Estimation of SARS-CoV-2 aerosol emissions from simulated patients with COVID-19 and no to moderate symptoms

A.A.Prof. Dr. Michael Riediker[1], Dr. Dai-Hua Tsai[1,2]

1 Swiss Centre for Occupational and Environmental Health, Winterthur, Switzerland

2 Department of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry and Psychotherapy, University Hospital of Psychiatry Zurich, University of Zurich, Zurich, Switzerland

Date of revision: 2 June 2020

Word counts: Abstract: 302, Manuscript: 2398, Tables: 1, Figures: 3

Address for correspondence

Michael Riediker

michael.riediker@alumni.ethz.ch

+41 77 431 08 58

Swiss Centre for Occupational and Environmental Health (SCOEH)

Binzhofstrasse 87

CH-8404 Winterthur

Switzerland

Key Points

Question: How much SARS-CoV-2 virus is released from a case by breathing and coughing, and what is the resulting concentration in a room?

Finding: In this mathematical modelling study, both, breathing and coughing were estimated to release large numbers of viruses, which can lead to billions of virus copies/m^3 in a poorly ventilated room with a coughing emitter.

Meaning: These results may explain the important rate of transmissions and implies the need for strict respiratory protection when people are in the same room with a case with COVID-19.

Abstract

Importance: Cases of the coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) with no or mild symptoms were reported to frequently transmit the disease even without direct contact. The severe acute respiratory syndrome virus (SARS-COV-2) was found at very high concentrations in swab and sputum of such cases.

Objective: We aimed to estimate in a mathematical modeling study the virus release from such cases into different aerosol sizes by normal breathing and coughing, and what exposure can result from this in a room shared with such as case.

Data Sources and Model: We combined the size-distribution of exhaled breath microdroplets for coughing and normal breathing with viral sputum concentrations as approximation for lung lining liquid to obtain an estimate of emitted virus levels. The resulting emission data fed a single-compartment model of airborne concentrations in a room of 50 m^3, the size of a small office or medical exam room.

Results: The estimated viral load in microdroplets emitted by simulated patients while breathing normally was on average 0.0049 copies/cm^3 and could go up to 24.5 copies/cm^3. The corresponding numbers for coughing simulated patients were 277 copies/cm^3 and 1,385,777 /cm^3, respectively, per cough. The resulting concentrations in a room with a coughing emitter were always very high, up to 286 million copies/m^3. However, also regular breathing microdroplets from high emitters was modelled to lead to several thousand copies/m^3.

Conclusions and Relevance: In this modelling study, breathing and coughing were estimated to release large numbers of viruses, ranging from thousands to billions of virus copies/m^3 in a room with an emitter having a high viral load, depending on ventilation and microdroplet formation process. These findings suggest that strict respiratory protection may be needed when there is a chance to be in the same room with a patient - whether symptomatic or not - especially for a prolonged time.

Introduction

The novel Coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19), emerged in late 2019 in Wuhan, China [1] from where it spread to the entire world. COVID-19 is caused by a novel type of Coronavirus, the severe acute respiratory syndrome virus (SARS-COV-2) [2]. The host-receptor for SARS-CoV-2 was found to be Angiotensin I converting enzyme 2 (ACE2), which is present in cells of the lungs and airways [3]. In the early phase of the outbreak, a large number of patients hospitalized for other reasons [4] and a considerable proportion of the medical staff [5] contracted COVID-19. However, the attack rate among medical staff corresponded to community rates when respiratory personal protective equipment (PPE) was used at work [6,7]. Also a series of community-transmissions were reported from cases that had no apparent symptoms [8–11]. The estimates for community and household attack rates are currently in the

range of 1 % and 10 %, respectively [12–15]. However, during super-spreading events in situations where many people engaged in loud voice activities gathered in closed rooms for prolonged time, such as a restaurant [16], a call-center [17], a dermatologists scientific board meeting [18], and a choir rehearsal [19] attack rates above 75% were reported. Notably, the choir rehearsal participants tried to follow social distancing and hand washing rules. These super-spreading events suggest that the airborne route may represent a virus transmission form in some indoor situations. Indeed, a study conducted in a Wuhan hospital found low airborne concentrations of the virus in the intensive care unit and in medical staff rooms [20]. Correspondences about the viral load in samples from patients with COVID-19 having no or only mild symptoms reported very high concentrations of SARS-CoV-2 in samples taken in the nose, throat and saliva [11,21–23], and high during antiviral treatment [24]. This all raised the question whether transfections could occur via the air.

