

Timing and Predictors of Loss of Infectivity among Healthcare Workers with Primary and Recurrent COVID-19: a Prospective Observational Cohort Study

Stefka Dzieciolowska, MD¹; Hugues Charest, PhD^{2,3,4}; Tonya Roy^{3,4}; Judith Fafard, MD^{3,4}; Sara Carazo, MD, MPH, PhD^{4,7}; Ines Levade, PhD^{3,4}; Jean Longtin, MD⁵; Leighanne Parkes, MD^{1,9}; Sylvie Nancy Beaulac, TM^{3,4}; Jasmin Villeneuve, MD⁴; Patrice Savard, MD, MSc^{2,6}; Jacques Corbeil, PhD⁷; Gaston De Serres, MD, PhD^{4,7}; Yves Longtin, MD^{1,8,9}

Affiliations:

- (1) McGill University Faculty of Medicine, Montreal, Canada
- (2) Université de Montréal, Faculté de médecine, Montréal, Canada
- (3) Laboratoire de Santé Publique du Québec, Sainte-Anne-de-Bellevue, Canada
- (4) Institut National de Santé Publique du Québec, Quebec City, Canada
- (5) CHU de Québec – Université Laval, Quebec City, Canada
- (6) Centre Hospitalier de l'Université de Montréal (CHUM) and CHUM Research Center, Montréal, Canada
- (7) Université Laval, Quebec City, Canada
- (8) Lady Davis Research Institute, Montreal, Canada
- (9) Jewish General Hospital Sir Mortimer B. Davis, Montreal, Canada

Running Title: Duration of COVID-19 infectivity

Keywords: SARS-CoV-2, COVID-19, contagiousness, infectivity, recurrent infection, viral culture

Word count (text only): 2991, 4 figures, 4 tables, 1 supplementary online content with 1 eMethod and 1

eFigure

Corresponding author:

Dr. Yves Longtin

Jewish General Hospital - SMBD

3755 Chemin de la Côte-Sainte-Catherine,

Montréal (Québec), Canada H3T 1E2

Tel: (514) 340.8294 ext 3731

Fax: (514) 340-7546

Email: yves.longtin@mcgill.ca

Funding: Supported by the Ministère de la Santé et des Services Sociaux du Québec. The funding source had no role in the design of the study, execution, analyses, interpretation of data, writing of report or decision to submit the manuscript.

Potential conflicts of interest: Y. Longtin reports receiving research support from Summit (Oxford). All other co-authors report no potential conflicts of interest.

Abstract

Background: There is a need to understand the duration of infectivity of primary and recurrent COVID-19 and identify predictors of loss of infectivity.

Methods: Prospective observational cohort study with serial viral culture, rapid antigen detection test (RADT) and RT-PCR on nasopharyngeal specimens of healthcare workers with COVID-19. The primary outcome was viral culture positivity as indicative of infectivity. Predictors of loss of infectivity were determined using multivariate regression model. The performance of the US CDC criteria (fever resolution, symptom improvement and negative RADT) to predict loss of infectivity was also investigated.

Results: 121 participants (91 female [79.3%]; average age, 40 years) were enrolled. Most (n=107, 88.4%) had received ≥ 3 SARS-CoV-2 vaccine doses, and 20 (16.5%) had COVID-19 previously. Viral culture positivity decreased from 71.9% (87/121) on day 5 of infection to 18.2% (22/121) on day 10. Participants with recurrent COVID-19 had a lower likelihood of infectivity than those with primary COVID-19 at each follow-up (day 5 OR, 0.14; $p < 0.001$; day 7 OR, 0.04; $p = 0.003$) and were all non-infective by day 10 ($p = 0.02$). Independent predictors of infectivity included prior COVID-19 (adjusted OR [aOR] on day 5, 0.005; $p = 0.003$), a RT-PCR Ct value < 23 (aOR on day 5, 22.75; $p < 0.001$), but not symptom improvement or RADT result.

The CDC criteria would identify 36% (24/67) of all non-infectious individuals on Day 7. However, 17% (5/29) of those meeting all the criteria had a positive viral culture.

Conclusions: Infectivity of recurrent COVID-19 is shorter than primary infections. Loss of infectivity algorithms could be optimized.

69 Word count: 250

70

Introduction

Coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) is caused by the severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2).¹ The current evidence regarding duration of infectivity rely on viral culture to detect shedding of replication-competent virus (also called viable or infectious virus). These studies suggest that immunocompetent individuals with non-severe COVID-19 can remain infective for up to 10 days.²⁻⁶

While infective, healthcare workers (HCWs) with COVID-19 must refrain from working to prevent nosocomial transmission.^{7,8} However, the timing of their return to work is complicated by the interindividual variation in the durations of infectivity. Approximately a fifth of individuals may be infective for as little as 5 days, while approximately a quarter can remain infective for 10 days or more.⁹ Determinants of loss of infectivity are largely unknown, but could be useful to optimize the return-to-work of infected HCWs. To limit absenteeism,¹⁰ the US Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) and European CDC have provided guidance to allow earlier return to work of eligible HCWs.^{7,8} These algorithms use readily available information such as symptom improvement and the result of rapid antigen detection tests (RADT) to predict loss of infectivity.^{7,8} However, whether these criteria can reliably distinguish infective and non-infective individuals remain unclear.

Furthermore, many studies that investigated duration of infectivity were conducted early in the pandemic when individuals were infected for the first time, and often were unvaccinated. Few studies have investigated duration of infectivity of recurrent COVID-19.⁹ Hence, we sought to evaluate the duration of infectivity of HCWs infected with primary and recurrent COVID-19, and identify predictors of infectivity using viral culture as a marker of infectivity.

Methods

Study population

We conducted a prospective observational cohort study at the CIUSSS Centre-Ouest-de-Montréal, a large healthcare organization employing 12,000 HCWs across 20 institutions. Participants were identified through the Occupational Health Service. Inclusion criteria included (1) SARS-CoV-2 infection confirmed by reverse transcription polymerase chain reaction (RT-PCR) from a nasopharyngeal specimen, and (2) symptom onset <72h prior to enrolment. Exclusion criteria included asymptomatic infections; moderate-to-severe COVID-19 (WHO Ordinal Scale for Clinical Improvement ≥ 3)¹¹; contraindication to nasopharyngeal sampling; and use of COVID-19-specific therapies (e.g. antivirals or monoclonal antibodies). Participants were followed on the 5th, 7th and 10th day of their infection (with the day of onset of symptoms defined as day 1).

The study follows the Strengthening the Reporting of Observational Studies in Epidemiology (STROBE) guideline,¹² and was approved by local research ethics committees. Written informed consent was obtained from participants.

Data collection

Clinical data included sociodemographic information, medical history (including prior COVID-19 infection), COVID-19 vaccination status (including number of doses and manufacturer), and symptomatology. We also assessed the use of antipyretics (acetaminophen and non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs) among afebrile participants as their use can mask fever. Participants reported this information online (LimeSurvey GmbH, Hamburg, Germany).

Outcome definitions

SARS-CoV-2 infectivity was defined as evidence of cytopathic effect (CPE) on microscopy of viral culture from a nasopharyngeal specimen, with etiology of the CPE being confirmed as SARS-CoV-2 by RT-PCR on the culture supernatant demonstrating at least 3 cycle threshold (Ct) values lower than the RT-PCR on the original sample.¹³ Duration of infectivity was defined as the number of days between the onset of symptoms and the last positive culture.

