

SARS-CoV-2 viral load distribution in different patient populations and age groups reveals that viral loads increase with age.

Sjoerd Euser, PhD¹, Sem Aronson, MD^{1,3}, Irene Manders, MD^{1,2}, Steven van Lelyveld, MD, PhD³, Bjorn Herpers, MD, PhD¹, Ruud Jansen, PhD¹, Sophie Schuurmans Stekhoven, MD³, Marlies van Houten, MD, PhD³, Ivar Lede, MD⁴, James Cohen Stuart, MD, PhD⁵, Fred Slijkerman Megelink, MD⁶, Erik Kapteijns, MD, PhD⁷, Jeroen den Boer, MD, PhD¹, Elisabeth Sanders, MD, PhD^{8,9}, Alex Wagemakers, MD, PhD^{*1}, Dennis Souverein, PhD¹.

- 1 Regional Public Health Laboratory Kennemerland, Haarlem, the Netherlands
- 2 Public Health Service Kennemerland, Haarlem, the Netherlands
- 3 Spaarne Gasthuis, Hoofddorp/Haarlem, the Netherlands
- 4 Comicro BV medical microbiology, Hoorn, the Netherlands
- 5 Department of Medical Microbiology, Noordwest Ziekenhuisgroep, Alkmaar, The Netherlands
- 6 Public Health Service Hollands Noorden, Alkmaar, the Netherlands
- 7 Rode Kruis Ziekenhuis, Beverwijk, the Netherlands
- 8 Wilhelmina Children's Hospital, University Medical Center Utrecht, Utrecht, The Netherlands
- 9 Center for Infectious Disease Control, National Institute for Public Health and the Environment, Bilthoven, the Netherlands

*shared senior author

Corresponding author: Sjoerd M. Euser, Regional Public Health Laboratory Kennemerland, Boerhaavelaan 26, 2035 RC, Haarlem, the Netherlands, telephone: +31 23 530 7879, email: s.euser@streeklabhaarlem.nl

ABSTRACT

Objectives: To describe the SARS-CoV-2 viral load distribution in different patient groups and age categories.

Methods: All SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR results from nasopharyngeal (NP) and oropharyngeal (OP) swabs (first PCR from unique patients only) that were collected between January 1 and December 1, 2020, in the Public Health Services regions Kennemerland and Hollands Noorden, province of Northern Holland, the Netherlands were included in this study. Swabs were derived from patients with respiratory symptoms who were presented at the general practitioner (GP) or hospital, hospital health care workers (HCWs) of four regional hospitals, nursing home residents and HCWs of multiple nursing homes, and in majority (>75%) from Public Health testing facilities of the two Public Health Services. SARS-CoV-2 PCR crossing point (Cp) values were used to estimate viral loads (higher Cp-values indicate lower viral loads).

Results: In total, 278.470 unique patients were tested of whom 9.1% (n=25.365) were SARS-CoV-2 positive. As there were differences in viral load distribution between tested populations, further analyses focused on PCRs performed by public health services (n=211.933) where sampling and inclusion were uniform. These data present reveal a clear relation between age and SARS-CoV-2 viral load, with especially children aged <12 years showing lower viral loads than shown in adults (β : -0.03, 95CI% -0.03 to -0.02, p<0.001), independent of sex and/or symptom duration. Interestingly, the median Cp values between the oldest (>79 years) and youngest (<12 years) population differed by over 4 PCR cycles, suggesting approximately a 16 fold difference in viral load. In addition, the proportion of children aged < 12 years with a Cp-value >30 was significantly higher compared to the other patients (31.1% vs. 16.9%, p-value<0.001).

Conclusion: We observed that in patients tested by public health services, SARS-CoV2 viral load increases significantly with age. Previous studies suggest that young children (<12 years) play a limited role in SARS-CoV-2 transmission. Currently, the relation between viral load and infectivity is not yet well understood, and further studies should elucidate whether the lower viral load in children is indeed related to their suggested limited role in SARS-CoV-2 transmission. Moreover, as antigen tests are less sensitive than PCR, these results suggest that SARS-CoV-2 antigen tests could have lower sensitivity in children than in adults.

