-qPCR. In 9/11 full autopsies PPE samples were tested RNA positive with PCR, in total 21% of all PPE samples taken. The main contaminated parts of the PPE were the gloves (64% positive), the aprons (50% positive), and the upper sides of shoes (36% positive) while for example the fronts of safety goggles were only positive in 4.5% of the samples and all face masks were negative. In MIA, viral RNA was observed in one sample from a glove, but not in other swabs. Infectious virus isolation in cell culture was performed in RNA positive swabs from full autopsies. Of all RNA positive PPE samples, 21% of the glove samples were positive for infectious virus taken in 3/11 full autopsies. In conclusion, in >80% of autopsies, PPE was contaminated with viral RNA. In >25% of autopsies, PPE was found to be even contaminated with infectious virus, signifying a potential risk of infection among autopsy staff. Adequate PPE and hygiene measures, including appropriate waste deposition, are therefore mandatory to enable safe work environment.

Keywords: autopsy, SARS-CoV-2, COVID-19, personal protective equipment, contamination

1 **Introduction**

2 The results obtained through autopsies of the Severe acute respiratory syndrome Coronavirus-2 (SARS-
3 CoV-2)-infected deceased are of crucial importance for understanding Coronavirus disease 2019
4 (COVID-19). Viral pneumonia with diffuse alveolar damage (DAD) is the most frequent cause of death
5 in fatal cases of COVID-19. In addition to the dramatic changes in the lungs, the affection of multiple
6 other organs is currently interpreted mainly as a systemic inflammatory reaction. Several authors have
7 described endothelial impairment with consecutive activation of the coagulation system (1, 2).

8 However, concerns about the safety of autopsy staff hampered the autopsy activities of surgical,
9 forensic and neuro-pathologists. Since the beginning of the pandemic, several reports and guidelines
10 from different authors and organizations have been published (3, 4) concerning this topic.

11 The environmental viability of the virus has been investigated in experimental conditions and real-
12 world settings of the domestic or clinical surroundings of SARS-CoV-2-positive persons in a few studies
13 which were recently summarized by Meyerowitz et al. (5). The presence of viable virus has been
14 identified for up to three hours in aerosols and 72 hours on surfaces. Half-lives were calculated to be
15 up to six hours (6).

16 In Germany, the Robert Koch Institute has recommended compliance with protection level 3, which
17 requires wearing appropriate protective equipment (surgical hood cap, eye/face-protection with fully
18 protective safety goggles or visors, filtering face piece (FFP) 2/3 masks, long-sleeved and impermeable
19 protective clothing, waterproof apron, additional forearm protection, a second layer of latex/nitrile
20 gloves with long cuffs, and appropriate shoes), when handling COVID-19 deceased (7).

21 Only a few reports addressing topics related to the infectiousness of dead bodies of the SARS-CoV-2-
22 infected deceased and the risk for autopsy staff have been published. All authors report detection of
23 the virus with reverse transcription quantitative PCR (RT-qPCR) in swabs taken from the airways at
24 different time intervals after death (8-11). Schroeder et al. detected viral RNA on various body surfaces
25 of the deceased, as well as body bags; however, no viable viruses were detected (12). Viral RNA

1 detection on the surfaces of the autopsy tables and autopsy room walls as well as face shields was
2 reported by Pomara et al. (11).

3 The aim of this study is to evaluate the extent of viral RNA contamination of the personal protective
4 equipment (PPE) of autopsy staff during autopsies of the COVID-19 deceased. Special focus was placed
5 on the infectivity of the samples with positive SARS-CoV-2 RNA detection.

6 **Materials and methods**

7 **Participating centers and case collection**

8 This study was conducted within the German framework of the DEFEAT PANDEMIcs initiative, which
9 aims, among other objectives, to develop an operational and organizational basis for autopsy programs
10 at the national level for pandemic preparedness. Four clinical pathology departments (Aachen [AA],
11 Augsburg [AU], Dresden [DR], and Munich [MU]) and one department of legal medicine (Hamburg
12 [HH]) participated in this study between January and May 2021. Four centers (AA, AU, DR, and HH)
13 performed complete autopsies with the opening of all body cavities, including the skulls. For the latter,
14 only oscillating saws with vacuum were used for safety reasons. Minimally invasive autopsies (MIA)
15 with ultrasound-conducted biopsies were performed at MU. Written consent was obtained from the
16 next of kin to perform the autopsies. The inclusion criterion for decedents was confirmed diagnosis of
17 SARS-CoV-2 infection, as evidenced by PCR test of the nasopharyngeal swab during the hospital stay
18 and by either rapid PCR or antigen testing during the full autopsies. Three autopsies each from AU, DR,
19 HH, and MU were included, and two cases were contributed by AA. All autopsy rooms were maintained
20 at negative pressure, with a minimum of 10 air changes per hour.

