

# 1 SARS-CoV-2 Distribution in Residential Housing 2 Suggests Contact Deposition and Correlates with 3 *Rothia* sp.

4 Victor J Cantú<sup>1,2</sup>, Rodolfo A. Salido<sup>1,2</sup>, Shi Huang<sup>3</sup>, Gibraan Rahman<sup>3,4</sup>, Rebecca Tsai<sup>3</sup>, Holly  
5 Valentine<sup>5,7</sup>, Celestine G. Magallanes<sup>5,7</sup>, Stefan Aigner<sup>7,8,12</sup>, Nathan A. Baer<sup>8</sup>, Tom Barber<sup>8</sup>,  
6 Pedro Belda-Ferre<sup>3</sup>, Maryann Betty<sup>3,8,10</sup>, MacKenzie Bryant<sup>3</sup>, Martin Casas Maya<sup>3</sup>, Anelizze  
7 Castro-Martínez<sup>8</sup>, Marisol Chacón<sup>8</sup>, Willi Cheung<sup>7,8,13</sup>, Evelyn S. Crescini<sup>8</sup>, Peter De Hoff<sup>7,8,11</sup>,  
8 Emily Eisner<sup>8</sup>, Sawyer Farmer<sup>3</sup>, Abbas Hakim<sup>8</sup>, Laura Kohn<sup>9</sup>, Alma L. Lastrella<sup>8</sup>, Elijah S.  
9 Lawrence<sup>8</sup>, Sydney C. Morgan<sup>7</sup>, Toan T. Ngo<sup>8</sup>, Alhakam Nouri<sup>8</sup>, R Tyler Ostrander<sup>8</sup>, Ashley  
10 Plascencia<sup>7,8,12</sup>, Christopher A. Ruiz<sup>8</sup>, Shashank Sathe<sup>7,8,12</sup>, Phoebe Seaver<sup>8</sup>, Tara Schwartz<sup>3</sup>,  
11 Elizabeth W. Smoot<sup>8</sup>, Thomas Valles<sup>3</sup>, Gene W. Yeo<sup>7,12</sup>, Louise C. Laurent<sup>7,11</sup>, Rebecca  
12 Fielding-Miller<sup>9,16</sup>, Rob Knight<sup>2,14-16</sup>.

- 13  
14 1. These authors contributed equally  
15 2. Department of Bioengineering, University of California, San Diego, La Jolla, CA 92093, USA  
16 3. Department of Pediatrics, University of California San Diego, La Jolla, CA  
17 4. Bioinformatics and Systems Biology Graduate Program, University of California San Diego, La Jolla, CA  
18 5. Department of Obstetrics, Gynecology, and Reproductive Sciences, University of California San Diego, USA  
19 6. Division of Infectious Diseases and Global Public Health, Department of Medicine; University of California San Diego  
20 School of Medicine, 9500 Gilman Drive, La Jolla, California 92093, USA  
21 7. Sanford Consortium of Regenerative Medicine, University of California San Diego, La Jolla, CA  
22 8. Expedited COVID Identification Environment (EXCITE) Laboratory, Department of Pediatrics, University of California San  
23 Diego, La Jolla, CA  
24 9. Herbert Wertheim School of Public Health, University of California, San Diego 9500 Gilman Drive, La Jolla, CA 92093  
25 10. Rady Children's Hospital, San Diego, CA  
26 11. Department of Obstetrics, Gynecology, and Reproductive Sciences, University of California San Diego, USA  
27 12. Dept of Cellular and Molecular Medicine, University of California San Diego, La Jolla, CA  
28 13. San Diego State University, San Diego, CA  
29 14. Department of Computer Science and Engineering, University of California San Diego, La Jolla, CA, USA  
30 15. Center for Microbiome Innovation, Jacobs School of Engineering, University of California San Diego, La Jolla, CA, USA  
31 16. Co-corresponding authors  
32