Keywords: SARS-CoV-2; viral load distribution; age; COVID-19

INTRODUCTION

Since the start of the COVID-19 pandemic, molecular testing of respiratory samples by reverse transcriptase polymerase chain reaction (RT-PCR) has been the primary method to diagnose SARS-CoV-2.¹ Although SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR results are in general reported in a qualitative manner (positive or negative), the quantitative test result (cycle threshold (Ct), or crossing point (Cp) which indicates the viral load in a sample) may offer additional insights in for instance SARS-CoV-2 transmission dynamics. Individual viral load kinetics show a sharp increase in viral load in the earliest (mostly pre-symptomatic) stages of the infection, followed by a gradual decline.² Interestingly, while viral cultures are mostly positive in samples with high viral load (Ct-value <27), samples with a low viral load hardly show any potential for viral cultivation (<3% at Ct 35), suggesting lower risk of transmission.³

One of the problems of studying SARS-CoV-2 viral loads in respiratory samples is the lack of comparability of Ct- or Cp-values derived from different laboratories, as these are assay- and method specific.⁴ This issue complicates the evaluation of SARS-CoV-2 viral loads in respiratory samples derived from large patient populations where often multiple laboratories are involved in analyzing these samples.

In this report we describe the SARS-CoV-2 viral load distribution of all routinely collected SARS-CoV-2 positive respiratory samples from a single large regional laboratory in the Netherlands, enabling us to evaluate the distinction between different patient groups (hospitalized patients, GP patients, nursing home patients, health care workers, patients tested in Public Health testing facilities) and age categories with respect to viral load distribution and the duration of symptoms.

METHODS

Setting

The Regional Public Health Laboratory Kennemerland, Haarlem, the Netherlands, performs SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR testing for over 800.000 inhabitants, including health care workers (HCW), patients of four large teaching hospitals, patients of more than 600 GPs, 90 nursing home organizations, and those who are tested because of mild symptoms in public health testing facilities set up by the Public Health Services Kennemerland and Hollands Noorden. Here, we report the SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR results from nasopharyngeal (NP), oropharyngeal (OP) and combined swabs (first samples from unique patients only) that were analyzed between January 1 and December 1, 2020, using the RT-PCR based on the presence

of the E-gene.¹ These swabs were derived from GP patients, hospital patients and hospital health care workers (HCW), nursing home residents and nursing home HCWs, and in majority from Public Health testing facilities. As Public Health testing facilities employed a uniform sampling (combined oro- and nasopharynx) and inclusion (only when symptomatic for all age groups) policy, these PCRs were included for further analyses. For several months during the testing period, the national testing policy required children to also have severe symptoms (dyspnea or fever) or a positive contact to be included for testing.

The Public Health Service Kennemerland, which is responsible for the data collection and reporting of new COVID-19 cases on a national level and performs contact tracing for these cases in the region Kennemerland, provided the date of first onset of disease for a subset of patients living in the region Kennemerland.

Ethics Statement

The Institutional Review Board of the Spaarne Gasthuis, Hoofddorp/Haarlem, the Netherlands, approved to conduct the study on November 10th, 2020 (Study number: 2020.0154). According to the Dutch regulation for research with human subjects, neither medical or ethical approval was required to conduct the study since the data were collected as part of standard care. The data were anonymized after collection and analyzed under code.

Statistical analysis

Descriptive statistics were used to present the data: continuous variables were presented as median (interquartile range (IQR)), categorical variables were presented as no. (%). Comparisons of continuous variables were made using Mann-Whitney U tests, for categorical variables Chi-square tests were used. The Kruskal-Wallis test, combined with post-hoc pairwise comparisons with Bonferroni correction for multiple testing was used to investigate differences in viral load between different patient- or age groups. Linear regression analyses were used to analyze the relation between age and viral load allowing additional adjustment for potentially confounding variables. Statistical analyses were performed with R and RStudio (R version 4.0.3), packages tidyverse, sf and broom. P-values <0.05 were considered significant.

RESULTS

Between January 1 and December 1, 278.470 unique patients were tested of whom the results of the first PCR were included. When patients were tested more than once, only the first positive PCR (when available) or the first negative PCR were included. Overall, 9.1% (n=25.365) samples were SARS-CoV-2 positive. Figure 1 shows the geographical distribution of the total number of positive unique patients for the period January 1-December 1, 2020 in the region Kennemerland and adjacent areas.

