

# 1 Shortened SARS-CoV-2 shedding in saliva during early Omicron compared 2 to wild-type pandemic phase

3 Authors:

4 Eva Kozanli \* <sup>a,b</sup>, Angelique M.A.M. Winkel \* <sup>b,c</sup>, Alvin X. Han <sup>b</sup>, Sharon van den Brink <sup>a</sup>, Annemarie van den  
5 Brandt <sup>a</sup>, Milly E. Haverkort<sup>d</sup>, Sjoerd Euser<sup>c,e</sup>, Colin A. Russell <sup>b</sup>, Menno D. de Jong <sup>a,b</sup>, Marlies A. van Houten  
6 <sup>c,f</sup>, Steven F.L. van Lelyveld <sup>†c,g</sup>, Dirk Eggink <sup>†a,b</sup>

7

8 Corresponding authors:

9 Dirk Eggink <sup>a,b</sup> ([dirk.eggink@rivm.nl](mailto:dirk.eggink@rivm.nl))

10 Steven F.L. van Lelyveld <sup>c,g</sup> ([s.van.lelyveld@spaarnegasthuis.nl](mailto:s.van.lelyveld@spaarnegasthuis.nl))

11

12 Affiliations:

13 <sup>a</sup> Centre for Infectious Disease Control, National Institute for Public Health and the Environment,  
14 Bilthoven, The Netherlands

15 <sup>b</sup> Department of Medical Microbiology and Infection Prevention, Amsterdam University Medical Center,  
16 University of Amsterdam, Amsterdam, the Netherlands.

17 <sup>c</sup> Spaarne Gasthuis Academy, Hoofddorp, The Netherlands

18 <sup>d</sup> Department of Infectious Disease Control, Public Health Services Kennemerland, Haarlem, The  
19 Netherlands

20 <sup>e</sup> Regional Public Health Laboratory Kennemerland, Haarlem, The Netherlands

21 <sup>f</sup> Department of Paediatrics, Spaarne Gasthuis, Haarlem/Hoofddorp, The Netherlands

22 <sup>g</sup> Department of Internal Medicine, Spaarne Gasthuis Hospital, Haarlem/Hoofddorp, The Netherlands

23

24 \*/<sup>†</sup>contributed equally

25 Abstract (46 words)

26 This study compared the dynamics of SARS-CoV-2 viral shedding in saliva between wild-type virus-infected  
27 and Omicron-infected household cohorts. Pre-existing immunity in participants likely shortens duration of  
28 viral shedding and lowers viral load peaks. Dense saliva sampling can be a convenient tool to study viral  
29 load dynamics.

30 Keywords: SARS-CoV-2, viral load, saliva, viral shedding, Omicron

31

## 32 Introduction (1671 words)

33 SARS-CoV-2 has caused a pandemic with a large number of respiratory infections worldwide. Studying the  
34 viral load dynamics of SARS-CoV-2 infections is helpful for understanding pathogenesis and transmission  
35 of the virus. Viral load dynamics can be influenced by various clinical host-factors, the emergence of novel  
36 variants and immunization (1).

37 SARS-CoV-2 infections are conventionally detected performing reverse transcriptase polymerase chain  
38 reaction (RT-PCR) on nasopharyngeal/oropharyngeal swabs (NP/OP). The cycle threshold (Ct) value of the  
39 PCR reaction cannot be directly translated to infectious virus particles (1), but nevertheless provides a  
40 valuable marker for viral load and thereby potentially for severity of infection and transmissibility. To date,  
41 NP/OP swabs is the gold standard for respiratory diagnostics (2), but since saliva can be self-sampled, it  
42 offers a convenient diagnostic method (3). Additionally, it is easier to facilitate longitudinal sampling of  
43 infected individuals and is especially beneficial for studying shedding in children, as it is non-invasive.  
44 Previous studies have found high sensitivity for SARS-CoV-2 detection in saliva compared to NP/OP swabs  
45 (4). Therefore, we hypothesize that shedding dynamics and underlying covariates could be effectively  
46 studied in saliva.

47 To our best knowledge, data from longitudinal household studies using saliva to characterize viral shedding  
48 dynamics is limited. We conducted two identical household studies during two different pandemic phases:  
49 SARSLIVA1 (SL1) during the circulation of wild-type (ancestral) SARS-CoV-2 in 2020 (3); and SARSLIVA2 (SL2)  
50 during circulation of Omicron variants in 2022 in a population with pre-existing immunity(5). Thus, we aim  
51 to investigate shedding dynamics and impact of SARS-CoV-2 variants in saliva, and the role of host-immune  
52 status.

