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Background

Severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) virus infection is presumed to reduce the risk of subsequent infection for at least 6 months [1]; however, when the antibody titer decreases and immunity wanes, SARS-CoV-2 reinfection is possible [2]. While cases of reinfection have been reported in several countries [3], it is challenging to distinguish between ongoing infection and reinfection [4]. Here, we present a cluster of cases of SARS-CoV-2 reinfection in a long-term care facility, detected 1 month after the initial infection, with reinfection confirmed by genetic sequencing.

Methods

From October 1 to 4, 2021, an outbreak of SARS-CoV-2 infected 39 people in a long-term care facility, including 9 healthcare workers and all inpatients on a floor. The outbreak lasted 3 days. The residents who tested positive for SARS-CoV-2 by reverse transcription polymerase chain reaction (RT-PCR) were transferred to other facilities for isolation and necessary treatment. The residents were released from at least 10 days of isolation on a clinical condition-based or test-based criteria in accordance with COVID-19 response guidelines (10–1st Edition) [5]. On October 26, 2 inpatients on another floor developed fevers and tested positive for SARS-CoV-2 by RT-PCR. Fourteen close contacts subsequently tested positive. This second outbreak led to facility-wide testing, leading to the detection of 12 re-positive cases on the floor where the first outbreak occurred.
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Between November 1 and 11, nasopharyngeal swab samples were collected from the 12 re-positive cases daily for the first 5 days and then every other day for 6 days (a further three times) to confirm RT-PCR re-positivity and to monitor changes in the cycle threshold (Ct) values. A substantial decrease in Ct value was observed in 5 cases, from an average of 33.64 in the first outbreak to 17.21 in the second outbreak.

In order to confirm reinfection, whole genome sequencing (WGS) was performed for the viral RNAs of specimens collected at two different time points during the first (2 out of 12 cases) and second (7 out of 12 cases) outbreaks. The sequences were aligned with MAFFT v7 [6], and maximum likelihood phylogenetic trees were inferred using FastTree v2.1.9 [7]. Viral culture was also conducted using nasopharyngeal specimens. On days 1 and 15 after the RT-PCR (Table 1). Result

### Genomic analysis of the two outbreaks

WGS showed that the two outbreaks were due to the delta variant, but the lineage was different. The lineage AY.122 was confirmed in 2 out of 12 cases in the first outbreak, and these 2 cases of AY.122 were closely related to 3 additional cases that occurred in the same facility at the same time as the first outbreak. The lineage AY.69 was confirmed in 7 out of 12 cases in the second outbreak, and these 7 cases of AY.69 were also closely related to 3 additional cases from the second outbreak. Therefore, it was confirmed that each outbreak was caused by different lineages of viruses, indicating reinfection (Fig. 1).

### Virus culture

Viruses were isolated in 1 case of the first outbreak and 5 cases of the second outbreak of 12 re-positive patients in those who showed considerable decreases in Ct values and observed the cytopathic