## 33 Abstract

34 Monitoring severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) on surfaces is  
35 emerging as an important tool for identifying past exposure to individuals shedding viral RNA.  
36 Our past work has demonstrated that SARS-CoV-2 reverse transcription-quantitative PCR  
37 (RT-qPCR) signals from surfaces can identify when infected individuals have touched surfaces  
38 such as Halloween candy, and when they have been present in hospital rooms or schools.  
39 However, the sensitivity and specificity of surface sampling as a method for detecting the  
40 presence of a SARS-CoV-2 positive individual, as well as guidance about where to sample, has  
41 not been established. To address these questions, and to test whether our past observations  
42 linking SARS-CoV-2 abundance to *Rothia* spp. in hospitals also hold in a residential setting, we  
43 performed detailed spatial sampling of three isolation housing units, assessing each sample for  
44 SARS-CoV-2 abundance by RT-qPCR, linking the results to 16S rRNA gene amplicon  
45 sequences to assess the bacterial community at each location and to the Cq value of the  
46 contemporaneous clinical test. Our results show that the highest SARS-CoV-2 load in this

47 setting is on touched surfaces such as light switches and faucets, but detectable signal is  
48 present in many non-touched surfaces that may be more relevant in settings such as schools  
49 where mask wearing is enforced. As in past studies, the bacterial community predicts which  
50 samples are positive for SARS-CoV-2, with *Rothia* sp. showing a positive association.

51

## 52 **Importance**

53 Surface sampling for detecting SARS-CoV-2, the virus that causes coronavirus disease 2019  
54 (COVID-19), is increasingly being used to locate infected individuals. We tested which indoor  
55 surfaces had high versus low viral loads by collecting 381 samples from three residential units  
56 where infected individuals resided, and interpreted the results in terms of whether SARS-CoV-2  
57 was likely transmitted directly (e.g. touching a light switch) or indirectly (e.g. by droplets or  
58 aerosols settling). We found highest loads where the subject touched the surface directly,  
59 although enough virus was detected on indirectly contacted surfaces to make such locations  
60 useful for sampling (e.g. in schools, where students do not touch the light switches and also  
61 wear masks so they have no opportunity to touch their face and then the object). We also  
62 documented links between the bacteria present in a sample and the SARS-CoV-2 virus,  
63 consistent with earlier studies.

64

## 65 **Body**

66 Environmental monitoring for severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-  
67 2) RNA by reverse transcription-quantitative polymerase chain reaction (RT-qPCR) is  
68 increasingly gaining acceptance. In the Safer at School Early Alert (SASEA)  
69 (<https://saseasystem.org/>) project, daily surface swabbing was employed as part of an effort to  
70 detect coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) cases in nine elementary schools. This study  
71 identified 89 clinically positive COVID-19 cases, 33% preceded by a room-matched surface  
72 positive (1). As pandemic response measures like SASEA become more widely implemented,  
73 understanding where SARS-CoV-2 signatures will most likely be found reduces cost and labor  
74 of surface swabbing in large facilities. Previous work has focused on sampling arbitrary surfaces  
75 in isolation and congregate care facilities, homes, and hospitals, with varying detection  
76 performance obscuring which surfaces are best for monitoring COVID-19 spread (2-6).  
77 Counterintuitively, high-touch hospital surfaces expected to accumulate viral load, including  
78 door handles and patient bed rails, can yield *lower* SARS-CoV-2 detection rates, presumably  
79 because they are cleaned more often (7-8).

80

81 Most microbes in the built environment come from human inhabitants (9-11). Oral, gut, and skin  
82 microbiomes of COVID-19 patients change during disease (8,12-13); therefore, SARS-CoV-2  
83 positive built environmental samples may differ in *bacterial* communities from SARS-CoV-2  
84 negative samples. This has been documented in a hospital setting, with associations between  
85 SARS-CoV-2 status (Detected/Not Detected) and both overall microbial community and *Rothia*  
86 spp. specifically (8).

