

1 **Viral load of SARS-CoV-2 across patients and compared to other**

2 **respiratory viruses**

3

4 Damien Jacot<sup>a</sup>, Gilbert Greub<sup>a, b</sup>, Katia Jaton<sup>a§</sup>, Onya Opota<sup>a§</sup>

5 <sup>a</sup>Institute of Microbiology, University Hospital Center and University of Lausanne, Switzerland.

6 <sup>b</sup>Infectious Diseases Service, University Hospital of Lausanne, Lausanne, Switzerland.

7 <sup>§</sup>Equal contribution

8 Corresponding authors: Onya.Opota@chuv.ch

9

10 **Abstract**

11 RT-PCRs to detect SARS-CoV-2 RNA is key to manage the COVID-19 pandemic. We analyzed SARS-  
12 CoV-2 viral loads from 22'323 RT-PCR results according to samples types, gender, age, and health  
13 units. Viral load did not show any difference across age and appears to be a poor predictor of  
14 disease outcome. SARS-CoV-2 viral load showed similar high viral loads than the one observed for  
15 RSV and influenza B. The importance of viral load to predict contagiousness and to assess disease  
16 progression is discussed.

17

18

19

## 20 **1. Introduction**

21

22 At the beginning of January 2020, the cluster of SARS-CoV-2 cases identified in Wuhan City, Hubei

23 Province (China) rapidly spread to other regions in China and to other countries, causing a world

24 pandemic (1, 2). Quantitative reverse transcription polymerase chain reaction (RT-PCR) represents a

25 key diagnostic tool for patients with suspected SARS-CoV-2 infection. Viral-specific genes, such as

26 the Envelope (E), the RdRP/Helicase (Hel), the spike protein encoding gene (S), as well as

27 Nucleocapsid (N) were used as molecular targets and combination of these genes have been

28 recommended by the WHO (3, 4). We introduced the E, RdRP, and N genes RT-PCRs in our fully

29 automated molecular diagnostic platform (MDx platform) (5). A lower sensitivity of the RT-PCRS

30 targeting the RdRP and N genes, compared to that targeting the E gene was observed leading us to

31 use solely the E gene, as RT-PCR target. Latter during the pandemic, the cobas® SARS-CoV-2 test

32 (Roche, Basel, Switzerland) became available targeting the ORF1/a, a non-structural region for

33 specific detection of SARS-CoV-2 and a conserved region in the E gene, for pan-Sarbecovirus

34 detection. The pan-Sarbecovirus primers and probe can also detect the SARS-CoV-1 virus, however

35 not currently circulating (6).

36 We determined the correlation between the cycle threshold (Ct) value and viral load and

37 investigated the distribution of viral loads across sex, age, and healthcare departments and as well

38 as against other respiratory viruses. The report of RT-PCR SARS-CoV-2 viral loads raised also several

39 questions regarding the use of this information for the laboratory as an internal quality assessment

40 tool, as well as (i) to predict contagiousness of patients and hence to guide epidemiological

41 decisions, especially for hospitalized patients and (ii) to predict the patient prognosis and assess

42 disease progression. These important questions will also be discussed here.

43

44

## 45 **2. Material and methods**

### 46 **Data**

47 Data from 19'832 SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR results from patients with suspected COVID-19 were collected  
48 from 1<sup>st</sup> February to 27<sup>th</sup> April 2020 at the diagnostic microbiology laboratory of the Lausanne's  
49 University Hospital (CHUV), representing 4172 positive cases.

### 50 **SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR, cycle thresholds and viral load quantification**

51 SARS-CoV-2 was detected in clinical specimen with i) a in-house RT-PCRs targeting the E-gene  
52 introduced in our automated molecular diagnostic platform (MDx platform) (5) and with the cobas  
53 SARS-CoV-2 test on the cobas 6800 instrument (Roche, Basel, Switzerland). The primers and probes  
54 for the E-gene PCR was those described by Corman and colleague (4). Cts of the MDx platform  
55 targeting the E gene were converted to viral load using either a plasmid containing the target  
56 sequence of the PCR obtained from RD-Biotech (Besançon, France) or using purified viral RNA, kindly  
57 provided by the Institute of Virology of the University of Berlin, la Charité (4). Both approaches  
58 showed similar virus quantifications and the following equation derived from RNA quantification was  
59 used:  $-0.27Ct+13.04$ . A comparative analysis of the Cts values obtained from our MDx platform  
60 compared to the cobas® SARS-CoV-2 test (Roche, Basel, Switzerland) showed a good congruency for  
61 Cts related to the E gene. This led us to use the E gene RT-PCR Cts values of both platforms in the  
62 present analyses. **Clinical specimens**

63 Among the 22'323 specimens collected, only the initial sample per patient was kept (19'832 samples  
64 with 4172 positives) and only nasopharyngeal and/or nasal swabs (NPS) were used (19'728 samples).  
65 Viral loads in different specimen types were instigated using multiple samples per patient as most of  
66 these investigations were performed after the first positive tests, usually an NPS. Comparison of viral  
67 load in different hospital unit was also performed using more than one sample per patient.