21 **Swabs – Specimen collection and locations**

22 Commercially available swab sets were used (COPAN eSwab B 80482CE, Mast Group, Reinfeld,
23 Germany). Before swabbing, the tips were moistened with the transport medium, and then the PPE
24 surfaces were thoroughly swabbed in a meandering manner for at least 15 seconds. Finally, the tips
25 were placed in the transport container. The swab locations are shown in Fig 1. Two swabs per location

1 were taken next to each other, one for RT-qPCR testing, one for testing of virus infectivity (virus
2 isolation). Samples for RT-qPCR testing were stored in refrigerators at 4°C, while swabs intended for
3 eventual isolation of infectious virus were frozen at -80°C. PCR testing of all samples was performed at
4 AU. For samples from full autopsies that showed positive results in the PCR testing, the corresponding
5 samples collected for viral isolation were sent to HH, where another PCR testing and virus isolation
6 were performed.

7 In all full autopsies, swabs from the PPE of the autopsy-conducting physician and one autopsy assistant
8 were performed after finishing the autopsy. In MIAs, only the team member with the closest contact
9 to the body of the deceased – the ultrasound-guiding physician – was evaluated.

10 To generate reference samples (positive controls), swabs from the plane-cut surface of the lungs and,
11 in one case, the bronchus (case AU2) or from the lung biopsies (MIA, MU) were collected during each
12 autopsy.

13

14 **RT-qPCR**

15 All samples were processed and analyzed primarily at the Institute of Pathology and Molecular
16 Diagnostics at the Medical Center in Augsburg. The method has been described in the literature (13).
17 In brief, RNA was extracted using the Promega Maxwell® 16 MDx system and the Promega Maxwell 16
18 LEV RNA FFPE Purification Kit (AS1260, Promega Corporation, Madison, WI, USA). Quantitative real-
19 time PCR for SARS-CoV-2 was performed on the extracts with one-step multiplex RT-qPCR targeting
20 the SARS-CoV-2 ORF1ab, N Protein, and S Protein using the TaqPath COVID-19 CE-IVD RT-PCR Kit
21 (A48067, Thermo Fisher, Pleasanton, TX, USA). The RT-qPCR was conducted using the QuantStudio 5
22 Dx real-time PCR Instrument, and the data were analyzed and interpreted using QuantStudio™ design
23 and analysis software (v.1.2x, Thermo Fisher, Carlsbad, CA, USA). Results with two or more positive
24 targets were considered as valid. A singular failure of the curve for the S protein was used as indirect

1 evidence for the presence of a virus variant. A verification was carried out by comparing it with the
2 results of the mutational diagnostics during the clinical stay.

3 **Cell culture and virus isolation**

4 Duplicate swabs stored at -80°C for isolation of infectious virus from locations with RT-qPCR positive
5 swabs (as determined in AU) were transferred to the biosafety level (BSL)-3 laboratory at the Institute
6 of Medical Microbiology, Virology, and Hygiene at the University Medical Center Hamburg-Eppendorf.
7 For control of RNA integrity, confirmatory RT-qPCR of the samples was performed as described (14).
8 Vero E6 cells were maintained and cultivated under standard conditions (15). For virus isolation, 500
9 µl of swab medium was used, and infection was performed as described (12, 15). Supernatants were
10 harvested at 72 hours post-infection, and virus growth was analyzed, as described before (16). Virus
11 isolation experiments were restricted to samples from full autopsies.

12 **Statistics**

13 To compare data measured by order or rank, the Mann-Whitney-U-Test and the One Way Repeated
14 Measures ANOVA test were used. The Spearman's rank order correlation was applied to calculate
15 correlations between ranked data. Depending on the proportion numbers, tabulated nominal data
16 were compared using either the chi-square test or Fisher's exact test. A p-value < 0.05 was considered
17 significant. All calculations were performed using the statistics package Sigmaplot 13.0 (Systat, San
18 Jose, CA, USA).

