

# Evaluation of SARS-CoV-2 existence in blood, urine, and rectal swab in positive patients with different virus titers

**Mahdiah Mondanizadeh**

Arak University of Medical Sciences

**Ensiyeh Rahimi**

Arak University of Medical Sciences

**Hossein Sarmadian**

Arak University of Medical Sciences

**Mohammad Jamalian**

Arak University of Medical Sciences

**Behzad Khansarinejad** (✉ [b\\_khansarinejad@yahoo.com](mailto:b_khansarinejad@yahoo.com))

Arak University of Medical Sciences

---

## Research article

**Keywords:** COVID-19, Coronavirus, SARS-CoV-2

**Posted Date:** April 12th, 2020

**DOI:** <https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-20499/v1>

**License:**   This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

[Read Full License](#)

---

**Version of Record:** A version of this preprint was published at Jundishapur Journal of Microbiology on November 18th, 2020. See the published version at <https://doi.org/10.5812/jjm.106534>.

# Abstract

Understanding the spreading routes of SARS-CoV-2 is crucial for patient management and defining biosafety strategies for public and health care workers. In the current study, the virus shedding in upper respiratory as well as blood, stool, and urine specimens of infected patients was examined using reverse transcription real-time PCR assay (RT-qPCR).

## Background

Since the emergence and spread of severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) in late 2019 from Wuhan (Hubei province, China), several countries have reported sporadic imported cases among travelers returning from China [1, 2]. The disease has become a global concern and now is spreading rapidly across the globe. The symptoms of the disease include fever, dry cough, fatigue, myalgia and dyspnea. In addition some patients might suffer from headache, dizziness, abdominal pain, diarrhea, nausea and vomiting [3]. Onset of disease may lead to progressive respiratory failure due to alveolar damage and even death [4]. On April 7, 2020, a total of laboratory confirmed 1348628 cases had been reported in at least 184 countries, causing more than 74834 deaths [5]. In Iran, first cases of virus was diagnosed on 18 February in the respiratory samples of two patients from Qom city. The third case were diagnosed at the same date in Arak city, by the specialized virology laboratory of Emam-Reza clinic (Arak, Iran). Until April 7, a total number of 60500 laboratory confirmed cases and 3 death were reported from the country.

The spreading routes of the virus has been a great concern, both for public and health care workers. Answering this question is essential in patient management and defining biosafety strategies. Therefore, in the current study, the virus shedding in respiratory, blood, stool, and urine samples of infected patients was examined using reverse transcription real-time PCR (RT-qPCR) assay.

## Methods

### Study setting and design

The oropharyngeal/nasopharyngeal swab specimens, in viral transport media (VTM), from suspected patients hospitalized at the hospitals of Markazi province were referred to the Specialized Virology laboratory of EmamReza clinic (Arak University of Medical Sciences, Arak, Iran). A total number of 50 patients with high (Cq value < 22, n = 30), moderate (Cq value 22–32, n = 10), and low (Cq value 35–39, n = 10), virus titer in their respiratory specimens were enrolled in the current study (20 February to 4 March). There were 21 (42%) female and 29 (58%) male, with a mean age of 46 year (range, 26 to 81 years). Since no quantitative RT-qPCR assay has been used for determination of SARS-CoV-1 viral load, patients were selected based on the Cq (cycle of quantification) values of the qualitative real-time PCR assay for the E gene of the virus. The day after reporting laboratory result, another oropharyngeal/nasopharyngeal swab sample along with 3 ml blood, 5 ml urine, and rectal swab sample (in VTM) of the sample patients were

requested to be sent to the Virology laboratory and subjected to RNA extraction and Real-time PCR assay. Informed and written consent were obtained from each patient prior to enrollment. The data of patients of the current study have not been neither reported nor will be submitted for any other publication. The study was approved by the Ethics Committee of Arak University of Medical Sciences, in accordance with the declaration of Helsinki (ethics number IR.ARAKMU.REC.1398.340).

