

1 **A 17-month longitudinal environmental sampling study carried out on public transport vehicles**
2 **operating in England during the COVID-19 pandemic identified low levels of SARS-CoV-2 RNA**
3 **contamination**

4 Paz Aranega-Bou^{a*}, Thomas Pottage^a, Abigail Fenwick^a, Wilhemina D’Costa^a, Natalie F. Brown^{a,e},
5 Nicola Yaxley^a, Marco-Felipe King^b, Simon T. Parker^c, Daniel Miller^c, Martín López-García^d, Catherine
6 J. Noakes^b, Ginny Moore^{a#} and Allan Bennett^{a#}

7 ^aBiosafety, Air and Water Microbiology Group, UK Health Security Agency, Porton Down, SP4 0JG,
8 Salisbury, United Kingdom

9 ^bSchool of Civil Engineering, University of Leeds, Woodhouse Lane, LS29JT, Leeds, UK

10 ^cDefence Science and Technology Laboratory, Porton Down, SP4 0JG, Salisbury, UK

11 ^dSchool of Mathematics, University of Leeds, Woodhouse Lane, LS2 9JT, Leeds, UK

12 ^ePresent address: School of Biosciences, University of Surrey, GU2 7XH, Guildford, Surrey, UK

13 #Contributed equally.

14 *Corresponding author. E-mail address: Paz.AranegaBou@ukhsa.gov.uk (P. Aranega-Bou)

15 **Running head**

16 SARS-CoV-2 RNA contamination in public transport

17 **Keywords**

18 Train, bus, coronavirus, surface

19

20

21

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

22 **Abstract**

23 Aims: To monitor severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus-2 (SARS-CoV-2) RNA contamination
24 in vehicles operating in England during the pandemic, to better understand transmission risk of
25 SARS-CoV-2 on public transport.

26 Methods and Results: We collected 1,314 surface samples between December 2020 and April 2022
27 on trains and buses managed by five different transport operators. The presence of SARS-CoV-2 RNA
28 was investigated through reverse transcription polymerase chain reaction (RT-PCR). SARS-CoV-2 RNA
29 was found on 197 (15%) of the 1,314 surfaces sampled, including seat head rests, handholds, and air
30 extract grilles, but the levels of RNA recovered on those samples (median value of 23.4, inter-
31 quartile range: 14.3-35.4, *N* gene copies per extraction) made the presence of infectious virus at the
32 time of sampling extremely unlikely. However, detection rates varied over time with peaks broadly
33 coinciding with times of high community transmission, suggesting that people infected with SARS-
34 CoV-2 when travelling on public transport could create opportunities for transmission.

35 Conclusion: During the pandemic, and as in other public spaces, low levels of SARS-CoV-2 RNA were
36 found on surfaces associated with public transport.

37 Impact statement: The results of this study will inform modelling approaches and the
38 implementation of mitigation strategies to minimise the risk of transmission of respiratory viruses in
39 public transport.

40 **1. Introduction**

41 Public transport is an essential service, and it is associated with improved individual employment
42 possibilities, a more active lifestyle and reduced air pollution (Saif et al., 2019). In 2019, public
43 transport use in England equated to 33 rail journeys and 50 bus trips per person. These were taken
44 for a variety of reasons including shopping, education, healthcare and leisure with over half of all rail
45 journeys being for commuting and business purposes (Department for Transport, 2020; Lucas et al.,

46 2019). In 2021, 22% of English households did not have access to a private car (Department for
47 Transport, 2022) and therefore relied on public transport, walking or cycling for their transport
48 needs (Lucas et al., 2019). Lowest income households are less likely to own a car, and it has been
49 shown that inequalities in transport provision can stop people from accessing key local services and
50 activities and contribute to social exclusion (Lucas et al., 2019). Due to the crucial nature of public
51 transport, during the COVID-19 pandemic, it was essential to understand the potential transmission
52 risk of SARS-CoV-2 and the effectiveness of mitigation strategies used in this setting.

53 As with other indoor settings where individuals can come into close contact with one another, use of
54 public transport carries a risk of COVID-19 transmission (Gartland et al., 2022). Modelling work
55 suggests that passengers in a subway carriage could be exposed to SARS-CoV-2 through the airborne
56 route (via small aerosols) without having to be within 2 meters of the infectious source, the close-
57 range route (via droplets or aerosols) or through exposure to contaminated fomites (Miller et al.,
58 2022). The same study also identified potential mitigation strategies, including policies to prevent
59 infectious passengers from travelling and/or to promote social distancing, the wearing of face
60 coverings and frequent handwashing (Miller et al., 2022).

61 Data collection can inform policy decisions and refine modelling assumptions. Several studies have
62 investigated the presence of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in public transport vehicles (Caggiano et al., 2021; Di
63 Carlo et al., 2020; Hadei et al., 2021; Hoffman et al., 2022; Moreno et al., 2021). However, these
64 studies have been carried out over short sampling timeframes. Longitudinal data collected over
65 longer periods reflecting different situations (prevalence of infection, implemented mitigations,
66 patronage, vaccination status in the population etc.) has been lacking. Here we report the results
67 from a longitudinal sampling study in which 1,314 samples were collected from buses and trains
68 operating in England between December 2020 and April 2022.

69 **2. Methods**

70 *2.1. Transport operators*

71 Transport operators, selected to give a spread of location and type of route, were approached to
72 take part in the study. Two train operators (T1 and T2) and three bus operators (B1-B3) agreed to
73 participate. Together these provided some geographical spread, operating long distance and local
74 routes in areas of the Northeast, Northwest, South and Southwest of England. Vehicles sampled
75 included passenger trains and both single-decker and double-decker buses.

76 All transport operators were implementing enhanced cleaning protocols during the sampling period
77 which included daily cleaning of touch points and periodic heavy cleaning (approximately monthly).
78 A range of products were used including BioHygiene sanitiser (Biological Preparations), Autoglym
79 potassium hydroxide solution (Autoglym), Virabact solution (Cleenol), Selgiene Ultra (Selden),
80 OdorBac Tec4 (OdorBac) and X-Mist (X-Mist Limited). Antimicrobial coatings were utilised by three
81 operators, with both train operators (T1 and T2) applying Zoono Z71 Microbe Shield (Zoono) to
82 contact surfaces on a monthly basis and operator B3 applying Zonitise Antimicrobial Spray (Zonitise)
83 annually as per manufacturers' instructions.

