

QUANTITATIVE ASSESSMENT OF THE RISK OF AIRBORNE TRANSMISSION OF SARS-COV-2 INFECTION: PROSPECTIVE AND RETROSPECTIVE APPLICATIONS

4 G. Buonanno^{1,2}, L. Morawska², L. Stabile^{1,*}

⁷ Department of Civil and Mechanical Engineering, University of Cassino and Southern Lazio, Cassino, FR, Italy

⁹ International Laboratory for Air Quality and Health, Queensland University of Technology, Brisbane, Qld,
¹⁰ Australia

12 *Corresponding author:

L3 Luca Stabile

14 Department of Civil and Mechanical Engineering,

15 University of Cassino and Southern Lazio, Cassino, FR, Italy

16 Via G. Di Biasio 43, 03043 Cassino (FR), Italy

17 e-mail: l.stabile@unicas.it

18 Abstract

Airborne transmission is a recognized pathway of contagion; however, it is rarely quantitatively evaluated. This study presents a novel approach for quantitative assessment of the individual infection risk of susceptible subjects exposed in indoor microenvironments in the presence of an asymptomatic infected SARS-CoV-2 subject. The approach allowed the maximum risk for an exposed healthy subject to be evaluated or, starting from an acceptable risk, the maximum

24 exposure time. We applied the proposed approach to four distinct scenarios for a prospective
25 assessment, highlighting that, in order to guarantee an acceptable individual risk of 10^{-3} for
26 exposed subjects in naturally ventilated indoor environments, the exposure time should be
27 shorter than 20 min. The proposed approach was used for retrospective assessment of
28 documented outbreaks in a restaurant in Guangzhou (China) and at a choir rehearsal in Mount
29 Vernon (USA), showing that, in both cases, the high attack rate values can be justified only
30 assuming the airborne transmission as the main route of contagion. Moreover, we shown that
31 such outbreaks are not caused by the rare presence of a superspreadер, but can be likely
32 explained by the co-existence of conditions, including emission and exposure parameters, leading
33 to a highly probable event, which can be defined as a “superspreading event”.

34

35 **Keywords:** SARS-CoV-2 (COVID-19) assessment; virus airborne transmission; indoor; ventilation;
36 coronavirus.

37

38 1. Introduction

39 The airborne transmission of a virus and the consequent contagion risk assessment is a complex
40 issue that requires multidisciplinary knowledge. It is necessary to understand the characteristics
41 and mechanisms behind the generation of respiratory microdroplets ^{1,2}, the survival of viruses in
42 microdroplets ³, the transport of microdroplets and human exposure to them ⁴, and the airflow
43 patterns that carry microdroplets in buildings ⁵. Expiratory human activities generate virus-
44 carrying microdroplets that are small enough to remain aloft in air during exhalation, talking, and
45 coughing ^{2,6,7}. Atomization occurs in the respiratory tract, and droplets are expelled at high speed
46 during expiration ^{8,9}. Toques of liquid originating from different areas of the upper respiratory
47 tract are drawn out from the surface and broken into droplets of different sizes ¹⁰. The findings of