### 68 **Comparison of SARS-CoV-2 with other respiratory viruses**

69 6'050 RT-PCR of 14 other respiratory viruses were extracted from our database over a period of 5  
70 years (2015-2020): Influenza A and B, Respiratory Syncytial Virus (RSV), adenovirus, parainfluenza 1-

71 4, Coronaviruses E229, OC43, HKU1, NL63, Pan-entero/rhinovirus and Human Metapneumovirus and  
72 Ct values were obtained on the MDx platform and converted to viral loads, as previously reported  
73 (5). For Influenza A and B and RSV the Xpert® Xpress Flu/RSV was used and converted to viral load  
74 according to Zou et al. (7). Only nasopharyngeal and nose swabs were included. **Statistical analysis:**  
75 Data were process with Rstudio and plotted using ggplot2. Median is presented in all graphs.  
76 Statistical significance of viral loads were assessed using a parametric paired t-test and the two-  
77 tailed p-values interpretation are written on the graphs.

78

### 79 **3. Results**

#### 80 **SARS-CoV-2 viral load across the pandemic and among other respiratory viruses**

81 We observed a broad distribution of viral load values (Fig. 1A) with an evolution over the pandemic  
82 period that mirrored the epidemiological observations of SARS-CoV-2 infection in Switzerland (8)  
83 (Fig. 1B). The first cases occurred early March with a peak of the COVID-19 epidemic mid-March  
84 followed by a 2 weeks stationary phase before a slow decrease. Interestingly, the median viral load  
85 was higher in the first phase of the outbreak as compared to the following period. This is likely linked  
86 to the diagnostic of newly infected symptomatic persons with high viral load during the first phase  
87 compared to a more heterogeneous population tested in the following months. The initial viral load  
88 of SARS-CoV-2 was compared to 14 other respiratory viruses (Fig. 2A) (9). We found that although  
89 significant differences in viral loads exist across the different viruses and compared to SARS-CoV-2,  
90 SARS-CoV-2 exhibits similar viral load than RSV and Influenza B and than other coronaviruses. The  
91 range of viral load is overall similar between all the different respiratory viruses, with some subjects  
92 exhibiting very high load while others may exhibit much lower viral load, reflecting likely different  
93 sampling times during the course of the disease.

#### 94 **SARS-Cov-2 viral loads stratified by gender and age**

95 A higher number of tests was achieved in women than in men (35% of difference); however the rate  
96 of positive results was similar for both sex (Fig. S1A and B) and both genders showed comparable

97 viral load distribution (Fig. 2B). Stratification of positive samples by age groups showed that older  
98 individuals, when tested, were likely to be proportionally more frequently positive than the rest of  
99 the population, while young children showed very low percentages of positivity despite being rarely  
100 tested (Fig. S1C-D). Interestingly, viral loads categorization based on 5-year brackets ages showed no  
101 significant differences across age groups (Fig. 2C). Although limited by the low samples size, the  
102 pediatric age groups showed viral loads values comparable to adults.

### 103 **SARS-Cov-2 viral loads across different hospital units**

104 We focused on the Intensive care unit (ICU), the internal medicine (IM) department, the emergency  
105 unit (EU) and patients addressed to a screening unit (SU) specifically developed during the outbreak.  
106 This stratification per unit was used to investigate possible differences in viral loads in patients with  
107 several days of evolution since first symptoms and with a severe lung disease (ICU), versus subjects  
108 sick enough to get hospitalized (IM), to patients screened with mild symptoms (SU). To assess if the  
109 initial viral load could correlate with disease progression, we traced back, when available, the initial  
110 or the highest viral load values obtained in other departments for all patient hospitalized in ICU and  
111 showed that this value is not significantly higher than the one obtain for all other patients (Fig. 2D).  
112 Interestingly, patients latter hospitalized in ICU showed the lowest viral load in the upper respiratory  
113 tract compared to all other patients (Fig. 2D). This might reflect the evolution of COVID-19 infection,  
114 from the upper respiratory tract where it causes mild symptoms such as a fever and cough to a more  
115 severe form when the lower respiratory tract are affected (10-12). Furthermore, in the secondary  
116 phase of the disease, inflammation rather than viral replication appears to predominate (although  
117 this was not formerly established in the present work). These observations might also be biased by  
118 the timing of the 1<sup>st</sup> nasopharyngeal test that was sometimes done very late, i.e. at time of  
119 admission at the ICU. Finally, geriatric patients did not show different viral loads than other  
120 departments.