84 *2.2. Sampling protocol*

85 Samples were collected by operatives working for the transport operators following instructions
86 provided by the study team at UKHSA. Sampling materials were prepared by the UKHSA team and
87 delivered, via courier, to each of the five transport operators once a month. Details of this process
88 can be found in the supplementary material.

89 Operatives were asked to take samples on a pre-specified date once a month when the vehicle had
90 returned to depot after use at the end of the day and before it was subjected to daily terminal
91 cleaning. Samples were collected using sterile cellulose sampling sponges with neutralising buffer
92 (Technical Service Consultants Ltd.). On each sampling occasion, the internal surfaces of two buses
93 or two second class carriages of the same train (designated as vehicle/carriage A and B) were
94 sampled. Ten pre-determined samples were collected from each train carriage (Table 1) and eight
95 from each bus (Table 2). All surfaces were in areas that could be occupied by passengers. None were

96 associated with the driver’s cab. In each vehicle, multiple surface sites of the same type (e.g.
 97 handholds) were numbered. Those that were sampled were selected via a random number
 98 generator. For example, for operator B1, each bus had 16 handholds with a bell push and each
 99 month, two were selected at random to be sampled. Tables 1 and 2 provide the sampling coverage
 100 for each surface type on each vehicle/carriage. Whilst it was not possible to ensure the same vehicle
 101 was sampled each month, the vehicles that were sampled all covered the same or similar routes in
 102 each region.

103 Sampling sponges were returned to UKHSA via courier and were in transit at room temperature for
 104 between twelve hours and seven days before being received.

105

106 **Table 1.** Overview of the different surface types sampled on passenger train carriages.

107

Surface type	Operator T1		Operator T2		Total n° of samples collected
	N° of samples per month (% of available sites sampled)	Total n° of samples collected over study period	N° of samples per month (% of available sites sampled)	Total n° of samples collected over study period	
Air Extract Grille	4 (50%)	64	4 (50%)	52	116
Table	2 (20-25%)	32	2 (20-22%)	25	57
Tray Table	2 (5-6%)	32	2 (6-8%)	26	58
Arm Rest	2 (3%)	32	2 (3%)	26	58
Head Rest Closest to Door	2 (50%)	32	2 (50-67%)	26	58
Head Rest	2 (3%)	32	3 (3-5%)	39	71
Toilet Door Handle	2 (100%)	32	-	-	32
Toilet Door Button	-	-	1 (100%)	13	13
Hand Pole	2 (50%)	32	2 (25%)	26	58
Internal Carriage Door Button	2 (50%)	32	2 (10-11%)	26	58
All surface types	20	320	20	259	579

108

109 **Table 2.** Overview of the different surface types sampled on buses.

110

Surface type	Operator B1		Operator B2		Operator B3		Total n° of samples collected
	N° of samples per month (% of available sites sampled)	Total n° of samples collected over study period	N° of samples per month (% of available sites sampled)	Total n° of samples collected over study period	N° of samples per month (% of available sites sampled)	Total n° of samples collected	
Head Rest	6 (11%)	96	4 (3%)	60	4 (4%)	60	216
Handhold	2 (33%)	32	4 (11%)	60	2 (10%)	30	122
Handhold High	2 (14%)	32	-	-	-	-	32
Handhold Stairs	-	-	2 (14%)	30	2 (20%)	30	60
Handhold and Bell Push	4 (13%)	64	4 (14%)	60	4 (13%)	60	184
Window Hopper	2 (13%)	32	2 (10%)	30	2 (10%)	29	91
Table	-	-	-	-	2 (25%)	30	30
All surface types	16	256	16	240	16	239	735

111

112

113

114 *2.3. Sample processing*

115 Once received, samples were stored at 4 °C or, if not processed within 24 h of receipt, at -80 °C.

116 Sample sponges were retained within the associated bag and massaged by hand for ~15 seconds.

117 Approximately 1.5 mL of the neutralising buffer associated with each sponge was transferred to a 2-

118 mL screw cap tube using a 2-mL stripette. A 100 µL and a 10 µL aliquot was inoculated on Columbia

119 Blood Agar plates (CBA; E&O Laboratories Ltd.) and incubated at 37 °C for 48 hours. After incubation,

120 bacteria were enumerated.

121 RNA was extracted using the QIAamp viral RNA mini kit (Qiagen) following the manufacturer's

122 instructions. Unused sampling sponges were extracted and processed as negative controls. Duplicate

123 aliquots were screened for detection of SARS-CoV-2 RNA by RT-PCR using the VIASURE SARS-CoV-2
124 Real Time PCR Detection kit (CerTest Biotec) which detects the *N* and *ORF1ab* genes and includes an
125 internal control, a positive control and a negative control to monitor inhibition in samples and for
126 quality assurance. Samples were quantified using a standard curve on the *N* target, run on each
127 plate. A sample was considered positive when amplification of at least one target (Ct<40) was
128 detected in both replicates and weak positive when amplification (of at least one target) was
129 detected in a single replicate. RNA extracts associated with ‘weak positive’ samples were re-analysed
130 and considered positive if amplification was detected in both replicates. Samples were also re-
131 analysed if the standard deviation for the internal control Ct values for the two replicates was >0.5.
132 The mean quantification value for all aliquots with RNA detection is reported.

133 Selected samples with the highest *N* gene copies per extraction were subjected to whole genome
134 sequencing. Sequencing was carried out by the UKHSA Pathogen Genomics Service at Porton Down,
135 following the ARTIC network protocol ([https://www.protocols.io/view/ncov-2019-sequencing-
136 protocol-v3-locost-bp2l6n26rgqe/v3](https://www.protocols.io/view/ncov-2019-sequencing-protocol-v3-locost-bp2l6n26rgqe/v3)).