87

88 To extend these results to a residential setting and understand how SARS-CoV-2 is distributed  
89 in the living space of an infected individual, we performed environmental sampling in the  
90 apartments of three people who recently tested positive for COVID-19 (Sup. Fig. S1) while

91 quarantined in an isolation facility. On the day of swabbing, each quarantining individual  
92 provided an anterior nares swab sample (Average Cq: 29.5, 28.4, 28.6 for Apartments A, B, and  
93 C respectively). Although apartments differed in size, floor plan, and features (furniture,  
94 appliances, etc.), similar features at similar densities were swabbed across all three  
95 (n=140,116,125).

96  
97 Each sampled surface was swabbed twice in immediately adjacent locations: first with a swab  
98 premoistened and stored in 95% ethanol, then by a second swab premoistened and stored in a  
99 0.5% SDS w/v solution (Supplementary Methods). Ethanol samples underwent 16S V4 rRNA  
100 gene amplicon (16S) sequencing, and SDS samples underwent RT-qPCR for SARS-CoV-2  
101 detection. 16S sequences were demultiplexed, quality filtered, and denoised with Deblur (14) in  
102 Qiita (15) using default parameters. Resulting feature tables were processed using QIIME2 (16).

103

## 104 Findings

105 We collected 381 matched 16S and SARS-CoV-2 surface samples from the three apartments,  
106 of which 178 (47%) were positive for SARS-CoV-2 (Fig 1) (Table 1). Apartments A and C had  
107 comparable positivity rates (53% and 61%, respectively), but Apartment B was substantially  
108 lower (24%). In all three apartments, the rate of detection was highest in the bedroom (72% on  
109 average vs 47% overall). We estimated surface viral load, in viral Genomic Equivalents (GE's),  
110 from Cq's using published regression curves (17) and mapped resulting viral loads onto 3D  
111 renderings of each apartment. High-touch surfaces, including handles and switches, had  
112 highest viral load across all apartments, followed by floor samples and then high-use objects  
113 (fridge, sinks, toilets, beds) (Fig. 1). The maps for each apartment were studied to understand  
114 patterns of SARS-CoV-2 detection and deposition by room use. In the kitchens, objects with  
115 planar faces and handles, such as the refrigerator, cabinets, and drawers, revealed that only the  
116 touched handles had detectable RT-qPCR signal (Fig. 1C inset, as an example). We could not  
117 detect viral RNA on adjacent planar faces, which were presumably breathed on but not touched.

118

119 For quality control of 16S sequencing from low-biomass samples, we sequenced surface swabs  
120 from the apartments together with positive and negative controls using KatharoSeq  
121 (Supplementary Methods) (Sup. Fig. S2A) (18). Of 381 samples that underwent 16S  
122 sequencing, 121 fell below the KatharoSeq threshold and were excluded (Sup. Fig. 2C).  
123 Informed by alpha rarefaction curves (Sup Fig 2B), remaining samples were rarefied to 4000  
124 features, removing an additional 36 samples from the analysis. Therefore, 157 samples were  
125 excluded from downstream analyses (122 SARS-CoV-2 negative matched swabs, 35 positive)  
126 (Sup Fig 2C).

127

128 Bacterial alpha diversity analysis demonstrated that 16S amplicon read count associated with  
129 SARS-CoV-2 detection status (Sup. Fig. S3). Forward stepwise redundancy analysis (RDA)  
130 using the unweighted UniFrac beta diversity metric identified four non-redundant variables of  
131 significant effect size (apartment, surface type, type of room, and SARS-CoV-2 detection status)  
132 which accounted for 45.4% of the variation in the data (Sup. Fig. 4B). Analyzed by apartment,  
133 only in apartment B did virus detection lack significant effect. When subsetting the entire dataset  
134 by room type, detection status had a significant effect on variability across all rooms.