Viral load distribution in different patient populations

Comparison of the number of patients tested with the SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR between the first (January 1-July 31) and second (August 1-December 1) wave of COVID-19 patients, reveals a shift in the number of tested patients from different patient populations (Table 1). In the first wave, a relatively large proportion of tests (26.6%) was performed for hospital patients, as compared to 0.8% in the second wave. The vast majority of samples (80.9%) in the second wave were derived from Public Health testing facilities.

In addition, the distribution of Cp-values (with higher Cp-values indicating a lower viral load) of respiratory samples showed lower viral loads for samples collected during the first wave compared to samples collected during the second wave (median Cp-value (IQR): 28.4 (8.1) vs. 25.7 (6.0), Mann-Whitney U test p-value<0.001) (Table 1). There were also remarkable differences between patient populations who were tested in the first wave (Figure 2A) and the second wave of COVID-19 patients (Figure 2B) with respect to Cp-value distributions. Analyses (Kruskal-Wallis test) indicated significant differences in viral load between these patients populations in both the first (p-value<0.001) and second wave (p-value<0.002). Pairwise post-hoc comparisons (with a Bonferroni corrected p-value) showed significantly higher viral loads in the following patient populations in the first wave: Public Health (higher viral load) vs. GP patients (lower viral load) (p-value=0.020), Public Health vs. not admitted hospital patients (p-value<0.001), Public Health vs. nursing home HCWs (p-value<0.001), nursing home residents vs. not admitted hospital patients (p-value<0.001), nursing home residents vs. nursing home HCWs (p-value=0.015). In the second wave, nursing home residents vs. other groups (p-value=0.004), and GP patients vs. other groups (p-value=0.006) showed significantly higher viral loads (see Appendix, Table 3 and 4).

Viral load distribution across age and gender categories

The relation between patient age and SARS-CoV-2 viral load was investigated in the Public Health testing facilities samples collected between January 1 and December 1 (n=211.933), which was considered to be a relatively consistent population with respect to performed sampling procedure (a combined NP/OP swab) and patient characteristics. Patients were categorized in different age categories: age<12 years (primary grade school); 12-17 years (high school); 18-29 years; 30-49 years; 50-59 years; 60-69 years; 70-79 years; age>79 years. Number of available tests in each age category and proportion of positive tests are shown in Table 2. Distribution of the SARS-CoV-2 Cp-values for these age categories is shown in Table 2 and in Figure 3. These data showed that both proportion of positive tests as well as SARS-CoV-2 viral load increase with age. Analyses with a Kruskal-Wallis test indicated significant differences in viral load between the age categories (p-value<0.001). Pairwise post-hoc comparisons (with a Bonferroni corrected p-value) showed significant differences between almost all age categories, except for those within higher age groups (see Appendix, Table 5). In addition, the proportion of patients with a Cp-value>30 was highest in the younger age groups. For example, the proportion of children aged < 12 years with a Cp-value >30 was significantly higher compared to the other patients (31.1% vs. 16.9%, Chi-square p-value<0.001). Interestingly, the median Cp-values had over 4 Cp-values difference between the oldest (>79 years) and youngest (<12 years) population, suggesting approximately 16 times difference in viral load. Additional data on the viral load distribution in age groups over time (March-December) are presented in Appendix, Table 6.

In a subset of 7.307 samples from SARS-CoV-2 PCR positive Public Health patients for whom time between onset of symptoms and testing was known (median (IQR) was: 2(2) days), linear regression analyses were performed. These analyses showed a significant relation between increasing age and decreasing Cp-values: β : -0.02, 95CI%: -0.03 to -0.02, p<0.001), independent of time between onset of symptoms and testing and sex (adjusted β : -0.03, 95CI%: -0.04 to -0.02, p<0.001). In addition, when the relation between patient sex and SARS-CoV-2 viral load was investigated (in the 7.307 SARS-CoV-2 PCR positive public health testing facilities samples), men showed a slightly (but significantly) higher viral load as compared to women (median Cp-value (IQR): 25.5 (5.9) vs. 25.8 (5.7), Mann-Whitney U test p-value=0.014), but when this was adjusted for age and time between onset of symptoms and testing in the linear regression analyses, no significant relation between sex and viral load was seen (adjusted β : 0.15, 95CI%: -0.02 to 0.33, p=0.088) anymore. Finally, a significant relation was found between viral load and time between onset of symptoms and testing (adjusted β : 0.45, 95CI%: 0.41 to 0.49, p<0.001), independent of age and sex.