Laboratory methods

Nasopharyngeal samples using a flocked swab (FLOQSwabs, Copan Italia) were placed in 3ml universal viral transport media (UTM, Copan Italia) and kept at -80°C. Primary samples and culture supernatants were processed with an in-house RT-PCR targeting the SARS-CoV-2 N gene as previously described.¹⁴ Forward, reverse and probe sequences were as follows: AACCAGAATGGAGAACGCAGTG, CGGTGAACCAAGACGCAGTATTAT and CGATCAAAACAACGTCGGCCCCAAGGTTTAC.¹⁴

Viral cultures were performed on Vero E6 cells as previously described.¹⁴ This cell line is commonly used to cultivate SARS-CoV-2 and has a median tissue culture infectious dose (TCID₅₀) ranging between 2.0E+04 to 6.3E+06.¹⁵ A 0.1 ml aliquot of specimen was used as an inoculum. Cultures were kept for 15 days.

All initial samples were sequenced to determine SARS-CoV-2 lineage using the Illumina technology. Data analysis was performed using the GenPipes Covseq pipeline¹⁶ and variant identification was performed with Pangolin program (see appendix for details).¹⁷

Lateral-flow RADT were provided for self-administration (COVID-19 Antigen Rapid Test, BTNX, Hannover, Germany). Participants performed the test on a self-sampled midturbinate swab specimen by following

the manufacturer's instructions and interpreted the test result as positive, negative, or uncertain.¹⁸

Sample size estimate

Based on studies indicating that 25% of individuals remain infective on the 7th day of their infection,¹⁹ we estimated that recruiting 120 participants would provide a precision of +/- 7% at the 95% confidence interval (CI).

Statistical analyses

Descriptive statistics reported discrete variables as numbers and proportions, and continuous variables as mean \pm standard deviation (SD) or median and interquartile ranges (IQR). The primary outcome was the proportion of HCWs with evidence of infectivity on the 5th, 7th and 10th day of their infection.

To investigate the capacity of the RT-PCR Ct value (an indicator of viral load that is inversely proportional to the quantity of nucleic acid in a sample) and RADT to predict infectivity, the Ct values of RT-PCR of samples with positive vs negative viral culture was depicted in the form of boxplots with overlaid jitter plot.

To investigate factors associated with persistent infectivity, odds ratios (OR) and 95% confidence intervals (CI) were estimated using bivariate and multivariate logistic regression at each follow-up visit. Multivariate models included clinical characteristics (symptom severity, symptom resolution, and fever) and results laboratory assays (RADT and RT-PCR) collected at each follow-up, as well as baseline individual (age, sex and immunological status) and viral (SARS-CoV-2 lineage) information. These variables were pre-defined as potential predictors of duration of infectivity according to literature and current practices.^{7,8} Categories were grouped when necessary for model convergence. Variables

perfectly predicting the presence of infectivity could not be included in the corresponding multivariate model. Immunologic status was categorized according to vaccination and prior infection as follows: recent vaccination (last dose received <6 months ago) without prior infection; non-recent vaccination (last dose received \geq 6 months ago) without prior infection; and hybrid immunity (vaccination at any time and prior infection).

Performance of return-to-work algorithms

We estimated the capacity of the CDC algorithm to discriminate infective and non-infective HCWs on day 7 of their infection.⁷ We also quantified the probability of an infectious HCW returning to work, and estimated the impact of these criteria to limit absenteeism. Finally, we explored the performance of alternative algorithms to predict loss of infectivity that were derived from variables identified in the current study. These evaluations assumed that in the absence of return-to-work criteria, HCWs would return to work 10 days after the onset of their symptoms.

All analyses were performed in SAS version 9.4. All tests were 2-tailed and a p-value < 0.05 was considered statistically significant. Adjustment for multiple comparisons were not applied in this exploratory study.^{20,21}

Role of Funding source

The study was sponsored by the Ministère de la Santé et des Services Sociaux du Québec. The sponsor had no role in the design, conduct and reporting of the study.

Results

Between Feb 20th 2022 and March 6th, 2023th, 237 patients were offered to participate, and 121 (51.1%) were included in the analyses (**Figure 1**). Overall, 714 specimens (360 nasopharyngeal and 354 mid-turbinate swabs) were collected. Baseline characteristics of participants are shown in **Table 1**; 79.3% (96/121) were female, and the average age was 40.2 (SD, 12.0 years). The infections were due to multiple Omicron lineages including BA.1 (11.6%), BA.2 (60.3%), and BA.5 (8.3%), inclusive of sublineages. Virtually all participants (98.3%) were previously immunized with ≥ 1 dose of SARS-CoV-2 vaccine. Most (84.3%) had received 3 doses, most commonly the Pfizer–BioNTech Comirnaty (89.3% of all received doses). The median elapsed time between the last dose and the current infection was 122 days (IQR, 95-175 days). Twenty (20) participants (16.5%) had a prior COVID-19 episode. All these previous episodes were mild (WHO Grade scale ≤ 2) and occurred a median of 347.5 days prior to the current episode (IQR, 264 to 454 days).

Symptoms of current COVID-19

Upon enrollment, all participants described their infection as either “very mild” or “mild” (WHO Grade scale of 1 or 2). The most common symptoms were sore throat (77.7%), rhinorrhea and/or nasal congestion (72.7%) and fatigue (66.9%). The clinical evolution was favourable. No participant was hospitalized. A single participant received nirmatrelvir-ritonavir after enrollment. The proportion of participants with markedly improved or resolved symptoms increased from 43.8% on day 5 to 84.3% on day 10 (data not shown). Fever was uncommon: only 14.9% were febrile on enrollment. However, antipyretic use was frequent in afebrile individuals. For example, they were used by 50% and 31% of afebrile individuals on day 5 and 7 of their infection, respectively.

Evolution of infectivity and viral shedding

The proportion of participants with a positive viral culture was 71.9% (87/121; 95% CI, 63.0% to 79.7%) on day 5, 46.7% (56/120; 95% CI, 37.5% to 56.0%) on day 7 and 18.2% (22/121; 95% CI, 11.8% to 26.2%) on day 10, respectively (**Figure 1**). The proportion of participants with a positive RT-PCR decreased from 93.3% (112/120) on day 5 (median Ct value, 23.4 (IQR, 20.6-27.9)) to 61.2% (74/120) on day 10 (median Ct value, 32.5 (IQR, 28.5 to undetectable)). Similarly, the proportion of RADT tests that were positive decreased progressively from 81.5% (97/119) on day 5, to 34.2% (40/117) on day 10.

Factors associated with infectivity

In bivariate analysis, multiple variables were associated with a positive viral culture (**Table 2**). A history of previous COVID-19 was strongly associated with a decreased likelihood of infectivity at each follow-up visit. Only 35% (7/20) of individuals with recurrent COVID-19 were still infective on day 5 compared with 79% of those with a primary episode (OR, 0.14; 95% CI 0.05-0.40; $p < 0.001$). Similarly, only 5% (1/20) of participants with recurrent COVID-19 were still infective on day 7, compared with 55% (55/100) of those with a first episode (OR, 0.04; 95% CI, 0.01-0.33; $p = 0.003$). Finally, the proportion of participants with primary vs recurrent infection that were still infective on day 10 were 22% vs. 0%, respectively ($p = 0.02$ by Fisher's).