137

138 *2.4. Statistical analysis*

139 Firstly, a chi-square test of independence was done to check for a relationship between vehicle type
140 (trains versus buses) and the proportion of positive samples. Logistic regression models were then
141 used to further investigate the relationship between the likelihood of finding a positive sample and
142 the variables vehicle type and surface type as not all surfaces were shared between buses and trains.
143 Both vehicle type and surface type were included as predictor variables. This allowed the assessment
144 of the effect of each variable while controlling for the effect of the other. All statistical tests were
145 two-sided and the significance level was set at 0.05.


146

147 3. Results

148 3.1. SARS-CoV-2 RNA was detected on train and bus surfaces

149 Between December 2020 and April 2022, 1,314 surface samples were collected from trains
150 belonging to 2 operators (T1-T2) and buses belonging to 3 different operators (B1-B3). In total, 92
151 buses and 58 train carriages were sampled. All samples were analysed using RT-PCR. Overall, SARS-
152 CoV-2 RNA was detected on 197 (15%) surfaces. The percentage of samples collected from trains
153 that contained SARS-CoV-2 RNA was the same regardless of operator (19%). The percentage of
154 samples collected from buses that contained SARS-CoV-2 RNA was 16%, 15% and 3% for operators
155 B1, B2 and B3 respectively (Figure 1a). Upon controlling for sample location (i.e. surface type), the
156 type of vehicle (train or bus) did not significantly influence the odds of obtaining a positive SARS-
157 CoV-2 RNA result, as determined by logistic regression analysis ($p=0.423$). This suggests that the
158 likelihood of finding positive samples does not significantly differ between trains and buses when
159 taking into account the specific location of the sample within the vehicle.

160 On surfaces where SARS-CoV-2 RNA was detected, the median number of N gene copies per
161 extraction ranged from 14.3 (operator B2; $n=240$) to 42.4 (operator B3; $n=239$). The mean ranged
162 from 29.2 (operator B2) to 338.5 (operator T2; $n=259$). While there were a few outliers, the
163 concentration of SARS-CoV-2 RNA detected in 93% of positive samples equated to less than 100 N
164 gene copies per extraction (Figure 1b). The highest concentrations of RNA were detected on a tray
165 table (13,504 N gene copies per extraction) and an arm rest (892 N gene copies per extraction)
166 sampled by operator T2 in March 2022 and a head rest (558 N gene copies per extraction) sampled
167 by operator B1 in August 2021. These three samples were subjected to whole genome sequencing
168 but none yielded enough reads to provide a complete genome sequence. All surfaces were
169 contaminated with high numbers of bacteria (87% of which were contaminated at levels $>40,000$
170 CFU/surface).



171
 172 **Fig. 1.** Detection of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in samples collected on train carriages (T1-T2) and buses (B1-
 173 B3) in England between December 2020 and April 2022. (a) Percentage of samples where SARS-CoV-
 174 2 RNA was detected in duplicate aliquots (positive) or in single aliquots (weak positive). (b) Number
 175 of N gene copies per extraction detected in samples containing SARS-CoV-2 RNA. The lines indicate
 176 the median and the interquartile range.

177 **3.2. SARS-CoV-2 RNA detection varied over time**


178 Detection of SARS-CoV-2 RNA varied over time, regardless of operator and vehicle type. Timepoints
 179 associated with the highest positivity rates (i.e. percentage of samples contaminated with SARS-CoV-
 180 2 RNA) included January 2021 (47%; when only operators T1 and B1 were collecting samples), March
 181 2022 (31%) and January 2022 (26%) (Figure 2; Supplementary figure 1). There was no correlation
 182 between the number of passengers that had travelled on the buses sampled and the percentage of
 183 surfaces contaminated with SARS-CoV-2 RNA (Supplementary figure 2). Train passenger data were
 184 not available. However, there was some indication that surface positivity rate increased with

185 increasing numbers of people testing positive for COVID-19 within the community (Office for
186 National Statistics positivity rate). This was particularly true for operator T2 (Supplementary figure
187 3).

188 Widespread contamination, defined as detection of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in at least 50% of the samples
189 collected on an individual vehicle, was observed in 5 (5%) of the 92 buses and 8 (14%) of the 58 train
190 carriages sampled. In January 2021, 7 (88%) of the 8 surfaces sampled in vehicle B1-B were
191 contaminated with SARS-CoV-2 RNA. Likewise, in March 2022, 7 (70%) of the 10 surfaces sampled in
192 both carriage T1-A and carriage T2-A were contaminated with SARS-CoV-2 RNA. Conversely, SARS-
193 CoV-2 RNA was not detected in any sample collected from 51 (55%) of the 92 buses sampled or from
194 15 (26%) of the 58 train carriages (Figure 2).

195

196



197
 198 **Fig. 2.** Detection and quantification (number of *N* gene copies per extraction) of SARS-CoV-2 RNA on
 199 the surfaces of train carriages (T1-T2) and buses (B1-B3) operating in England between December
 200 2020 and April 2022. Each transport operator sampled two vehicles on each sampling occasion. Each
 201 row represents a vehicle, and each rectangle displays the results for one month, with each sample
 202 containing SARS-CoV-2 RNA represented on the x-axis (blue column) and the number of *N* gene
 203 copies per extraction for each of the samples represented on the y-axis (orange circle). Samples

204 where SARS-CoV-2 RNA was detected but could not be quantified are represented with a blue semi-
205 circle on the x-axis (e.g B1-B on May 2021). When no data was available for a vehicle on a certain
206 month the square is shaded. Note that it was not possible to sample the same vehicles each month.

207

208 *3.3. Some types of surface were more likely to be contaminated with SARS-CoV-2 RNA than others*

209 SARS-CoV-2 RNA was detected on all sampled surface types at least once over the course of the
210 study (Table 3). On trains, 129 seat head rests were sampled. Fifty-eight of these were associated
211 with seats located close to the internal carriage door whilst 71 were located elsewhere within the
212 carriage. SARS-CoV-2 was more likely to be detected on those closest to the door (27% vs 8%).

213 Similarly, sample positivity was higher for shared tables (26%) than for tray tables (17%) and for
214 toilet door handles (16%) than for toilet door buttons (8%).