19 **Results**

20 **Case collection**

21 The case characteristics are given in Table 1. Fourteen autopsies were included, of which three were
22 conducted as MIA. The median age of the deceased was 71 years (range: 52 – 91 years), with a male
23 to female ratio of 1.8: 1. The postmortem interval (PMI) had a broad range (15 to 144 hours, median

1 55 hours). The median period from the first positive SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR test to death was 10.5 days
2 (range: 0 – 51 days).

3 **RT-qPCR results of swabs in full autopsies**

4 In total, 209 swabs were performed for 11 full autopsies for RT-qPCR testing. Eleven of these samples
5 were taken from the lungs/bronchus of the dead body to serve as a reference (positive control) for
6 each case. All lung/bronchus swabs (11/11) were positive.

7 The remaining 198 swabs were collected from nine locations on the PPE of one physician and one
8 assistant per autopsy. Of these, 41 (21%) were SARS-CoV-2 RNA-positive, 24 from physicians and 17
9 from assistants (Fig. 2A). In only two autopsies (2/11, 18%) all PPE swabs were SARS-CoV-2 RNA
10 negative, (Fig. 2A), while in 9/11 autopsies (82%) RNA contamination was detected with the number
11 of SARS-CoV-2 RNA-positive PPE swabs per autopsy ranging from 3 to 7 (median 4, Fig. 2A). No
12 correlation was observed between the PMI and the number of RNA positive PPE swabs ($p = 0.503$; Fig.
13 2A). In addition, the total number of positive swabs per autopsy did not correlate with the cycle
14 threshold (Ct) values of the lungs/bronchus swabs ($R = -0.51$; $p = 0.126$) (Table 1).

15
16 Contaminations occurring at different locations are shown in Fig. 2B and 2C and Supplementary Fig. 1.
17 Gloves were the most frequently contaminated parts of the PPE (14/22, i.e. 14 SARS-CoV-2 positive
18 samples from 22 glove samples in total, 64%), followed by aprons (11/22, 50%), upper sides of the
19 shoes (8/22, 36%) and shoe soles (6/22, 27%). The front of the safety goggles was positive in 4.5% of
20 the goggle-samples, while lateral sides of safety goggles, FFP masks, and the back of the protective
21 clothing were negative. In the 14 events when gloves were positive, also aprons were positive in 9
22 events (64%) and the upper sides of the shoes in 7 events (50%) (Fig. 2C). There was a correlation trend
23 between contamination of gloves and aprons ($p = 0.08$). Furthermore, a correlation trend between
24 parallel RNA detection on the apron and the upper sides of the shoes ($R = 0.38$; $p = 0.08$) could be

1 observed. The latter was also trend-wise associated with the positivity of the shoe soles ($R = 0.39$; $p =$
2 0.08 ; Figures 2B and 2C).

3 A highly significant difference ($p < 0.001$) was observed between the Ct values of the samples obtained
4 from the lungs or bronchus (median Ct: 17; range: 14 – 28) and from the PPE (median Ct: 28; range: 18
5 – 32). The viral density decreased highly significantly in a sequel from the lung/bronchus samples
6 (positive controls) via the gloves and the aprons to the shoes (Figure 2D).

7 **RT-qPCR results of swabs in minimally invasive autopsies**

8 In total, 30 swabs were performed for three autopsies, including one lung control from each autopsy.

9 In one autopsy (MIA-1), the lung control was tested positive for SARS-CoV-2, the lung controls of the
10 other two autopsies (MIA-2 and MIA-3) were negative (Table 1). In MIA-1 viral RNA could be detected
11 from the gloves of the ultrasound-physician, all other swabs were negative. For MIA-2 and MIA-3 all
12 swabs were tested negative for SARS-COV-2 RNA.

13 **Isolation of infectious virus from full autopsy samples**

14 198 swabs from PPE and 11 swabs from lung/bronchus were taken in parallel with the swabs for RT-
15 qPCR and were stored at -80°C for assessment of infectivity by virus isolation. Virus isolation was
16 performed on the 52 samples from locations where the duplicate swab was tested SARS-CoV-2 RNA
17 positive in AU. Eleven of these samples represented references directly obtained from the
18 lungs/bronchus of the dead bodies. The remaining 41 samples came from the positive PPE locations
19 detected with RT-qPCR before.

