

1           **Aerosol and surface stability of HCoV-19 (SARS-CoV-2) compared to SARS-CoV-1**

2  
3  
4           **Short author list:** Neeltje van Doremalen<sup>1</sup>, James O. Lloyd-Smith<sup>3,5</sup>, Vincent J. Munster<sup>1</sup>

5  
6  
7           **Full author list:** Neeltje van Doremalen<sup>1\*</sup>, Trenton Bushmaker<sup>1\*</sup>, Dylan H. Morris<sup>2\*</sup>, Myndi G.  
8 Holbrook<sup>1</sup>, Amandine Gamble<sup>3</sup>, Brandi N. Williamson<sup>1</sup>, Azaibi Tamin<sup>4</sup>, Jennifer L. Harcourt<sup>4</sup>, Natalie J.  
9 Thornburg<sup>4</sup>, Susan I. Gerber<sup>4</sup>, James O. Lloyd-Smith<sup>3,5</sup>, Emmie de Wit<sup>1</sup>, Vincent J. Munster<sup>1</sup>

- 10  
11           1. Laboratory of Virology, Division of Intramural Research, National Institute of Allergy and  
12           Infectious Diseases, National Institutes of Health, Hamilton, MT, USA  
13           2. Department of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology, Princeton University, Princeton, NJ, USA  
14           3. Department of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology, University of California, Los Angeles, Los  
15           Angeles, CA, USA  
16           4. Division of Viral Diseases, National Center for Immunization and Respiratory Diseases, Centers  
17           for Disease Control and Prevention, Atlanta, GA, USA.  
18           5. Fogarty International Center, National Institutes of Health, Bethesda, MD, USA

19  
20           \* These authors contributed equally to this article

21 To the Editor,

22 A novel human coronavirus, now named severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2  
23 (SARS-CoV-2, referred to as HCoV-19 here) that emerged in Wuhan, China in late 2019 is now causing a  
24 pandemic<sup>1</sup>. Here, we analyze the aerosol and surface stability of HCoV-19 and compare it with SARS-  
25 CoV-1, the most closely related human coronavirus.<sup>2</sup> We evaluated the stability of HCoV-19 and SARS-  
26 CoV-1 in aerosols and on different surfaces and estimated their decay rates using a Bayesian regression  
27 model (see Supplementary Appendix). All experimental measurements are reported as mean across 3  
28 replicates.

29  
30 HCoV-19 remained viable in aerosols throughout the duration of our experiment (3 hours) with a  
31 reduction in infectious titer from  $10^{3.5}$  to  $10^{2.7}$  TCID<sub>50</sub>/L, similar to the reduction observed for SARS-CoV-  
32 1, from  $10^{4.3}$  to  $10^{3.5}$  TCID<sub>50</sub>/mL (Figure 1A).

33 HCoV-19 was most stable on plastic and stainless steel and viable virus could be detected up to  
34 72 hours post application (Figure 1A), though the virus titer was greatly reduced (plastic from  $10^{3.7}$  to  
35  $10^{0.6}$  TCID<sub>50</sub>/mL after 72 hours, stainless steel from  $10^{3.7}$  to  $10^{0.6}$  TCID<sub>50</sub>/mL after 48 hours). SARS-CoV-  
36 1 had similar stability kinetics (polypropylene from  $10^{3.4}$  to  $10^{0.7}$  TCID<sub>50</sub>/mL after 72 hours, stainless steel  
37 from  $10^{3.6}$  to  $10^{0.6}$  TCID<sub>50</sub>/mL after 48 hours). No viable virus could be measured after 4 hours on copper  
38 for HCoV-19 and 8 hours for SARS-CoV-1, or after 24 hours on cardboard for HCoV-19 and 8 hours for  
39 SARS-CoV-1 (Figure 1A).