## 53 Methods

### 54 Participants and sampling

55 Two identical prospective household cohort studies were performed, named SARSLIVA 1 (SL1) and  
56 SARSLIVA 2 (SL2). SL1 took place during the circulation of wild-type SARS-CoV-2 from October to December  
57 2020 (3); and SL2 during circulation of Omicron variant, mainly BA.2, in March and April 2022 in a  
58 population with pre-existing immunity (5). Participants were recruited through community testing in the  
59 Netherlands as described (3). If these individuals (index cases) tested positive, were younger than 65 years  
60 old and had at least two other household members were willing to participate, their households were  
61 included. All participants completed questionnaires regarding medical history and updated their health  
62 status throughout the study. Dense interval self-sampling of saliva led to 10 samples in 42 days. Capillary  
63 serum samples were collected at day 1 and day 42 for SL2 and at day 42 for SL1. Index cases also indicated  
64 their date of symptom onset.

65 Written informed consent was obtained from all participants. This study was reviewed and approved by  
66 the Medical Ethical Committee of the Amsterdam University Medical Centre, The Netherlands (reference  
67 number 2020.436 (SARSLIVA 1) and 2022.0073 (SARSLIVA 2.0)).

68

### 69 Outcomes and definitions

70 Primary outcomes are the viral load peak and viral shedding duration. The peak is defined as the minimum  
71 Ct-values observed during the testing period. Duration is defined as the number of days between the first  
72 positive and the midpoint between the last positive PCR result and first negative result. The last positive  
73 PCR result should be followed by at least two negative PCR results. Secondary outcomes are determinants  
74 that influence the viral load peak and shedding duration, which include sex, age, disease severity, weight  
75 class and pre- and post-infection antibody levels.

76 Laboratory assays: RT-PCR and serology

77 RT-PCR for SARS-CoV-2 was performed on each self-sampled saliva specimen (6). Ct-values under 40 were  
78 considered SARS-CoV-2 positive. Sera were analyzed for presence of SARS-COV-2 specific antibodies by  
79 protein microarray for the spike protein, using dose-response curves from serial dilutions to determine  
80 fluorescent signal (7).

81 Cohort comparisons

82 Bayes t-tests were performed to compare the mean viral load peak and mean viral shedding duration  
83 between cohorts. We assumed that there was strong evidence to support the alternate hypothesis (i.e.  
84 differences between cohorts) if the Bayes Factor (BF) exceeded 10. Sensitivity analyses were performed  
85 for our index cases only to correct for enrollment time by including interval between symptom onset and  
86 inclusion.

87 Bayesian linear regression for viral load decline

88 We used a Bayesian hierarchical linear regression model to estimate rates of viral load decline (8). We  
89 included all participants whose symptom onset dates were known. We estimated the response variable  
90 difference in Ct-value ( $Y$ ) over time since symptom onset ( $t$ ) for each sample ( $s$ ):

91 
$$Y = \beta_s t + c_s$$

92 The full model details, including priors used, are described in Supplementary methods.

93 Bayesian hierarchical ANOVA model for shedding duration and minimum Ct-value

94 An Bayesian hierarchical ANOVA model was used to estimate effects of covariates on the viral load peak  
95 and shedding duration, separately for SL1 and SL2. Full model and prior details are described in  
96 Supplementary methods.

97

## 98 Results

### 99 Participants and sampling

100 The SL1 and SL2 cohort yielded 213 and 130 SARS-CoV-2 positive participants, of which 80 and 65 index  
101 cases, from 85 and 69 households, respectively (Supplemental table 1). In total, 3273 saliva samples were  
102 obtained, with an average of 9.5 of the 10 samples per participant included in our analyses. Of SL2  
103 participants, 73.2% were vaccinated (at least once) at inclusion. None of our participants was hospitalized.

### 104 Viral load and shedding duration in different pandemic phases

105 We observed a difference in inclusion time (i.e. time from NP/OP swab to first day of saliva sampling)  
106 between SL1 (median: 5 days) and SL2 (median: 3 days, BF > 100), which was corrected for in our sensitivity  
107 analysis, reported as the corrected mean.