When coughing, humans release thousands of microdroplets per cubic-centimeter in the size range of 0.6 to 15 µm, with the droplet concentration increasing strongly with cough flow rate [25]. But also normal breathing will lead to some microdroplet production, which is attributed to fluid film rupture in the respiratory bronchioles during inhalation leading to the formation of droplets that are released during exhalation [26]. The size of these droplets is mostly below 1 µm [27]. The mode of droplet generation implies that they consist of lung lining liquid including dispersed viruses. Indeed, human volunteers exposed to virus-sized nanoparticles show nano-scaled particles in their exhaled breath [28,29]. Also, the described size distribution of particles emitted from coughing as well as normal respiration suggests that an important proportion of them will be able to remain airborne for many hours in turbulent conditions [30].

Objectives

This study aimed to estimate the cumulative viral load released from simulated patients with COVID-19 with no to moderate symptoms in different microdroplet sizes via respiration and coughing. We then used this information to make a risk appraisal for the situation of a low, average or high emitter that is either breathing normally or coughing in a room operated at different air exchange rates. We chose a room size that is similar to a medical examination room or an office shared by two to three people.

Design and Methods

Concept:

The release of viruses from individual simulated patients was modeled by first calculating the viral load per exhaled microdroplets formed during normal breathing and while coughing. The resulting size-distribution provided an initial estimate of the concentration of SARS-CoV-2 virus copies released by a regularly breathing or coughing simulated patient. This viral emission factor was then fed into a well-mixed one-compartment model to simulate the situation in a closed room with different ventilation air exchange rates. This study follows the concept of Strengthening The Reporting of Empirical Simulation Studies (STRESS) guideline [31]. This mathematical modelling corresponds to a meta-analysis and was as such exempt from ethics approval.

Data sources:

Data on the number of viral copies present in sputum and swab samples were used to estimate the SARS-CoV-2 viral load present in the lining liquid of respiratory bronchioles in patients published before the here presented modelling (May 2020) [11,21–24,32], specifically 1,000 copies/ml representing a low-virus producing patient ("low emitter"), an "average emitter" producing 10^6 copies/ml, and a "high emitter" producing 5*10^9 copies/ml.

111 Exhaled microdroplet size distributions and numbers were retrieved from published studies
112 on healthy persons coughing [25] and breathing normally [26]. Both studies assessed the size-
113 number distribution of freshly emitted microdroplets. The concentration of viral copies in
114 each microdroplet size was calculated from the volume of the microdroplets, the actual
115 count number in each size and the above-mentioned virus-load per ml sputum. The viral
116 load in the actual microdroplet counts in each microdroplet size was then used to calculate
117 the total viral concentration. The cumulative emissions in the PM_{10} fraction were summed
118 up after applying the standard size fractionation curves [33] to the microdroplet distribution.

119 ## Model:

120 A one-compartment model [34] estimated the virus load concentration C for a perfectly mixed
121 room of volume V_R of 50 m^3 with one simulated patient as source, using the following mass-
122 balance (equation 1):

123 $$V_R * \frac{dC}{dt} = c_{PM10} * RR * V_t - V_R * \mathrm{ER} * C(t) - \frac{ln(2) * V_R}{t_{½}} * C(t) \qquad (1)$$

124 The emission rate was calculated from the concentration c_{PM10}, the viral load in the PM_{10}-
125 size range, which are particles collected with a 50% efficiency cut-off at 10 µm aerodynamic
126 diameter; and a respiratory rate of 15 breaths per minute (RR) at a tidal volume of V_t of 500
127 ml per breath. Air exchange rates (ER) used were 1-, 3-, 10- and 20-times per hour. The virus'
128 half-life $t_{½}$ of 1.1 hours was obtained from an experimental study about the persistence of
129 SARS-CoV-2 on surfaces and when airborne [35], tested by assessing the 50% tissue culture
130 infective dose ($TCID_{50}$).