DISCUSSION

To our knowledge this is the first study to evaluate SARS-CoV-2 viral load distributions in a large number of patients from different patient categories. Our data present a clear relation between age and SARS-CoV-2 viral load, with children (<12 years) showing lower viral loads independent of sex and symptom duration. In addition, we observed that testing for COVID-19 using the SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR in a large Dutch region shifted between the first wave (January 1-July 31) and second wave (August 1-December 1) of identified COVID-19 patients with respect to the populations of patients who were tested and the SARS-CoV-2 viral load distribution, with higher viral loads seen in samples analyzed in the second wave.

The shift in tested patients from different patient populations between the first and the second wave was influenced by the national testing policy that was primarily focused on hospital patients in the first wave (due to limited testing capacity), and gradually moved to testing all patients with COVID-19 related symptoms (in large Public Health testing facilities) during the second wave. This could also have resulted in a more rapid diagnosis (since the onset of symptoms) for patients tested in the second wave resulting in the significantly higher viral load detected in the second wave samples.

Our observation of increasing SARS-CoV-2 viral load with increasing age, especially showing low viral loads in children under 12 years of age, is not in line with previous studies.⁵⁻⁸ However, most of these studies argue that the relatively low number of pediatric patients who could be included in their studies limited the possibility to investigate this relation over a broad age range, including younger children (aged < 12 years). The study of Jones et al.,⁶ who analyzed viral loads of 3.712 patients (of all ages) reported no significant differences in viral load across age groups, although their study population included only 117 patients aged <20 years, and it was argued by others that there was moderate but not overwhelming evidence of increasing viral load with increasing age present in their data.⁸ In our study we had SARS-CoV-2 viral load data available for 18.290 unique patients tested in a public health setting, including 2.654 patients aged <20 years (with 238 children aged <12 years).

There are several potential explanations for the lower SARS-CoV-2 viral load in respiratory samples derived from children. For instance, quality of swabbing might differ between children and adults. The discomfort caused by nasopharyngeal or oropharyngeal sampling in children could have resulted in more nasal or mid-turbinate samples, despite clear testing guidelines. There are studies that showed combined throat/nasal swab samples yielding a lower SARS-CoV-2 viral load compared to nasopharyngeal samples,⁹ although others showed no difference,¹⁰ or even higher viral loads in nasal or

mid-turbinate samples.¹¹ One could assume that even if the sampling method has a profound influence on SARS-CoV-2 viral load, this effect would have primarily been present in the youngest patients (where discomfort or protesting of the patient may have led to a different sampling procedure). As the effect of age on SARS-CoV-2 viral load in our data is present across a broad range of age-categories we do not think this can be explained by differences in sampling method alone. Moreover, to homogenize for sampling method, we only included PCRs performed by Public Health services (combined OP/NP performed by trained personnel). By only including Public Health PCRs we also homogenized for inclusion criteria (symptoms present), although for children a restricted testing policy was employed during several months, where they needed to have severe symptoms (dyspnea/fever) or a positive contact. While it does explain the lower number of children tested, the increase in viral loads with age does not appear to change in time (Appendix, Table 6), therefore changes in testing policy for children do not appear to explain our findings.

One could also argue that children were in general tested later after the first onset of symptoms compared to adults, as the parents postponed the moment of exposing their children to the distress of being sampled. This could have led to children being tested in a later stage of the infection, when their individual viral load may have declined compared to the early stage of the infections (following individual viral load kinetics).² However, results were similar when we adjusted the relation between age and viral load for time since onset of disease.

Also, one could consider that despite the need for symptoms to be included for testing by public health agencies before December 1st, some of the tested population might have falsely reported symptoms in order to be tested free of charge. It is impossible to correct for this potential bias, and it is impossible to ascertain whether there are age-dependent differences in this respect. Nevertheless, it seems unlikely that the observed large difference in Cp-distribution is primarily caused by age-related differences in the false reporting of symptoms.