20 Concerning lung/bronchus samples, virus isolation was successful in 4/11 (36%) samples taken at three
21 centers (AU, DR, and HH) (Fig. 3).

22 Concerning PPE samples, 11/41 samples used for virus isolation were negative in confirmatory RT-
23 qPCR performed in HH and thus probable RNA degradation was suspected. Hence, they were excluded

1 from the final calculation of infectivity rate. For the sake of completeness, it is mentioned that none of
2 those samples yielded infectious virus.

3 Out of the remaining 30 PPE samples, isolation of infectious virus was successful in three samples
4 (3/30, 10%). All positive samples came from the gloves (1 assistant-AU, 1 assistant-DR, 1 physician-DR).
5 Thus, 21% (3/14) of the RNA positive glove samples were infectious and samples from three of 11
6 autopsies (27%) were infectious. In these autopsies, the median time between death and autopsy was
7 72 hours (range: 15 – 120 hours). The total number of positive swabs per autopsy did not correlate
8 with the PMI ($R = 0.049$; $P = 0.89$).

9 On an autopsy related basis, positive results for virus isolation from positive controls or PPE swabs
10 were obtained in four of six autopsies with a lung/bronchus sample Ct value below 18, suggesting a
11 high viral load, while only one of five cases with lower virus concentration ($Ct > 21$) was infectious (for
12 Ct values, see Table 1). However, this distribution trend did not reach significance ($p = 0.242$).

13

14 **Discussion**

15 This study aimed to evaluate the extent and severity of PPE contamination from physicians and autopsy
16 assistants with SARS-CoV-2 during autopsies of COVID-19 deceased at five German centers under real-
17 world conditions. These five centers represent four different geographic regions (north, south, east,
18 and west), two different medical disciplines (pathology and legal medicine), and two different
19 techniques (conventional complete autopsies and minimally invasive autopsies). Swabs were chosen
20 as the method for generating samples for RT-qPCR and infectivity assessment in cell culture
21 experiments, as used by others recently (10-12).

22 For full autopsies, only autopsies with positive rapid SARS-CoV-2 diagnostic at the beginning of autopsy
23 were included. Consequently, all of them were SARS-CoV-2 RNA positive in the lungs/bronchus
24 samples used for reference (positive control). Because rapid analysis was not available at MU, this
25 criterion was not fulfilled, and only in one of the three autopsies, the positive control sample (lung

1 biopsy) was tested positive. Thus, the number of evaluable MIA autopsies was only one. The fact that
2 in this one positive case the glove sample was positive showed that even in MIA, PPE contamination
3 could not be completely excluded. However, further investigations with a higher number of autopsies
4 are necessary to elucidate its real extent.

5
6 For full autopsies, SARS-CoV-2 RNA contamination of parts of the PPE was found at a high frequency
7 (9/11 autopsies, 82%). In only two out of 11 full autopsies, neither the physician's nor the assistant's
8 PPE were contaminated. Pomara et al. reported a considerably lower positivity rate of 15.6% (11).
9 However, they only evaluated face shields. In our study, the front of safety goggles was contaminated
10 only in a single case, resulting in an even lower positivity rate (1/22 goggle samples, 4.5%), compared
11 to Pomara et al., while gloves (64%), aprons (50%), and shoes (upper sides: 36%, soles: 27%) were
12 frequently positive. The distribution of the contaminated PPE parts indicates that intensive mechanical
13 contact is a cause of contamination. As expected, samples from the gloves were tested positive most
14 often, followed by swabs from the apron. Handling the cadavers and the organs makes it difficult to
15 avoid any contact simply because the examiner's distance and the specimen are naturally minimal in
16 this case. The virus contaminated material, very likely from gloves and aprons, reach the shoes and the
17 floor, from where the shoe soles are also contaminated. This spatial sequence is supported by a
18 stepwise increase in the Ct values, denoting a decreasing viral RNA load (Figure 2D).