131 The model for coughing was identical, except that coughing was assumed to happen every
132 30 seconds at a volume of 250 ml, as described for chronic dry cough patient (not having
133 COVID-19) [36].

All statistics and models were calculated using Stata/SE 15.1 (Mac 64-bit Intel, Rev. 03 Feb 2020, StataCorp, College Station, TX, USA). Robust data reported include estimated averages and ranges. The models and code are available on request.

Results

Emissions from normal breathing simulated patients

To estimate the virus emissions from simulated patients breathing normally, we first calculated the viral load for the microdroplet size distribution. Figure 1 shows that the highest virus load is present in the largest microdroplet size. The cumulative total emission per breath was 0.0000049 copies/cm^3(air) for a low emitter, 0.0049 copies/cm^3 for an average simulated patient, and 24.5 copies/cm^3 for a high emitter. The cumulative emissions in the PM_{10} fraction were approximately 1/3 of these values with 0.0017 copies/cm^3 (average) and 8.69copies/cm^3 (high) per breath.

Emission from coughing simulated patient

We then estimated the virus emissions from a coughing simulated patient (Figure 2). The cumulative total emission per cough was 0.277 copies/cm^3 for a low emitter, 277 copies/cm^3 for an average simulated patient, and 1,385,777 copies/cm^3 for a high emitter. The cumulative emissions in the PM_{10} fraction were about 1/2 of these values with 10,900 copies/cm^3 (average) and 366,000 copies/cm^3 (high) per cough.

Exposure estimation for bystanders

To estimate the exposure of bystanders spending time in the same room as a person with COVID-19, we calculated the time-course of the viral load in the thoracic size fraction for small droplets released from a high-emitter either breathing normally or coughing. Figure 3 shows the results for a high-emitting simulated patient coughing frequently.

For a typical hospital ventilation situation of 10 air exchanges per hour, the concentration plateaus after about 30 minutes, while for a typical office with 3 air exchanges/hour, concentrations continue to rise for over one hours. In the used model, concentrations scale linearly with the simulated patient emission rate, the plateau concentrations for different emitting simulated patients and ventilation types are summarized in Table 1.

Discussion

An elevated number of viruses is expected to be released by patients with COIVD-19 having high viral load in the form of airborne microdroplets, especially when they are coughing. While the bigger portion of the emitted viral load is in the form of large droplets that can deposit rapidly, there is also an important portion in the smaller size fractions. Small microdroplets can remain airborne for an extended time [30] and are very effective at reaching the lungs [37].

One study assessed airborne SARS-CoV-2 levels in a hospital in Wuhan, China and found concentrations in the range of 20 copies/m^3 in medical staff offices and meeting rooms [20], concentrations that our modelling would suggest for a small room with a regularly breathing non-symptomatic person having a viral load slightly above an average emitter.

An average person breathes about a half m^3 per hour in resting state [38], which can rapidly increase to several m^3 during exercise [39]. Thus, a person spending time in a room with an average emitting patient breathing normally has the chance of inhaling only a few copies of the virus when keeping distance from that person. However, the situation is worse in the presence of a high emitter and worst if the patient is a coughing high emitter. A review of a wide range of respiratory viruses suggests that the infective dose is often quite low. Sometimes as few as few hundred units of active virus ($TCID_{50}$) [40] seem sufficient to provoke a disease. Thus, our modelling suggests that there is a clear risk of infections for a person

181 spending an extended time in the room with an infected person having an elevated viral
182 load, even if the distance is too large for direct transmission. The situation is worse if the
183 person is coughing.