48 early investigations ^{11–13} served as a foundation for subsequent studies involving temporal and
49 spatial visualization methods using high-speed cameras ¹⁴, particle image velocimetry ⁸ and, above
50 all, increasingly accurate particle counters ⁶, which have facilitated the detailed characterization
51 and quantitation of droplets expelled during various forms of human respiratory exhalation flows.
52 The issue of the viral load emitted, however, remained difficult to solve. In the past, backward
53 calculation was used to estimate the emission of an infected subject based on retrospective
54 assessments of infectious outbreaks only at the end of an epidemic ^{15–18}. This led to the definition
55 of emission values for each virus regardless of the type of respiratory act and the metabolic
56 activity of the infected subject. Recently, the authors presented an approach to evaluate the viral
57 load emitted by infected individuals with a view to provide new predictive capacities, not currently
58 available ¹⁹. This approach, based on the oral viral load and the infectivity of the virus, takes into
59 account the effect of other parameters such as inhalation rate, type of respiratory activity, and
60 activity level, to estimate the quanta emission rate. This value provides key information for
61 engineers and indoor air quality experts to simulate airborne dispersion of diseases in indoor
62 environments. Indeed, the use of exposure risk models in closed environments ^{20,21} makes it
63 possible to estimate contagion starting from the emission values of a contagious subject.
64 The overall approach of emission and exposure modelling represents an essential tool to be
65 applied in enclosed spaces, and can support air quality experts and epidemiologists in the
66 management of indoor environments during an epidemic for both prospective and retrospective
67 assessments.
68 In this paper we apply a novel approach that takes into account the characteristics of the emitting
69 subject, the microenvironment, and the exposed subject to calculate the probability of infection
70 and the individual risk, for both prospective and retrospective assessments of airborne infectious
71 transmission of SARS-CoV-2. In the case of prospective assessment, various exposure scenarios in

72 indoor environments were analyzed in order to assess the influence of risk mitigation parameters.
73 In the case of retrospective assessment, we estimated the probability of infection and the
74 individual risk of two documented outbreaks.

75 **2. Materials and methods**

76 To evaluate both prospective and retrospective assessments of the airborne transmission of SARS-
77 CoV-2, we used a four-step approach to quantify the probability of infection, i.e. the ratio between
78 infected cases and the exposed population due to exposure in a microenvironment where a SARS-
79 CoV-2 infected subject is present. The four steps of the proposed approach are: i) evaluation of
80 the quanta emission rate; ii) evaluation of the exposure to quanta concentration in the
81 microenvironment; iii) evaluation of the dose of quanta received by an exposed susceptible
82 subject; and iv) estimation of the probability of infection on the basis of a dose-response model.
83 The simulations of the probability of airborne transmission of SARS-CoV-2 were performed
84 applying a Monte Carlo method ²². Further they adopted the infection risk assessment typically
85 implemented to evaluate the transmission dynamics of infectious diseases and to predict the risk
86 of these diseases to the public ^{17,20,21}.

87 Once the probability of infection was obtained, an approach to evaluate the individual infection
88 risk, i.e. a parameter that also takes into account how likely the probability of infection can occur,
89 was also implemented. Individual risk can be easily compared to an acceptable risk, i.e. a target
90 reference risk that could be suggested by agencies and regulatory authorities to control the
91 pandemic. In the following sections, the methodologies adopted to evaluate the probability of
92 infection based on the four step approach (section 2.1) and the individual infection risk (section
93 2.2) are described. The application of the proposed approach for prospective and retrospective
94 assessments is described in sections 2.3 and 2.4.

95 2.1 *Estimation of the probability of infection*

96 2.1.1 *Evaluation of the quanta emission rate: the forward emission approach*

97 Recently, Buonanno et al.¹⁹ proposed a forward emission approach to estimate the quanta
98 emission rate of an infectious subject on the basis of the viral load in the sputum and the
99 concentration of droplets expired during different activities. A quantum is defined as the dose of
100 airborne droplet nuclei required to infect a susceptible person. The quanta emission rate (ER_q ,
101 quanta h^{-1}) was evaluated as:

102

103
$$ER_q = c_v \cdot c_i \cdot IR \cdot \int_0^{10\mu m} N_d(D) \cdot dV_d(D) \quad (1)$$

104 where c_v is the viral load in the sputum (RNA copies mL^{-1}), c_i is a conversion factor defined as the
105 ratio between one infectious quantum and the infectious dose expressed in viral RNA copies, IR is
106 the inhalation rate ($m^3 h^{-1}$), N_d is the droplet number concentration (part. cm^{-3}), and $V_d(D)$ is the
107 volume of a single droplet (mL) as a function of the droplet diameter (D). The number and volume
108 of the droplets (V_d) is determined on the basis of data obtained experimentally by Morawska et al.
109 (2009)⁶.