The observed lower viral load in children might be explained by age-related differences in viral infection dynamics. For example, several studies have suggested a differential expression of angiotensin-converting enzyme 2 (ACE2) (the receptor that SARS-CoV-2 uses for host entry) in different age categories.¹²⁻¹³ Bunyavanich et al. showed a positive association between ACE2 gene expression and age, which might explain the lower incidence of COVID-19 in children and the lower SARS-CoV-2 viral loads we found in the younger age categories.¹² In addition, there are other factors that might protect children from higher viral load including for instance: differences in innate and adaptive immunity, more

frequent recurrent and concurrent infections, pre-existing immunity to coronaviruses and differences in microbiota.¹⁴

Currently, antigen tests provide a rapid- yet less sensitive method to diagnose SARS-CoV-2. Antigen tests do not employ a target replication technique, and false-negatives are mostly observed in samples with a low viral load.¹⁵ We found Cp-values > 30 in 31.1% of children <12 years, which was almost double the proportion found in the rest of the population. Therefore, these lower viral loads found in our study might indicate that antigen tests will have lower sensitivity in children. While further studies should validate these findings, caution should be warranted when using antigen tests to diagnose SARS-CoV-2 in populations with lower viral loads, in order to reduce the risk of false-negative results.

One of the limitations of our study is that there were no data available on symptomatic status, underlying disease, sampling method, and moment of onset of first symptoms of all patients for whom respiratory samples were included. This is why the analyses of the relation between age and viral load was evaluated in samples from patients tested in the Public Health testing facilities which was considered to be a relatively consistent population with respect to performed sampling procedure and patient characteristics, and for whom time of onset of first symptoms was known (for a large subset of patients). Another limitation was the inclusion of symptomatic patients only, thus not reflecting the spectrum of SARS-CoV-2 infection, especially as asymptomatic presentations are frequently seen in children.¹⁶⁻¹⁷

In addition, it should be noted that the samples included in this study were collected before the novel SARS-CoV-2 variant, VOC 202012/01, that was first identified in the UK was likely to have been widespread in the Netherlands.¹⁸

To conclude, with this study we have tried to emphasize the usefulness of analyzing SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR (viral load) data that are derived from a large population made up of a broad range of patient groups and age categories in a single laboratory (using the identical SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR method for all samples). With these data, shifts in tested patients populations and viral load distributions during the course of the COVID-19 pandemic can be closely monitored. This may contribute to a better understanding of SARS-CoV-2 transmission, and improve future measures that are taken to restrict the viral spread. The most remarkable finding of this study was the relation between SARS-CoV-2 viral load and age, with significantly lower viral loads in children. As previous studies have suggested that young children (<12 years) play a limited role in SARS-CoV-2 transmission,^{8,19} our data support this suggestion.

Furthermore, these results suggest that SARS-CoV-2 antigen tests could have lower sensitivity in children than in adults.

However, viral load cannot solely explain differences in transmissibility between patients as for instance epidemiological aspects (exposure to others) and clinical presentation (coughing as a symptom) should not be overlooked.^{6,8} Further studies (that for instance combine viral load data with contact tracing data) should elucidate whether the lower viral load in children is indeed related to their suggested limited role in SARS-CoV-2 transmission.