184 High emitters are not very frequent in the population. However, if such a person is engaged
185 in activities such as loud speaking or singing, microdroplet formation and thus viral
186 emissions can rapidly increase by one to two orders of magnitude [41]. This may help explain
187 the occasional superspreading events in crowded situations involving loud voices [16–19].

188 The occasionally very high virus load in exhaled respiratory microdroplets proposed by our
189 assessment may be an explanation why COVID-19 was associated with more transfections to
190 hospital staff than what was expected from SARS [4]. While having everybody wear a surgical
191 face mask can be an effective source control [42], the protective factors may still be
192 insufficient if an extended amount of time is spent in the same room with a coughing high
193 emitter, especially if the room is small and the ventilation low. Increasing ventilation can
194 help to some extent but is not sufficient in a room of the size of a typical office or medical
195 exam room. Note also that ventilation design for hospitals is complex and not always
196 functioning as intended [43].

197 The implications for the normal life and the workplace are that the risk of infection is real
198 when being near an infected person with high viral load in a room for more than a few
199 minutes and this even when keeping distance to that person. Sharing a workplace in a small
200 room with a non-symptomatic case seems not advised. This implies that workplaces should
201 not be shared as long as there are no rapid tests to differentiate between healthy and non-
202 symptomatic cases. Medical staff is advised to wear the best possible respiratory protection
203 whenever in the same room as a patient, especially when this person is coughing, in which
204 case eye protection is advised as well [44]. In addition, every patient, also non-symptomatic

205 ones, should wear a well-fitting surgical face mask to reduce emissions, which will increase
206 the overall protection for the medical staff [42].

207 Limitations

208 Our assessment has a number of limitations. Namely: 1) The estimated virus levels strongly
209 depend on the number of virus copies produced by a case with COVID-19. We used sputum
210 data from a well described peer-reviewed study [21] assuming that it is a reasonable
211 approximation for the virus load in the respiratory bronchioles, the space where most
212 respiratory microdroplets are formed. Our high-emitter estimates would be 100-fold higher
213 if the most extreme correspondence data was used [22]. 2) We used information about virus
214 copies but compare the results with $TCID_{50}$ infective dose. Research on other virus types
215 suggests that the number of virus copies and $TCID_{50}$ are comparable [45]. However, it would be
216 important to confirm this relationship for the case of SARS-CoV-2. 3) For breath and cough
217 microdroplets release, we used data collected in experimental setups involving healthy
218 young subjects. However, microdroplet formation is influenced by surface tension of the
219 lung lining liquid [46]. It is likely that microdroplet formation will be altered in cases with
220 COVID-19 but it is not clear in which direction. 4) Microdroplets will shrink in dry air [47],
221 resulting in a shift to smaller particle sizes. This will not directly change the number of copies
222 in the PM_{10} range but simply upconcentrate the viral load per microdroplet. While we
223 addressed passivation of viruses in the air by using the documented half-life [35], it is still
224 possible that viruses in smaller droplets are quicker passivated because of shorter diffusion
225 distances for airborne oxidants and faster increasing salinity. Our estimates would be slightly
226 smaller if this was relevant. 5) The one-compartment model assumes perfectly mixed
227 conditions. However, often, rooms are not perfectly mixed and also ventilation and room
228 geometry will add spatiotemporal variability. The modelling provides an average estimate,
229 but exact concentrations will vary in function of the real circumstances. In multi-room

230 situations, numerical flow simulations seem indicated to describe the microdroplet
231 distribution [48]. 6) Finally, though our results suggest that in certain situations, airborne
232 transmission of COVID-19 may be possible, it is important to keep in mind that this was a
233 modelling effort. While this route would provide a convenient explanation for several
234 superspreading events [16–19], and even though the virus was found in airborne microdroplets
235 in hospital situations [20], it still needs to be validated in clinical settings and animal models.