---

### Table 1

| Case   | Age (y) | Re-infection | Outcome | Sitting (Manufacturer) | Vaccine status | C<sub>t</sub> | C<sub>t</sub> | Viral lineage | C<sub>t</sub> | Viral lineage | C<sub>t</sub> | C<sub>t</sub> | Viral lineage | C<sub>t</sub> | Viral lineage | C<sub>t</sub> | Viral lineage | C<sub>t</sub> | Viral lineage | C<sub>t</sub> | Viral lineage | C<sub>t</sub> | Viral lineage | C<sub>t</sub> | Viral lineage | C<sub>t</sub> | Viral lineage | C<sub>t</sub> | Viral lineage | C<sub>t</sub> | Viral lineage | C<sub>t</sub> | Viral lineage | C<sub>t</sub> | Viral lineage | C<sub>t</sub> | Viral lineage | C<sub>t</sub> | Viral lineage | C<sub>t</sub> | Viral lineage | C<sub>t</sub> | Viral lineage | C<sub>t</sub> | Viral lineage | C<sub>t</sub> | Viral lineage | C<sub>t</sub> | Viral lineage | C<sub>t</sub> | Viral lineage | C<sub>t</sub> | Viral lineage | C<sub>t</sub> | Viral lineage | C<sub>t</sub> | Viral lineage | C<sub>t</sub> | Viral lineage | C<sub>t</sub> | Viral lineage | C<sub>t</sub> | Viral lineage | C<sub>t</sub> | Viral lineage | C<sub>t</sub> | Viral lineage | C<sub>t</sub> | Viral lineage | C<sub>t</sub> | Viral lineage | C<sub>t</sub> | Viral lineage | C<sub>t</sub> | Viral lineage | C<sub>t</sub> | Viral lineage | C<sub>t</sub> | Viral lineage | C<sub>t</sub> | Viral lineage | C<sub>t</sub> | Viral lineage | C<sub>t</sub> | Viral lineage | C<sub>t</sub> | Viral lineage | C<sub>t</sub> | Viral lineage | C<sub>t</sub> | Viral lineage | C<sub>t</sub> | Viral lineage | C<sub>t</sub> | Viral lineage | C<sub>t</sub> | Viral lineage | C<sub>t</sub> | Viral lineage | C<sub>t</sub> | Viral lineage | C<sub>t</sub> | Viral lineage | C<sub>t</sub> | Viral lineage | C<sub>t</sub> | Viral lineage | C<sub>t</sub> | Viral lineage | C<sub>t</sub> | Viral lineage | C<sub>t</sub> | Viral lineage | C<sub>t</sub> | Viral lineage | C<sub>t</sub> | Viral lineage | C<sub>t</sub> | Viral lineage | C<sub>t</sub> | Viral lineage | C<sub>t</sub> | Viral lineage | C<sub>t</sub> | Viral lineage | C<sub>t</sub> | Viral lineage | C<sub>t</sub> | Viral lineage | C<sub>t</sub> | Viral lineage | C<sub>t</sub> | Viral lineage | C<sub>t</sub> | Viral lineage | C<sub>t</sub> | Viral lineage | C<sub>t</sub> | Viral lineage | C<sub>t</sub> | Viral lineage | C<sub>t</sub> | Viral lineage | C<sub>t</sub> | Viral lineage | C<sub>t</sub> | Viral lineage | C<sub>t</sub> | Viral lineage | C<sub>t</sub> | Viral lineage | C<sub>t</sub> | Viral lineage | C<sub>t</sub> | Viral lineage | C<sub>t</sub> | Viral lineage | C<sub>t</sub> | Viral lineage | C<sub>t</sub> | Viral lineage | C<sub>t</sub> | Viral lineage | C<sub>t</sub> | Viral lineage | C<sub>t</sub> | Viral lineage | C<sub>t</sub> | Viral lineage | C<sub>t</sub> | Viral lineage | C<sub>t</sub> | Viral lineage | C<sub>t</sub> | Viral lineage | C<sub>t</sub> | Viral lineage | C<sub>t</sub> | Viral lineage | C<sub>t</sub> | Viral lineage | C<sub>t</sub> | Viral lineage | C<sub>t</sub> | Viral lineage | C<sub>t</sub> | Viral lineage | C<sub>t</sub> | Viral lineage | C<sub>t</sub> | Viral lineage | C<sub>t</sub> | Viral lineage | C<sub>t</sub> | Viral lineage | C<sub>t</sub> | Viral lineage | C<sub>t</sub> | Viral lineage | C<sub>t</sub> | Viral lineage | C<sub>t</sub> | Viral lineage | C<sub>t</sub> | Viral lineage | C<sub>t</sub> | Viral lineage | C<sub>t</sub> | Viral lineage | C<sub>t</sub> | Viral lineage | C<sub>t</sub> | Viral lineage | C<sub>t</sub> | Viral lineage | C<sub>t</sub> | Viral lineage | C<sub>t</sub> | Viral lineage | C<sub>t</sub> | Viral lineage | C<sub>t</sub> | Viral lineage | C<sub>t</sub> | Viral lineage | C<sub>t</sub> | Viral lineage | C<sub>t</sub> | Viral lineage | C<sub>t</sub> | Viral lineage | C<sub>t</sub> | Viral lineage | C<sub>t</sub> | Viral lineage | C<sub>t</sub> | Viral lineage | C<sub>t</sub> | Viral lineage | C<sub>t</sub> | Viral lineage | C<sub>t</sub> | Viral lineage | C<sub>t</sub> | Viral lineage | C<sub>t</sub> | Viral lineage | C<sub>t</sub> | Viral lineage | C<sub>t</sub> | Viral lineage | C<sub>t</sub> | Viral lineage | C<sub>t</sub> | Viral lineage | C<sub>t</sub> | Viral lineage | C<sub>t</sub> | Viral lineage | C<sub>t</sub> | Viral lineage | C<sub>t</sub> | Viral lineage | C<sub>t</sub> | Viral lineage | C<sub>t</sub> | Viral lineage | C<sub>t</sub> | Viral lineage | C<sub>t</sub> | Viral lineage | C<sub>t</sub> | Viral lineage | C<sub>t</sub> | Viral lineage | C<sub>t</sub> | Viral lineage | C<sub>t</sub> | Viral lineage | C<sub>t</sub> | Viral lineage | C<sub>t</sub> | Viral lineage | C<sub>t</sub> | Viral lineage | C<sub>t</sub> | Viral lineage | C<sub>t</sub> | Viral lineage | C<sub>t</sub> | Viral lineage | C<sub>t</sub> | Viral lineage | C<sub>t</sub> | Viral lineage | C<sub>t</sub> | Viral lineage | C<sub>t</sub> | Viral lineage | C<sub>t</sub> | Viral lineage | C<sub>t</sub> | Viral lineage | C<sub>t</sub> | Viral lineage | C<sub>t</sub> | Viral lineage | C<sub>t</sub> | Viral lineage | C<sub>t</sub> | Viral lineage | C<sub>t</sub> | Viral lineage | C<sub>t</sub> | Viral lineage | C<sub>t</sub> | Viral lineage | C<sub>t</sub> | Viral lineage | C<sub>t</sub> | Viral line
effects of inoculated Vero E6 cell., suggesting reinfection (Table 1, Supplementary Fig. S1).