In terms of lineage, the BA.1 lineage was associated with a higher likelihood of infectivity on each follow-up visit than the BA.2 ($p \leq 0.02$), while no difference was detected between BA.2 and BA.4/5.

In terms of clinical features, a lack of symptom improvement was predictive of ongoing infectivity on day 7 (OR, 4.81; $p = 0.01$) but not on day 5 or 10. Also, when compared to afebrile individuals who were not using antipyretics, those who were still using antipyretics were more likely to be infective at each follow up visit (range of OR, 2.97 to 4.26; $p \leq 0.01$ for each comparison).

In terms of laboratory assays, a positive RADT result was associated with a higher likelihood of infectivity at day 5 (OR, 6.16; $p=0.004$) and day 7 (OR, 10.93; $p<0.001$). A positive RT-PCR was also significantly associated with infectivity at each follow-up, and there was an inverse association between the RT-PCR Ct value and ongoing infectivity (**Figure 2**). Notably, participants with recurrent COVID-19 differed from those with primary infection in terms of laboratory assays. At each visit, they had significantly higher RT-PCR Ct values (**Figure 3**) and were significantly more likely to have a negative RADT test result (**Table 3**).

In multivariate analysis (**Table 4**), the following variables were independently associated ongoing infectivity: A RT-PCR Ct value <23 was independently associated with an increased probability of infectivity on each follow-up visit (adjusted OR [aOR] on day 5, 22.75; $p<0.001$; aOR on day 7, 182.30; $p<0.001$; and aOR on day 10; 24.71; $p=0.02$). A Ct value ranging between 23 and 27 was also predictive of ongoing infectivity at Day 7 and Day 10. A history of previous COVID-19 was independently associated with a decreased probability of infectivity on day 5 (aOR, 0.005; $p<0.001$). By contrast, there was no significant association between ongoing infectivity and the absence of fever (with or without the use of antipyretics), symptom improvement, or RADT results.

Performance of return-to-work algorithms

We applied the US CDC criteria to our cohort to identify non-infectious individuals on day 7 of COVID-19 (**Figure 4**).⁷ Approximately three quarters (88/117; 75.2%) would be ineligible for return to work because of fever ($n=3$), the use of antipyretics ($n=35$), a lack of symptom improvement ($n=3$) or a positive RADT ($n=47$). Hence, only 29 HCWs (24.8%) would meet all the return-to-work criteria. Of these, 17.2% (5/29) were infectious by viral culture, and 82.8% (24/29) were non-infectious. Hence, this algorithm could identify a third (35.8%; 24/67) of all non-infectious individuals on day 7. If all 29 HCWs who fulfilled all

criteria returned to work on day 7, this algorithm would decrease absenteeism by 7.4%.

We applied an alternative algorithm that used a history of previous COVID-19 and a RT-PCR Ct value >27 to predict loss of infectivity on day 7. This algorithm would identify 56.4% (66/117) of all HCWs as eligible for return to work and could avoid 198 days of absence (16.9%). Of these, 52 (78.8%) were non-infectious, and 14 (21.2%) were infectious. This algorithm would identify a greater proportion of all non-infectious HCWs than the CDC algorithm (77.6% vs 35.8%; $p < 0.001$). Even though it would return to work a greater absolute number of infectious individuals, it would not significantly increase in the probability of returning to work an infectious HCW (21.2% vs 17.2% of all eligible HCWs, $p = 0.78$).

Given that approximately two thirds of individuals with recurrent COVID-19 were non-infectious by day 5, we explored various criteria that could accelerate their return-to-work (**eFigure 1** in supplementary appendix). Among these, a RT-PCR Ct value >27 could identify most (77%; 10/13) non-infectious individuals on day 5 with low probability (9%; 1/11) of returning to work an infectious HCW.

Discussion

Healthcare workers with COVID-19 must be removed from work, but their absence can exacerbate staff shortages.²² There is a need to identify predictors of loss of infectivity of SARS-CoV-2 to prevent unwarranted prolongation of absence. Most published studies on this topic have relatively low number of participants limiting the identification of predictors of loss of infectivity.^{6,23,24}

In this prospective study, approximately three quarters (71.9%) were still shedding infectious viral particles on 5th day of infection, half (46.7%) on the 7th day, and a fifth (18.2%) on the 10th day. These

results, along with other recent publications,²⁵⁻²⁸ differ from those of earlier studies that estimated the duration of infectivity to 10 days or less.^{6,29} A study of 66 individuals infected with the Omicron variant BA.1 reported that a quarter of participants were still infective on the 10th day of infection.⁹ In another recent study, 8.5% were still shedding viable virus on day 14.³⁰

However, our study also identifies important nuances regarding durations of infectivity. Nowadays, an increasing proportion of infections occurs in individuals who have hybrid immunity due to vaccination and previous COVID-19. Our study identified that vaccinated individuals with recurrent COVID-19 have a significantly shorter duration of infectivity as well as a distinct viral kinetic as evidenced by lower viral loads and earlier negativisation of RADT. A prepublication study of 1400 professional athletes also reported faster viral clearance by RT-PCR in individuals with recurrent COVID-19 compared with primary infections (4.9 vs 7.2 days, respectively).³¹ A cohort study in Alaska recently reported that individuals with previous COVID-19 infections were less likely to have a positive RADT result by day 5 compared to those with primary COVID-19.²⁵ A similar phenomenon has been described with other *Coronaviridae*. A study performed three decades ago among volunteers infected with coronavirus 229E determined that reinfections led to a shorter duration of virus shedding compared with the primary episode.³² Taken together, these findings profoundly alter our understanding of the infectivity and viral kinetic of recurrent COVID-19.

Our study also identified that a higher RT-PCR Ct value was the strongest independent predictor of loss of infectivity. This confirms findings from other studies that demonstrated that higher Ct values correspond with a non-replicative virus^{3,26,33-39}. Hence, RT-PCR Ct values could help determine the timing of return to work of HCWs. A negative RADT result was also predictive of loss of infectivity by bivariate analysis.⁴⁰ However, our multivariate analysis indicates that RT-PCR Ct values hold superior predictive

capacity.

Our study also suggests that the guidance provided by the CDC to accelerate the return to work of infected HCWs is relatively stringent as it allows the return to work of only a third of all non-infectious individuals.^{7,8} Also, they appear to have moderate discriminatory power as up to a sixth of those eligible for return to work are still shedding viable virus. By contrast, an alternative algorithm using RT-PCR Ct values and a history of previous COVID-19 could be able to return to work a greater proportion of HCWs on Day 7 without significantly increasing the probability of returning to work an infectious HCW. Importantly, the performance of these algorithms will be influenced by whether the COVID-19 episode is a first episode or a recurrence. In our opinion, such distinction will be essential when updating these algorithms.

Our study has strengths. To our knowledge, this study is the first to demonstrate that individuals with recurrent COVID-19 have significantly shorter durations of infectivity using the gold standard of viral culture. It is among the largest that assessed infectivity using viral culture. Our laboratory technique was sensitive and could detect viable viruses in many individuals 10 days into their infection. It also has limitations. The study enrolled young, healthy, and highly immunized participants with mild COVID-19, so generalizability to other populations is uncertain. Even though culture positivity is the best marker of infectivity, the correlation between culture positivity and transmission remains unclear.⁹ Additional studies, including validation with an external cohort, would be required to better inform return-to-work policies.^{20,21}

In conclusion, our study detected a higher RT-PCR Ct value and COVID-19 reinfection as independent predictors of loss of infectivity in a highly vaccinated population, and suggests that return-to-work

algorithms could be optimized to limit absenteeism.¹⁰ Further studies are needed to further characterize the viral kinetics of COVID-19 reinfections as they appear to fundamentally differ from those with primary COVID-19.