### 121 **SARS-Cov-2 viral loads across different specimens**

122 Over the time course of the epidemic several, non-nasal specimens were analysed mainly lower  
123 respiratory samples for patient in the ICU (Fig. S1F). Although, lower viral load values were obtained  
124 compared to the upper respiratory part (Fig. 2E), the lower respiratory tract samples were often  
125 useful to allow an early microbial diagnostic of COVID-19, and might prove to be useful to assess the  
126 clinical prognosis and disease progression. Only few blood samples were tested and only one of  
127 them was positive; this suggest a low rate of viremia. Interestingly, SARS-CoV-2 was not detected in  
128 urines. This was expected since respiratory tract viruses, which are not associated with a sustained  
129 viremia, are unlikely to be shed in urines. Moreover, the absence of virus in the CSF tested samples  
130 suggests that the serology should be considered as first line test for meningoencephalitis and  
131 Guillain-Barre syndrome. Only a handful number of samples were positive for stools and rectal  
132 swabs, due to limited number of subjects tested. Statistical comparison across the different  
133 specimens was however limited by the low number of data.

134

#### 135 **4. Discussion**

136 Initial SARS-CoV-2 viral load is widely distributed ranging from 3 to 10 log copies/ml and the  
137 evolution of the viral load over-time mirrored the evolution of SARS-CoV-2 infections in Switzerland.  
138 The median viral load for SARS-CoV-2 in NPS was 6.78 log<sub>10</sub> copies per ml. This supports the fact that  
139 RT-PCR, which can detect less than 100 copies per ml of samples, is a sensitive method for the  
140 diagnostic of COVID-19. This is however limited by the quality of specimen sampling and the time  
141 course of infection.

142 We also compared SARS-CoV-2 viral loads to that of other respiratory viruses in order to determine  
143 whether higher viral loads, that could affect contagiousness, are observed. Although significant  
144 differences were observed when compared to some other respiratory viruses, SARS-CoV-2 appears  
145 to exhibit similar viral load than RSV and influenza B, as previously reported (9). For respiratory  
146 viruses other than Influenza and RSV, we have a bias towards immunocompromised or severely ill  
147 patients, which might tend to have higher viral loads. Interestingly, others reported that the pattern

148 of patients infected with SARS-CoV-2 resembles more to patients infected with influenza (13) than  
149 SARS-CoV-1 (14); the former being characterized by increased infectiousness at time or even before  
150 symptoms onset (15). SARS-CoV-2 viral load appears to be a poor predictor of disease outcome.  
151 Indeed neither the initial nor the highest viral load of patients latter admitted to the ICU was  
152 significantly higher than the specimens from patient treated in a SU. This absence of correlation with  
153 the clinical outcome is also supported (i) by other published data showing high viral load in  
154 asymptomatic patients (15-18) and (ii) by the fact that asymptomatic or minimally symptomatic  
155 patients can transmit the virus (19). We also observed that viral load seems not to correlate with  
156 age. In particular, older individual and young children showed similar viral loads than the general  
157 population (20-22). Concentration of the virus in the respiratory tract can indirectly reflects  
158 contagiousness; however, viral load is not the only factor at play in term of contagiousness, since  
159 nasal discharge and cough are clearly important co-variables impacting transmission (23).

160 The clinical relevance and usefulness of viral load measures appears to be mainly restricted to  
161 specifically classifying the patient as being in the first phase of the disease with high viral load or  
162 rather in the 2<sup>nd</sup> phase of the disease when viral load tends to decrease and when inflammation  
163 predominates (12). This may be useful to help treatment decision, i.e. to use for instance anti-IL6 or  
164 steroids in presence a cytokine storm or during a macrophage activation syndrome. Indeed, COVID-  
165 19 disease severity is not directly linked to viral replication in the upper and lower respiratory tracts  
166 but is also to an unregulated inflammatory process induced by the host immune response (12).