236 ## Conclusions

237 In conclusion, our mathematical modelling suggests that the viral load in the air can rapidly
238 reach critical concentrations in small and ill-ventilated rooms, especially when the patient is
239 a super-spreader defined as a person emitting large number of microdroplets containing a
240 high viral load. Thus, strict respiratory protection is needed whenever there is a chance to be
241 in the same room with such a patient - whether symptomatic or not - especially if this was
242 for a prolonged time.

243 # Acknowledgments

244 This modelling was entirely funded by the Swiss Centre for Occupational and Environmental
245 Health (SCOEH). No external funder had any role in the design and conduct of the study;
246 collection, management, analysis, and interpretation of the data; preparation, review, or
247 approval of the manuscript; and decision to submit the manuscript for publication. Both
248 authors had full access to all the data in the study and take responsibility for the integrity of
249 the data and the accuracy of the data analysis.

250 # References

251 1. Zhu N, Zhang D, Wang W, et al. A Novel Coronavirus from Patients with Pneumonia
252 in China, 2019. *N Engl J Med*. 2020;382(8):727-733. doi:10.1056/NEJMoa2001017

253 2. Gorbalenya AE, Baker SC, Baric RS, et al. *Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome-*
254 *Related Coronavirus: The Species and Its Viruses – a Statement of the Coronavirus Study*
255 *Group*. Microbiology; 2020. doi:10.1101/2020.02.07.937862

256 3. Qi F, Qian S, Zhang S, Zhang Z. Single cell RNA sequencing of 13 human tissues
257 identify cell types and receptors of human coronaviruses. *Biochem Biophys Res Commun*.
258 Published online March 2020:S0006291X20305234. doi:10.1016/j.bbrc.2020.03.044

259 4. Wang D, Hu B, Hu C, et al. Clinical Characteristics of 138 Hospitalized Patients With
260 2019 Novel Coronavirus–Infected Pneumonia in Wuhan, China. *JAMA*. 2020;323(11):1061.
261 doi:10.1001/jama.2020.1585

262 5. Chu J, Yang N, Wei Y, et al. Clinical characteristics of 54 medical staff with COVID-
263 19: A retrospective study in a single center in Wuhan, China. *J Med Virol*. Published online
264 April 6, 2020:jmv.25793. doi:10.1002/jmv.25793

265 6. Kluytmans-van den Bergh MFQ, Buiting AGM, Pas SD, et al. Prevalence and Clinical
266 Presentation of Health Care Workers With Symptoms of Coronavirus Disease 2019 in 2
267 Dutch Hospitals During an Early Phase of the Pandemic. *JAMA Netw Open*.
268 2020;3(5):e209673. doi:10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2020.9673

269 7. Cheng VC-C, Wong S-C, Yuen K-Y. Estimating Coronavirus Disease 2019 Infection
270 Risk in Health Care Workers. *JAMA Netw Open*. 2020;3(5):e209687.
271 doi:10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2020.9687

272 8. Bai Y, Yao L, Wei T, et al. Presumed Asymptomatic Carrier Transmission of COVID-
273 19. *JAMA*. Published online February 21, 2020. doi:10.1001/jama.2020.2565

274 9. Kimball A, Hatfield KM, Arons M, et al. Asymptomatic and Presymptomatic SARS-
275 CoV-2 Infections in Residents of a Long-Term Care Skilled Nursing Facility - King County,
276 Washington, March 2020. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep*. 2020;69(13):377-381.
277 doi:10.15585/mmwr.mm6913e1

278 10. Li R, Pei S, Chen B, et al. Substantial undocumented infection facilitates the rapid
279 dissemination of novel coronavirus (SARS-CoV2). *Science*. Published online March 16,
280 2020. doi:10.1126/science.abb3221

281 11. Zou L, Ruan F, Huang M, et al. SARS-CoV-2 Viral Load in Upper Respiratory
282 Specimens of Infected Patients. *N Engl J Med*. 2020;382(12):1177-1179.
283 doi:10.1056/NEJMc2001737

284 12. Cheng H-Y, Jian S-W, Liu D-P, et al. Contact Tracing Assessment of COVID-19
285 Transmission Dynamics in Taiwan and Risk at Different Exposure Periods Before and After
286 Symptom Onset. *JAMA Intern Med*. Published online May 1, 2020.
287 doi:10.1001/jamainternmed.2020.2020