19 Because all samples from the FFP masks, the lateral parts of the safety goggles, and the back of the
20 protective clothing were negative for viral RNA, aerosols are likely not a relevant contamination source
21 in the autopsy setting. However, we cannot exclude the possibility that the viral RNA might be less
22 stable on these surfaces. Nonetheless, direct touch and splash represent the main threats to the
23 transmission of viral material. This direct transmission is likely to be independent of the kind of
24 pathogen. This substantiates the necessity of proper PPE and hygiene measures including waste
25 disposal during and after autopsies.

1 In concordance with other reports investigating the persistence of viral material on and in people
2 deceased due to COVID-19 (10-12, 17, 18), the PIM of up to 144 hours did not reduce the risk of PPE
3 contamination with SARS-CoV-2 RNA. In our study, we did not aim to evaluate the stability of the virus
4 on PPE over time. Data addressing the topic of SARS-CoV-2 stability have been summarized by
5 Meyerowitz et al. (5).

6 To assess for infectivity, frozen swabs from all locations previously tested SARS-CoV-2 positive with RT-
7 qPCR were selected for further cultivation, including the reference lung/bronchus samples. Notably,
8 only 41 of these 52 samples tested positive by confirmatory RT-qPCR in HH; therefore, they had to be
9 excluded from calculation of the overall infectivity rate. Retrospectively, it is difficult to identify the
10 reason for this RT-qPCR negativity. RNA degradation during storage and transport could have been an
11 issue. Of note, even though all samples were shipped on dry ice by an experienced courier service, it
12 is remarkable that none of the negative samples came from HH, where the samples could be shipped
13 in-house. Remarkably, the non-evaluable samples were mainly from the shoes (7/11) with high Ct-
14 values. In addition, it is conceivable that sampling the swabs at locations directly next to each other
15 might contribute to these differences, suggesting that the contamination might be more locally
16 concentrated than distributed.

17 In 3/30 evaluable (i.e. positive in confirmatory RT-qPCR) PPE samples, the isolation of infectious virus
18 was successful. Of note, virus isolation only succeeded from gloves. Besides viral load, which might be
19 highest at the gloves that are in direct contact with the organs, also a more fluid microenvironment on
20 the gloves at the time of sampling may contribute to viral infectivity in contrast to dried out viral
21 material on other PPE items. To our knowledge, this is the first description of isolation of infectious
22 SARS-CoV-2 from PPE in an autopsy setting. Pomara et al. demonstrated SARS-CoV-2 RNA on 15.6% of
23 the face shields, but they did not investigate infectivity (11). Concerning other extracorporeal surfaces,
24 Schröder et al., demonstrated viral RNA on six body bags. However, no viable virus was detectable
25 (12).

1 In the lung/bronchus samples that were chosen as positive control, virus isolation was successful in
2 4/11 samples (36%). There was a clear trend towards a higher viability rate in cases with low Ct -values
3 under 18 in the lung/bronchus samples, reflecting that higher viral load likely results in higher
4 probability of virus infectivity, as was shown before (19). There was no correlation between successful
5 virus isolation and PMI. Also Plenzig et al. reported the isolation of viable viruses from lungs in two out
6 of four cases independent from PMI (10).

7 The fact that only the lung/bronchus samples and samples from the gloves were infectious - with a
8 higher infectivity rate in lungs/bronchus - while no infectious virus could be isolated from RNA positive
9 samples from aprons or shoes might indicate a certain instability of SARS-CoV-2 as soon as it is
10 transferred to inanimate surfaces. Haddow et al. investigated SARS-CoV-2 stability on different PPE
11 materials (different face shields, coverall, 50/50 nylon/cotton ripstop fabric) in an experimental
12 setting, and found a PPE material dependent reduction in plaque-forming units over 72 hours (20). For
13 other pathogens, infectivity after transfer to surfaces may be higher or lower, depending on the nature
14 of the pathogen (6, 21).

15

16 **Conclusion**

17 The results of this study show a considerable contamination rate of PPE during autopsies of COVID-19
18 deceased. Contamination even occurred during a minimally invasive approach. Independent of the
19 length of the postmortem interval, SARS-CoV-2 RNA was detectable in 21% of the samples taken from
20 PPE of N = 9 of 11 full autopsies. Gloves (64%), aprons (50%), and shoes (36%) showed the highest
21 frequency of RNA contamination. Infectious virus could be isolated from 21% of the RNA-positive glove
22 samples of N = 3 of 11 full autopsies.