215 Only 3% of the internal carriage door button surfaces sampled by operator T1 were found to be
216 contaminated with SARS-CoV-2 RNA, compared to 35% of those sampled by operator T2
217 (supplementary table 1). This might have been due to vehicles operated by operator T2 having a
218 higher number of internal doors therefore increasing opportunities for interaction with the open
219 buttons. Air extract grilles were also frequently contaminated with SARS-CoV-2 RNA, particularly in
220 vehicles operated by operator T1 (31% for operator T1 vs. 15% for operator T2) (supplementary
221 table 1). On buses, those surfaces that could be used as a handhold were the most contaminated
222 (Table 3).

223 Whilst differences existed, our overall test did not find a significant association with sample
224 positivity (Likelihood ratio chi-squared = 20.075, df = 14, p = 0.1278). However, individual surface
225 types did show significant associations. Specifically, samples taken from 'Handhold and Bell Push'
226 (Estimate = -1.015, p = 0.0458), 'Handhold Stairs' (Estimate = -1.693, p = 0.0237), 'Head Rest'

227 (Estimate = -1.028, $p = 0.0142$), and 'Window Hopper' (Estimate = -1.333, $p = 0.0231$) were less likely
228 to be positive compared to the 'Air Extract Grille'.

229 Despite the lack of overall statistical significance, these individual associations suggest that the
230 likelihood of SARS-CoV-2 RNA can vary between specific surface types. As such, while our analysis
231 did not find surface type as a whole to be a significant predictor of sample positivity, specific surface
232 types do appear to be associated with the likelihood of finding the virus.

233

234 **Table 3.** Detection of SARS-CoV-2 RNA on the different surface types sampled on buses and trains in
235 England between December 2020 and April 2022. Sampling locations are ordered by most to least
236 detection for each transport operator.

VEHICLE TYPE	SURFACE TYPE	OPERATOR	N° SAMPLES COLLECTED	N° SAMPLES WHERE SARS-COV-2 RNA WAS DETECTED	% SAMPLES WHERE SARS-COV-2 RNA WAS DETECTED
TRAIN CARRIAGE	Head Rest Closest to Door	T1, T2	58	16	27%
	Table	T1, T2	57	15	26%
	Air Extract Grille	T1, T2	116	28	24%
	Arm Rest	T1, T2	58	14	24%
	Internal Carriage Door Button	T1, T2	58	10	17%
	Tray Table	T1, T2	58	10	17%
	Toilet Door Handle	T1	32	5	16%
	Hand Pole	T1, T2	58	7	12%
	Head Rest	T1, T2	71	6	8%
	Toilet Door Button	T2	13	1	8%
BUS	Handhold	B1, B2, B3	122	21	17%
	Handhold High	B1	32	4	13%
	Head Rest	B1, B2, B3	216	27	13%
	Handhold and Bell push	B1, B2, B3	184	21	11%

	Window Hopper	B1, B2, B3	91	8	9%
	Handhold Stairs	B2, B3	60	3	5%
	Table	B3	30	1	3%

237

238

239 4. Discussion

240 Here we describe the results of a longitudinal sampling study conducted on train carriages and buses

241 operating in England between December 2020 and April 2022. SARS-CoV-2 RNA was detected in 84

242 (58%) of the 146 vehicles sampled and, although viability was not assessed, the low levels of SARS-

243 CoV-2 RNA detected suggest that no live virus was present on any of the surfaces at the time of

244 sampling. However, it is acknowledged that RNA degradation may have occurred over time and it is

245 possible that infectious virus may have been present on surfaces sometime prior to sampling. The

246 inability to successfully sequence samples containing comparatively high concentrations of RNA

247 confirmed the potential for viral genetic material to partially degrade. Moreover, when being

248 returned to the laboratory, samples were usually in transit at room temperature for between 12 and

249 36 hours but occasionally for up to seven days, thereby increasing the potential for some RNA

250 degradation. In previous studies, infectious SARS-CoV-2 virus has been isolated from surfaces in

251 close proximity to individuals who have tested positive for COVID-19 in the hospital (Ahn et al.,

252 2020), the domestic setting (Marcenac et al., 2021) and during an experimental infection study

253 (Zhou et al., 2023). In a study investigating household transmission, infectious SARS-CoV-2 virus was

254 also isolated from the hands of a contact who subsequently tested positive one day later (Derqui et

255 al., 2023). While laboratory studies have reported that SARS-CoV-2 can survive on surfaces and skin

256 for hours to days when left undisturbed (Hirose et al., 2020; Paton et al., 2021; Riddell et al., 2020),

257 the persistence of infectious virus under more realistic conditions remains to be fully investigated.

258 In contrast, there is evidence to suggest that SARS-CoV-2 RNA can persist on a wide range of porous

259 and nonporous surfaces for long periods. Salido et al., (2021) used heat inactivated viral particles to

260 monitor the persistence of SARS-CoV-2 RNA over a period of one week. No decay of SARS-CoV-2 RNA
261 was observed on many commonly used materials. Paton et al., (2021) contaminated surfaces with
262 live SARS-CoV-2 virus and reported a 90% (one log₁₀) reduction in SARS-CoV-2 RNA concentration
263 after three weeks, despite viability being lost within hours or days. A study that involved the
264 sampling of 17 farms did not detect any SARS-CoV-2 RNA in 246 swabs collected from animals or in
265 93 swabs collected from farm workers but traces of SARS-CoV-2 RNA were detected in 11 of 77
266 concurrent environmental samples collected from stable walls, barkers and milking parlours,
267 suggesting that surface contamination from previous infection events had persisted (Cardinale et al.,
268 2022). In a home where one adult and one child had been isolating with COVID-19, 46% of 24
269 surfaces were contaminated with SARS-CoV-2 RNA one month after symptom resolution (Maestre et
270 al., 2021). Therefore, in the current study, the detection of residual RNA may not reflect a recent
271 contamination event.