Acknowledgements

Conflict of Interest Disclosures: Dr Longtin reported receiving a grant from Summit (Oxford) outside the submitted work. No other disclosures were reported.

Funding/Support: This work was supported by the Ministère de la Santé et des Services Sociaux du Québec. The sponsor was not involved in the design and conduct of the study; collection, management, analysis, and interpretation of the data; preparation, review, or approval of the manuscript; and decision to submit the manuscript for publication.

Data Access, Responsibility, and Analysis: Yves Longtin had full access to all the data in the study and takes responsibility for the integrity of the data and the accuracy of the data analysis. Data not publicly available.

Author Contribution:

Concept and Design: Dzieciolowska, Fafard, Charest, De Serres, J. Longtin, Villeneuve, Y. Longtin
Acquisition, analysis, or interpretation of data: Dzieciolowska, Roy, Charest, Fafard, Levade, Beaulac, Parkes, Y. Longtin
Drafting of manuscript: Dzieciolowska, Y. Longtin

358 Critical revision of the manuscript for important intellectual content: Charest, Roy, Fafard, Carazo,
 359 Levade, J. Longtin, Parkes, Beaulac, Villeneuve, Savard, Corbeil, De Serres,
 360 Statistical analyses: Carazo, De Serres, Y. Longtin
 361 Obtained funding: Y. Longtin, De Serres
 362 Administrative, technical or material support: Dzieciolowska, Y. Longtin
 363 Supervision: Y. Longtin, De Serres
 364
 365
 366

Legends to figures

FIGURE 1. Flow diagram of participant selection into the study and proportion of infective participants at each follow-up visit.

FIGURE 2. Box plot with overlaid jitter plot comparing SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR Cycle threshold, rapid antigen diagnostic test (RADT) result and viral culture positivity at day 5, 7 and 10 of COVID-19 among 121 healthcare workers.

Footnote: The horizontal line in each box indicates the median, whereas the top and bottom of the boxes represent the 75th and 25th percentile, respectively. Error bars represent 95% confidence intervals. Negative RT-PCR results were attributed a Ct-value of 40 to facilitate data visualization.

FIGURE 3. Box plot comparing *SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR Cycle threshold* at day 5, 7 and 10 of primary vs. recurrent COVID-19 infection.

Footnote: The horizontal line in each box indicates the median, whereas the top and bottom lines represent the 75th and 25th percentile, respectively. Error bars represent 95% confidence intervals. Negative RT-PCR results were attributed a Ct-value of 40 to facilitate data visualization. Comparison between primary vs recurrent infections assessed by Mann-Whitney U test.

FIGURE 4. Performance of return-to-work criteria for healthcare workers with COVID-19. **Panel A** shows the performance of the US Centers for Diseases Control and Prevention (US CDC) Return to Work criteria

391 on a cohort of healthcare workers with COVID-19. **Panel B** shows the performance of an alternative set
392 of criteria derived from the current study. **Panel C** compares the CDC and alternative criteria.
393

REFERENCES

1. Helmy YA, Fawzy M, Elasad A, Sobieh A, Kenney SP, Shehata AA. The COVID-19 Pandemic: A Comprehensive Review of Taxonomy, Genetics, Epidemiology, Diagnosis, Treatment, and Control. *J Clin Med*. Apr 24 2020;9(4)doi:10.3390/jcm9041225
2. Kadire SR, Fabre V, Wenzel RP. Doctor, How Long Should I Isolate? *N Engl J Med*. Mar 25 2021;384(12):e47. doi:10.1056/NEJMcide2100910
3. Arons MM, Hatfield KM, Reddy SC, et al. Presymptomatic SARS-CoV-2 Infections and Transmission in a Skilled Nursing Facility. *N Engl J Med*. May 28 2020;382(22):2081-2090. doi:10.1056/NEJMoa2008457
4. Wolfel R, Corman VM, Guggemos W, et al. Virological assessment of hospitalized patients with COVID-2019. *Nature*. May 2020;581(7809):465-469. doi:10.1038/s41586-020-2196-x
5. Bullard J, Dust K, Funk D, et al. Predicting infectious SARS-CoV-2 from diagnostic samples. *Clin Infect Dis*. May 22 2020;doi:10.1093/cid/ciaa638
6. Cevik M, Tate M, Lloyd O, Maraolo AE, Schafers J, Ho A. SARS-CoV-2, SARS-CoV, and MERS-CoV viral load dynamics, duration of viral shedding, and infectiousness: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Lancet Microbe*. Jan 2021;2(1):e13-e22. doi:10.1016/S2666-5247(20)30172-5
7. US Centers for Diseases Control and Prevention. Interim Guidance for Managing Healthcare Personnel with SARS-CoV-2 Infection or Exposure to SARS-CoV-2 (2022). <https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/hcp/guidance-risk-assessment-hcp.html>. Accessed May 10, 2023.

8. European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control. Guidance on quarantine of close contacts to COVID-19 cases and isolation of COVID-19 cases, in the current epidemiological situation, 7 January 2022 (2022).
<https://www.ecdc.europa.eu/en/covid-19/prevention-and-control/quarantine-and-isolation> Accessed May 10, 2023.
9. Boucau J, Marino C, Regan J, et al. Duration of Shedding of Culturable Virus in SARS-CoV-2 Omicron (BA.1) Infection. *N Engl J Med*. Jul 21 2022;387(3):275-277.
doi:10.1056/NEJMc2202092
10. Black JRM, Bailey C, Przewrocka J, Dijkstra KK, Swanton C. COVID-19: the case for health-care worker screening to prevent hospital transmission. *Lancet*. May 2 2020;395(10234):1418-1420. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(20)30917-X
11. World Health Organization. *WHO R&D Blueprint Novel Coronavirus COVID-19 Therapeutic Trial Synopsis*. 2020. February 18, 2020.
https://cdn.who.int/media/docs/default-source/blue-print/covid-19-therapeutic-trial-synopsis.pdf?sfvrsn=44b83344_1&download=true
12. von Elm E, Altman DG, Egger M, et al. The Strengthening the Reporting of Observational Studies in Epidemiology (STROBE) statement: guidelines for reporting observational studies. *J Clin Epidemiol*. Apr 2008;61(4):344-9. doi:10.1016/j.jclinepi.2007.11.008
13. Figueira MD, Luczkowiak J, Lasala F, Perez-Rivilla A, Delgado R. Prolonged SARS-CoV-2 cell culture replication in respiratory samples from patients with severe COVID-19. *Clin Microbiol Infect*. Feb 22 2021;doi:10.1016/j.cmi.2021.02.014