110 With reference to the SARS-CoV-2 viral load in the mouth, researchers have recently found c_v
111 values of up to 10^{11} copies mL^{-1} , which is also variable in the same patient during the course of the
112 disease^{23–26}. In particular, Rothe et al.²⁴ reported a case of SARS-CoV-2 infection in which
113 transmission appears to have occurred during the incubation period in the index patient. A high
114 viral load of 10^8 copies mL^{-1} was found, confirming that asymptomatic persons are potential
115 sources of SARS-CoV-2 infection. Furthermore, Pan et al.²³, in a study on 82 SARS-CoV-2 infected
116 patients, found c_v values in the range of 10^8 – 10^9 RNA copies mL^{-1} , also in the previous days and in
117 the first days of onset of the disease. Consequently, the concentrations of the viral load in the

118 mouth can reach values of 10^9 RNA copies mL^{-1} and occasionally up to 10^{11} RNA copies mL^{-1} during
119 the course of the disease.

120 The conversion factor, c_i , i.e. the ratio between one infectious quantum and the infectious dose
121 expressed in viral RNA copies, barely represents the probability of a pathogen surviving inside the
122 host to initiate the infection; thus $c_i=1$ implicitly assumes that infection will occur for each
123 pathogen (RNA copy in the case of SARS-CoV-2) received by the exposed people. There are
124 currently no values available in the scientific literature for c_i for SARS-CoV-2. Watanabe et al.²⁷
125 estimated the infectious doses of several coronaviruses on the basis of data sets challenging
126 humans with virus HCoV-229E (known as an agent of human common cold) and animals with
127 other viruses (e.g. mice with MHV-1, considered as a surrogate of SARS-CoV-1). On the basis of the
128 orders of magnitude of the infectivity conversion factors for the overall data sets, we assumed a c_i
129 range between 0.01 and 0.1.

130 The quanta emission rate calculation was performed for four different emission profiles (which are
131 adopted in the risk evaluations described later) evaluated as a combination of expiratory activities
132 and activity levels: (i) oral breathing during resting; (ii) oral breathing during heavy activity; (ii)
133 speaking during light activity; and (iv) singing (or loudly speaking) during light activity.

134 Quanta emission rates were calculated using eq. (1) and applying a Monte Carlo method²² in order
135 to take into account for the possible variation of the input data. To this end, probability density
136 functions characteristics of each parameter were considered. In particular, we considered normal
137 distributions for: (i) the log-transformed c_v data (average and standard deviation of $\log_{10}(c_v)$ equal
138 to 8 and 0.7 \log_{10} (RNA copies mL^{-1}), respectively); and (ii) the infectious dose c_i (average and
139 standard deviation equal to 0.025 and 0.125, respectively). A distribution of quanta emission rates
140 (ER_q), was obtained as a result of application of the Monte Carlo method (Figure 1), i.e. the
141 probability density function of ER_q (pdf_q).

142 2.1.2 *Evaluation of the exposure to quanta concentration*

143 The second step in evaluating the probability of infection is evaluation of the quanta
144 concentration to which a susceptible subject is exposed. The quanta concentration at time t , $n(t)$,
145 in an indoor environment is based on the quanta mass balance proposed by Gammaitoni and
146 Nucci ²⁰, and can be evaluated as:

147

$$148 n(t) = \frac{ER_q \cdot I}{IVRR \cdot V} + \left(n_0 - \frac{ER_q \cdot I}{IVRR} \right) \cdot \frac{e^{-IVRR \cdot t}}{V} \quad (\text{quanta m}^{-3}) \quad (2)$$