Conflict of interest

The authors have no conflicts of interest to declare

REFERENCES

1. Corman VM, Landt O, Kaiser M, et al. Detection of 2019 novel coronavirus (2019-nCoV) by real-time RT-PCR. *Euro Surveill.* 25(3) 2020. pii=2000045.
2. Wölfel R, Corman VM, Guggemos W, et al. 2020. Virological assessment of hospitalized patients with COVID-2019. www.nature.com/articles/s41586-020-2196-x.
3. Jaafar R, Aherfi S, Wurtz N, et al. 2020. Correlation between 3790 qPCR positives samples and positive cell cultures including 1941 SARS-CoV-2 isolates. *Clin Infect Dis*, ciaa1491, <https://doi.org/10.1093/cid/ciaa1491>
4. Rhoads D, Peaper DR, She RC, et al. 2020. College of American Pathologists (CAP) Microbiology Committee Perspective: Caution Must Be Used in Interpreting the Cycle Threshold (Ct) Value. *Clin Infect Dis*, ciaa1199, <https://doi.org/10.1093/cid/ciaa1199>
5. Kleiboeker et al., SARS-CoV-2 viral load assessment in respiratory samples. *J Clin Virol* 2020;129: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcv.2020.104439>
6. Jacot et al., Viral load of SARS-CoV-2 across patients and compared to other respiratory viruses. *Microbes and Infection* 2020(22);617-621.
7. Jones et al., An analysis of SARS-CoV-2 viral load by patient age.
8. Walsh et al., SARS-CoV-2 detection, viral load and infectivity over the course of an infection. *J of Infection* 2020;81:357-371.
9. Vlek et al., Combined throat/nasal swab sampling for SARS-CoV-2 is equivalent to nasopharyngeal sampling. *Eur J Clin microbial Infect Dis* 2020: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10096-020-03972-y>
10. Péré et al., Nasal Swab Sampling for SARS-CoV-2: a Convenient Alternative in Times of Nasopharyngeal Swab Shortage. *J Clin Microbiol* 2020: <https://jcm.asm.org/content/58/6/e00721-20>
11. Tu et al., Swabs Collected by Patients or Health Care Workers for SARS-CoV-2 Testing. *NEJM* 2020;383;5: <https://www.nejm.org/doi/full/10.1056/NEJMc2016321>
12. Bunyavanich et al., Nasal Gene Expression of Angiotensin-Converting Enzyme 2 in Children and Adults. *JAMA* 2020;323(23):2427-2429. <https://jamanetwork.com/journals/jama/fullarticle/2766524>
13. Patel et al., Nasal ACE2 levels and Covid-19 in children. *JAMA* 2020;323(23):2386-2387. <https://jamanetwork.com/journals/jama/fullarticle/2766522>
14. Zimmermann P. and Curtis N. Why is COVID-19 less severe in children? A review of the proposed mechanisms underlying the age-related difference in severity of SARS-CoV-2 infections. *Arch Dis Child* 2020;0:1–11. doi:10.1136/archdischild-2020-320338.
15. Porte et al., Evaluation of a novel antigen-based rapid detection test for the diagnosis of SARS-CoV-2 in respiratory samples. *Int J Infect Dis* 2020; 99:328-333.
16. Baggio et al. Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) Viral Load in the Upper Respiratory Tract of Children and Adults With Early Acute Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19). *Clin Infect Dis* 2020. doi:10.1093/cid/ciaa1157.
17. Zimmermann P. and Curtis N. COVID-19 in Children, Pregnancy and Neonates: A Review of Epidemiologic and Clinical Features. *Pediatr Infect Dis J* 2020;39:469–477.

18. Davies NG, Barnard RC, Jarvis CI, et al. Estimated transmissibility and severity of novel SARS-CoV-2 Variant of Concern 202012/01 in England. 2020.
<https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.12.24.20248822v1>
19. Gudbjartsson et al., Spread of SARS-CoV-2 in the Icelandic population, NEJM 2020;382:2302-2315.
<https://www.nejm.org/doi/pdf/10.1056/NEJMoa2006100?articleTools=true>




Figure 1. Geographical distribution of total number of SARS-CoV-2 PCR positive unique patients (n=25.365) tested in the Regional Public Health Laboratory Kennemerland for the period January-December 2020.

Data are presented for Public Health Services areas; darker colors represent higher numbers of patients. The majority of patients lived relatively close by the laboratory, located in the red colored area.




Figure 2. Distribution of SARS-CoV-2 PCR Cp-values within different patient populations in the first (Panel A, n=2.700) and second (Panel B, n=22.669) wave of the COVID-19 epidemic in the region Kennemerland and adjacent areas.

Each color corresponds to one specific patient population that was routinely tested in the period January 1-July 31 (Panel A) or August 1-December 1 (Panel B).

For each group the frequency of reported Cp-values was used to calculate a density score of which the area under the curve sums to 1.

Table 1. Cp-value characteristics for different patient populations in the First (January-July) and Second (August-December) Wave.