288 13. Bi Q, Wu Y, Mei S, et al. Epidemiology and transmission of COVID-19 in 391 cases
289 and 1286 of their close contacts in Shenzhen, China: a retrospective cohort study. *Lancet*
290 *Infect Dis*. Published online April 2020:S1473309920302875. doi:10.1016/S1473-
291 3099(20)30287-5

292 14. Li W, Zhang B, Lu J, et al. The characteristics of household transmission of COVID-
293 19. *Clin Infect Dis*. Published online April 17, 2020:ciaa450. doi:10.1093/cid/ciaa450

294 15. COVID-19 National Emergency Response Center, Epidemiology and Case
295 Management Team, Korea Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Coronavirus Disease-
296 19: Summary of 2,370 Contact Investigations of the First 30 Cases in the Republic of Korea.
297 *Osong Public Health Res Perspect*. 2020;11(2):81-84. doi:10.24171/j.phrp.2020.11.2.04

298 16. Lu J, Gu J, Li K, et al. COVID-19 Outbreak Associated with Air Conditioning in
299 Restaurant, Guangzhou, China, 2020. *Emerg Infect Dis*. 2020;26(7).
300 doi:10.3201/eid2607.200764

301 17. Shin Young Park, Young-Man Kim, Seonju Yi, et al. Coronavirus Disease Outbreak
302 in Call Center, South Korea. *Emerg Infect Dis J*. 2020;26(8). doi:10.3201/eid2608.201274

303 18. Hijnen D, Marzano AV, Eyerich K, et al. SARS-CoV-2 Transmission from
304 Presymptomatic Meeting Attendee, Germany. *Emerg Infect Dis*. 2020;26(8).
305 doi:10.3201/eid2608.201235

306 19. Hamner L, Dubbel P, Capron I, et al. High SARS-CoV-2 Attack Rate Following
307 Exposure at a Choir Practice — Skagit County, Washington, March 2020. *MMWR Morb*
308 *Mortal Wkly Rep*. 2020;69(19):606-610. doi:10.15585/mmwr.mm6919e6

309 20. Liu Y, Ning Z, Chen Y, et al. Aerodynamic analysis of SARS-CoV-2 in two Wuhan
310 hospitals. *Nature*. Published online April 27, 2020. doi:10.1038/s41586-020-2271-3

311 21. Wölfel R, Corman VM, Guggemos W, et al. Virological assessment of hospitalized
312 patients with COVID-2019. *Nature*. Published online April 1, 2020. doi:10.1038/s41586-020-
313 2196-x

314 22. Pan Y, Zhang D, Yang P, Poon LLM, Wang Q. Viral load of SARS-CoV-2 in clinical
315 samples. *Lancet Infect Dis*. 2020;20(4):411-412. doi:10.1016/S1473-3099(20)30113-4

316 23. Pasomsub E, Watcharananan SP, Boonyawat K, et al. Saliva sample as a non-invasive
317 specimen for the diagnosis of coronavirus disease-2019 (COVID-19): a cross-sectional study.
318 *Clin Microbiol Infect*. Published online May 2020:S1198743X20302780.
319 doi:10.1016/j.cmi.2020.05.001

320 24. Zheng S, Fan J, Yu F, et al. Viral load dynamics and disease severity in patients
321 infected with SARS-CoV-2 in Zhejiang province, China, January-March 2020: retrospective
322 cohort study. *BMJ*. Published online April 21, 2020:m1443. doi:10.1136/bmj.m1443

323 25. Yang S, Lee GWM, Chen C-M, Wu C-C, Yu K-P. The Size and Concentration of
324 Droplets Generated by Coughing in Human Subjects. *J Aerosol Med*. 2007;20(4):484-494.
325 doi:10.1089/jam.2007.0610

326 26. Johnson GR, Morawska L. The Mechanism of Breath Aerosol Formation. *J Aerosol*

