

1 Title: Air and surface sampling for monkeypox virus in UK hospitals

2 Susan Gould,^{1,2*} Barry Atkinson,^{3*} Okechukwu Onianwa,³ Antony Spencer,³ Jenna
3 Furneaux,³ James Grieves,³ Caroline Taylor,⁴ Iain Milligan,⁴ Allan Bennett,³ Tom Fletcher,^{1,2}
4 Jake Dunning,^{4,5} NHS England Airborne HCID Network**

5 Affiliations

6 1. Department of Clinical Sciences, Liverpool School of Tropical Medicine, Liverpool,
7 UK

8 2. Tropical and Infectious Disease Unit, Liverpool University Hospitals NHS
9 Foundation Trust, Liverpool, UK

10 3. UK Health Security Agency, Porton Down, Salisbury, UK

11 4. Department of Infectious Diseases, Royal Free London NHS Foundation Trust,
12 London, UK

13 5. NIHR Health Protection Research Unit in Emerging and Zoonotic Infections,
14 Pandemic Sciences Institute, University of Oxford, Oxford, UK

15

16 *Authors contributed equally

17 **Members are listed in the appendix

18 Word count: 2332

19 **Sources of funding:** SG, JD and TF are supported by the National Institute for Health
20 Research (NIHR) Health Protection Research Unit in Emerging and Zoonotic Infections. SG
21 is supported by the Research, Evidence and Development Initiative (READ-It). READ-It
22 (project number 300342-104) is funded by UK aid from the UK government; however, the
23 views expressed do not necessarily reflect the UK government's official policies

24 **Abstract**

25 **Background**

26 An unprecedented outbreak of monkeypox virus (MPXV) infections in non-endemic
27 countries has been recognised since 12 May 2022. More than 6000 cases have been identified
28 globally with more than 1500 in the UK by July 2022. Transmission of MPXV is believed to
29 be predominantly through direct contact with lesions or infected body fluids, with possible
30 involvement of fomites and large respiratory droplets. Importantly, a case of monkeypox in a
31 UK healthcare worker in 2018 was suspected to be due to virus exposure while changing
32 bedding.

33 **Methods**

34 We investigated environmental contamination with MPXV from infected patients admitted to
35 isolation rooms in the UK, to inform infection prevention and control measures. Surface
36 swabs of high-touch areas in isolation rooms, of healthcare worker personal protective
37 equipment (PPE) in doffing areas, and from air samples collected before and during bedding
38 change were analysed using MPXV qPCR to assess contamination levels. Virus isolation was
39 performed to confirm presence of infectious virus in key positive samples.

40 **Findings**

41 We identified widespread surface contamination (66 positive out of 73 samples) in occupied
42 patient rooms (MPXV DNA Ct values 24.7-38.6), on healthcare worker personal protective
43 equipment after use, and in doffing areas (Ct 26.3-34.3). Five out of fifteen air samples taken
44 were positive. Significantly, three of four air samples collected during a bed linen change in
45 one patient's room were positive (Ct 32.7-35.8). Replication-competent virus was identified
46 in two of four samples selected for viral isolation, including from air samples collected
47 during the bed linen change.

48 **Interpretation**

49 These data demonstrate significant contamination in isolation facilities and potential for
50 aerosolisation of MPXV during specific activities. PPE contamination was observed after
51 clinical contact and changing of bed linen. Additionally, contamination of hard surfaces in
52 doffing areas supports the importance of cleaning protocols, PPE use and doffing procedures.