167 Interpretation of a unique viral load value in a given patients should be done cautiously since (i)  
168 there is a trend to a natural gradual decrease of the viral load in the nasopharyngeal samples over  
169 time during the course of the infection (15, 16) and (ii) the absolute value of the viral load in the  
170 nasopharyngeal samples may be highly different according to the quality of sampling. Despite these  
171 limitations, our laboratory decided to provide quantitative results to clinicians, and these values are  
172 now used not only for patient care, but also to define contagiousness, i.e. values below 1000  
173 copies/ml may be considered at low risk of transmission. Of course, decisions about patients

174 isolation inside the hospital is not only based on viral load but also takes into account (i)  
175 epidemiological aspects such as the possible exposure of other immunocompromised subjects and  
176 (ii) clinical presentation, since a patient with cough and/or nasal discharge will be more contagious.

177

## 178 **Acknowledgments**

179 We would like to thank all the staff of the Institute of Microbiology of the Lausanne University  
180 Hospital. In particular all the biomedical technicians of the molecular diagnostic laboratory for their  
181 incredible work and support during the pandemic.

182

## 183 **Conflict of interest**

184 The authors declare to have no conflict of interest.

185

186



## 187 References

- 188 1. Huang C, Wang Y, Li X, Ren L, Zhao J, Hu Y, et al. Clinical features of patients infected with  
189 2019 novel coronavirus in Wuhan, China. *Lancet*. 2020;395(10223):497-506.
- 190 2. Wang C, Horby PW, Hayden FG, Gao GF. A novel coronavirus outbreak of global health  
191 concern. *Lancet*. 2020;395(10223):470-3.
- 192 3. Chan JF, Yip CC, To KK, Tang TH, Wong SC, Leung KH, et al. Improved Molecular  
193 Diagnosis of COVID-19 by the Novel, Highly Sensitive and Specific COVID-19-RdRp/Hel Real-Time  
194 Reverse Transcription-PCR Assay Validated In Vitro and with Clinical Specimens. *J Clin Microbiol*.  
195 2020;58(5).
- 196 4. Corman VM, Landt O, Kaiser M, Molenkamp R, Meijer A, Chu DK, et al. Detection of 2019  
197 novel coronavirus (2019-nCoV) by real-time RT-PCR. *Euro Surveill*. 2020;25(3).
- 198 5. Greub G, Sahli R, Brouillet R, Jatton K. Ten years of R&D and full automation in molecular  
199 diagnosis. *Future Microbiol*. 2016;11(3):403-25.
- 200 6. Poljak M, Korva M, Knap Gasper N, Fujs Komlos K, Sagadin M, Ursic T, et al. Clinical  
201 evaluation of the cobas SARS-CoV-2 test and a diagnostic platform switch during 48 hours in the  
202 midst of the COVID-19 pandemic. *J Clin Microbiol*. 2020.
- 203 7. Zou X, Chang K, Wang Y, Li M, Zhang W, Wang C, et al. Comparison of the Cepheid Xpert  
204 Xpress Flu/RSV assay and commercial real-time PCR for the detection of influenza A and influenza B  
205 in a prospective cohort from China. *Int J Infect Dis*. 2019;80:92-7.
- 206 8. FOPH SFOoPH. New coronavirus: Situation in Switzerland. 2020.
- 207 9. Feikin DR, Fu W, Park DE, Shi QY, Higdon MM, Baggett HC, et al. Is Higher Viral Load in the  
208 Upper Respiratory Tract Associated With Severe Pneumonia? Findings From the PERCH Study.  
209 *Clinical Infectious Diseases*. 2017;64:S337-S46.
- 210 10. Varga Z, Flammer AJ, Steiger P, Haberecker M, Andermatt R, Zinkernagel AS, et al.  
211 Endothelial cell infection and endotheliitis in COVID-19. *Lancet*. 2020;395(10234):1417-8.
- 212 11. Vincent JL, Taccone FS. Understanding pathways to death in patients with COVID-19. *Lancet*  
213 *Respir Med*. 2020;8(5):430-2.
- 214 12. Tay MZ, Poh CM, Renia L, MacAry PA, Ng LFP. The trinity of COVID-19: immunity,  
215 inflammation and intervention. *Nat Rev Immunol*. 2020;20(6):363-74.
- 216 13. Tsang TK, Cowling BJ, Fang VJ, Chan KH, Ip DK, Leung GM, et al. Influenza A Virus  
217 Shedding and Infectivity in Households. *J Infect Dis*. 2015;212(9):1420-8.
- 218 14. Peiris JS, Chu CM, Cheng VC, Chan KS, Hung IF, Poon LL, et al. Clinical progression and  
219 viral load in a community outbreak of coronavirus-associated SARS pneumonia: a prospective study.  
220 *Lancet*. 2003;361(9371):1767-72.
- 221 15. To KK, Tsang OT, Leung WS, Tam AR, Wu TC, Lung DC, et al. Temporal profiles of viral load  
222 in posterior oropharyngeal saliva samples and serum antibody responses during infection by SARS-  
223 CoV-2: an observational cohort study. *Lancet Infect Dis*. 2020;20(5):565-74.
- 224 16. Zou L, Ruan F, Huang M, Liang L, Huang H, Hong Z, et al. SARS-CoV-2 Viral Load in Upper  
225 Respiratory Specimens of Infected Patients. *N Engl J Med*. 2020;382(12):1177-9.
- 226 17. Arons MM, Hatfield KM, Reddy SC, Kimball A, James A, Jacobs JR, et al. Presymptomatic  
227 SARS-CoV-2 Infections and Transmission in a Skilled Nursing Facility. *N Engl J Med*. 2020.
- 228 18. He X, Lau EHY, Wu P, Deng X, Wang J, Hao X, et al. Temporal dynamics in viral shedding  
229 and transmissibility of COVID-19. *Nat Med*. 2020.
- 230 19. Kimball A, Hatfield KM, Arons M, James A, Taylor J, Spicer K, et al. Asymptomatic and  
231 Presymptomatic SARS-CoV-2 Infections in Residents of a Long-Term Care Skilled Nursing Facility -  
232 King County, Washington, March 2020. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep*. 2020;69(13):377-81.
- 233 20. Lu X, Zhang L, Du H, Zhang J, Li YY, Qu J, et al. SARS-CoV-2 Infection in Children. *N Engl J*  
234 *Med*. 2020;382(17):1663-5.
- 235 21. Castagnoli R, Votto M, Licari A, Brambilla I, Bruno R, Perlini S, et al. Severe Acute  
236 Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) Infection in Children and Adolescents: A  
237 Systematic Review. *JAMA Pediatr*. 2020. [Online ahead of print.]
- 238 22. Bi Q, Wu Y, Mei S, Ye C, Zou X, Zhang Z, et al. Epidemiology and transmission of COVID-19  
239 in 391 cases and 1286 of their close contacts in Shenzhen, China: a retrospective cohort study.  
240 *Lancet Infect Dis*. 2020. [Online ahead of print.]
- 241 23. Tom MR, Mina MJ. To Interpret the SARS-CoV-2 Test, Consider the Cycle Threshold Value.  
242 *Clin Infect Dis*. 2020.
- 243