272 Understanding how different settings and activities contribute to transmission of SARS-CoV-2 is key
273 to better targeted public health interventions and recommendations. Contact tracing has
274 determined that households are responsible for most transmission but there is limited data for other
275 social settings, including workplaces and schools (Thompson et al., 2021). Linking transmission
276 events to a particular journey in public transport is particularly challenging due to the random and
277 dynamic group of people using multiple vehicles for variable amounts of time, often to travel to
278 other social settings (Gartland et al., 2022). Nonetheless, outbreaks of SARS-CoV-2 have been linked
279 to bus travel in China (Luo et al., 2020a; Shen et al., 2020) and a study carried out in Norway
280 reported an association between use of public transport and SARS-CoV-2 infection (Ellingjord-Dale et
281 al., 2022). On the other hand, other studies have reported little to no transmission. Studies tracing
282 public transport contacts in China cited attack rates of 0.1% to 2.1% compared to 4.2% for private
283 cars (Liu et al., 2020; Luo et al., 2020b). A school in USA observed no transmission on 15 buses
284 transporting 462 students on a school route, even though 37 students, 1 driver and 1 aide were
285 determined to have travelled while infectious at some point (Ramirez et al., 2021). In these

286 instances, the implementation of mitigation strategies (e.g. use of face coverings, ventilation and
287 sanitation) may have reduced the risk of transmission (Liu et al., 2020; Luo et al., 2020b; Ramirez et
288 al., 2021).

289 In our study, all transport operators applied enhanced cleaning protocols during the sampling
290 period. Moreover, three operators supplemented routine cleaning with antimicrobial coatings
291 applied to high-touch surfaces. Operator T1 and T2 applied Zoono Z71 Microbe Shield surface
292 sanitizer monthly and operator B3 applied Zonitise antimicrobial spray yearly, as recommended by
293 the manufacturers. Despite this, the number of bacteria recovered from all surfaces, regardless of
294 presence or type of coating was consistently high (87% of all samples were contaminated at levels
295 >40,000 CFU/surface) suggesting limited effectiveness of antimicrobial coatings in this setting. While
296 samples were taken before daily terminal cleaning, high bacterial levels demonstrate the ease with
297 which passengers contaminate the environment. We previously showed that when Zoono was used
298 to coat a range of materials relevant to public transport, the deposition of organic debris severely
299 reduced its virucidal efficacy against $\phi 6$ (a surrogate for SARS-CoV-2) (Aranega-Bou et al., 2023). As
300 part of the same study, we found that Zonitise, when applied to stainless steel or polystyrene test
301 surfaces, was ineffective against $\phi 6$ even in the absence of organic debris (previously unpublished
302 data, supplementary table 2). However, its effect on RNA was not assessed, and whilst many factors
303 could account for the less frequent contamination of vehicles operated by operator B3, degradation
304 of RNA cannot be ruled out. Further research into appropriate mitigation strategies for public
305 transport is warranted to ensure the safety of this crucial service, including the development of
306 cleaning guidelines and standards to facilitate effective cleaning in this setting.

307 Previous sampling studies have described higher recovery of SARS-CoV-2 RNA on surfaces in close
308 prolonged contact with people infected with SARS-CoV-2 in households (Marcenac et al., 2021) and
309 hospitals (Moore et al., 2021). In our study, some surface types were contaminated with SARS-CoV-
310 2 RNA more frequently than others, although these differences were not found to be statistically

311 significant when considering the type of surface as a whole. In general, those surfaces found to be
312 contaminated most often were those associated with handholds (i.e., surfaces that are gripped)
313 and/or where there is opportunity for prolonged contact (e.g., tables and arm rests) or frequent
314 contact (e.g., head rest of seats close to the carriage door, which passengers are often seen holding
315 when waiting to leave the train). These surface types might facilitate the dispersal of SARS-CoV-2 in
316 this environment via hand contact and self-inoculation could occur if facial mucosas are touched
317 after contact with a contaminated surface. A previous study investigating surface touch networks
318 and surface contamination with a tracer bacterium in an office observed high contamination on the
319 office door handle and chair seatbacks, both surfaces that are gripped during contact, and
320 determined that both surfaces contributed to contamination spread, alongside hand-to-hand
321 contact (Wang et al., 2021). In an observational study on the subway of Mexico City, 89% of the 120
322 passengers selected at random for observation contacted a pole during their trip, with a mean of 4.4
323 contacts per passenger every 10 minutes (Vargas-Robles et al., 2020). Both studies also reported
324 individuals touching their facial mucosas, with 17% of subway passengers doing so during their trip
325 with a mean of 0.2 contacts per passenger every 10 minutes (Vargas-Robles et al., 2020; Wang et al.,
326 2021). Future work linking behavioural observations in public transport to microbiological sampling
327 data might elucidate the contribution of the surface types identified in this study to contamination
328 spread and provide some context to allow more informative interpretation of results.

329 Studies with volunteers have shown that SARS-CoV-2 RNA can be shed in aerosol particles in exhaled
330 breath by people with a SARS-CoV-2 infection during respiratory activities such as breathing and
331 talking, particularly during early stages of infection (Adenaiye et al., 2022; Ma et al., 2021; Tan et al.,
332 2023). Previous studies in public transport have detected SARS-CoV-2 RNA in air samples taken on
333 buses and from associated air conditioning filters (Hadei et al., 2021; Hoffman et al., 2022; Moreno
334 et al., 2021). Others have not (Di Carlo et al., 2020), probably reflecting differences in sampling
335 methodologies, prevalence of COVID-19 in the community, mitigation strategies (e.g. use of face
336 coverings) and/or passenger behaviour. Swabbing transportation air extract grilles could be a good

337 alternative to indirectly sample the air, as SARS-CoV-2 RNA has previously been found on the
338 surfaces of ventilation grilles and other air handling unit components in various locations housing
339 COVID-19 patients (Maestre et al., 2021; Mouchtouri et al., 2020; Santarpia et al., 2020). In this
340 study, 31% and 15% of air extract grilles sampled by operators T1 and T2 respectively were
341 contaminated with SARS-CoV-2 RNA, suggesting that viral RNA and potentially viable SARS-CoV-2
342 virus had been present in the air before being captured on the surface of the air extract over time.
343 Air extract grilles were more likely to be contaminated than other surfaces. However, this most likely
344 reflects less frequent cleaning in comparison to high touch surface sites, and the accumulation of
345 contamination over time.