53 **Funding**

54 No funding source for this study

55 **Introduction**

56 An unprecedented number of cases of monkeypox have been confirmed outside endemic
57 areas of West and Central Africa since 12 May 2022. As of the 5th July, >6900 infections
58 have been reported by more than 40 non-endemic countries; up to 7th July, 1552 cases were
59 reported by the UK.^{1,2}

60 Monkeypox virus (MPXV) is an enveloped double stranded DNA virus classified within the
61 *Orthopoxvirus* genus of the *Poxviridae* family. MPXV infection causes a clinical illness that
62 is typically milder than smallpox, consisting of an influenza-like prodrome followed by a
63 distinctive vesiculo-pustular rash. Lymphadenopathy typically occurs in monkeypox but not
64 in smallpox.³ Mortality in monkeypox is thought to be between one and ten percent,
65 influenced by clade and patient characteristics; as of 22 June 2022, only one death had been
66 reported from non-endemic countries experiencing outbreaks during the current outbreak.⁴

67 Cases increased in endemic countries following the cessation of the smallpox vaccination
68 program, and there have been concerns about potential increase in cases in travellers over the
69 past decade.^{5,6} Primary cases arise from contact with animal reservoirs, and rodents are
70 thought to have an important role, although further research is needed.⁷ Sustained human-to-
71 human transmission has not been reported, and the secondary household attack rate in
72 endemic settings has been reported to be between 0-10.2% in the majority of cases, and as
73 high as 50% in one outbreak.⁸ Transmission to secondary cases is believed to be
74 predominately via direct contact with body fluids or lesions, respiratory droplets and fomites.
75 Infection by inhalation of high titre aerosolised Central African clade MPXV has been
76 demonstrated in non-human primates, raising the possibility of potential aerosol transmission
77 between humans, although existing epidemiological investigations suggest long-range aerosol
78 transmission does not occur.^{9,10}

79 Orthopox viruses are stable in the environment and can remain viable in aerosols for up to 90
80 hours.^{11,12} A hospital worker in the UK who developed monkeypox was thought to have been
81 exposed to virus while changing the bedding used by a patient with monkeypox, before the
82 diagnosis had been considered and appropriate infection control measures instigated.¹³
83 Widespread surface contamination in hospital rooms occupied by two patients with MPXV
84 infection has recently been reported.¹⁴

85 The outbreaks occurring in higher resource settings in 2022 provide opportunities to
86 investigate the extent of environmental contamination in symptomatic patient rooms within
87 the airborne isolation units of NHS England's High Consequence Infectious Diseases (HCID)
88 Network, to inform practice around isolation, personal protective equipment,
89 decontamination protocols and public health management of community exposures. There is
90 also an opportunity to investigate whether aerosol transmission risks occur, and whether
91 certain activities – such as changing bedding – increase the risk of exposure.

92 **Methods**

93 **Sampling of patient rooms**

94 Hospitalised adult patients with confirmed monkeypox and active skin lesions were
95 identified, and verbal consent obtained to sample the air and environment within isolation
96 rooms at the Royal Free Hospital. Air and surface sampling was performed in four positive
97 pressure ventilated lobby (PPVL)¹⁵ single-occupancy respiratory isolation rooms (Room A,
98 C, D and E including the negative pressure ensuite bathroom and positive pressure ventilated
99 anterooms) in addition to the anterooms for three PPVL respiratory isolation rooms (Rooms
100 A, B and C). The number of air changes per hour (ACH) greater than or equal to 10 in
101 patient rooms and the average pressure differential between negative pressure areas (bedroom
102 and bathroom) and other areas is maintained at 8 Pa or higher. Sampling of Room A and the
103 anteroom of room C was performed twice with different occupants; these rooms were
104 decontaminated using vapourised hydrogen peroxide and manual cleaning of surfaces with
105 sodium hypochlorite solution between occupancies. Clinicians provided clinical data relevant
106 to interpreting the results of environmental sampling e.g. recent virology results, date of onset
107 of symptoms and date of admission.

108 Surface sampling using Copan UTM® swabs targeted high-touch areas, an air vent above the
109 door leading to the ensuite bathroom, and a potential deposition area unlikely to have been
110 directly touched by patient. Air sampling using the MD8 Airport (Sartorius, with gelatine
111 filters; flow rate = 50L/min for ten mins) was performed before and during change of bed
112 linen for the first visit to room A, all subsequent air sampling in rooms was for five minutes
113 (flow rate=50 L/min). Air samplers were sited near to the bed (height ~1 m, distance from
114 patient bed ~1 m) and further away (height ~2 m, distance from bed >1.5 m). Wearable
115 samplers (SKC, with gelatine filters; flow rate 4 L/min for ten mins) were utilised on the first
116 visit to room A including by the healthcare worker (HCW) performing the linen change.