108 Shedding duration during SL1 (mean 25 days; corrected mean 29 days) was significantly longer as  
109 compared to SL2 (mean 15 days; corrected mean 17 days, initial and corrected BF>100). Minimum Ct-value  
110 (mean SL1: 26.3; SL2: 25.6; corrected mean: SL1: 26.2; SL2: 25.6), or viral load peak, were comparable  
111 between the two cohorts, and thus during these two stages of the pandemic. Moreover, modeling the  
112 decrease in viral load over time (Figure 1a/b), revealed a faster decline of viral load for SL2 than for SL1  
113 (slope Ct-value per day SL1: 0.266; and SL2: 0.491).

### 114 Covariates for shedding duration and viral load peak

115 We analyzed the adjusted effects of sex, age, weight class, disease severity and pre- and post-infection  
116 immunity on shedding duration (Figure 1c/1d) and viral load peak (Figure 1e/1f). During SL1, males were  
117 more likely to shed virus longer than females (Figure 1c). Disease severity played a role in this early phase,  
118 as more severe disease showed a significant association with longer shedding duration and higher viral  
119 loads in SL1. In SL2, children shed shorter and had lower peak viral loads compared to adults.

120 Participants in both SL1 as SL2 with high viral loads developed higher SARS-CoV-2 specific antibody titers  
121 42 days post-infection. In SL1, longer duration of shedding was also associated with high antibody titers  
122 post-infection. Additionally, in SL2 we found that high baseline titers led to lower viral load and shorter  
123 shedding (Figure 1 c-f, Supplementary Table 2).

124

125

126

127

128

129

130

131

132

133

134

135

136

137

138

139

140

141

142

143

## 144 Discussion

145 We used dense saliva sampling to compare SARS-CoV-2 shedding dynamics between mildly infected  
146 household cohorts from the 2020, wild-type SARS-CoV-2 phase of the pandemic (SL1) and the 2022  
147 Omicron (post-immunization) phase (SL2). Duration of shedding of SARS-CoV-2 was shorter during SL2,  
148 but viral load peak was similar. Children in the SL2 cohort experienced lower viral loads and shorter  
149 shedding periods than adults, independent of covariates. Furthermore, we found that SARS-CoV-2 specific  
150 antibodies are protective against high viral loads and longer duration of shedding in saliva.

151 Viral shedding dynamics differed in pandemic phases. It is difficult to distinguish between the effect of  
152 immunity and the intrinsic characteristics of the circulating variant, since the two are strongly correlated  
153 throughout time and inevitably intertwined. However, the presence of higher antibody titers in  
154 participants with low viral loads suggests a protective contribution of immunity, which is consistent with  
155 findings from other studies involving vaccinated participants (9). In contrast, the viral load peak was similar  
156 in our two cohorts, despite pre-existing immunity by vaccination or earlier confirmed infection for most  
157 participants in SL2, and no pre-existing immunity in SL1. We hypothesize that the protective effect of pre-  
158 existing immunity against infection and severe disease is counteracted in the infected participants by  
159 properties of the Omicron variant, leading to a comparable shedding peak in both cohorts. It is often  
160 suggested that high viral loads are associated with disease severity. Our study confirms this increased  
161 severity correlated to viral load for SL1. However, for SL2 we do not see this same effect, so despite similar  
162 peak viral load, no correlation is seen with disease severity in SL2, likely attributable to both host immunity  
163 and characteristics of Omicron variant.

164 This study showed that shedding duration in both cohorts was much longer than isolation advices stated  
165 over the course of the pandemic. During the pandemic, there has been debate about the correlation  
166 between shedding and viral transmission, partly because the detection of RNA does not directly translate



167 to the detection of infectious virus (1). Our study showed that children have lower viral loads and shed  
168 shorter than adults during the omicron phase. However, in the previous study that investigated  
169 transmission within the SL2 cohort (5), children contributed largely to transmission within households.  
170 This suggests that transmission is multifactorial, involving presence of immunity and behavioral factors.  
171 Consequently, we emphasize that transmission cannot be predicted solely by shedding dynamics, which  
172 should be considered in policy making based on these shedding dynamics.

173 A limitation of this study was posed by the fluctuating Ct-values in saliva samples which affected the  
174 resolution of viral load curves. Nonetheless, we show that saliva is a reliable measure for viral load, as has  
175 been suggested before (1, 10, 11). Moreover, we observed a longer inclusion time in SL1 than SL2, due to  
176 delayed reporting of results and limited accessibility of testing in the first pandemic phase. However, we  
177 corrected for this difference in our sensitivity analysis, which showed that inclusion time did not affect the  
178 outcome on shedding duration. Although this study is not the first to compare viral loads of different  
179 variants(12), this study is the first to use dense, saliva sampling over a period of six weeks to compare  
180 shedding.