23 In conclusion, as recommended by several national and international instances, the use of adequate
24 PPE is mandatory because the risk of infection during autopsy is a matter of reality, not a theoretical

1 consideration. Together with hygiene measures, including appropriate waste disposal, they enable
2 the safe performance of COVID-19 autopsies, which are essential for a better understanding of this
3 disease. Also, for future infectious diseases advised selection of appropriate PPE and hygienic
4 measures will provide the basics to carry out autopsies as an important source for new knowledge.

7 **Acknowledgments**

8 The authors thank Dr. Susanne Pfefferle, Institute of Microbiology, Virology and Hygiene, University
9 Medical Center Hamburg-Eppendorf, Hamburg, Germany for virus isolation, as well as Nadine
10 Eismann, Christian Beul, Jenny Müller, Marc Britz, and Patrick Kühn for their excellent technical
11 assistance. The authors are also thankful to Oliver Eger for the creation of the illustrations. This
12 study was supported by the German Registry of COVID-19 Autopsies (DeRegCOVID;
13 www.DeRegCOVID.ukaachen.de; funded by the German Federal Ministry of Health, Project No.
14 ZMVI1-2520COR201) and the German Federal Ministry of Education and Research in the framework
15 of the Network of University Medicine (DEFEAT PANDEMICs, Project No. 01KX2021) as well as the
16 “Bavarian State Ministry for Science, Research and Arts”

18 **Ethics Approval / Consent to Participate**

19 This study was approved by the ethics commissions of Aachen (EK119/20, EK092/20), Augsburg (BKF
20 No. 2020-18), Dresden (BO-EK-175052020), Hamburg (PV7311) and Munich (20-426). Written
21 consent was obtained from the next of kin to perform the autopsies.

23 **Author Contribution Statement:**

24 DEFEAT PANDEMICs workgroup performed study concept and design, DEFEAT PANDEMICs
25 workgroup, SD and LB performed laboratory analyses and data interpretation, AK and JS-H provided
26 data acquisition and interpretation, JMB and BM provided analysis of data, BM provided statistical

1 analysis, DEFEAT PANDEMIcs workgroup, PB JS-H, SD performed writing of the paper. All authors
2 read and approved the final version of the paper.

3

4 **Funding Statement**

5 This study was funded by the “German Federal Ministry of Education and Research” in the
6 framework of the “Network of University Medicine” DEFEAT PANDEMIcs, Project No. 01KX2021
7 (DEFEAT PANDEMIcs working group), German Federal Ministry of Health, Project No. ZMVI1-
8 2520COR201 (PB, SvS), and the “Bavarian State Ministry for Science, Research and Arts” (BM)

9

10

11 **Data Availability Statement**

12 The datasets used and/or analyzed during the current study are available from the corresponding
13 author on reasonable request.

14

15

16

1

2 **References**

- 3 1. Satturwar S, Fowkes M, Farver C, Wilson AM, Eccher A, Girolami I, et al. Postmortem Findings
4 Associated With SARS-CoV-2: Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. *Am J Surg Pathol*. 2021.
- 5 2. Wichmann D, Sperhake JP, Lutgehetmann M, Steurer S, Edler C, Heinemann A, et al. Autopsy
6 Findings and Venous Thromboembolism in Patients With COVID-19: A Prospective Cohort Study. *Ann
7 Intern Med*. 2020;173(4):268-77.
- 8 3. Boor P, Eichhorn P, Hartmann A, Lax SF, Märkl B, Menter T, et al. [Practical aspects of COVID-
9 19 autopsies]. *Pathologe*. 2021;42(2):197-207.
- 10 4. Hirschbühl K, Schaller T, Kling E, Märkl B, Claus R. Autopsy of patients with COVID-19: A
11 balance of fear and curiosity. *Pathology - Research and Practice*. 2020;216(8):153039.
- 12 5. Meyerowitz EA, Richterman A, Gandhi RT, Sax PE. Transmission of SARS-CoV-2: A Review of
13 Viral, Host, and Environmental Factors. *Ann Intern Med*. 2021;174(1):69-79.
- 14 6. van Doremalen N, Bushmaker T, Morris DH, Holbrook MG, Gamble A, Williamson BN, et al.
15 Aerosol and Surface Stability of SARS-CoV-2 as Compared with SARS-CoV-1. *N Engl J Med*.
16 2020;382(16):1564-7.
- 17 7. Robert-Koch-Institut. [Recommendations for the management of SARS-CoV-2-infected
18 decedents] 2021 [Available from:
19 https://www.rki.de/DE/Content/InfAZ/N/Neuartiges_Coronavirus/Verstorbene.html].
- 20 8. Davis GG, Williamson AK. Risk of COVID-19 Transmission During Autopsy. *Arch Pathol Lab
21 Med*. 2020.
- 22 9. Aquila I, Ricci P, Bonetta CF, Sacco MA, Longhini F, Torti C, et al. Analysis of the persistence
23 time of the SARS-CoV-2 virus in the cadaver and the risk of passing infection to autopsy staff. *Med
24 Leg J*. 2021;89(1):40-53.
- 25 10. Plenzig S, Held H, Gradhand E, Kettner M, Verhoff MA, Berger A. [Infectivity of COVID-19
26 cadavers]. *Rechtsmedizin (Berl)*. 2020(5):365.