117 Minimal anonymised epidemiological and clinical data was provided by treating clinical team
118 including date of admission, date of onset of illness, most recent virology results and whether
119 the patient has received tecovirimat. All patients provided written informed consent for the
120 ISARIC Clinical Characterisation Protocol (ref) that includes air and environmental
121 sampling. The study was undertaken as an Urgent Public Health Investigation with UK HSA
122 Research Ethics and Governance of Public Health Practice Group (REGG) approval.

123 **Sampling of PPE**

124 Staff entering an isolation room wear disposable single-use PPE (surgical gown, plastic
125 apron, double nitrile gloves, FFP3 respirator, hair cover, and autoclavable plastic clogs)
126 which is donned prior to entering the anteroom. To exit a patient room, staff enter the
127 anteroom which is demarcated into toxic (close to patient room) and non-toxic (close to exit
128 to the corridor) using tape on the floor. PPE doffing protocols within the anteroom are
129 designed to limit contamination of the non-toxic area with potentially contaminated items
130 entering waste-streams located in the toxic area. Staff transfer into clean clogs after all PPE
131 apart from scrubs has been removed as they transition to the non-toxic part of the anteroom
132 before a final hand wash prior to exit. This process is monitored by a buddy to ensure all
133 parts are executed in the correct order.

134 Prior to the removal of PPE in the anteroom, swabs were taken of the front of the gown,
135 gloves and visor of HCWs who had either had clinical contact (rooms B and C) or changed
136 the bedding (room A). Swabs were taken of the floor in the doffing area immediately after
137 PPE removal in each case. Air samples were taken simultaneously in the anteroom and in the
138 adjacent corridor prior to, and during, the doffing procedure using the MD8 Airport with
139 gelatine filters (50 L/min for five minutes) in rooms A-C.

140 **Sample processing**

141 For surface samples, 140 µL of UTM was inactivated using Buffer AVL (Qiagen) with
142 nucleic acid using the Viral RNA Mini Kit (Qiagen) in accordance with the manufacturer's
143 instructions. For air samples, gelatine filter were dissolved in 20 mL of warmed MEM media
144 (Gibco) for MD8 filters, or 5ml for personal sampler gelatine filters, with 140 µL then used
145 for inactivation and extraction as described above. Analysis of extracted nucleic acid for the
146 presence of MPXV DNA was performed using a published assay with minor modifications to
147 conform with local standardised diagnostic processes.¹⁶

148 **Viral Isolation**

149 Four key samples were selected for viral isolation. 0.5 mL of UTM (swab samples) or MEM
150 media containing dissolved gelatine filter (air sample) was added to a 70% confluent
151 monolayer of Vero C1008 cells (ECACC 85020206) in a T-25cm² non-vented tissue culture
152 flasks (Corning) and incubated for 1hr at 37°C. After 1 hr, the inoculum was removed and
153 washed with sterile PBS before addition of 5mL viral culture medium consisting of 1 x MEM
154 + GlutaMAX™ supplemented with 5% heat-inactivated FBS, 25mM HEPES, and 4x
155 antibiotic-antimycotic solution (all Gibco). A negative control flask was also prepared by the
156 same method using 0.5 mL of MEM as the inoculum. All flasks were incubated at 37°C and
157 monitored for cytopathic effect (CPE) using a phase contrast inverted light microscope. 140
158 µL timepoints were collected every 48-72 hours to monitor for a change in detectable DNA
159 via qPCR. Over-confluent cell monolayers (five days post infection) that did not display viral
160 CPE were passaged by inoculating supernatant onto fresh sub-confluent cells providing
161 continuous assessment for CPE for 10 days.