181 To our best knowledge, we here describe a unique approach by analyzing saliva to compare viral shedding  
182 dynamics in different stages of the COVID-19 pandemic using two household cohorts separated in time  
183 but with identical study designs. Saliva specimens provide a convenient, non-invasive and adaptable  
184 method to study the effect of SARS-CoV-2 variant and immunity on shedding dynamics, which might  
185 contribute to future early surveillance for epidemic outbreaks.

186


187

188


**a.** Linear model for shedding SL1




**b.** Linear model for shedding SL2




**c.** Covariates for shedding duration SL1




**d.** Covariates for shedding duration SL2



**e.** Covariates for viral load peak SL1



**f.** Covariates for viral load peak SL2



190 **Figure 1. Viral shedding dynamics for two cohorts. (a/b)** Bayesian model shows the linear decrease of  
191 viral load (increase of Ct-value) over time using inverted Ct-value on the y-axis. The two models for SL1 (a)  
192 and SL2 (b) show a steeper decline for SL2. **(c/d)** Visualization of covariates included that might influence  
193 duration of shedding for the two different cohorts, based on a Bayesian ANOVA model. SL1 (c) shows that  
194 men have prolonged duration of shedding and antibody titers at day 42 are higher when shedding is longer.  
195 In SL2 (d) high baseline titer affects shedding duration and children shed shorter. **(e/f)** Models show the  
196 effect size of covariates when comparing the minimum Ct-value (viral load peak) in the different cohorts.  
197 In both cohorts, children had lower viral load than adults. Also, antibodies were higher at day 42 in  
198 participants with high viral loads. We found that increase in disease severity correlated with higher peak  
199 viral load peak in SL1, but not in SL2 (f). In SL2 higher baseline antibody titers were associated with lower  
200 viral loads.

201

## 202 **DECLARATIONS**

### 203 **Ethics approval and consent to participate**

204 Written informed consent was obtained from all participants. This study was reviewed and approved by  
205 the Medical Ethical Committee of the Amsterdam University Medical Centre, The Netherlands (reference  
206 number 2020.436 (SARSLIVA 1) and 2022.0073 (SARSLIVA 2.0)).

### 207 **Data availability statement**

208 De-identified data collected for the study, including individual participant data collected during the study  
209 and a data dictionary, will be shared upon reasonable request. These requests will be discussed with all  
210 project partners (Spaarne Gasthuis, Public Health Service Kennemerland and RIVM). Requests should be  
211 directed to [s.van.lelyveld@spaarnegasthuis.nl](mailto:s.van.lelyveld@spaarnegasthuis.nl) or [dirk.eggink@rivm.nl](mailto:dirk.eggink@rivm.nl). These requests will be reviewed  
212 and approved by the investigator and project partners based on scientific merit. To gain access, data  
213 requesters will need to sign a data access agreement. Privacy-sensitive data, which is traceable to the  
214 participant, will not be shared.

### 215 **Declaration of interests**

216 We declare no competing interests.

### 217 **Funding**

218 The SARSLIVA 1 study was supported by internal funds from the National Institute for Public Health and  
219 the Environment (RIVM), and by The Netherlands Organization for Health Research and Development  
220 (ZonMw), grant number 10430012010017, financed in part by The Netherlands Ministry of Health,  
221 Welfare and Sport. E. A. M. S. reports employment with RIVM, who supported the research for this work.  
222 Moreover, both SARSLIVA studies were supported by internal funds from Spaarne Gasthuis.

223 **Authors' contributions**

224 DE, SvL, MAVH, MH, SE, EK, AW were responsible for the conceptualization and design of the study and  
225 participated in the acquisition of data; DE, AvdB, SvdB coordinated and performed laboratory analyses; EK  
226 and AXH designed the model and analyzed the data. EK, AW, AXH, DE, SvL, MAVH, were responsible for  
227 interpretation of the analyses and verified the underlying data; AW and EK wrote the manuscript with  
228 review and editing put from all authors. DE, SvL, MAVH, CAR, MDdJ were responsible for resources,  
229 supervision, project administration and funding acquisition. All authors had full access to all the data and  
230 reviewed and approved the final version of the manuscript.