### RNA extraction and qualitative Real-time PCR

Viral RNA was extracted using QIAamp DSP Virus Kit (Qiagen, Hilden, Germany) in QIAcube extractor machines (Qiagen), based on the standard protocol of the manufacturer. Reverse-transcription Real-time PCR (RT-qPCR) assays were performed by LightMix SarbecoV E-Gene plus EAV control (TIB MOLBIOL, Berlin, Germany) using QuantiNova Pathogen + IC master mix (Qiagen) in LightCycler®96 instruments (Roche Diagnostics, Mannheim, Germany). The oligonucleotide primer-probes are based on the hydrolysis probe technology that are designed for the E-gene (first line screening assay) and RdRp-gene (confirmatory assay) [6]. Reaction was set up in a 20- $\mu$ l volume containing 5  $\mu$ l master mix, 0.6 M of each primer, 0.3 M of each specific probe, and 5  $\mu$ l of extracted RNA. The amplification profile consisted of reverse-transcription at 50 °C for 10 min, a single cycle of enzyme activation at 95 °C for 2 min followed by 45 cycles of denaturation at 95 °C for 10 s and 60 °C for 30 s with a single fluorescence acquisition. To ensure the quality of specimen collection and the absence of PCR inhibitors, amplification of human RnaseP gene was used as internal control, in separate tubes and based on the above-mentioned reaction conditions.

## Statistical analysis

The difference between Cq values of two successive respiratory specimens and the internal control gene in different samples was compared using the paired-sample t-test and One-way ANOVA, respectively. P-values of less than 0.05 were considered statistically significant. All statistical analyses were calculated using SPSS software (version 16; SSPS Inc., 184 Chicago, IL, USA).

## Results

The results of RT-qPCR assay indicates that SARS-CoV-2 was detectable in all respiratory specimens and no positive results were observed in the urine samples of all patients. The viral genome was diagnosed in 3 blood sample (5%) and 2 rectal swab (3.3%). The Cq (Cycle of quantification) value of positive results on the stool and blood samples of positive individuals were greater than 4 Cq above the value of the respiratory specimen of the same patient. No patients showed both positive blood and stool sample at the same time. The Cq value of the internal control gene used as an indicator for specimen quality and the lack of inhibitors in the amplification reaction, and was arbitrarily defined to be < 26. There was not a significant difference in the Cq values of two successive respiratory specimens of the patients (P = 0.465 by paired-sample t-test). The mean Cq values of the internal control gene was higher in the blood samples, nevertheless, the difference was not statistically significant (one-way ANOVA). To

evaluate the accuracy of the negative results, all rectal swab, blood and urine specimens, were reassessed using 2019-nCoV Nucleic Acid Diagnostic kit (Sansure biotech, Changsha, China), and the results remained negative.

## Discussion

Within a few weeks of emergence of the SARS-CoV-2 virus and the COVID-19 disease, controversy exists about the routes of viral spread and its existence in different biological samples. Understanding the routes of the virus shedding is essential in terms of defining biosafety for health care workers and the society and managing patients in hospitals or home isolation. The probable existence of SARS-CoV-2 in different biological samples have been evaluated in a few studies [7–9]. Although some reports declare that the virus is detected in the blood sample [7], the others could not diagnose it in the blood [9]. To our knowledge, no report study has been reported the detection of SARS-CoV-2 in the urine sample. On the other hand, the viral RNA is reported in the fecal sample of more than 30% of patients [7].

Our data of confirms the lack of viral genome in the urine. The result is discordant with the study conducted by Xie et al. that the virus is not detected in the blood of infected patients [9]. Additionally, the viral RNA was detected in the 3.3% rectal swab of infected patients. In the current study, we categorizes the study population based on the virus titer in their respiratory specimen, to try to cover patients with different stages of the disease. The major group consisted of the patients whose virus titer in their upper-respiratory secretion was high, assuming that this group experiencing the acute onset of the disease. The virus in the upper-respiratory mucosa of this group was high, and hence, the virus could have been detected if it had existed in the blood or stool. Patients with moderate or low titer of the virus were either on the late phase of the disease or very beginning of viral infection and there was a possibility that in these stages the patients might have been viremic. The other advantage of the current study was to evaluate the internal control gene in all analyzed specimens, in order to prevent false negative results due to the poor sample collection. In the current study the virus is detected in 5% of individuals, 2 with high and 1 with moderate virus titer. The percentage of positive result in the current study is comparable to the data obtained by Wang et al. [10]. On the other hand, the discordant percentage of positive rectal swab between this and previous studies might be due to the sample size, type and quality of specimens, and genetic variations between two populations. In the current study, rectal swab was used, but in a few studies stool samples were examined directly. Additionally, none of patients in our study had diarrhea, while in some reports diarrheal samples were also examine [9]. Some studies were also examined pediatrics samples and the age and physiological differences between different age group might be considered as a contributing factor. Finally, the genetic variations between the population in china and Iran may be a factor that should not be easily neglected. Despite the difference in the percentage of positive stools samples in different studies and the fact that only a few of patients have positive result, the positive RT-qPCR in stool does not necessarily reflect the active replication of the virus in gastrointestinal tract and it seems that the residual viral RNA from digested virus in the digestive system makes template for RT-qPCR.