Med Pulm Drug Deliv. 2009;22(3):229-237. doi:10.1089/jamp.2008.0720

27. Papineni RS, Rosenthal FS. The Size Distribution of Droplets in the Exhaled Breath of Healthy Human Subjects. *J Aerosol Med*. 1997;10(2):105-116. doi:10.1089/jam.1997.10.105

28. Gschwind S, Graczyk H, Günther D, Riediker M. A method for the preservation and determination of welding fume nanoparticles in exhaled breath condensate. *Env Sci Nano*. 2016;3(2):357–364. doi:10.1039/C5EN00240K

29. Sauvain J-J, Hohl MSS, Wild P, Pralong JA, Riediker M. Exhaled breath condensate as a matrix for combustion-based nanoparticle exposure and health effect evaluation. *J Aerosol Med Pulm Drug Deliv*. 2014;27(6):449–458. doi:10.1089/jamp.2013.1101

30. Willeke K, Baron PA, eds. *Aerosol Measurement: Principles, Techniques, and Applications*. Van Nostrand Reinhold; 1993.

31. Monks T, Currie CSM, Onggo BS, Robinson S, Kunc M, Taylor SJE. Strengthening the reporting of empirical simulation studies: Introducing the STRESS guidelines. *J Simul*. 2019;13(1):55-67. doi:10.1080/17477778.2018.1442155

32. The COVID-19 Investigation Team. Clinical and virologic characteristics of the first 12 patients with coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) in the United States. *Nat Med*. Published online April 23, 2020. doi:10.1038/s41591-020-0877-5

33. BSI. *EN 481:1993 Workplace Atmospheres. Size Fraction Definitions for Measurement of Airborne Particles*. BSI; 1993.

34. Scheff PA, Paulius VK, Curtis L, Conroy LM. Indoor Air Quality in a Middle School, Part II: Development of Emission Factors for Particulate Matter and Bioaerosols. *Appl Occup Environ Hyg*. 2000;15(11):835-842. doi:10.1080/10473220050175715

35. van Doremalen N, Bushmaker T, Morris DH, et al. Aerosol and Surface Stability of SARS-CoV-2 as Compared with SARS-CoV-1. *N Engl J Med*. Published online March 17,

2020:NEJMc2004973. doi:10.1056/NEJMc2004973

36. Hsu JY, Stone RA, Logan-Sinclair RB, Worsdell M, Busst CM, Chung KF. Coughing frequency in patients with persistent cough: assessment using a 24 hour ambulatory recorder. *Eur Respir J*. 1994;7(7):1246-1253. doi:10.1183/09031936.94.07071246

37. Lippmann M, Yeates DB, Albert RE. Deposition, retention, and clearance of inhaled particles. *Br J Ind Med*. 1980;37(4):337–62.

38. Beardsell I, ed. *Get through MCEM. Part A: MCQs*. RSM; 2011.

39. Ramos CA, Reis JF, Almeida T, Alves F, Wolterbeek HT, Almeida SM. Estimating the inhaled dose of pollutants during indoor physical activity. *Sci Total Environ*. 2015;527-528:111-118. doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2015.04.120

40. Yezli S, Otter JA. Minimum Infective Dose of the Major Human Respiratory and Enteric Viruses Transmitted Through Food and the Environment. *Food Environ Virol*. 2011;3(1):1-30. doi:10.1007/s12560-011-9056-7

41. Asadi S, Wexler AS, Cappa CD, Barreda S, Bouvier NM, Ristenpart WD. Aerosol emission and superemission during human speech increase with voice loudness. *Sci Rep*. 2019;9(1):2348. doi:10.1038/s41598-019-38808-z

42. Patel RB, Skaria SD, Mansour MM, Smaldone GC. Respiratory source control using a surgical mask: An *in vitro* study. *J Occup Environ Hyg*. 2016;13(7):569-576. doi:10.1080/15459624.2015.1043050

43. Grosskopf KR, Herstein KR. The aerodynamic behavior of respiratory aerosols within a general patient room. 2012;18(4):15.