149 where $IVRR$ (h^{-1}) represents the infectious virus removal rate in the space investigated, n_0
150 represents the initial number of quanta in the space, I is the number of infectious subjects, V is the
151 volume of the indoor environment considered, and ER_q is the quanta emission rate (quanta h^{-1}) for
152 the specific disease/virus under investigation. The quanta concentration calculation adopted here
153 is based on the following hypotheses: the quanta emission rate is considered to be constant, the
154 latent period of the disease is longer than the time scale of the model, and the droplets are
155 instantaneously and evenly distributed in the room ²⁰. The infectious virus removal rate is the sum
156 of three contributions ²⁸: the air exchange rate (AER) via ventilation, the particle deposition on
157 surfaces (k , e.g. via gravitational settling), and the viral inactivation (λ). The deposition rate was
158 evaluated as the ratio between the settling velocity of super-micrometric particles [roughly
159 $1.0 \times 10^{-4} \text{ m s}^{-1}$ as measured by Chatoutsidou and Lazaridis ²⁹] and the height of the emission
160 source (1.5 m); thus, k was 0.24 h^{-1} . The viral inactivation was evaluated on the basis of the SARS-
161 CoV-2 half-life (1.1 h) detected by van Doremalen et al.³, thus λ was 0.63 h^{-1} .

162 In the exposure scenarios tested with the prospective and retrospective approaches, to take the
163 variability of the input parameters into account, the indoor quanta concentration $n(t)$ was
164 determined through eq. (2), applying a Monte Carlo method that adopted the probability density
165 functions (pdf_q) characteristic of quanta emission rates (ER_q). Since the probability density

166 functions of the log-transformed $\log_{10}(\text{ER}_q)$ for the different expiratory activities resulted in a
167 normal distribution (Shapiro-Wilk test, $p < 0.01$), the quanta concentration $n(t)$ was evaluated by
168 providing a Gaussian distribution of $\log_{10}(\text{ER}_q)$ (average and standard deviation values are is
169 summarized in the results section; see Table 2) and then applying a back-transformation from
170 $\log_{10}(\text{ER}_q)$ to ER_q . The relative frequency at which a certain quanta concentration occurred for each
171 time step of simulation, i.e. the probability density function of the quanta concentration (pdf_n),
172 was also obtained as result of the Monte Carlo simulations.

173 *2.1.3 Evaluation of the dose of quanta received by an exposed susceptible subject*

174 The dose of quanta received by a susceptible subject exposed to a certain quanta concentration,
175 $n(t)$, for a certain time interval, T , can be evaluated by integrating the quanta concentration over
176 time as:

177

$$178 \quad D_q = IR \int_0^T n(t) dt \quad (\text{quanta}) \quad (3)$$

179 It can be concluded from Eq. (3) that the dose of quanta received by a susceptible subject is
180 affected by the inhalation rate (IR) and subsequently by their activity level. As an example, for the
181 same exposure scenario [i.e. identical $n(t)$ and T], the dose of quanta received by subjects
182 performing at a light activity level ($IR = 1.38 \text{ m}^3 \text{ h}^{-1}$; e.g. slowly walking) is more than double that
183 received by people just sitting or standing ($IR = 0.54 \text{ m}^3 \text{ h}^{-1}$). For the dose, in the exposure
184 scenarios described in this paper, the Monte Carlo method was applied to eq. (3) considering the
185 probability density function of the quanta concentration (pdf_n), whereas the IR was considered as
186 a constant value; thus, the probability density function of the dose (pdf_D) was obtained for each
187 time step of the simulation.

188 2.1.4 *Evaluation of the probability of infection through a dose-response model*

189 The fourth and final step in evaluating the probability of infection is the adoption of a dose-
190 response model. Several dose-response models are available in the scientific literature for
191 assessing the probability of infection of airborne-transmissible pathogens^{16,17}, including
192 deterministic and stochastic models, and threshold and non-threshold models.