14. Longtin Y, Charest H, Quach C, et al. Infectivity of healthcare workers diagnosed with coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) approximately 2 weeks after onset of symptoms: A cross-sectional study. *Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol*. Jan 11 2021;1-3. doi:10.1017/ice.2020.1420
15. Wurtz N, Penant G, Jardot P, Duclos N, La Scola B. Culture of SARS-CoV-2 in a panel of laboratory cell lines, permissivity, and differences in growth profile. *Eur J Clin Microbiol Infect Dis*. Mar 2021;40(3):477-484. doi:10.1007/s10096-020-04106-0
16. CoV Sequencing Pipeline. https://genpipes.readthedocs.io/en/genpipes-v4.1.2/user_guide/pipelines/gp_covseq.html, 2019.
17. O'Toole A, Scher E, Underwood A, et al. Assignment of epidemiological lineages in an emerging pandemic using the pangolin tool. *Virus Evol*. 2021;7(2):veab064. doi:10.1093/ve/veab064
18. Papenburg J, Campbell JR, Caya C, et al. Adequacy of Serial Self-performed SARS-CoV-2 Rapid Antigen Detection Testing for Longitudinal Mass Screening in the Workplace. *JAMA Netw Open*. May 2 2022;5(5):e2210559. doi:10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2022.10559
19. Killingley B, Mann AJ, Kalinova M, et al. Safety, tolerability and viral kinetics during SARS-CoV-2 human challenge in young adults. *Nat Med*. May 2022;28(5):1031-1041. doi:10.1038/s41591-022-01780-9
20. Bender R, Lange S. Adjusting for multiple testing--when and how? *J Clin Epidemiol*. Apr 2001;54(4):343-9. doi:10.1016/s0895-4356(00)00314-0

21. Rothman KJ. No adjustments are needed for multiple comparisons. *Epidemiology*. Jan 1990;1(1):43-6.
22. Poon YR, Lin YP, Griffiths P, Yong KK, Seah B, Liaw SY. A global overview of healthcare workers' turnover intention amid COVID-19 pandemic: a systematic review with future directions. *Hum Resour Health*. Sep 24 2022;20(1):70. doi:10.1186/s12960-022-00764-7
23. Keske S, Esken GG, Vatansever C, et al. Duration of infectious shedding of SARS-CoV-2 omicron variant and its relation with symptoms. *Clin Microbiol Infect*. Jul 16 2022;doi:10.1016/j.cmi.2022.07.009
24. Wu Y, Guo Z, Yuan J, et al. Duration of viable virus shedding and polymerase chain reaction positivity of the SARS-CoV-2 Omicron variant in the upper respiratory tract: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *International journal of infectious diseases : IJID : official publication of the International Society for Infectious Diseases*. Feb 18 2023;129:228-235. doi:10.1016/j.ijid.2023.02.011
25. Lefferts B, Blake I, Bruden D, et al. Antigen Test Positivity After COVID-19 Isolation — Yukon-Kuskokwim Delta Region, Alaska, January–February 2022. *MMWR Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report*. 2022;71(8):293-298. doi:10.15585/mmwr.mm7108a3
26. Qi L, Yang Y, Jiang D, et al. Factors associated with the duration of viral shedding in adults with COVID-19 outside of Wuhan, China: a retrospective cohort study. *Int J Infect Dis*. Jul 2020;96:531-537. doi:10.1016/j.ijid.2020.05.045
27. Landon E, Bartlett AH, Marrs R, Guenette C, Weber SG, Mina MJ. High Rates of Rapid Antigen Test Positivity After 5 days of Isolation for COVID-19. Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory; 2022.

28. Stiefel U, Bhullar D, Zabarsky TF, et al. Healthcare personnel frequently have positive severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) antigen tests 5 days or more after diagnosis of coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19). *Infection Control & Hospital Epidemiology*. 2022;1-2. doi:10.1017/ice.2022.21
29. Takahashi K, Ishikane M, Ujiie M, et al. Duration of Infectious Virus Shedding by SARS-CoV-2 Omicron Variant-Infected Vaccinees. *Emerg Infect Dis*. May 2022;28(5):998-1001. doi:10.3201/eid2805.220197
30. Keske S, Guney-Esken G, Vatansever C, et al. Duration of infectious shedding of SARS-CoV-2 Omicron variant and its relation with symptoms. *Clin Microbiol Infect*. Feb 2023;29(2):221-224. doi:10.1016/j.cmi.2022.07.009
31. Kissler SM, Hay JA, Fauver JR, et al. Viral kinetics of sequential SARS-CoV-2 infections. *medRxiv*. 2023:2023.03.03.23286775. doi:10.1101/2023.03.03.23286775
32. Callow KA, Parry HF, Sergeant M, Tyrrell DA. The time course of the immune response to experimental coronavirus infection of man. *Epidemiol Infect*. Oct 1990;105(2):435-46. doi:10.1017/s0950268800048019
33. Gniazdowski V, Paul Morris C, Wohl S, et al. Repeated Coronavirus Disease 2019 Molecular Testing: Correlation of Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 Culture With Molecular Assays and Cycle Thresholds. *Clin Infect Dis*. Aug 16 2021;73(4):e860-e869. doi:10.1093/cid/ciaa1616
34. Kim MC, Cui C, Shin KR, et al. Duration of Culturable SARS-CoV-2 in Hospitalized Patients with Covid-19. *N Engl J Med*. Feb 18 2021;384(7):671-673. doi:10.1056/NEJMc2027040

35. Longtin Y, Parkes LO, Charest H, et al. Persistence of infectivity in elderly individuals diagnosed with severe acute respiratory coronavirus virus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) infection 10 days after onset of symptoms: A cross-sectional study. *Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol.* Dec 6 2021;1-4. doi:10.1017/ice.2021.502
36. Bullard J, Dust K, Funk D, et al. Predicting Infectious Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 From Diagnostic Samples. *Clin Infect Dis.* Dec 17 2020;71(10):2663-2666. doi:10.1093/cid/ciaa638
37. Aranha C, Patel V, Bhor V, Gogoi D. Cycle threshold values in RT-PCR to determine dynamics of SARS-CoV-2 viral load: An approach to reduce the isolation period for COVID-19 patients. *J Med Virol.* Dec 2021;93(12):6794-6797. doi:10.1002/jmv.27206
38. Jefferson T, Spencer EA, Brassey J, Heneghan C. Viral cultures for COVID-19 infectious potential assessment - a systematic review. *Clin Infect Dis.* Dec 3 2020;doi:10.1093/cid/ciaa1764
39. Gniazdowski V, Morris CP, Wohl S, et al. Repeat COVID-19 Molecular Testing: Correlation of SARS-CoV-2 Culture with Molecular Assays and Cycle Thresholds. *Clin Infect Dis.* Oct 27 2020;doi:10.1093/cid/ciaa1616
40. Bouton TC, Atarere J, Turcinovic J, et al. Viral Dynamics of Omicron and Delta Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) Variants With Implications for Timing of Release from Isolation: A Longitudinal Cohort Study. *Clin Infect Dis.* Feb 8 2023;76(3):e227-e233. doi:10.1093/cid/ciac510

523

524 **Table 1.** Demographic and clinical characteristics of healthcare workers with COVID-19

Characteristic	Overall population (n=121)
Demographic characteristics	
Mean Age – years (SD)	40.2 (12.0)
Female sex (%)	96 (79.3)
Workplace	
Acute care hospital (%)	56 (46.3)
Local Community Services Centers (%)	16 (13.2)
Long term care facilities (%)	15 (12.4)
Rehabilitation center (%)	9 (7.4)
Private clinic, family medicine clinic (%)	7 (5.8)
Other ^a (%)	18 (14.9)
Occupation	
Nurse, nurse practitioner, patient care attendant (%)	45 (37.2)
Physician (%)	20 (16.5)
Administration (%)	13 (10.7)
Physiotherapy, occupational therapy, social worker, radiology technician (%)	22 (18.2)
Other (%)	21 (17.4)
Comorbidities and past medical history	
Immunocompromised condition ^b (%)	4 (3.3)
Previous COVID-19 episode (%)	20 (16.5)
Median elapsed time since last COVID-19 episode – days (IQR)	347.5 (264-454)
COVID-19 Vaccination status	
Not vaccinated (%)	2 (1.7)
1 dose (%)	3 (2.5)
2 doses (%)	9 (7.4)
3 doses (%)	102 (84.3)
4 doses (%)	5 (4.1)
COVID-19 vaccine type (n=347 doses)^d	
Pfizer-BioNTech Comirnaty (%)	310 (89.3)
Moderna Spikevax (%)	30 (8.6)