231

232 **Acknowledgements**

233 We thank all participants of SARSLIVA 1 and 2 without whom this study could not have been possible. We  
234 also thank the team of the Public Health Services (GGD) Kennemerland for providing information to the  
235 (possible) participants, the laboratory team of the National Institute for Public Health and the Environment  
236 (RIVM), including Gert-Jan Godeke, Bas van der Veer, Jordy de Bakker, Afke Vogelzang, Jeroen Cremer, Lisa  
237 Wijsman, Ryanne Jaarsma, Kim Freriks, Lynn Aarts, Sanne Bos, Mansoer Elahi, Jil Kocken for the laboratory  
238 analyses and the research team of the Spaarne Gasthuis Academy, particularly Lisa Kolodziej, Jordy Koole,  
239 Jacqueline Zonneveld, Sandra Kaamer van Hoegge, Mara van Roermund, Josseline Veldhuijzen and Yara  
240 Sijm.

241

242

243

244

## 245 References

246

247

248

249 1. Puhach O, Meyer B, Eckerle I. SARS-CoV-2 viral load and shedding kinetics. *Nat Rev Microbiol.*  
250 2023;21(3):147-61.

251 2. Tallmadge RL, Laverack M, Cronk B, Venugopalan R, Martins M, Zhang X, et al. Viral RNA Load and  
252 Infectivity of SARS-CoV-2 in Paired Respiratory and Oral Specimens from Symptomatic, Asymptomatic, or  
253 Postsymptomatic Individuals. *Microbiol Spectr.* 2022;10(3):e0226421.

254 3. Kolodziej LM, van Lelyveld SFL, Haverkort ME, Mariman R, Sluiter-Post JGC, Badoux P, et al. High  
255 Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) Household Transmission Rates Detected  
256 by Dense Saliva Sampling. *Clin Infect Dis.* 2022;75(1):e10-e9.

257 4. Medeiros da Silva RC, Nogueira Marinho LC, de Araújo Silva DN, Costa de Lima K, Pirih FQ, Luz de  
258 Aquino Martins AR. Saliva as a possible tool for the SARS-CoV-2 detection: A review. *Travel Medicine and*  
259 *Infectious Disease.* 2020;38:101920.

260 5. Winkel A, Kozanli E, Haverkort M, Euser S, Sluiter-Post J, Mariman R, et al. Lower levels of  
261 household transmission of SARS-CoV-2 VOC Omicron compared to Wild-type: an interplay between  
262 transmissibility and immune status. *medRxiv.* 2024.

263 6. Corman VM, Landt O, Kaiser M, Molenkamp R, Meijer A, Chu DK, et al. Detection of 2019 novel  
264 coronavirus (2019-nCoV) by real-time RT-PCR. *Euro Surveill.* 2020;25(3).

265 7. van Tol S, Mogling R, Li W, Godeke GJ, Swart A, Bergmans B, et al. Accurate serology for SARS-CoV-  
266 2 and common human coronaviruses using a multiplex approach. *Emerg Microbes Infect.* 2020;9(1):1965-  
267 73.

268 8. van Gils MJ, van Willigen HDG, Wynberg E, Han AX, van der Straten K, Burger JA, et al. A single  
269 mRNA vaccine dose in COVID-19 patients boosts neutralizing antibodies against SARS-CoV-2 and variants  
270 of concern. *Cell Rep Med.* 2022;3(1):100486.

271 9. Puhach O, Adea K, Hulo N, Sattonnet P, Genecand C, Iten A, et al. Infectious viral load in  
272 unvaccinated and vaccinated individuals infected with ancestral, Delta or Omicron SARS-CoV-2. *Nat Med.*  
273 2022;28(7):1491-500.

274 10. Groh AM, Vehreschild M, Diaz D, Kuchta AL, Doodoo C, Alvarado LA, et al. Kinetics of SARS-CoV-2  
275 infection biomarkers in a household transmission study. *Sci Rep.* 2024;14(1):12365.

276 11. de Koff EM ES, Badoux P, Sluiter-Post J, Eggink D, Sanders EAM, van Houten MA. Respiratory  
277 Pathogen Detection in Children: Saliva as a Diagnostic Specimen. *The Pediatric Infectious Disease Journal.*  
278 2021; 40(9):p e351-e3.

279 12. Julin CH, Robertson AH, Hungnes O, Tunheim G, Bekkevold T, Laake I, et al. Household Transmission  
280 of SARS-CoV-2: A Prospective Longitudinal Study Showing Higher Viral Load and Increased Transmissibility  
281 of the Alpha Variant Compared to Previous Strains. *Microorganisms.* 2021;9(11).