162 **Results**

163 MPXV DNA was detected in 56 of 60 (93%) surface swab samples obtained within the
164 patients' bedrooms and bathrooms, with Ct values between 24.7 and 37.4 (Table 1). All
165 patients had monkeypox lesions present on multiple areas of their bodies at the time of
166 environmental sampling. The detections included samples from areas unlikely to have been
167 directly touched by patient, such as the air vent above the door between the bedroom and the
168 bathroom, suggesting non-contact contamination possibly via respiratory droplets or re-
169 aerosolisation from activities such as changing bed linen.

170 Following doffing of PPE by hospital staff, MPXV DNA was detected on the floor of the
171 anteroom where doffing took place (Table 2). MPXV DNA was detected (Ct 38.2) in one air
172 sample taken in the anteroom prior to doffing, but not in other air samples taken before and
173 during doffing in anterooms used for doffing, nor in the corridor outside the anterooms. The
174 volume of air filtered in air sample collected in the anteroom and corridor was 250 litres
175 (50L/min for five minutes). MPXV DNA was not detected in samples from any wearable air
176 sampler. By contrast, and of importance, five of eight air samples collected over ten minutes
177 by the large volume air sampler (flow rate 50L/min) in Room A contained MPXV DNA;
178 these samples were collected in two sets approximately three weeks apart with different
179 patients in this room at the time each sampling was performed. These results include samples
180 taken further away from the patient (>1.5m), and observation of a lower Ct value for the

181 sample obtained during the bedding change compared to the Ct values for samples collected
182 before the bedding change (Figure 1). MPXV DNA was not detected in air samples collected
183 over five minutes at the same distances prior to and during bedding changes in rooms C-E.

184 Previous work suggests that MPXV is likely to be culturable from samples with a Ct value
185 below 30 for this particular reference laboratory PCR assay.¹⁷ Virus isolation was attempted
186 for four samples: Room A light switch (original Ct 24.7), Room A anteroom floor after PPE
187 doffing (original Ct 26.3), Room B anteroom floor after PPE doffing (original Ct 26.9) and
188 near bed air sample during bed linen change in Room A (original Ct 32.7). While no flask
189 showed marked CPE during the experiment, viral DNA replication was witnessed for both
190 Room B anteroom floor swab sample and Room A bed change air sample with Ct values
191 recorded as >31.0 cycles for all timepoints between Day 0 and Day 5, but with Ct values
192 <16.0 for Day 10, indicating at least 100,000 times more detectable DNA between the Day 5
193 and Day 7 timepoint (Table 3). Only very subtle CPE was witnessed in the Room B sample
194 with no obvious CPE is the Room A air sample. The other two swab samples, and the
195 negative control, showed no increase in detectable DNA during the ten-day isolation attempt.

196 **Discussion**

197 We identified widespread MPXV DNA contamination of the environment in respiratory
198 isolation rooms occupied by infected symptomatic individuals. MPXV PCR Ct values
199 obtained from these samples are within the range previously shown to be associated with
200 recovery of infection-competent MPXV. We found evidence of replication-competent virus
201 from two samples including from an air sample collected during a bed linen change.
202 Detection of infectious MPXV in air samples collected during a bed linen change highlights
203 the importance of suitable respiratory protection equipment when performing activities that
204 may re-aerosolise infectious material within contaminated environments. The variability in
205 the frequency of detection and the Ct values observed in surface samples from different
206 patient rooms may be due to individual patient factors, the point during patient infection that
207 environmental sampling was performed, staff or patient behaviour, and the frequency of
208 cleaning.

209 Significant contamination of PPE was also found following clinical contact with a patient
210 (rooms B, C) or bed linen (room A). MPXV DNA was detected on the glove samples where
211 swabbing included both palmar surface and fingertips, and not detected on a sample collected
212 only from the palmar surface. The detection of MPXV DNA with relatively low Ct values in