**SARS-CoV-2 serological assays for the two outbreaks**

SARS-CoV-2 IgM antibody was detected in the re-positive samples in 5 out of 11 cases (excluding the patient who died). Specifically, 3 patients who were IgM negative on the day 1 sample from the second outbreak were IgM positive on day 14. The neutralizing antibody titers against delta variant increased in 7 cases and decreased in 4 cases. The increased IgM and neutralizing antibody titers reflect a boost of immunity due to reinfection. Therefore, the serology results suggest that 7 out of 12 RT-PCR re-positive cases were due to reinfection (Table 1).

**Discussion**

Shedding of infectious SARS-CoV-2 usually ends within 10–20 days of symptom onset, but RT-PCR results may remain positive for more than 8 weeks [8–10]. In other words, since it is difficult to distinguish between reinfection and re-positivity in some cases, reinfection is proposed as positive PCR result after 90 days of first episode, and additional analysis such as WGS are required to confirm reinfection within 90 days [11]. In the reinfection cases confirmed between 4 and 9 weeks in South Korea, the United States and Ecuador, genetically different viruses were identified in each episode through WGS, and seroconversion of IgM and IgG or increased antibody levels were confirmed in the second infection [12–14].

In this study, based on the epidemiological, genomic and serological analyses, undetermined 12 RT-PCR re-positive cases were investigated and 8 cases were classified as confirmed reinfection and 4 cases as presumed reinfection, despite of the short interval between the first and second outbreaks (29–33 days) and a history of full vaccination in 7 of the 12 re-positive cases. To our knowledge, this is the first confirmed cluster of cases of reinfection to be reported in a long-term care facility, which is a setting where residents are at ongoing risk of infection given the closed environment and close contact between residents. Notably, a decline in the immune response with age and the presence of underlying health conditions can offset the protective effect generated by previous infection or vaccination when residents in long-term care facilities are exposed to a distinct lineage of SARS-CoV-2, even a short period after recovery, as clearly shown in this study.

This study suggests that a package of COVID 19 infection prevention and control measures are still of paramount importance when caring for older adults in long-term care, regardless of their vaccination status and previous infection history. In light of the emergence of SARS-CoV-2 variants and a growing body of evidence
of waning immunity following infection and vaccination, the current definition of reinfection needs to be reconsidered for case management and surveillance.
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