193 The best-suited dose-response models for airborne transmission of pathogens are the stochastic
194 models. In particular, exponential models have been mostly adopted in previous studies because
195 of their suitability and simplicity²⁷. Such models consider the pathogens as discrete bundles (i.e.
196 quanta) distributed in a medium (e.g. saliva/sputum) in a random manner described by the
197 Poisson probability distribution. When the medium is aerosolized, the pathogen distribution in the
198 aerosols, and hence their distribution in the air, also follows the Poisson probability distribution.
199 The complex Poisson summation equations can be simplified in an exponential equation^{17,27,30}, i.e.
200 the exponential dose-response model, which evaluates the probability of infection, P_I (%), of
201 susceptible people as:

202

$$203 P_I = 1 - e^{-D_q} = \frac{c}{s} \quad (4)$$

204 For a unit dose of quanta ($D_q = 1$), the probability of infection P_I is equal to 63%, from which
205 derives the definition of “quantum” as the “amount of infectious material to infect $1-e^{-1}$ (i.e. 63%)
206 of the people in an enclosed space”^{13,20}.

207 In the exponential dose-response model, the variation of host sensitivity to the pathogen is not
208 considered. More complex models, such as the Beta-Poisson probability distribution, could take
209 this factor into account^{17,27,30}; nonetheless, in the present paper the differences in the exposed
210 population in terms of susceptibility to the virus will not be considered.

211 The probability of infection P_I evaluated in the following exposure scenarios was determined
212 through eq. (4), also applying a Monte Carlo method. To this end, the probability density functions
213 of the dose of quanta (pdf_D) obtained as a result of the Monte Carlo simulation on D_q were
214 considered; thus, a probability density function of P_I was also obtained (pdf_P).
215 The probability of infection represents the ratio between the number of infection cases (C) and
216 the number of exposed susceptibles (S). In retrospective analyses of documented outbreaks, the
217 known C/S ratio is typically defined as the “attack rate”.

218 2.2 *The individual infection risk and the basic reproduction number*

219 As stated above, the probability of infection (P_I) is the expected number of infection cases in
220 relation to the number of exposed susceptibles (C/S ratio). However, based on eqs. (2-4), such
221 probability is strongly influenced by the probability density function of the dose (pdf_D), which is
222 influenced in turn by the probability density function of the quanta concentration (pdf_n) and by
223 the probability density function of the quanta emission rate (pdf_q). In other words, for a given
224 exposure scenario (microenvironment, ventilation, inhalation rate of the exposed subject, etc.) the
225 probability of infection (P_I) can assume different values on the basis of the rate of quanta emitted
226 by the infected subject: the lower the quanta emission rates, the lower the probability of infection
227 (since all the other parameters affecting the exposure were considered to be constant values).
228 Thus, when evaluating the individual risk (R) of an exposed person, we should know both the
229 probability of infection (P_I) and the probability of occurrence of such a P_I value (P_P). The latter is
230 defined by the probability density function pdf_P . Since the probability of infection (P_I) and the
231 probability of occurrence P_P are independent events, the individual infection risk, R, can be
232 evaluated as the product of the two terms:

233

234
$$R = P_I \cdot P_P \quad (\%) \quad (5)$$

235

236 The probability density function of the individual risk, pdf_R , can be obtained by multiplying all the
237 possible P_I values obtained from the application of the Monte Carlo method to the four-step
238 approach by the corresponding probability of occurrence. The maximum value of R in eq. (5), i.e.
239 the mode of the pdf_R , is of particular interest because it represents the most probable individual
240 risk for a healthy subject or, in other words, the highest probability of being infected. In a
241 conservative application of the proposed approach to estimate and reduce the risk of individuals
242 being together with an infected individual in an indoor environment, the maximum individual
243 infection risk must be less than an acceptable risk.

244 The US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) typically uses a target reference risk range of 10^{-4}
245 to 10^{-6} for carcinogens in drinking water³¹, which is in line with World Health Organization (WHO)
246 guidelines for drinking water quality, which base guideline values for genotoxic carcinogens on the
247 upper bound estimate of an excess lifetime cancer risk of 10^{-5} ³². If the estimated lifetime cancer
248 risk is lower than 10^{-6} , the risk is considered acceptable, while risks above 10^{-4} are considered
249 unacceptable³³.