- 1 11. Pomara C, Salerno M, Sessa F, Esposito M, Barchitta M, Ledda C, et al. Safe Management
2 Strategies in Clinical Forensic Autopsies of Confirmed COVID-19 Cases. *Diagnostics (Basel)*.
3 2021;11(3).
- 4 12. Schröder AS, Edler C, Ondruschka B, Püschel K, Schadler J, Heinemann A, et al. The handling
5 of SARS-CoV-2 associated deaths - infectivity of the body. *Forensic Sci Med Pathol*. 2021(in press).
- 6 13. Hirschbühl K, Dintner S, Beer M, Wylezich C, Schlegel J, Delbridge C, et al. Viral mapping in
7 COVID-19 deceased in the Augsburg autopsy series of the first wave: a multiorgan and
8 multimethodological approach. *PLOSone*. 2021;Accepted for publication.
- 9 14: Pfefferle S, Reucher S, Nörz D, Lütgehetmann M. Evaluation of a quantitative RT-PCR assay
10 for the detection of the emerging coronavirus SARS-CoV-2 using a high throughput system. *Euro*
11 *Surveill*. 2020;25(9).
- 12 15. Brehm TT, Pfefferle S, von Possel R, Kobbe R, Norz D, Schmiedel S, et al. SARS-CoV-2
13 Reinfection in a Healthcare Worker Despite the Presence of Detectable Neutralizing Antibodies.
14 *Viruses*. 2021;13(4).
- 15 16. Pfefferle S, Huang J, Nörz D, Indenbirken D, Lutgehetmann M, Oestereich L, et al. Complete
16 Genome Sequence of a SARS-CoV-2 Strain Isolated in Northern Germany. *Microbiol Resour Announc*.
17 2020;9(23).
- 18 17. Edler C, Schröder AS, Aepfelbacher M, Fitzek A, Heinemann A, Heinrich F, et al. Dying with
19 SARS-CoV-2 infection-an autopsy study of the first consecutive 80 cases in Hamburg, Germany. *Int J*
20 *Legal Med*. 2020;134(4):1275-84.
- 21 18. Aquila I, Ricci P, Bonetta CF, Sacco MA, Longhini F, Torti C, et al. Analysis of the persistence
22 time of the SARS-CoV-2 virus in the cadaver and the risk of passing infection to autopsy staff. *Med*
23 *Leg J*. 2021:25817220980601.
- 24 19 Jones TC, Biele G, Mühlemann B, Veith T, Schneider J, Beheim-Schwarzbach J, Bleicker T,
25 Tesch J, Schmidt ML, Sander LE, Kurth F, Menzel P, Schwarzer R, Zuchowski M, Hofmann J, Krumbholz
26 A, Stein A, Edelmann A, Cormann VM, Drosten C. Estimating infectiousness throughout SARS-CoV-2
27 infection course. *Science*. 2021; DOI 10.1126/science.abi5273. Online ahead of print.
- 28 20. Haddow AD, Watt TR, Bloomfield HA, Fetterer DP, Harbourt DE. Modeling the Stability of
29 SARS-CoV-2 on Personal Protective Equipment (PPE). *Am J Trop Med Hyg*. 2020.

1 21. Abad FX, Pinto RM, Bosch A. Survival of enteric viruses on environmental fomites. Appl
2 Environ Microbiol. 1994;60(10):3704-10.