## Conclusion

The results of the current study showed that the SARS-CoV-2 is mainly detected in the respiratory samples. The virus is not detectable in the urine and only a few blood and stool. The importance of viremia in virus spread in human population through transfusion needs further investigation.

## Abbreviations

RT-qPCR: Reverse transcription Real-Time PCR assay; Cq: Cycle of quantification.

## Declarations

### - Ethics approval and consent to participate

The study was approved by the Ethics Committee of Arak University of Medical Sciences, in accordance with the declaration of Helsinki (ethics number IR.ARAKMU.REC.1398.340).

### - Consent to publish

Not applicable.

### - Availability of data and materials

Not applicable

### - Competing interests

The authors declare that they have no competing interests

### - Funding

This study was supported by a grant from the Deputy for research and technology, Arak University of Medical Sciences. The funders had no role in study design, data collection and analysis, decision to publish, or preparation of the manuscript.

### - Authors' Contributions

MM and BK participated in the design of the study, ER drafted the manuscript, HS revised manuscript critically for important intellectual content and MJ and BK managed the project implementation the study. All authors read and approved the final version of the manuscript.

### - Acknowledgements

The authors thank Elham Taheri, Somayeh Salimi, and Masoumeh Jamshidi for their assistance in this research.

## References

1. Zhu N, Zhang D, Wang W, Li X, Yang B, Song J, Zhao X, Huang B, Shi W, Lu R, et al. A Novel Coronavirus from Patients with Pneumonia in China, 2019. *N Engl J Med*. 2020;382(8):727–33.
2. Coronavirus disease. **(COVID-2019) situation reports**. 2020.
3. Wang D, Hu B, Hu C, Zhu F, Liu X, Zhang J, Wang B, Xiang H, Cheng Z, Xiong Y, et al: **Clinical Characteristics of 138 Hospitalized Patients With 2019 Novel Coronavirus-Infected Pneumonia in Wuhan, China**. *JAMA* 2020.
4. Zhou P, Yang XL, Wang XG, Hu B, Zhang L, Zhang W, Si HR, Zhu Y, Li B, Huang CL, et al. A pneumonia outbreak associated with a new coronavirus of probable bat origin. *Nature*. 2020;579(7798):270–3.
5. Dong E, Du H, Gardner L. **An interactive web-based dashboard to track COVID-19 in real time**. 2020.
6. Corman VM, Landt O, Kaiser M, Molenkamp R, Meijer A, Chu DKW, Bleicker T, Brunink S, Schneider J, Schmidt ML, et al: **Detection of 2019 novel coronavirus (2019-nCoV) by real-time RT-PCR**. *Euro Surveill* 2020, 25(3).
7. Zhang J, Wang S, Xue Y. **Fecal specimen diagnosis 2019 novel coronavirus-infected pneumonia**. *J Med Virol* 2020.
8. Zhang W, Du RH, Li B, Zheng XS, Yang XL, Hu B, Wang YY, Xiao GF, Yan B, Shi ZL, et al. Molecular and serological investigation of 2019-nCoV infected patients: implication of multiple shedding routes. *Emerg Microbes Infect*. 2020;9(1):386–9.
9. Xie C, Jiang L, Huang G, Pu H, Gong B, Lin H, Ma S, Chen X, Long B, Si G, et al: **Comparison of different samples for 2019 novel coronavirus detection by nucleic acid amplification tests**. *Int J Infect Dis* 2020.
10. Wang W, Xu Y, Gao R, Lu R, Han K, Wu G, Tan W: **Detection of SARS-CoV-2 in Different Types of Clinical Specimens**. *JAMA* 2020.