244 **Figures and legends**

245 **Figure 1**

246 **A:** Histogram of SARS-CoV-2 viral loads. **B:** Time-course analyses of SARS-CoV-2 viral loads across  
247 time. Viral loads mirrored the reported COVID-19 infections in Switzerland.

248

249 **Figure 2**

250 **A:** Viral loads of 14 respiratory viruses compared to SARS-CoV-2. HPMV: Human-metapneumovirus,  
251 HPIV1-4: Human Parainfluenza Viruses 1-4, InfA and B: Influenza viruses A and B; RSV: Respiratory  
252 Syncytial Virus. m represents the median, n the number of observations, and the percentage of  
253 positive test is presented. Statistical significance of viral loads of SARS-CoV-2 was assessed against  
254 the other viruses. **B-C:** Viral loads distribution of SARS-CoV-2 across sex and age showed comparable  
255 values among all groups. **D:** Initial viral loads of SARS-CoV-2 in different hospital departments. ICU  
256 first and ICU max correspond to respectively the first or highest sample recorder for patients latter  
257 admitted to the ICU. Statistical significance of viral loads was assessed against the SU samples (upper  
258 stars), and against the ICU (lower stars). **E:** Distribution of viral loads across different specimens.  
259 Statistical significance of viral loads was assessed against the NPS samples AS: anal swab, BAL:  
260 bronchoalveolar lavage, CSF cerebrospinal fluid, NTS: nasal-throat swab, TS: throat swab. P-values:  
261 ns:  $p > 0.05$ , \*:  $p \leq 0.05$ , \*\*:  $p \leq 0.01$ , \*\*\*:  $p \leq 0.001$ , \*\*\*\*:  $p \leq 0.0001$

262



263 **Supplementary figure**

264 **Figure S1**

265 A-D: Absolute and percentage values of SARS-CoV-2 infection across sex and ages. E-F: Absolute and  
266 percentage values of SARS-CoV-2 viral loads across different specimens. AS: anal swab, BAL:  
267 bronchoalveolar lavage, CSF cerebrospinal fluid, NTS: nasal-throat swab, TS: throat swab.

# Figure 1


**A** medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.07.15.20154518>; this version posted September 3, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a [CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/).




# Figure 2

medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.07.15.20154518>; this version posted September 3, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a [CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/).


**A**




**B**



**C**



**D**



**E**