Patient populations	First Wave						Second Wave					
	No. tested (%)	No. positive (%)	Cp-value (IQR)	Cp < 20 No. (%)	Cp 20-30 No. (%)	Cp>30 No. (%)	No. tested (%)	No. positive (%)	Cp-value (IQR)	Cp < 20 No. (%)	Cp 20-30 No. (%)	Cp>30 No. (%)
GP patients	3295 (5.8)	253 (7.7)	28.6 (8.8)	14 (5.5)	132 (52.2)	107 (42.3)	3285 (1.5)	394 (12.0)	25.3 (7.9)	61 (15.5)	253 (64.2)	80 (20.3)
Hospital HCW	1017 (1.8)	78 (7.7)	28.7 (8.5)	4 (5.1)	43 (55.1)	31 (39.7)	2828 (1.3)	427 (15.1)	25.0 (5.8)	18 (4.2)	341 (79.9)	68 (15.9)
Hospital patients (admitted)	969 (1.7)	46 (4.7)	33.3 (8.6)	3 (6.5)	13 (28.3)	30 (65.2)	724 (0.3)	67 (9.3)	27.0 (10.0)	9 (13.4)	33 (49.3)	25 (37.3)
Hospital patients (not admitted)	14097 (24.9)	1171 (8.3)	29.2 (7.7)	55 (4.7)	616 (52.6)	500 (42.7)	1142 (0.5)	117 (10.2)	26.5 (8.4)	20 (17.1)	62 (53.0)	35 (29.9)
Nursing home HCW	1431 (2.5)	175 (12.2)	29.0 (6.5)	1 (0.6)	102 (58.3)	72 (41.1)	14125 (6.4)	1793 (12.7)	25.6 (6.9)	106 (5.9)	1319 (73.6)	368 (20.5)
Nursing home residents	2124 (3.8)	478 (22.5)	27.5 (7.7)	34 (7.1)	295 (61.7)	149 (31.2)	4630 (2.1)	799 (17.3)	25.0 (7.9)	96 (12.0)	512 (64.1)	191 (23.9)
Other	1266 (2.2)	125 (9.9)	27.8 (6.9)	10 (8.0)	75 (60.0)	40 (32.0)	15604 (7.0)	1152 (7.4)	26.2 (8.3)	98 (8.5)	726 (63.0)	328 (28.5)
Public Health testing	32395 (57.2)	374 (1.2)	26.2 (7.3)	11 (2.9)	262 (70.1)	101 (27.0)	179538 (80.9)	17916 (10.0)	25.7 (5.8)	611 (3.4)	14232 (79.4)	3073 (17.2)
Total	56594 (100.0)	2700 (4.8)	28.4(8.1)	132 (4.9)	1538 (57.0)	1030 (38.1)	221876 (100.0)	22665 (10.2)	25.7 (6.0)	1019 (4.5)	17478 (77.1)	4168 (18.4)

Data are presented as No. (%) or median (IQR). GP=general practitioner; HCW=health care worker; IQR=interquartile range;




Figure 3. Distribution of SARS-CoV-2 PCR Cp-values within different age groups (n=18.290)

Each color corresponds to one specific age group that was routinely tested in the period January 1-December 1.

For each group the frequency of reported Cp-values was used to calculate a density score of which the area under the curve sums to 1.

Table 2. Cp-value characteristics for different age groups in Public Health patients.

Age groups	Cp-values					
	No. tested (%)	No. positive (%)	Cp-value (IQR)	Cp < 20 No. (%)	Cp 20-30 No. (%)	Cp>30 No. (%)
<12 year	5506 (2.6)	238 (4.3)	28.7 (5.0)	0 (0)	164 (68.9)	74 (31.1)
12-17 year	22345 (10.5)	1589 (7.1)	26.9 (5.7)	33 (2.1)	1181 (74.3)	375 (23.6)
18-29 year	47260 (22.3)	4372 (9.3)	26.0 (5.6)	132 (3.0)	3424 (78.3)	816 (18.7)
30-39 year	41536 (19.6)	2771 (6.7)	25.9 (5.7)	61 (2.2)	2217 (80.0)	493 (17.8)
40-49 year	34960 (16.5)	3068 (8.8)	25.5 (5.6)	92 (3.0)	2487 (81.1)	489 (15.9)
50-59 year	30099 (14.3)	3466 (11.5)	25.0 (5.3)	165 (4.8)	2829 (81.6)	472 (13.6)
60-69 year	19227 (9.1)	1751 (9.1)	25.3 (5.8)	78 (4.5)	1363 (77.8)	310 (17.7)
70-79 year	8718 (4.1)	800 (9.2)	24.8 (5.9)	48 (6.0)	634 (79.2)	118 (14.8)
>79 year	2282 (1.1)	235 (10.3)	24.6 (5.4)	13 (5.6)	195 (83.0)	27 (11.5)
Total	211933 (100.0)	18290 (8.6)	25.7 (5.8)	622 (3.4)	14494 (79.2)	3174 (17.4)

Data are presented as No. (%) or median. IQR=interquartile range.