AstraZeneca Vaxzevria (%)	7 (2.0)	525
		526
Median elapsed time since last COVID-19 vaccine dose – days (IQR)	122 (95-175)	527
		528
		529
		530
Severity of COVID-19 infection^c		531
		532
Very mild (Ambulatory, no limitation of activities) (%)	97 (80.2)	533
		534
Mild (Ambulatory, with limitation of activities) (%)	24 (19.8)	535
		536
SARS-CoV-2 specific therapy ^e (%)	1 (0.8)	537
		538
COVID-19 symptomatology on enrollment		539
		540
Median number of symptoms (IQR)	5 (3-6)	541
		542
Sore throat (%)	94 (77.7)	543
		544
Rhinorrhea and/or nasal congestion (%)	88 (72.7)	545
		546
Fatigue (%)	81 (66.9)	547
		548
Headache (%)	77 (63.6)	549
		550
Myalgia (%)	55 (45.5)	551
		552
Chills (%)	50 (41.3)	553
		554
Cough (%)	21 (17.4)	555
		556
Fever (%)	18 (14.9)	557
		558
Dizziness (%)	17 (14.0)	559
		560
Diarrhea (%)	14 (11.6)	561
		562
Nausea and/or vomiting (%)	10 (8.3)	563
		564
Chest pain (%)	10 (8.3)	565
		566
Dyspnea (%)	8 (6.6)	567
		568
Anosmia (%)	3 (2.5)	569
		570
Ageusia (%)	3 (2.5)	571
		572
SARS-CoV-2 lineage		573
		574
BA.1 and sublineages (%)	14 (11.6)	575
		576
BA.2 and sublineages (%)	73 (60.3)	577
		578
BA.4 and sublineages (%)	3 (2.5)	579
		580
BA.5 (%)	10 (8.3)	581
		582
BQ.1 (%)	9 (7.4)	583
		584
XBB (%)	1 (0.8)	585
		586
Recombinants (%)	2 (1.7)	587
		588
Unknown (%)	9 (7.4)	589
		590
		591
		592

Footnotes
a. Includes

vaccination center (n=3), research institute (n=5), rehabilitation centers (n=3), health phone services (n=5), cancer wellness center (n=1) and medical school (n=1)

- b. Includes multiple sclerosis receiving fingolimod (n=1), multiple myeloma post autologous stem cell transplantation (n=1), colorectal cancer under chemotherapy (n=1), and Crohn disease receiving anti-tumor necrosis factor (anti-TNF) therapy.
- c. Severity determined by the World Health Organization Ordinal Scale for Clinical Improvement.
- d. Sum of percentages is greater than 100% because of rounding
- e. A single patient received nirmatrelvir and ritonavir after enrollment into the study

Abbreviations: SD, standard deviation; IQR, interquartile range

Table 2. Predictors of infectivity on day 5, 7 and 10 of COVID-19 among healthcare workers (bivariate analyses)

Explanatory variable	Day 5					Day 7					Day 10				
	N ^b	Absence of infectivity	Presence of infectivity	OR (95% CI)	P-value ^c	N ^b	Absence of infectivity	Presence of infectivity	OR (95% CI)	P-value ^c	N ^b	Absence of infectivity	Presence of infectivity	OR (95% CI)	P-value ^c
		n (line %)	n (line %)				n (line %)	n (line %)				n (line %)	n (line %)		
OVERALL	121	34 (28.1)	87 (71.9)			120	64 (53.3)	56 (46.7)			121	99 (81.8)	22 (18.2)		
Demographics															
Median age (IQR)	121	40 (34-53)	38 (30-48)	NE	0.12	120	38.5 (31.5-49)	39.5 (32-48)	NE	0.99	121	38 (31-48)	39.5 (29-51)	NE	0.84
Male sex (%)	25	7 (28.0)	18 (72.0)	Ref		24	13 (20.3)	11 (19.6)	Ref		25	21 (84.0)	4 (16.0)	Ref	
Female sex (%)	96	27 (28.1)	69 (71.9)	0.99 (0.37-2.65)	0.99	96	51 (53.1)	45 (46.9)	1.04 (0.43-2.56)	0.93	96	78 (81.3)	18 (18.8)	1.21 (0.37-3.96)	0.75
Previous infection status															
No previous COVID-19	101	21 (20.8)	80 (79.2)	Ref		100	45 (45.0)	55 (55.0)	Ref		101	79 (78.2)	22 (21.8)	Ref	
Previous COVID-19	20	13 (65.0)	7 (35.0)	0.14 (0.05-0.40)	<0.001	20	19 (95.0)	1 (5.0)	0.04 (0.01-0.33)	0.003	20	20 (100)	0 (0.0)	NE	0.02
Vaccination: number of doses received															
No vaccination or one dose received	5	2 (40.0)	3 (60.0)	Ref		5	2 (40.0)	3 (60.0)	Ref		5	5 (100)	0 (0.0)	Ref	
≥2 doses received	116	32 (27.6)	84 (72.4)	1.75 (0.28-10.96)	0.55	115	62 (53.9)	53 (46.1)	0.57 (0.09-3.54)	0.55	116	94 (81.0)	22 (19.0)	NE	0.58
Immunity status stratified by timing of last vaccine and previous COVID-19															
No previous infection & last vaccine dose ≥6 months ago	12	2 (16.7)	10 (83.3)	Ref		11	7 (63.6)	4 (36.4)	Ref		12	11 (91.7)	1 (8.3)	Ref	
No previous infection & last vaccine dose <6 months ago	89	19 (21.3)	70 (78.7)	0.74 (0.15-3.65)	0.71	89	38 (42.7)	51 (57.3)	2.35 (0.64-8.60)	0.20	89	68 (76.4)	21 (23.6)	3.40 (0.41-27.87)	0.26
Previous infection, last vaccine dose > or < 6 months ago ^a	20	13 (65.0)	7 (35.0)	0.11 (0.02-0.64)	0.01	20	19 (95.0)	1 (5.0)	0.09 (0.01-0.97)	0.047	20	20 (100)	0 (0.0)	NE	0.38
Rapid antigen detection test (RADT) result															
Negative	13	8 (61.5)	5 (38.5)	Ref		34	29 (85.3)	5 (14.7)	Ref		64	64 (100)	0 (0)	Ref	
Positive	97	20 (20.6)	77 (79.4)	6.16 (1.82-20.88)	0.004	75	26 (34.7)	49 (65.3)	10.93 (3.78-31.60)	<0.001	40	22 (55.0)	18 (45.0)	NE	0.03
Uncertain	9	6 (66.7)	3 (33.3)	0.80 (0.13-4.75)	0.81	8	7 (87.5)	1 (12.5)	0.83 (0.08-8.27)	0.87	13	11 (84.6)	2 (15.4)	NE	<0.001
SARS-CoV2 RT-PCR															
Median Ct value (IQR)	120	28.5 (25.0-33.4)	21.8 (20.3-25.0)		<0.001	120	31.3 (27.4-35.6)	24.7 (22.9-27.4)		<0.001	120	35.5 (31.4-40.0)	26.7 (24.4-28.3)		0.002
Negative result	8	6 (75.0)	2 (25.0)	Ref		13	13 (100)	0 (0.0)	Ref		46	46 (100)	0 (0.0)	Ref	