40 Both viruses exhibited exponential decay in virus titer across all experimental conditions, as  
41 indicated by linear decrease in the  $\log_{10}$ TCID<sub>50</sub>/mL over time (Figure 1B). HCoV-19 and SARS-CoV-1  
42 exhibited similar half-lives in aerosols, with median estimates around 1.1-1.2 hours, and 95% credible  
43 intervals of [0.64, 2.64] hours for HCoV-19 and [0.78, 2.43] hours for SARS-CoV-1 (Figure 1C, Table  
44 S1). Half-lives on copper were also similar between the two viruses. On cardboard, HCoV-19 showed a  
45 considerably longer half-life than SARS-CoV-1. Both viruses showed longest viability on stainless steel  
46 and plastic: the median half-life estimate for HCoV-19 was roughly 5.6 hours on steel and 6.8 hours on

47 plastic (Figure 1C, Table S1). Estimated differences in half-life between the two viruses were small  
48 except for on cardboard (Figure 1C, Table S1). Individual replicate data were noticeably noisier for  
49 cardboard than other surfaces (Figures S1–S5), so we advise caution in interpreting this result.

50  
51 Our findings show that the stability of HCoV-19 and SARS-CoV-1 under the experimental  
52 circumstances tested is similar. This indicates that differences in the epidemiology of these viruses likely  
53 arise from other factors, including high viral loads in the upper respiratory tract and the potential for  
54 individuals infected with HCoV-19 to shed and transmit the virus while asymptomatic<sup>3,4</sup>. Our results  
55 indicate that aerosol and fomite transmission of HCoV-19 are plausible, as the virus can remain viable  
56 and infectious in aerosols for multiple hours and on surfaces up to days. This echoes the experience with  
57 SARS-CoV-1, where these modes of transmission were associated with nosocomial spread and  
58 superspreading events<sup>5</sup>, and provides guidance for pandemic mitigation measures.

59

## 60 References

- 61 1. Coronavirus disease (COVID-2019) situation reports. 2020. (Accessed 26th of February 2020, at  
62 <https://www.who.int/emergencies/diseases/novel-coronavirus-2019/situation-reports/>.)
- 63 2. Wu A, Peng Y, Huang B, et al. Genome Composition and Divergence of the Novel Coronavirus  
64 (2019-nCoV) Originating in China. *Cell Host Microbe* 2020.
- 65 3. Bai Y, Yao L, Wei T, et al. Presumed Asymptomatic Carrier Transmission of COVID-19. *JAMA*  
66 2020.
- 67 4. Zou L, Ruan F, Huang M, et al. SARS-CoV-2 Viral Load in Upper Respiratory Specimens of  
68 Infected Patients. *N Engl J Med* 2020.
- 69 5. Chen YC, Huang LM, Chan CC, et al. SARS in hospital emergency room. *Emerg Infect Dis*  
70 2004;10:782-8.

71

72 Figure 1. Viability of SARS-CoV-1 and HCoV-19 in aerosols and on different surfaces. A) SARS-CoV  
73 and HCoV-19 were aerosolized in a rotating drum maintained at 21-23°C and 65% RH over three hours.  
74 Viable virus titer is shown in TCID<sub>50</sub>/L air. For surfaces, viruses were applied on copper, cardboard, steel  
75 and plastic maintained at 21-23°C and 40% RH over seven days. Viable virus titer is shown in  
76 TCID<sub>50</sub>/mL collection medium. All samples were quantified by end-point titration on Vero E6 cells. Plots  
77 show the mean and standard error across three replicates. B) Regression plots showing predicted decay of

78 virus titer over time; titer plotted on a logarithmic scale. Points show measured titers and are slightly  
79 jittered along the time axis to avoid overplotting. Lines are random draws from the joint posterior  
80 distribution of the exponential decay rate (negative of the slope) and intercept (initial virus titer), thus  
81 visualizing the range of possible decay patterns for each experimental condition. 150 lines per panel: 50  
82 lines from each plotted replicate. C) Violin plots showing posterior distribution for half-life of viable  
83 virus based on the estimated exponential decay rates of virus titer. Dot shows the posterior median  
84 estimate and black line shows a 95% credible interval. Experimental conditions are ordered by posterior  
85 median half-life for HCoV-19. Dotted line shows Limit of Detection (LOD),  $3.33 \times 10^{0.5}$  TCID<sub>50</sub>/L air for  
86 aerosols,  $10^{0.5}$  TCID<sub>50</sub>/mL media for plastic, steel and cardboard and  $10^{1.5}$  TCID<sub>50</sub>/mL media for copper.  
87