APPENDIX

Table 3. Kruskal-Wallis test post-hoc pairwise comparisons with Bonferroni correction between patient groups in the first wave.

	GP patients	Hospital HCW	Hospital patients (admitted)	Hospital patients (not admitted)	Nursing home HCW	Nursing home residents	Other	Public Health testing
GP patients	-	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	0.667	1.000	0.020
Hospital HCW		-	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	0.564
Hospital patients (admitted)			-	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	0.785
Hospital patients (not admitted)				-	1.000	<0.001	0.334	<0.001
Nursing home HCW					-	0.015	0.921	<0.001
Nursing home residents						-	1.000	1.000
Other							-	1.000
Public Health testing								-

Data are p-values.

Table 4. Kruskal-Wallis test post-hoc pairwise comparisons with Bonferroni correction between patient groups in the second wave.

	GP patients	Hospital HCW	Hospital patients (admitted)	Hospital patients (not admitted)	Nursing home HCW	Nursing home residents	Other	Public Health testing
GP patients	-	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	0.006	0.382
Hospital HCW		-	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	0.106	1.000
Hospital patients (admitted)			-	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000
Hospital patients (not admitted)				-	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000
Nursing home HCW					-	1.000	0.183	1.000
Nursing home residents						-	0.004	0.475
Other							-	0.084
Public Health testing								-

Data are p-values.

Table 5. Kruskal-Wallis test post-hoc pairwise comparisons with Bonferroni correction between age groups.

	< 12 year	12-17 year	18-29 year	30-39 year	40-49 year	50-59 year	60-69 year	70-79 year	>79 year
<12 year	-	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001
12-17 year		-	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001
18-29 year			-	1.000	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001
30-39 year				-	0.020	<0.001	0.011	<0.001	<0.001
40-49 year					-	<0.001	1.000	0.006	0.081
50-59 year						-	0.059	1.000	1.000
60-69 year							-	0.084	0.258
70-79 year								-	1.000
>79 year									-

Data are p-values.

Table 6. Cp-value characteristics for different age groups per month

Age groups	March	April	May	June	July	August	September	October	November
< 12 year				9 (28.1)	4 (27.7)	9 (27.9)	29 (30)	94 (27.6)	93 (29.1)
12-17 year		1 (31.8)	2 (27.5)	5 (29.7)	8 (30.6)	33 (25.5)	306 (27.1)	627 (26.6)	607 (27.2)
18-29 year	1 (19.9)	5 (26.5)	8 (29.5)	8 (29.3)	74 (25.8)	322 (25.5)	1324 (26.6)	1846 (25.7)	784 (26.4)
30-39 year	3 (21.8)	5 (28.6)	6 (26.9)	17 (24.6)	34 (23.8)	107 (26.6)	743 (26)	1285 (25.6)	571 (26.4)
40-49 year	3 (34.3)	9 (32.3)	7 (29.1)	10 (25.1)	25 (23.6)	93 (25.1)	713 (25.7)	1412 (25)	796 (26)
50-59 year	4 (26.9)	25 (28.2)	10 (24.3)	8 (23.4)	33 (24.6)	85 (23.8)	836 (25)	1645 (24.6)	820 (25.9)
60-69 year	1 (37.2)	5 (33)	3 (30.5)	9 (33.2)	15 (27.8)	46 (26.5)	346 (25.5)	913 (24.8)	413 (26.2)
70-79 year	4 (21.4)			3 (23.9)	6 (26)	11 (22.7)	126 (25)	445 (24.5)	205 (25.9)
> 79 year		2 (25.5)	1 (25.6)		4 (29.1)	1 (26.5)	33 (24.9)	125 (24)	69 (25)
Total	16 (24.2)	52 (29.5)	37 (28.5)	69 (26.7)	203 (25.1)	707 (25.5)	4456 (26)	8392 (25.2)	4358 (26.3)

Data are presented as No. (median Cp-value).