346 The percentage of samples with SARS-CoV-2 RNA was very similar for both train operators (19%) and
347 for operators B1 and B2 (16% and 15% respectively) but a lower rate was reported for operator B3
348 (3%). The reasons for the lower detection rate for operator B3 are unknown. Previous studies
349 carried out on trains and buses over shorter timeframes (1 day to 11 days) reported detection rates
350 of between 0% and 43% (Caggiano et al., 2021; Cardinale et al., 2022; Di Carlo et al., 2020; Moreno
351 et al., 2021). Whilst these studies included comparatively fewer samples (ranging from 30 to 150)
352 they also illustrate that variable levels of contamination can be detected in different vehicles,
353 geographic locations and pandemic waves. In our study, detection of SARS-CoV-2 RNA varied over
354 time with peaks mostly coinciding with times of high community transmission. Detection was highest
355 during the winter months of 2020/2021 (when the Alpha (B.1.1.7) variant emerged in England) and
356 in the winter and spring of 2021/2022 (concurrent to the spread of the Omicron (B.1.1.529) variant
357 in England). A smaller peak was also observed in summer 2021 which correlates with the spread of
358 the Delta (B.1.617.2) variant (Wellcome Sanger Institute). It is likely that the number of individuals
359 travelling on public transport whilst infected with COVID-19 will increase during times of high
360 community transmission. Similarly, Zhang et al., (2022) observed a correlation between the number
361 of COVID-19 cases at a university and the presence of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in air and surface samples
362 collected in the campus gym, bus, lab office and classroom. Differences in the prevalent variant over

363 the sampling period might have also affected the detection rates. It has been suggested that
364 infection with the Alpha and Omicron variants might be associated with increased shedding of SARS-
365 CoV-2 RNA, although the results are confounded by high variability between individuals and the low
366 number of individuals included in the studies (Adenaiye et al., 2022; Tan et al., 2023).

367 The main limitation of this study is the scarcity of metadata in relation to the parameters that might
368 have affected the recovery of SARS-CoV-2 RNA from surfaces including the number and location of
369 passengers, their infection status and demographic characteristics, behaviour including the use of
370 face coverings and vaccination status, cleaning frequency and the ambient temperature and relative
371 humidity of the vehicles, which can affect viral persistence (Biryukov et al., 2020). However, the
372 number of daily passengers on buses was available and no correlation was found with the detection
373 rate, suggesting that other parameters had a bigger influence. We also did not assess the
374 competency of those carrying out the sampling; if the sampling instructions were followed
375 appropriately or their sampling technique, which might have introduced bias (Hedman et al., 2020).

376 To simplify the sampling and for ease of use by the samplers, we chose cellulose sponges to facilitate
377 the sampling of large areas and operators were instructed to sample each site in its entirety (e.g.,
378 the whole length of a handhold). However, our sampling method made RNA quantification difficult,
379 and results are presented as copies per extraction instead of copies per surface area. Another
380 limitation for using this data in modelling is that the sampling efficiency for the different materials
381 that were sampled is unknown and likely to vary (Hardison et al., 2023; Jansson et al., 2020).

382 Sampling efficiency is predicted to have a large effect on the amount of SARS-CoV-2 RNA detected
383 on surfaces (Supplementary figure 4) but it is very challenging to determine experimentally due to
384 the high number of variables involved.

385 In conclusion, while we detected SARS-CoV-2 RNA on surfaces at levels which were not indicative of
386 the presence of live virus, the occasional widespread contamination on some public transport
387 vehicles suggests that people who travel on public transport when infected with SARS-CoV-2 may

388 contaminate the environment and create opportunities for onward transmission. Appropriate
389 mitigation strategies should be identified and implemented, particularly during times of high
390 community transmission. However, we found no evidence of public transport contamination with
391 SARS-CoV-2 RNA being higher in comparison to other public spaces including university campuses,
392 public squares, business premises and bus stations (Abrahão et al., 2021; Cardinale et al., 2022;
393 Harvey et al., 2021; Mihajlovski et al., 2022; Zhang et al., 2022).

394 **Author contributions**

395 Conceptualization: PAB, TP, CN, GM and AB; Data curation: PAB; Formal analysis and Visualization:
396 PAB, MFK, SP, DM, MLG; Funding acquisition: TP, CN, GM, AB; Investigation: PAB, AF, WDC, NB, NY;
397 Methodology: PAB, TP, NY, GM; Project administration: PAB, TP, CN, GM, AB; Writing- original draft:
398 PAB; Writing- review and editing: all authors.

399 **Acknowledgements**

400 We would like to thank all the transport operators that participated in the study and, in particular,
401 the operatives that collected samples over the 17-month sampling period. We would also like to
402 thank the “UKHSA Pathogen Genomics Service – Porton Down” for carrying out the sequencing
403 work. The views expressed in this article are those of the authors and are not necessarily those of
404 UKHSA or of the Department of Health and Social Care.

405 **Funding**

406 This work was supported by the TRACK: Transport Risk Assessment for COVID Knowledge project –
407 EPSRC, EP/V032658/1.

408 **Conflict of interest**

409 Catherine J. Noakes was co chair of the environment and modelling subgroup of the UK Scientific
410 Advisory Group for Emergencies (SAGE) during the COVID19 pandemic and provided scientific advice

411 to several UK government departments including the Department for Transport. Allan Bennett and
412 Simon Parker were members of the environment and modelling subgroup of SAGE during the
413 COVID19 pandemic. All other authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests
414 or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