44. Chen M-J, Chang K-J, Hsu C-C, Lin P-Y, Liu CJ-L. Precaution and Prevention of Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) Infection in the Eye: *J Chin Med Assoc*. Published online April 2020:1. doi:10.1097/JCMA.0000000000000334

45. Kim J-O, Kim W-S, Kim S-W, et al. Development and Application of Quantitative Detection Method for Viral Hemorrhagic Septicemia Virus (VHSV) Genogroup IVa. *Viruses*. 2014;6(5):2204-2213. doi:10.3390/v6052204

46. Edwards DA, Man JC, Brand P, et al. Inhaling to mitigate exhaled bioaerosols. *Proc Natl Acad Sci*. 2004;101(50):17383-17388. doi:10.1073/pnas.0408159101

47. Holmgren H, Bake B, Olin A-C, Ljungström E. Relation Between Humidity and Size of Exhaled Particles. *J Aerosol Med Pulm Drug Deliv*. 2011;24(5):253-260. doi:10.1089/jamp.2011.0880

48. Chang T-J, Hsieh Y-F, Kao H-M. Numerical investigation of airflow pattern and particulate matter transport in naturally ventilated multi-room buildings. *Indoor Air*. 2006;16(2):136-152. doi:10.1111/j.1600-0668.2005.00410.x

Figure legends

Figure 1: Size distribution of exhaled microdroplets (left) and resulting viral emissions (right) during normal breathing.

The left panel shows the average exhaled microdroplet concentration used as input for the simulation, the right panel shows the modelled viral emission per breath for average (red), high and low emitters (spike-lines).

Figure 2: Size distribution of exhaled microdroplets (left) and resulting viral emissions (right) during coughing.

The left panel shows the average exhaled microdroplet concentration used as input for the simulation, the right panel shows the modelled viral emission per breath for average (red), high and low emitters (spike-lines).

Figure 3: Temporal course of airborne virus load in a perfectly mixed room of 50 m^3.

The simulation estimated the concentration in a closed room for different air exchange rates. The emitter was assumed to have a high virus-load in the lungs and to be coughing intermittently every 30 seconds.

Tables

Table 1: Plateau concentration for different combinations of air exchange rate, emission form and emitter type.

Air exchange rate (times / hour)	1 / hour	3 / hour	10 / hour	20 / hour
Time until 99% of plateau	169 minutes	77 minutes	26 minutes	14 minutes
	Airborne viral concentration at plateau (copies/m^3)			
Regular breathing				
Low emitter	0.00960	0.00431	0.00147	0.00076
Average emitter	9.60	4.31	1.47	0.76
High emitter	47,989	21,550	7,359	3,792
Frequent coughing (every 30 seconds)				
Low emitter	57.25	25.71	8.78	4.52
Average emitter	57,250	25,709	8,779	4,524
High emitter	286,300,000	128,600,000	43,897,000	22,619,000


Aerosol droplets per breath [dN/dlogD$_p$/cm^3]
1.5
1
.5
0
.5
1
2
5
10
20
Aerosol size [μm]


Virus load in exhaled breath [dN/dlogD$_p$ /cm^3]
1.0e+02
1.0e+00
1.0e-02
1.0e-04
1.0e-06
.5
1
2
5
10
20
Aerosol size [μm]


6000
4000
2000
0
Aerosol droplets per cough [dN/dlogD$_p$/cm^3]
.5
1
2
5
10
20
Aerosol size [μm]


1.0e+06
1.0e+04
1.0e+02
1.0e+00
1.0e-02
Virus load in exhaled cough [dN/dlogD$_p$/cm^3]
.5
1
2
5
10
20
Aerosol size [μm]


1/hour
3/hour
10/hour
20/hour
Airborne virus load for high emitter cough
[copies/m³ in PM10]
350,000,000
300,000,000
250,000,000
200,000,000
150,000,000
100,000,000
50,000,000
0
0
20
40
60
80
100
120
140
160
180
Minutes