135  
136 To test whether the bacterial community predicted SARS-CoV-2 status, we built a random forest  
137 classifier using sOTU data. The overall Area Under the Precision-Recall Curve (AUPRC) was  
138 0.78, suggesting a statistically significant association, but insufficiently strong to predict SARS-  
139 CoV-2 status of a single sample from the bacterial community (Fig. 2A). Cross-application of  
140 models trained from one apartment or room type to other apartments or room types generally  
141 performed well (AUPRC=0.7-0.96), suggesting generalizable associations (Fig. 2B). We also  
142 applied multinomial regression to our dataset to identify differentially abundant microbes  
143 between SARS-CoV-2 status groups. The top 32 features identified by the random forest  
144 classifier and the ranked log-fold-changes in feature abundance from the multinomial regression  
145 are shown in Figure 2C. Agreeing with previously published findings, *Rothia dentocariosa* was  
146 one of the top features identified by the classifier and was relatively positively associated with  
147 SARS-CoV-2 positive samples in the regression (8,12). Six sOTUS belonging to members of  
148 the genus *Corynebacterium* were also highly ranked as predictive for positive samples.

## 149 150 **Discussion**

151 Our results show that detailed spatial mapping of SARS-CoV-2 RNA abundance and associated  
152 bacterial signatures from built environment surfaces provides useful insight into potential  
153 sampling locations and associations between the viral and bacterial components of the  
154 microbiome. In the residential setting, high-touch surfaces have especially high viral loads,  
155 although confirming this with detailed spatial maps in other settings (hospitals, isolation hotels,  
156 schools) may be useful for guiding sampling designs. We note that sensitivity of arbitrary single  
157 surface sampling to detect presence of even an unmasked SARS-CoV-2 individual is low, so  
158 multiple samples or samples from selected surfaces should be collected. These results reinforce  
159 the utility of surface sampling as a cost-effective method for locating SARS-CoV-2 signals in the  
160 environment.

161  
162 Our findings also corroborate SARS-CoV-2 associated changes in the microbiome published  
163 previously. *Rothia dentocariosa* specifically has been identified across different sample types in  
164 diverse settings, although reasons for these associations remain unclear. We also see multiple  
165 sOTUs belonging to the genus *Corynebacterium* predictive of a SARS-CoV-2 detection event, in  
166 contrast to the findings of another study that found *Corynebacterium* significantly decreased in  
167 the oral microbiome of individuals with COVID-19 (12). We hypothesize that *Corynebacterium*  
168 signal in this study might be evidence of human skin contamination of indoor surfaces through  
169 contact, leading to SARS-CoV-2 deposition on surfaces. It has been established that the  
170 occupants of a room contribute to the environmental microbiota, but our findings are among the  
171 first to demonstrate that disease-associated changes in the microbiome are mirrored in the built  
172 environment.

## 173 174 **Acknowledgements**

175 This research was supported by NIH grant (K01MH112436) to RFM, and the County of San  
176 Diego Health and Human Services Agency (Contract 563236). We thank Min Yi Wu, Bing Xia,  
177 Daniel Maunder, Michal Machnicki, Bhavika K. Kapadia, and Lizbeth Franco Vargas for their  
178 support with environmental SARS-CoV-2 detection as part of the EXCITE Lab.

## 179 Figure Legends:

180 *Supplementary Figure 1. Timeline of events from first positive test to the end of the individual's*  
181 *quarantine period. Apartment C has no move in date because the individual quarantined in*  
182 *place.*

183  
184 *Supplementary Table 1. Environmental samples with detectable SARS-CoV-2 per apartment*  
185 *and room type.*

186  
187 *Figure 1. Distribution of SARS-CoV-2 viral load in isolation dorm apartments. (A-C) Floor plans*  
188 *for each apartment highlighting where SARS-CoV-2 RNA signatures were detected. (Inset) 3D*  
189 *rendering of the kitchen in Apartment C showing SARS-CoV-2 viral load in Genomic*  
190 *Equivalents (GEs) mapped to features in that room.*