Positive result	112	28 (25.0)	84 (75.0)	9.00 (1.72-47.17)	0.01	107	51 (47.7)	56 (52.3)	NE	<0.001	74	52 (70.3)	22 (29.7)	NE	<0.001
RT-PCR cycle threshold (Ct) (reference: negative RT-PCR)															
Ct value: 27 – 34	26	15 (57.7)	11 (42.3)	2.20 (0.37-13.04)	0.39	52	36 (69.2)	16 (30.8)	Ref (CT ≥27)		49	40 (81.6)	9 (18.4)	Ref (CT ≥27)	
Ct value: 23 - <27	27	9 (33.3)	18 (66.7)	6.00 (1.00-35.91)	0.05	39	13 (33.3)	26 (66.7)	6.12 (2.56-14.66)	<0.001	21	10 (47.6)	11 (52.4)	9.67 (1.21-77.12)	0.03
Ct value: 20 - <23	38	3 (7.9)	35 (92.1)	35.00 (4.79-255.47)	0.001	13	2 (15.4)	11 (84.6)	16.84 (3.37-84.17)	<0.001	4	2 (50.0)	2 (50.0)	10.63 (3.55-31.86)	<0.001
Ct value: <20	21	1 (4.8)	20 (95.2)	60.00 (4.60-782.36)	0.002	3	0 (0.0)	3 (100)	NE	0.02	0	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	NE	NE
SARS-CoV-2 lineage															
BA.2	73	21 (28.8)	52 (71.2)	Ref		73	39 (53.4)	34 (46.6)	Ref		73	62 (84.9)	11 (15.1)	Ref	
BA.1	14	0 (0.0)	14 (100.0)	NE	0.02	14	1 (7.1)	13 (92.9)	14.91 (1.85-199.99)	0.01	14	8 (57.1)	6 (42.9)	4.23 (1.23-14.57)	0.02
BA.4/5	13	3 (23.1)	10 (76.9)	1.35 (0.34-5.38)	0.67	12	8 (66.7)	4 (33.3)	0.57 (0.16-2.07)	0.40	13	10 (76.9)	3 (23.1)	1.69 (0.40-7.14)	0.48
Others (BQ.1, XBB.1, recombinant, unknown)	21	10 (47.6)	11 (52.4)	0.44 (0.16-1.20)	0.11	21	16 (76.2)	5 (23.8)	0.36 (0.12-1.08)	0.07	21	19 (90.5)	2 (9.5)	0.59 (0.12-2.91)	0.52
Severity of symptoms															
Asymptomatic	5	3 (60.0)	2 (40.0)	Ref		19	11 (57.9)	8 (42.1)	Ref		43	38 (88.4)	5 (11.6)	Ref	
Very mild (able to carry out regular activities of daily living)	105	28 (26.7)	77 (73.3)	4.12 (0.65-25.99)	0.13	92	50 (54.3)	42 (45.7)	1.16 (0.43-3.14)	0.78	73	58 (79.5)	15 (20.5)	1.97 (0.66-5.86)	0.23
Mild (Unable to carry out regular activities of daily living)	9	3 (33.3)	6 (66.7)	3.00 (0.31-28.84)	0.34	6	1 (16.7)	5 (83.3)	6.87 (0.67-70.81)	0.11	1	1 (100)	0 (0.0)	NE	1.000
Evolution of symptoms															
Symptoms are better or entirely gone	92	30 (32.6)	62 (67.4)	Ref		105	61 (58.1)	44 (41.9)	Ref		112	92 (82.1)	20 (17.9)	Ref	
Symptoms are the same or worse than before	27	4 (14.8)	23 (85.2)	2.78 (0.88-8.77)	0.08	12	1 (8.3)	11 (91.7)	4.81 (1.90-122.49)	0.01	5	5 (100)	0 (0.0)	NE	0.59
Symptomatology															
Fever and antipyretics use (last 24h)															
No fever, without antipyretics use	55	22 (40.0)	33 (60.0)	Ref		79	48 (60.8)	31 (39.2)	Ref		95	83 (87.4)	12 (12.6)	Ref	
No fever, with antipyretics use	55	9 (16.4)	46 (83.6)	3.41 (1.39-8.34)	0.007	35	12 (34.3)	23 (65.7)	2.97 (1.29-6.82)	0.01	21	13 (61.9)	8 (38.1)	4.26 (1.46-12.39)	0.008
Fever	9	3 (33.3)	6 (66.7)	1.33 (0.30-5.90)	0.71	3	2 (66.7)	1 (33.3)	0.77 (0.07-8.91)	0.84	1	1 (100)	0 (0.0)	NE	1.000
Presence of any symptom (last 48h)	91	22 (24.2)	69 (75.8)	2.35 (0.97-5.72)	0.06	78	38 (48.7)	40 (51.3)	1.68 (0.77-3.69)	0.19	66	52 (78.8)	14 (21.2)	2.02 (0.72-5.69)	0.18
Median Number of symptoms (IQR)	119	3 (42.9)	4 (57.1)	NA	0.14	117	2 (40)	3 (60)	NA	0.07	117	1 (33.3)	2 (66.7)	NA	0.41

Chills	15	1 (6.7)	14 (93.3)	6.51 (0.8251.59)	0.08	7	2 (28.6)	5 (71.4)	3.00 (0.56-16.13)	0.20	4	3 (75.0)	1 (25.0)	1.65 (0.16-16.72)	0.67
Cough	79	20 (25.3)	59 (74.7)	1.58 (0.70-3.62)	0.27	67	31 (46.3)	36 (53.7)	1.89 (0.90-4.00)	0.09	54	41 (75.9)	13 (24.1)	2.54 (0.93-6.92)	0.07
Fatigue	59	12 (20.3)	47 (79.7)	2.27 (1.00-5.16)	0.051	44	22 (50.0)	22 (50.0)	1.21 (0.57-2.56)	0.62	36	27 (75.0)	9 (25.0)	2.12 (0.79-5.69)	0.14
Myalgia	33	7 (21.2)	26 (78.8)	1.70 (0.66-4.40)	0.27	18	6 (33.3)	12 (66.7)	2.60 (0.90-7.50)	0.08	11	9 (81.8)	2 (18.2)	1.09 (0.22-5.46)	0.92
Sore throat	48	9 (18.8)	39 (81.3)	2.36 (0.98-5.64)	0.06	32	16 (50.0)	16 (50.0)	1.18 (0.52-2.66)	0.69	19	18 (94.7)	1 (5.3)	0.23 (0.03-1.84)	0.17
Headache	44	10 (22.7)	34 (77.3)	1.60 (0.68-3.77)	0.28	26	10 (38.5)	16 (61.5)	2.13 (0.87-5.21)	0.10	16	14 (87.5)	2 (12.5)	0.66 (0.14-3.16)	0.60
Dizziness	12	4 (33.3)	8 (66.7)	0.78 (0.22-2.78)	0.70	15	5 (33.3)	10 (66.7)	2.53 (0.81-7.94)	0.11	11	10 (90.9)	1 (9.1)	0.46 (0.06-3.79)	0.47
Rhinorrhea and/or congestion	82	19 (23.2)	63 (76.8)	2.26 (0.98-5.20)	0.055	65	31 (47.7)	34 (52.3)	1.16 (0.77-3.38)	0.20	47	36 (76.6)	11 (23.4)	2.07 (0.78-5.48)	0.14
Diarrhea	16	4 (25.0)	12 (75.0)	1.23 (0.37-4.13)	0.73	11	4 (36.4)	7 (63.6)	2.11 (0.58-7.66)	0.25	4	2 (50.0)	2 (50.0)	5.28 (0.70-39.93)	0.11
Loss of appetite	28	8 (28.6)	20 (71.4)	1.00 (0.39-2.55)	1.00	21	7 (33.3)	14 (66.7)	2.68 (0.99-7.24)	0.052	16	11 (68.8)	5 (31.3)	2.61 (0.79-8.57)	0.12