213 hard-surface samples from the doffing environment reinforces the importance of surface
214 cleaning protocols, the use of appropriate PPE, and robust doffing procedures to maintain the
215 safety of staff and avoid potential onward transmission. Although our findings are specific to
216 sampling in a specialist healthcare environment and sampling within occupied rooms was
217 limited to a small number of patients, the environmental contamination findings may be
218 relevant to public health measures for other spaces and settings where individuals with
219 monkeypox spend prolonged periods, such as residential bedrooms and bathrooms. Further
220 investigation is required into the contamination of areas occupied for shorter periods of time,
221 such as outpatient clinics, and also healthcare spaces that do not have mechanical negative
222 pressure ventilation. Previous investigations of surface contamination in a domestic setting
223 and in two hospital rooms occupied by infected symptomatic individuals have demonstrated a
224 high frequency of MPX viral DNA detection and isolation of virus.^{14,17}

225 To the best of our knowledge, this is the first time that detection of MPXV (DNA and virus
226 by isolation) in environmental air samples from healthcare settings has been reported, for any
227 clade of MPXV. Detection of MPXV DNA in air samples collected at distances of greater
228 than 1.5m from the patient and at a height of nearly 2m supports the theory that MPXV can
229 be present in either aerosols, suspended skin particles or dust containing virus, and not only
230 in large respiratory droplets that fall to the ground within 1 to 1.5m of an infected individual.
231 Low flow-rate wearable button samplers provided negative samples but were only deployed
232 for under ten minutes, which may be an insufficient sampling time (<40L of air sampled).
233 Our findings support recommendations for healthcare workers interacting with patients with
234 confirmed MPXV infection to use suitable PPE, including respiratory protective equipment,
235 as well as other IPC measures designed to limit exposure to pathogens that may become
236 aerosolised in hospital inpatient settings.

237

238 **Acknowledgments**

239 The authors gratefully acknowledge the medical, nursing and multidisciplinary staff
240 supporting the Airborne HCID Treatment Centres at the Royal Free London NHS Foundation
241 Trust and the Royal Liverpool University Hospital, the NHS England Airborne HCID
242 Network, the UK Health Security Agency, and the Rare and Imported Pathogens Laboratory
243 at UKHSA Porton Down. The authors also acknowledge the assistance of Ian Nicholls and
244 Wilhemina D'Costa (both UKHSA) for assisting with nucleic acid extractions, and from Sian
245 Summers (UKHSA) for providing cell culture flasks.

247

248 References

249

- 250 1 UK HSA. Monkeypox cases confirmed in England – latest updates.
251 [https://www.gov.uk/government/news/monkeypox-cases-confirmed-in-england-](https://www.gov.uk/government/news/monkeypox-cases-confirmed-in-england-latest-updates)
252 [latest-updates.](https://www.gov.uk/government/news/monkeypox-cases-confirmed-in-england-latest-updates)
- 253 2 CDC. 2022 Global Map and Case Count. 2022.
- 254 3 Cann JA, Jahrling PB, Hensley LE, Wahl-Jensen V. Comparative Pathology of Smallpox
255 and Monkeypox in Man and Macaques. *J Comp Pathol* 2013; **148**: 6–21.
- 256 4 WHO. Multi-country monkeypox outbreak: situation update.
257 <https://www.who.int/emergencies/disease-outbreak-news/item/2022-DON392>
258 (accessed June 15, 2022).
- 259 5 Rimoin AW, Mulembakani PM, Johnston SC, *et al.* Major increase in human
260 monkeypox incidence 30 years after smallpox vaccination campaigns cease in the
261 Democratic Republic of Congo. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 2010; **107**: 16262–7.
- 262 6 Reynolds MG, Doty JB, McCollum AM, Olson VA, Nakazawa Y. Monkeypox re-
263 emergence in Africa: a call to expand the concept and practice of One Health. *Expert*
264 *Rev Anti Infect Ther* 2019; **17**: 129–39.
- 265 7 Wilson ME, Hughes JM, McCollum AM, Damon IK. Human monkeypox. *Clin Infect Dis*
266 2014; **58**: 260–7.
- 267 8 Bunge EM, Hoet B, Chen L, *et al.* The changing epidemiology of human monkeypox—
268 A potential threat? A systematic review. *PLoS Negl Trop Dis* 2022; **16**: 1–20.
- 269 9 Barnewall RE, Fisher DA, Robertson AB, Vales PA, Knostman KA, Bigger JE. Inhalational
270 monkeypox virus infection in cynomolgus macaques. *Front Cell Infect Microbiol* 2012;
271 **2**: 117.
- 272 10 Nalca A, Livingston VA, Garza NL, *et al.* Experimental infection of cynomolgus
273 macaques (*Macaca fascicularis*) with aerosolized monkeypox virus. *PLoS One* 2010; **5**:
274 1–12.
- 275 11 Verreault D, Killeen SZ, Redmann RK, Roy CJ. Susceptibility of monkeypox virus
276 aerosol suspensions in a rotating chamber. *J Virol Methods* 2013; **187**: 333–7.
- 277 12 Wood JP, Choi YW, Wendling MQ, Rogers J V, Chappie DJ. Environmental persistence
278 of vaccinia virus on materials. *Lett Appl Microbiol* 2013; **57**: 399–404.