191  
192 *Supplementary Figure 2. Exclusion criteria for low biomass samples. (A) Diluted stock of a*  
193 *KatharoSeq positive control was sequenced along with the environmental samples and the*  
194 *resultant reads underwent pre-processing as detailed in the Supplementary Methods. The*  
195 *KatharoSeq Threshold (dashed lined), a minimum number of reads derived from a fitted*  
196 *allosteric sigmoidal curve, corresponds to a sequencing depth where at least 80% of the*  
197 *positive control reads are taxonomically classified to the appropriate target organisms (B) Top*  
198 *panel: Rarefaction curve showing observed features (alpha diversity metric) as a function of*  
199 *sequencing depth. Bottom panel: Graph showing how many samples would be included in*  
200 *downstream analysis as a function of rarefaction depth. (C) Table showing how many samples*  
201 *were removed at the KatharoSeq and Rarefaction thresholds and overall.*

202  
203 *Supplementary Figure 3. Correlation between microbial biomass/diversity and SARS-CoV-2*  
204 *detection. (A) Number of 16S reads in SARS-CoV-2 positive samples shows significant*  
205 *correlation with SARS-CoV-2 viral load (GE's) (Pearson correlation,  $r=0.3$ ,  $p=3 \times 10^{-5}$ ). (B) Read*  
206 *counts are significantly different between positive and negative samples when compared within*  
207 *room types (Mann-Whitney U tests,  $p \leq 0.003$ ). (C) Alpha diversity (Faith's PD) shows a weaker*  
208 *significance between positive and negative samples when compared within room types with*  
209 *only the bedroom and kitchen showing a significant difference between positive and negative*  
210 *samples (Mann-Whitney U tests,  $p=0.01$ ).*

211  
212 *Supplementary Figure 4. Beta diversity analysis identifies the factors that contribute most to the*  
213 *separation of the data. (A) Principal coordinates analysis of the Unweighted Unifrac distance*  
214 *matrix shows that a major driver in the separation of this data is which apartment the samples*  
215 *came from. (B) Barplot showing the statistically significant effect sizes for non-redundant*  
216 *variables returned by RDA analysis. The largest effect size was explained by apartment (30.7%,*  
217  *$p=0.0002$ ), followed by surface material type (10.7%,  $p=0.0002$ ), room type (3.2%,  $p=0.0004$ ),*  
218 *and SARS-CoV-2 detection status (0.84%,  $p=0.01$ ).*

219  
220 *Figure 2. (A) Area under the precision-recall curve showing the overall prediction performance*  
221 *of the random forest classifiers when trained on the features from two apartments and cross*



222 *validated on the remaining apartment. (B) Confusion matrix showing per-room type classifiers*  
223 *when cross-applied on the remaining room types. The diagonal represents self validation. (C)*  
224 *Phylogenetic tree visualization (EMPress) where the differentially-abundant features between*  
225 *SARS-CoV-2 status groups identified by multinomial regression (Songbird) are plotted on the*  
226 *inner ring, and the ranked sOTUs identified as important by the random forest classifier are*  
227 *indicated on the outer ring.*  
228