415 **Data availability**

416 The data underlying this article will be shared on reasonable request to the corresponding author.

417 **References**

- 418 Abrahão JS, Sacchetto L, Rezende IM, Rodrigues RAL, Crispim APC, Moura C, et al. Detection of SARS-
419 CoV-2 RNA on public surfaces in a densely populated urban area of Brazil: A potential tool
420 for monitoring the circulation of infected patients. *Sci Total Environ* 2021; 766: 142645.
- 421 Adenaiye OO, Lai J, Bueno de Mesquita PJ, Hong F, Youssefi S, German J, et al. Infectious Severe
422 Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) in Exhaled Aerosols and Efficacy of
423 Masks During Early Mild Infection. *Clinical Infectious Diseases* 2022; 75: e241-e248.
- 424 Ahn JY, An S, Sohn Y, Cho Y, Hyun JH, Baek YJ, et al. Environmental contamination in the isolation
425 rooms of COVID-19 patients with severe pneumonia requiring mechanical ventilation or
426 high-flow oxygen therapy. *The Journal of hospital infection* 2020; 106: 570-576.
- 427 Aranega-Bou P, Brown N, Stigling A, D'Costa W, Verlander Neville Q, Pottage T, et al. Laboratory
428 Evaluation of a Quaternary Ammonium Compound-Based Antimicrobial Coating Used in
429 Public Transport during the COVID-19 Pandemic. *Applied and Environmental Microbiology*
430 2023; 0: e01744-22.
- 431 Biryukov J, Boydston JA, Dunning RA, Yeager JJ, Wood S, Reese AL, et al. Increasing Temperature and
432 Relative Humidity Accelerates Inactivation of SARS-CoV-2 on Surfaces. *mSphere* 2020; 5.
- 433 Caggiano G, Apollonio F, Triggiano F, Diella G, Stefanizzi P, Lopuzzo M, et al. SARS-CoV-2 and Public
434 Transport in Italy. *Int J Environ Res Public Health* 2021; 18.

- 435 Cardinale D, Tafuro M, Mancusi A, Girardi S, Capuano F, Proroga YTR, et al. Sponge Whirl-Pak
436 Sampling Method and Droplet Digital RT-PCR Assay for Monitoring of SARS-CoV-2 on
437 Surfaces in Public and Working Environments. *International Journal of Environmental
438 Research and Public Health* 2022; 19: 5861.
- 439 Department for Transport. Transport Statistic Great Britain 2020, 2020. Available at:
440 [https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_
441 data/file/945829/tsgb-2020.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/945829/tsgb-2020.pdf)
- 442 Department for Transport. National Travel Survey 2021: Household car availability and trends in car
443 trips, 2022. Available at: [https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/national-travel-survey-
444 2021/national-travel-survey-2021-household-car-availability-and-trends-in-car-
445 trips#:~:text=Household%20car%20access,-
446 Chart%207%3A%20Percentage&text=The%20proportion%20of%20households%20without,e
447 every%2010%20households%20in%20England](https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/national-travel-survey-2021/national-travel-survey-2021-household-car-availability-and-trends-in-car-trips#:~:text=Household%20car%20access,-Chart%207%3A%20Percentage&text=The%20proportion%20of%20households%20without,every%2010%20households%20in%20England)
- 448 Derqui N, Koycheva A, Zhou J, Pillay TD, Crone MA, Hakki S, et al. Risk factors and vectors for SARS-
449 CoV-2 household transmission: a prospective, longitudinal cohort study. *Lancet Microbe*
450 2023.
- 451 Di Carlo P, Chiacchiaretta P, Sinjari B, Aruffo E, Stuppia L, De Laurenzi V, et al. Air and surface
452 measurements of SARS-CoV-2 inside a bus during normal operation. *PLoS One* 2020; 15:
453 e0235943.
- 454 Ellingjord-Dale M, Kalleberg KT, Istre MS, Nygaard AB, Brunvoll SH, Eggesbø LM, et al. The use of
455 public transport and contraction of SARS-CoV-2 in a large prospective cohort in Norway.
456 *BMC Infectious Diseases* 2022; 22: 252.
- 457 Gartland N, Fishwick D, Coleman A, Davies K, Hartwig A, Johnson S, et al. Transmission and control of
458 SARS-CoV-2 on ground public transport: A rapid review of the literature up to May 2021. *J
459 Transp Health* 2022; 26: 101356.

- 460 Hadei M, Mohebbi SR, Hopke PK, Shahsavani A, Bazzazpour S, Alipour M, et al. Presence of SARS-
461 CoV-2 in the air of public places and transportation. *Atmos Pollut Res* 2021; 12: 302-306.
- 462 Hardison RL, Lee SD, Limmer R, Marx J, Taylor BM, Barriga D, et al. Sampling and Recovery of
463 Infectious SARS-CoV-2 from High-Touch Surfaces by Sponge Stick and Macrofoam Swab.
464 *Journal of Occupational and Environmental Hygiene* 2023: 1-18.
- 465 Harvey AP, Fuhrmeister ER, Cantrell ME, Pitol AK, Swarthout JM, Powers JE, et al. Longitudinal
466 Monitoring of SARS-CoV-2 RNA on High-Touch Surfaces in a Community Setting.
467 *Environmental Science & Technology Letters* 2021; 8: 168-175.
- 468 Hedman J, Jansson L, Akel Y, Wallmark N, Gutierrez Liljestrand R, Forsberg C, et al. The double-swab
469 technique versus single swabs for human DNA recovery from various surfaces. *Forensic
470 Science International: Genetics* 2020; 46: 102253.
- 471 Hirose R, Ikegaya H, Naito Y, Watanabe N, Yoshida T, Bandou R, et al. Survival of Severe Acute
472 Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) and Influenza Virus on Human Skin:
473 Importance of Hand Hygiene in Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19). *Clinical Infectious
474 Diseases* 2020; 73: e4329-e4335.
- 475 Hoffman JS, Hirano M, Panpradist N, Breda J, Ruth P, Xu Y, et al. Passively sensing SARS-CoV-2 RNA in
476 public transit buses. *Sci Total Environ* 2022; 821: 152790.
- 477 Jansson L, Akel Y, Eriksson R, Lavander M, Hedman J. Impact of swab material on microbial surface
478 sampling. *Journal of Microbiological Methods* 2020; 176: 106006.
- 479 Liu T, Liang W, Zhong H, He J, Chen Z, He G, et al. Risk factors associated with COVID-19 infection: a
480 retrospective cohort study based on contacts tracing. *Emerg Microbes Infect* 2020; 9: 1546-
481 1553.
- 482 Lucas K, Stokes G, Bastiaanssen J, Burkinshaw J. Inequalities in Mobility and Access in the UK
483 Transport System. UK government's Foresight Future of Mobility projec, Government
484 Office for Science 2019.