- 279 13 Vaughan A, Aarons E, Astbury J, *et al.* Human-to-human transmission of monkeypox
280 virus, United Kingdom, October 2018. *Emerg Infect Dis* 2020; **26**: 782–5.
- 281 14 Nörz D, Pfefferle S, Brehm T, *et al.* Evidence of surface contamination in hospital
282 rooms occupied by patients infected with monkeypox, Germany, June 2022.
283 *Eurosurveillance* 2022; **27**: pii=2200477.
- 284 15 NHS England. Health Building Note 04-01 Supplement 1. 2021.
285 [https://www.england.nhs.uk/publication/adult-in-patient-facilities-planning-and-](https://www.england.nhs.uk/publication/adult-in-patient-facilities-planning-and-design-hbn-04-01/)
286 [design-hbn-04-01/](https://www.england.nhs.uk/publication/adult-in-patient-facilities-planning-and-design-hbn-04-01/) (accessed July 11, 2022).
- 287 16 Li Y, Zhao H, Wilkins K, Hughes C, Damon IK. Real-time PCR assays for the specific
288 detection of monkeypox virus West African and Congo Basin strain DNA. *J Virol*
289 *Methods* 2010; **169**: 223–7.
- 290 17 Atkinson B, Burton C, Pottage T, *et al.* Infection-competent monkeypox virus
291 contamination identified in domestic settings following an imported case of
292 monkeypox into the UK. *medRxiv Prepr Serv Heal Sci* 2022.
293 DOI:<https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.06.27.22276202>.
294

Table 1: Clinical characteristics and results of surface and air environmental sampling in patients' rooms.

	Room A (P1)*	Room A (P2)	Room C (P2)	Room D*	Room E*
Background information					
<i>Date of sampling</i>	24 th May	17 th June	16 th June	17 th June	16 th June
<i>Days since onset</i>	9	30	6	26	7
<i>Days since admission</i>	2	7	7	18	3
<i>Throat Ct at admission</i>	27	Negative	22	37	30
<i>Lesion Ct at admission</i>	22	23	28	23	31
<i>Plasma Ct at admission</i>	32	34	35	Negative	31
<i>Days on tecovirimat</i>	2	4	NR	NR	3
Patient Room Ct values					
Floor	NA	26.9	30.9	34.9	32.5
Call button	27.5	29.4	32.4	Negative	26.1
Light switch	24.7	31.6	34.5	36.3	30.2
TV remote control	25.0	28.9	37.4	32.2	28.2
Observation machine	26.4	NA	NA	NA	NA
Tap handle (bedroom)	32.4	34.2	35.6	36.7	27.1
Window ledge	28.8	29.7	Negative	35.6	35.5
Chair – arm rest	29.9	33.5	33.8	31.6	24.9
Door handle (room to bathroom)	26.7	33.3	32.6	Negative	28.1
Bathroom Ct values					
Vent/grille (room to bathroom)	26.4	25.9	27.9	33.3	33.6
Toilet flush handle	28.7	32.6	31.8	34.8	26.4
Shower handle	28.8	33.5	34.0	33.8	32.7
Tap handle (bathroom)	29.2	29.3	32.8	Negative	25.9
Anteroom Ct values					
Floor: toxic side	26.3	28.7	33.2	32.9	30.6
Floor: non-toxic side	NA	33.6	Negative	36.8	36.8
Ward Ct values					
Corridor	NA	Negative	37.5	Negative	36.7
Air sampling Ct values					
Pre bed change near	Negative	Negative	Negative	Negative	Negative
Pre bed change far	36.2	36.5	Negative	Negative	Negative
During bed change near	32.7	36.2	Negative	Negative	Negative
During bed change far	35.8	Negative	Negative	Negative	Negative