## 229 References:

- 230 1. Fielding-Miller R, Karthikeyan S, Gaines T, Garfein RS, Salido R, Cantu V, Kohn L,  
231 Martin NK, Wijaya C, Flores M, Omaleki V, Majnoonian A, Gonzalez-Zuniga P,  
232 Nguyen M, Vo A V, Le T, Duong D, Hassani A, Dahl A, Tweeten S, Jepsen K,  
233 Henson B, Hakim A, Birmingham A, Mark AM, Nasamran CA, Rosenthal SB,  
234 Moshiri N, Fisch KM, Humphrey G, Farmer S, Tubb HM, Valles T, Morris J, Kang  
235 J, Khaleghi B, Young C, Akel AD, Eilert S, Eno J, Curewitz K, Laurent LC, Rosing  
236 T, SEARCH, Knight R. 2021. Wastewater and surface monitoring to detect COVID-  
237 19 in elementary school settings: The Safer at School Early Alert project. medRxiv  
238 2021.10.19.21265226.
- 239 2. Jiang FC, Jiang XL, Wang ZG, Meng ZH, Shao SF, Anderson BD, Ma MJ. 2020.  
240 Detection of severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 RNA on surfaces in  
241 quarantine rooms. *Emerg Infect Dis* 26:2162–2164.
- 242 3. Zhou J, Otter JA, Price JR, Cimpeanu C, Meno Garcia D, Kinross J, Boshier PR,  
243 Mason S, Bolt F, Holmes AH, Barclay WS. 2021. Investigating Severe Acute  
244 Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) Surface and Air  
245 Contamination in an Acute Healthcare Setting During the Peak of the Coronavirus  
246 Disease 2019 (COVID-19) Pandemic in London. *Clin Infect Dis* 73:e1870–e1877.
- 247 4. Ben-Shmuel A, Brosh-Nissimov T, Glinert I, Bar-David E, Sittner A, Poni R, Cohen R,  
248 Achdout H, Tamir H, Yahalom-Ronen Y, Politi B, Melamed S, Vitner E, Cherry L,  
249 Israeli O, Beth-Din A, Paran N, Israely T, Yitzhaki S, Levy H, Weiss S. 2020.  
250 Detection and infectivity potential of severe acute respiratory syndrome  
251 coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) environmental contamination in isolation units and  
252 quarantine facilities. *Clin Microbiol Infect* 26:1658–1662.
- 253 5. Renninger N, Nastasi N, Bope A, Cochran SJ, Haines SR, Balasubrahmaniam N,  
254 Stuart K, Bivins A, Bibby K, Hull NM, Dannemiller KC. 2021. Indoor Dust as a  
255 Matrix for Surveillance of COVID-19. *mSystems* 6.
- 256 6. Maestre JP, Jarma D, Yu JRF, Siegel JA, Horner SD, Kinney KA. 2021. Distribution of  
257 SARS-CoV-2 RNA signal in a home with COVID-19 positive occupants. *Sci Total*  
258 *Environ* 778:146201.
- 259 7. Wu S, Wang Y, Jin X, Tian J, Liu J, Mao Y. 2020. Environmental contamination by  
260 SARS-CoV-2 in a designated hospital for coronavirus disease 2019. *Am J Infect*  
261 *Control* 48:910–914.
- 262 8. Marotz C, Belda-Ferre P, Ali F, Das P, Huang S, Cantrell K, Jiang L, Martino C, Diner  
263 RE, Rahman G, McDonald D, Armstrong G, Kodera S, Donato S, Ecklu-Mensah  
264 G, Gottel N, Salas Garcia MC, Chiang LY, Salido RA, Shaffer JP, Bryant MK,  
265 Sanders K, Humphrey G, Ackermann G, Haiminen N, Beck KL, Kim H-C, Carrieri