250 The choice of an acceptable contagion risk for SARS-CoV-2 is difficult and certainly questionable.
251 However, considering the mortality rate of SARS-CoV-2, this turns out to be an order of magnitude
252 lower than the corresponding value associated with carcinogenic diseases. For this reason, only for
253 discussion purposes, the value of 10^{-3} is taken as an acceptable risk reference for SARS-CoV-2.

254 For the purpose of managing an epidemic and keeping the infection under control, it is also
255 important to estimate the basic reproduction number of the infection, R_0 , which is calculated as
256 the ratio between the number of susceptible people infected (C) and the infected subject (I). Thus,
257 R_0 can be easily evaluated by multiplying the infection probability, P_I , by the number of exposed
258 susceptible individuals (S). To control an epidemic, the R_0 value must be less than 1. Therefore, in

259 addition to estimating an acceptable individual infection risk, it is necessary to specifically verify
260 that, with the crowding expected within the environment, the corresponding value of R_0 is less
261 than 1.

262 2.3 *Scenarios in the prospective assessment*

263 The proposed four-step approach was applied to different indoor microenvironments by varying
264 the main parameters in order to evaluate the effect of the influencing parameters. In particular,
265 four emission profiles of the infected subject⁶ and corresponding profiles of the healthy subjects
266 exposed were chosen. For the sake of simplicity, the simulations were run assuming that the
267 susceptible subjects remained in the microenvironment for the same length of time as the
268 infected subject (i.e. the two subjects enter and leave the environment under test together). Each
269 indoor environment under investigation was tested for three different values of air exchange rate
270 (AER). Table 1 presents a detailed summary of the four different indoor exposure scenarios
271 considered to evaluate the risk of airborne transmission of SARS-CoV-2. Scenario A consists of a
272 hospital room of 100 m³ where a resting infected patient emits quanta in the room through oral
273 breathing, whereas the exposed susceptible subjects consist of a member of the medical staff in a
274 light exercise activity (scenario A-1) and another patient at rest (scenario A-2). In scenario B, the
275 infection affects two subjects, both oral breathing during a sports activity in a 300 m³ gym.
276 Scenario C concerns two subjects (infected and healthy) in light activity while speaking in a generic
277 300 m³ office (bank, post office, supermarket, shop, etc.). Finally, scenario D represents an
278 infected subject singing or speaking loudly in an 800 m³ room with healthy subjects listening at a
279 sedentary activity level.

280 **Table 1** - Description of the exposure scenarios tested in the prospective assessment.

| | Scenario A | Scenario B | Scenario C | Scenario D |
|--|------------|------------|------------|------------|
|--|------------|------------|------------|------------|

| Type of indoor environment | Hospital room | Gym | Public indoor environments (e.g. restaurant, bank) | Conference room or auditorium |
|---|---|---|---|--|
| | Singer or conference | | | |
| Emitting subject | Patient (Resting, oral breathing) | Exercising person (heavy exercise, oral breathing) | Speaking person (light exercise, voiced counting) | loud speaker (light exercise, unmodulated vocalization) |
| Exposed subject | A-1. Medical staff (light exercise) A-2. Patient (resting) | Exercising person (heavy exercise) | Speaking person (light exercise) | Spectator (sedentary activity) |
| Volume (m ³) | 100 | 300 | 300 | 800 |
| Ventilation, AER (h ⁻¹) | <ul style="list-style-type: none">Natural ventilation 0.5 h⁻¹,Mechanical ventilation 3 h⁻¹,Mechanical ventilation 10 h⁻¹ | | | |
| Deposition rate, k (h ⁻¹) | 0.24 | | | |
| Inactivation rate, λ (h ⁻¹) | 0.63 | | | |

281 2.4 *Retrospective assessments: outbreaks in a restaurant in Guangzhou, China, and at choir*