- 485 Luo K, Lei Z, Hai Z, Xiao S, Rui J, Yang H, et al. Transmission of SARS-CoV-2 in Public Transportation
486 Vehicles: A Case Study in Hunan Province, China. *Open Forum Infectious Diseases* 2020a; 7.
- 487 Luo L, Liu D, Liao X, Wu X, Jing Q, Zheng J, et al. Contact Settings and Risk for Transmission in 3410
488 Close Contacts of Patients With COVID-19 in Guangzhou, China : A Prospective Cohort Study.
489 *Annals of internal medicine* 2020b; 173: 879-887.
- 490 Ma J, Qi X, Chen H, Li X, Zhang Z, Wang H, et al. Coronavirus Disease 2019 Patients in Earlier Stages
491 Exhaled Millions of Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 Per Hour. *Clinical*
492 *Infectious Diseases* 2021; 72: e652-e654.
- 493 Maestre JP, Jarma D, Yu JF, Siegel JA, Horner SD, Kinney KA. Distribution of SARS-CoV-2 RNA signal in
494 a home with COVID-19 positive occupants. *Sci Total Environ* 2021; 778: 146201.
- 495 Marcenac P, Park GW, Duca LM, Lewis NM, Dietrich EA, Barclay L, et al. Detection of SARS-CoV-2 on
496 Surfaces in Households of Persons with COVID-19. *Int J Environ Res Public Health* 2021; 18.
- 497 Mihajlovski K, Buttner MP, Cruz P, Labus B, St. Pierre Schneider B, Detrick E. SARS-CoV-2 surveillance
498 with environmental surface sampling in public areas. *PLOS ONE* 2022; 17: e0278061.
- 499 Miller D, King M-F, Nally J, Drodge JR, Reeves GI, Bate AM, et al. Modeling the factors that influence
500 exposure to SARS-CoV-2 on a subway train carriage. *Indoor Air* 2022; 32: e12976.
- 501 Moore G, Rickard H, Stevenson D, Aranega-Bou P, Pitman J, Crook A, et al. Detection of SARS-CoV-2
502 within the healthcare environment: a multi-centre study conducted during the first wave of
503 the COVID-19 outbreak in England. *J Hosp Infect* 2021; 108: 189-196.
- 504 Moreno T, Pintó RM, Bosch A, Moreno N, Alastuey A, Minguillón MC, et al. Tracing surface and
505 airborne SARS-CoV-2 RNA inside public buses and subway trains. *Environment International*
506 2021; 147: 106326.
- 507 Mouchtouri VA, Koureas M, Kyritsi M, Vontas A, Kourentis L, Sapounas S, et al. Environmental
508 contamination of SARS-CoV-2 on surfaces, air-conditioner and ventilation systems.
509 *International Journal of Hygiene and Environmental Health* 2020; 230: 113599.

- 510 Paton S, Spencer A, Garratt I, Thompson KA, Dinesh I, Aranega-Bou P, et al. Persistence of Severe
511 Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) Virus and Viral RNA in Relation to
512 Surface Type and Contamination Concentration. *Appl Environ Microbiol* 2021; 87: e0052621.
- 513 Ramirez DWE, Klinkhammer MD, Rowland LC. COVID-19 Transmission during Transportation of 1st to
514 12th Grade Students: Experience of an Independent School in Virginia. *Journal of School
515 Health* 2021; 91: 678-682.
- 516 Riddell S, Goldie S, Hill A, Eagles D, Drew TW. The effect of temperature on persistence of SARS-CoV-
517 2 on common surfaces. *Virology Journal* 2020; 17: 145.
- 518 Saif MA, Zefreh MM, Torok A. Public Transport Accessibility: A Literature Review. *Periodica
519 Polytechnica Transportation Engineering* 2019; 47: 36-43.
- 520 Salido RA, Cantú VJ, Clark AE, Leibel SL, Foroughshafiei A, Saha A, et al. Analysis of SARS-CoV-2 RNA
521 Persistence across Indoor Surface Materials Reveals Best Practices for Environmental
522 Monitoring Programs. *mSystems* 2021; 6: e0113621-e0113621.
- 523 Santarpia JL, Rivera DN, Herrera VL, Morwitzer MJ, Creager HM, Santarpia GW, et al. Aerosol and
524 surface contamination of SARS-CoV-2 observed in quarantine and isolation care. *Scientific
525 Reports* 2020; 10: 12732.
- 526 Shen Y, Li C, Dong H, Wang Z, Martinez L, Sun Z, et al. Community Outbreak Investigation of SARS-
527 CoV-2 Transmission Among Bus Riders in Eastern China. *JAMA Internal Medicine* 2020; 180:
528 1665-1671.
- 529 Tan KS, Ong SWX, Koh MH, Tay DJW, Aw DZH, Nah YW, et al. SARS-CoV-2 Omicron variant shedding
530 during respiratory activities. *International Journal of Infectious Diseases* 2023; 131: 19-25.
- 531 Thompson HA, Mousa A, Dighe A, Fu H, Arnedo-Pena A, Barrett P, et al. Severe Acute Respiratory
532 Syndrome Coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) Setting-specific Transmission Rates: A Systematic
533 Review and Meta-analysis. *Clinical infectious diseases : an official publication of the
534 Infectious Diseases Society of America* 2021; 73: e754-e764.

- 535 Vargas-Robles D, Gonzalez-Cedillo C, Hernandez AM, Alcaraz LD, Peimbert M. Passenger-surface
536 microbiome interactions in the subway of Mexico City. PLOS ONE 2020; 15: e0237272.
- 537 Wang P, Zhang N, Miao T, Chan JPT, Huang H, Lee PKH, et al. Surface touch network structure
538 determines bacterial contamination spread on surfaces and occupant exposure. J Hazard
539 Mater 2021; 416: 126137.
- 540 Wellcome Sanger Institute, COVID-19 Genomic Surveillance. Available at:
541 <https://covid19.sanger.ac.uk/lineages/raw>.
- 542 Zhang X, Wu J, Smith LM, Li X, Yancey O, Franzblau A, et al. Monitoring SARS-CoV-2 in air and on
543 surfaces and estimating infection risk in buildings and buses on a university campus. Journal
544 of Exposure Science & Environmental Epidemiology 2022.
- 545 Zhou J, Singanayagam A, Goonawardane N, Moshe M, Sweeney FP, Sukhova K, et al. Viral emissions
546 into the air and environment after SARS-CoV-2 human challenge: a phase 1, open label, first-
547 in-human study. The Lancet Microbe 2023.
- 548
- 549
- 550