- 266 AP, Parida L, Vázquez-Baeza Y, Torriani FJ, Knight R, Gilbert J, Sweeney DA,  
267 Allard SM. 2021. SARS-CoV-2 detection status associates with bacterial  
268 community composition in patients and the hospital environment. *Microbiome*  
269 9:132.
- 270 9. Dunn RR, Fierer N, Henley JB, Leff JW, Menninger HL. 2013. Home Life: Factors  
271 Structuring the Bacterial Diversity Found within and between Homes. *PLoS One*  
272 8:e64133.
- 273 10. Kembel SW, Jones E, Kline J, Northcutt D, Stenson J, Womack AM, Bohannan BJ,  
274 Brown GZ, Green JL. 2012. Architectural design influences the diversity and  
275 structure of the built environment microbiome. *ISME J* 6:1469–1479.
- 276 11. Lax S, Smith DP, Hampton-Marcell J, Owens SM, Handley KM, Scott NM, Gibbons  
277 SM, Larsen P, Shogan BD, Weiss S, Metcalf JL, Ursell LK, Vazquez-Baeza Y, Van  
278 Treuren W, Hasan NA, Gibson MK, Colwell R, Dantas G, Knight R, Gilbert JA.  
279 2014. Longitudinal analysis of microbial interaction between humans and the  
280 indoor environment. *Science* (80- ) 345:1048–1052.
- 281 12. Wu Y, Cheng X, Jiang G, Tang H, Ming S, Tang L, Lu J, Guo C, Shan H, Huang X.  
282 2021. Altered oral and gut microbiota and its association with SARS-CoV-2 viral  
283 load in COVID-19 patients during hospitalization. *npj Biofilms Microbiomes* 7:61.
- 284 13. Gu S, Chen Y, Wu Z, Chen Y, Gao H, Lv L, Guo F, Zhang X, Luo R, Huang C, Lu H,  
285 Zheng B, Zhang J, Yan R, Zhang H, Jiang H, Xu Q, Guo J, Gong Y, Tang L, Li L.  
286 2020. Alterations of the Gut Microbiota in Patients With Coronavirus Disease 2019  
287 or H1N1 Influenza. *Clin Infect Dis* 71:2669–2678.
- 288 14. Amir A, McDonald D, Navas-Molina JA, Kopylova E, Morton JT, Zech Xu Z, Kightley  
289 EP, Thompson LR, Hyde ER, Gonzalez A, Knight R. 2017. Deblur Rapidly  
290 Resolves Single-Nucleotide Community Sequence Patterns. *mSystems* 2.
- 291 15. Gonzalez A, Navas-Molina JA, Kosciolk T, McDonald D, Vázquez-Baeza Y,  
292 Ackermann G, DeReus J, Janssen S, Swafford AD, Orchanian SB, Sanders JG,  
293 Shorestein J, Holste H, Petrus S, Robbins-Pianka A, Brislawn CJ, Wang M,  
294 Rideout JR, Bolyen E, Dillon M, Caporaso JG, Dorrestein PC, Knight R. 2018.  
295 Qiita: rapid, web-enabled microbiome meta-analysis. *Nat Methods* 15:796–798.
- 296 16. Bolyen E, Rideout JR, Dillon MR, Bokulich NA, Abnet CC, Al-Ghalith GA, Alexander  
297 H, Alm EJ, Arumugam M, Asnicar F, Bai Y, Bisanz JE, Bittinger K, Brejnrod A,  
298 Brislawn CJ, Brown CT, Callahan BJ, Caraballo-Rodríguez AM, Chase J, Cope  
299 EK, Da Silva R, Diener C, Dorrestein PC, Douglas GM, Durall DM, Duvallet C,  
300 Edwardson CF, Ernst M, Estaki M, Fouquier J, Gauglitz JM, Gibbons SM, Gibson  
301 DL, Gonzalez A, Gorlick K, Guo J, Hillmann B, Holmes S, Holste H, Huttenhower  
302 C, Huttley GA, Janssen S, Jarmusch AK, Jiang L, Kaehler BD, Kang K Bin, Keefe  
303 CR, Keim P, Kelley ST, Knights D, Koester I, Kosciolk T, Kreps J, Langille MGI,