Footnote:

^a Regardless of timing of last vaccine dose

^b Among 121 participants with data on infectivity on day 5, 2 had missing information for RADT result and symptoms and 1 have missing information on RT-PCR CT result; among 120 participants with data on infectivity on day 7, 3 had missing information for RADT result and symptoms; among 121 participants with data on infectivity on day 10, 4 had missing information for RADT result and symptoms and 1 have missing information on RT-PCR CT result.

^c Means were compared using student's t-test, proportions were compared using chi-square or fisher exact test when appropriate

Abbreviations: IQR, interquartile range; Ref, reference category; NE, No estimate could be calculated due to perfect correlation; NA, not applicable; RADT, Rapid antigen detection test; Ct, RT-PCR cycle threshold value

Table 3. Comparison of rapid antigen detection test results of healthcare workers with primary vs recurrent COVID-19

	Day 5 of infection			Day 7 of infection			Day 10 of infection		
	Primary COVID-19 N (%)	Recurrent COVID-19 N (%)	P-value	Primary COVID-19 N (%)	Recurrent COVID-19 N (%)	P-value	Primary COVID-19 N (%)	Recurrent COVID-19 N (%)	P-value
RADT result (n)	100	20		99	19		98	19	
Positive RADT	86 (86.0)	11 (57.9)	0.005	73 (73.7)	3 (15.8)	<0.001	40 (40.8)	0 (0.0)	<0.001
Negative RADT	7 (7.0)	6 (31.6)		18 (18.2)	16 (84.2)		45 (45.9)	19 (100)	
Uncertain RADT	7 (7.0)	2 (10.5)		8 (8.1)	0 (0.0)		13 (13.3)	0 (0.0)	

Abbreviation: RADT, Rapid antigen detection test

Table 4. Predictors of infectivity among HCWs with COVID-19 (multivariate analysis)

	Day 5 (n=121)			Day 7 (n=117)			Day 10 (n=117)		
	Adjusted OR	95% CI	P-value	Adjusted OR	95% CI	P-value	Adjusted OR	95% CI	P-value
Female sex	0.42	0.09-2.06	0.287	1.28	0.31-5.34	0.73	0.83	0.16-4.18	0.82
Age (years)									
20-39	Ref			Ref			Ref		
40-59	0.50	0.15-1.68	0.26	1.43	0.47-4.34	0.52	1.28	0.36-4.63	0.70
60-77	0.17	0.02-1.63	0.12	0.52	0.06-4.71	0.56	2.54	0.25-26.31	0.43
Immunity status stratified by timing of last vaccine and previous COVID-19									
No previous infection & last vaccine dose ≥6 months ago	Ref			Ref			Ref		
No previous infection & last vaccine dose <6 months ago	0.27	0.03-2.33	0.23	7.50	0.89-62.83	0.06	1.41	0.14-14.15	0.77
Previous infection, last vaccine dose > or < 6 months ago ^a	0.005	0.002-0.16	0.003	0.14	0.003-6.61	0.32	NE		
RADT result									
Negative	Ref			Ref			NE		
Positive	0.69	0.11-4.43	0.70	3.20	0.74-13.91	0.12	NE		
Uncertain	0.14	0.1-1.48	0.10	0.07	0.002-1.82	0.11	NE		
SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR Ct									
≥27 (including negative)	Ref			Ref			Ref		
23 - <27	1.30	0.29-5.62	0.73	4.81	1.52-15.25	0.008	12.39	3.32-46.20	<0.001
14 - <23	22.75	3.89-133.05	<0.001	182.30	8.83-3764.36	0.001	24.71	1.53-398.50	0.02
SARS-CoV-2 lineage^b									

BA.1, BA.2 and subvariants	Ref			Ref			Ref		
BA.4, BA.5, BQ.1, XBB and subvariants	4.14	0.50-33.97	0.19	3.13	0.46-21.43	0.24	2.95	0.52-16.70	0.22
Evolution of symptoms									
Symptoms are better or entirely gone	Ref			Ref			NE		
Symptoms are the same or worse than before	0.52	0.11-2.57	0.42	18.67	0.98-355.49	0.05	NE		
Fever and antipyretic use^c									
No fever, without antipyretics use	Ref			Ref			Ref		
No fever, with antipyretics use	4.83	1.30-17.98	0.85	1.32	0.40-4.35	0.65	4.16	1.00-16.95	0.047
Fever	1.21	0.18-8.17	0.85	NA			NA		

Footnote:

^a Regardless of timing of last vaccine dose

^b For 9 individuals with missing information, lineage BA.1 / BA.2 or lineage BA.4 / BA.5 / BQ.1 / XBB were assigned based on circulating variants at the date of testing

^c For the analyses of day 7 and day 10, “fever” and “no fever, with antipyretic use” were considered a single category

Abbreviations: CI, confidence interval; NE, not estimable; NA, not applicable; OR, odds ratio; RADT, Rapid antigen detection test; Ref, reference category; RT-PCR Ct, cycle threshold of real-time polymerase chain reaction




FIGURE 1. Flow diagram of participant selection into the study and proportion of infective participants at each follow-up visit.




FIGURE 2. Box plot with overlaid jitter plot comparing SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR Cycle threshold, rapid antigen diagnostic test (RADT) result and viral culture positivity at day 5, 7 and 10 of COVID-19 infection among 121 healthcare workers.

Footnote: The horizontal line in each box indicates the median, whereas the top and bottom of the boxes represent the 75th and 25th percentile, respectively. Error bars represent 95% confidence intervals. Negative RT-PCR results were attributed a Ct-value of 40 to facilitate data visualization.




FIGURE 3. Box plot comparing *SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR Cycle threshold* at day 5, 7 and 10 of primary vs. recurrent COVID-19 infection.

Footnote: The horizontal line in each box indicates the median, whereas the top and bottom lines represent the 75th and 25th percentile, respectively. Error bars represent 95% confidence intervals. Negative RT-PCR results were attributed a Ct-value of 40 to facilitate data visualization. Comparison between primary vs recurrent infections assessed by Mann-Whitney U test.




FIGURE 4. Performance of return-to-work criteria for healthcare workers with COVID-19. Panel A shows the performance of the US Centers for Diseases Control and Prevention (US CDC) Return to Work criteria on a cohort of healthcare workers with COVID-19. Panel B shows the performance of an alternative set of criteria derived from the current study. Panel C compares the CDC and alternative criteria.