3

4

5 **Figure Legends**

6

7 **Table**

8 **Demographic and autoptic data of all cases.** Rf = reference organ (positive control); GI = Gloves; n.a.

9 = no data available; n.i. = no information concerning the viral lineage available; * evaluated during

10 RT-qPCR – loss of the S-curve as hint for variant of concern; ** no testing prior to death #:positive

11 tested in confirmatory RT-qPCR in HH.

12

13 **Fig. 1** Schematic representation of the swab collection localizations.

14

15 **Fig. 2 RT-qPCR results from PPE a** Number of positive swabs per case divided according to physicians

16 and assistants with corresponding postmortem intervals (PMI). **b** Proportion of positive swabs from

17 physicians and assistants in the different localizations. **c** Results from PPE other than gloves in cases

18 when the gloves were tested positive. **d** Box plots of the Ct-values depending on the localizations.

19

20 **Fig. 3 Exemplary representation of the cytopathic effect by SARS-CoV-2 in cell culture. a** uninfected

21 Vero E6 cells grow to confluence in cell culture, while **b** infected Vero E6 cells show a clear cytopathic

22 effect already 48 hours post infection, characterized by rounding and detachment. **c** Overview of

23 swab samples from organs (lung/bronchus) or PPE positive or negative for successful virus isolation

24 reflecting virus infectivity.

25

26 **Supplementary Information**

1 Supplementary figure 4: **A** Frequency of contamination of PPE of physicians and assistants at
2 different locations. **B** Results from PPE other than gloves in cases when the gloves were tested
3 positive.


4

5

Table

	Autopsy/ Case-No	Gender	Age [5 year intervalls]	BMI [kg/m ²]	Time between 1st positive test and death [days]	Time between death and autopsy [hours]	Location of death	Cause of death	Ct-value reference sample at autopsy [N- gene]	Infectious Virus	Variant of concern*
Full autopsies	1 (AA-1)	male	70-74	22	28	38	hospital	DAD - COVID-19	24	no	no
	2 (AA-2)	female	85-89	23	25	64	hospital	DAD - COVID-19	28	no	no
	3 (AU-1)	male	85-89	25	8	15	hospital	DAD - COVID-19	15	Rf /GI	no
	4 (AU-2)	female	75-79	36	13	40	hospital	DAD - COVID-19	28	no	no
	5 (AU-3)	female	90-94	16	19	36	hospital	DAD - COVID-19	17	Rf	no
	6 (DR-1)	male	60-64	50	7	96	hospital	DAD - COVID-19	16	no	no
	7 (DR-2)	male	80-84	36	10	120	hospital	DAD - COVID-19	16	Rf/GI	no
	8 (DR-3)	male	65-69	35	3	72	hospital	combined hepatic and cardial failure	14	GI	yes
	9 (HH-1)	male	65-69	68	2	48	outpatient	Systemic inflammatory due to pyelonephritis and pneumonia	15	no	no
	10 (HH-2)	female	50-54	53	n.a.	144	hospital	DAD - COVID-19	32 [#]	no	no
	11 (HH-3)	female	70-74	30	0**	144	outpatient	DAD - COVID-19	22	Rf	yes
MIA	MU-1	male	60-64	18	11	21	hospital	n.a.	20	/	yes
	MU-2	male	50-54	47	n.a.	62	hospital	acute respiratory failure due to pneumothorax	negative	/	n.i.
	MU-3	male	70-74	23	51	22	hospital	n.a.	negative	/	n.i.

Demographic and autoptic data of all cases. Rf = reference organ; GI = Gloves; n.a. = no data available; n.i. = no information concerning the viral lineage available; * evaluated during RT-qPCR – loss of the S-curve as hint for variant of concern; ** no testing prior to death #: positive tested in confirmatory RT-qPCR in HH.



- 1: Gloves, right or left palms
- 2: FFP-Mask, outside, front in the middle part
- 3: Safety goggles, on the lenses
- 4: Side area of safety goggles
- 6: Plastic apron, at the level of the chest/ cleavage
- 7: Protective clothing back
- 7: Shoe, right or left in the forefoot area, on top
- 8: Shoe sole, right or left before leaving the autopsy room
- 9: Shoe sole, right or left after disinfection