- 304 Lee J, Ley R, Liu Y-X, Lofffield E, Lozupone C, Maher M, Marotz C, Martin BD,  
305 McDonald D, Mclver LJ, Melnik A V., Metcalf JL, Morgan SC, Morton JT, Naimey  
306 AT, Navas-Molina JA, Nothias LF, Orchanian SB, Pearson T, Peoples SL, Petras  
307 D, Preuss ML, Pruesse E, Rasmussen LB, Rivers A, Robeson MS, Rosenthal P,  
308 Segata N, Shaffer M, Shiffer A, Sinha R, Song SJ, Spear JR, Swafford AD,  
309 Thompson LR, Torres PJ, Trinh P, Tripathi A, Turnbaugh PJ, UI-Hasan S, van der  
310 Hooft JJJ, Vargas F, Vázquez-Baeza Y, Vogtmann E, von Hippel M, Walters W,  
311 Wan Y, Wang M, Warren J, Weber KC, Williamson CHD, Willis AD, Xu ZZ,  
312 Zaneveld JR, Zhang Y, Zhu Q, Knight R, Caporaso JG. 2019. Reproducible,  
313 interactive, scalable and extensible microbiome data science using QIIME 2. *Nat*  
314 *Biotechnol* 37:852–857.
- 315 17. Salido RA, Cantú VJ, Clark AE, Leibel SL, Foroughshafiei A, Saha A, Hakim A, Nouri  
316 A, Lastrella AL, Castro-Martínez A, Plascencia A, Kapadia BK, Xia B, Ruiz CA,  
317 Marotz CA, Maunder D, Lawrence ES, Smoot EW, Eisner E, Crescini ES, Kohn L,  
318 Vargas LF, Chacón M, Betty M, Machnicki M, Wu MY, Baer NA, Belda-Ferre P,  
319 Hoff P De, Seaver P, Ostrander RT, Tsai R, Sathe S, Aigner S, Morgan SC, Ngo  
320 TT, Barber T, Cheung W, Carlin AF, Yeo GW, Laurent LC, Fielding-Miller R, Knight  
321 R. 2021. Analysis of SARS-CoV-2 RNA Persistence across Indoor Surface  
322 Materials Reveals Best Practices for Environmental Monitoring Programs.  
323 *mSystems* <https://doi.org/10.1128/MSYSTEMS.01136-21>.
- 324 18. Minich JJ, Zhu Q, Janssen S, Hendrickson R, Amir A, Vetter R, Hyde J, Doty MM,  
325 Stillwell K, Benardini J, Kim JH, Allen EE, Venkateswaran K, Knight R. 2018.  
326 KatharoSeq Enables High-Throughput Microbiome Analysis from Low-Biomass  
327 Samples. *mSystems* 3.
- 328 19. Morton JT, Marotz C, Washburne A, Silverman J, Zaramela LS, Edlund A, Zengler K,  
329 Knight R. 2019. Establishing microbial composition measurement standards with  
330 reference frames. *Nat Commun* 10:2719.
- 331 20. Cantrell K, Fedarko MW, Rahman G, McDonald D, Yang Y, Zaw T, Gonzalez A,  
332 Janssen S, Estaki M, Haiminen N, Beck KL, Zhu Q, Sayyari E, Morton JT,  
333 Armstrong G, Tripathi A, Gauglitz JM, Marotz C, Matteson NL, Martino C, Sanders  
334 JG, Carrieri AP, Song SJ, Swafford AD, Dorrestein PC, Andersen KG, Parida L,  
335 Kim H-C, Vázquez-Baeza Y, Knight R. 2021. EMPress Enables Tree-Guided,  
336 Interactive, and Exploratory Analyses of Multi-omic Data Sets. *mSystems* 6.
- 337 21. Protsyuk I, Melnik A V., Nothias LF, Rappez L, Phapale P, Aksenov AA, Bouslimani  
338 A, Ryazanov S, Dorrestein PC, Alexandrov T. 2017. 3D molecular cartography  
339 using LC–MS facilitated by Optimus and 'ili software. *Nat Protoc* 2017 131 13:134–  
340 154.
- 341 22. Hunter, J. D. Matplotlib: A 2D graphics environment. *Comput. Sci. Eng.* 9, 90–95  
342 (2007).





**A****B****C**



**C**

Apartment	Apt A		Apt B		Apt C		Total	
	+	-	+	-	+	-	+	-
Total Samples Sequenced	74	66	28	88	76	49	178	203
<KatharoSeq Threshold	6	30	14	55	2	14	22	99
<Rarefaction Threshold	5	5	6	11	2	7	13	23
Samples Removed	11	35	20	66	4	21	35	122
Samples Included	63	31	8	22	72	28	143	81