Table 1: Details of environmental sampling performed in five patient rooms at the Royal Free Hospital May-June 2022. P1/P2 = Rooms A was sampled on two occasions with different patients occupying this room on each visit; rooms were decontaminated every 12hrs during occupancy using 5,000ppm available chlorine sodium hypochlorite on all surfaces and 10,000 ppm available chlorine sodium hypochlorite for toilet, shower, wash basins and floors with a full room clean after patient discharge, followed by decontamination using vapourised hydrogen peroxide. *Denotes occupant of this room was the first patient admitted into this room with monkeypox Ct = qPCR crossing threshold value of MPXV DNA detected. NA = Not applicable (sample not taken for this room). NR = Tecovirimat not received.

Figure 1: Plan of Room A representing sites of sampling and MPXV PCR Ct values




Table 2: Clinical characteristics and results of sampling around doffing procedure

	Room A (P1)*	Room B*	Room C (P1)*
Background information			
Date of sampling	24 th May	25 th May	25 th May
Days since onset	9	15	15
Days since admission	2	2	1
Throat Ct at admission	27	27	23
Lesion Ct at admission	22	31	18
Plasma Ct at admission	32	30	32
Days on tecovirimat	2	2	NA
Surface sampling Ct values			
Gloves	30.8	27.1	Negative#
Gown	Negative	35.6	34.3
Visor	Negative	Negative	Negative
Anteroom floor post doffing	26.1	26.9	30.9
Air sampling Ct values			
Corridor pre-doffing	Negative	Negative	38.2
Anteroom pre-doffing	Negative	Negative	Negative
Corridor during doffing	Negative	Negative	Negative
Anteroom during doffing	Negative	Negative	Negative

Table 2: Details of environmental sampling performed around doffing procedure at the Royal Free Hospital May 2022. P1/P2 = Rooms A and C were both sampled on two occasions with different patients occupying these rooms on each visit; rooms were decontaminated every 12hrs using 5,000ppm available chlorine sodium hypochlorite during occupancy with a full room clean with 5,000ppm available chlorine sodium hypochlorite after patient discharge, followed by decontamination using vapourised hydrogen peroxide. *Denotes occupant of this room was the first patient admitted into this room with monkeypox. #This negative result is likely due to sampling of the palmar surface only rather than palmar surface and fingertips. Ct = qPCR crossing threshold value of MPXV DNA detected.

Table 3: MPXV Ct values at specified timepoints from viral isolation cultures

	No infection control	Room B Anteroom floor	Room A (P1) Bed change	Room A (P1) Anteroom floor	Room A (P1) Light switch
Environmental sample Ct	NA	26.9	32.7	26.3	24.7
Day 0 P0	ND	32.2	ND	33.5	32.2
Day 3 P0	ND	ND	ND	33.6	33.1
Day 5 P0	ND	31.4	35.5	36.3	38.1
Day 7 P0	ND	22.4	27.6	ND	35.6
Day 7 P1 (5+2)	ND	39.5	ND	ND	ND
Day 10 P1 (5+5)	ND	14.9	17.5	36.2	36.5
Cultured MPXV?	No	Yes	Yes	No	No

Table 3: qPCR crossing threshold values from viral isolation cultures of environmental samples. Ct = Crossing threshold value; NA = Not applicable; ND = Not detected; P0/P1 = passage 0/1.