282 *rehearsal in Skagit Valley (USA)*

283 2.4.1 *The outbreak in a restaurant in Guangzhou, China*

284 A possible case of airborne transmission was recently documented by Lu et al.³⁴. Here, an index
285 case patient traveled from the Chinese epidemic epicenter, Wuhan, on 23 January 2020 and ate
286 lunch in a restaurant in Guangzhou, China, with his family on 24 January 2020 (family A, 10 people
287 sitting at the same table). Later that day, the index patient experienced onset of fever and cough
288 and SARS-CoV-2 infection was diagnosed. On the following days, nine other people were
289 diagnosed with SARS-CoV-2 infection: four members from family A's table and five other people at

290 two different tables (families B and C). No other customers seated at other tables or waiters were
291 infected.

292 The restaurant is a 5-floor building without windows; each floor has its own air ventilation system.

293 The third floor dining area, at which the index patient ate lunch, has a floor area of 145 m², with
294 15 tables arranged with a distance between each table of about 1 m. A total of 91 people (83

295 customers, 8 staff members) were in the room during that lunch. The exposure time was variable

296 for the customers: those seated at tables close to the index patient had exposure times of
297 53 minutes (family B) and 73 minutes (family C). The ventilation and air conditioning situation is

298 reported in Lu et al.³⁴. Five fan coil air-conditioning units are installed in the room and there is no
299 outdoor air supply; thus, the ventilation relies only upon infiltration and natural ventilation. The

300 authors performed computational fluid dynamics analyses and tracer gas decay tests to obtain
301 more information about the possible air-flow pathway in the room, and to determine the air

302 exchange rate expected during that lunch. The analyses performed showed that, due to the
303 particular installation and use of the fan coils, the room can be divided into different air-flow

304 zones, with well-mixed conditions. The air-flow zone involving the table at which the index patient
305 sat also included the two tables at which the other five infected people sat; and covered an area

306 of roughly 45 m³. The tracer gas decay tests revealed a low air exchange rate (mostly due to the
307 absence of an outdoor air supply) in the range of 0.56–0.77 h⁻¹.

308 Therefore, on the basis of the available information, the retrospective assessment was applied to
309 this outbreak case, through eqs. (2) and (3), using the following input data: i) room volume of

310 45 m³; ii) documented probability of infection, i.e. attack rate, of 45% (i.e. 5 out of 11 people of
311 families B and C (family A members were excluded as they could easily have been infected through

312 other infection routes); iii) average exposure time of 1 h; iv) speaking at a light activity level for all
313 people (both emitting and exposed subjects), and v) average AER = 0.67 h⁻¹.

314 2.4.2 *The outbreak at a choir rehearsal in Skagit (USA)*

315 A further possible case of airborne transmission of SARS-CoV-2 was documented by the USA
316 media (www.latimes.com/world-nation/story/2020-03-29/coronavirus-choir-outbreak). This case
317 was recorded on 10 March, in Mount Vernon (Skagit County, Washington State, USA). In a 810 m³
318 hall, 61 choir members (out of a total of 121 regular members) gathered to rehearse, aware of the
319 practices for the containment of contagion (frequent hand washing and social distancing). None of
320 the members that attended had evident symptoms of SARS-CoV-2 infection. There was hand
321 sanitizer at the front door and members refrained from the usual hugs and handshakes; each
322 person brought their own sheet music. The event lasted from 6:30 pm to 9:00 pm (about 2.5
323 hours). Within few days, 33 of the 61 participants (53%) were diagnosed with SARS-CoV-2
324 infection, at least three were hospitalized, and two died ³⁵.

325 As pointed out by Hamner et al.³⁵, the 2.5-hour singing practice could have provided several
326 opportunities for droplet and fomite transmission (e.g. members sitting close to one another,
327 sharing snacks, and stacking chairs at the end of the practice). Nonetheless, the abovementioned
328 voluntary measures put in place would not support the documented spread of the contagion. On
329 the contrary, the act of singing, itself, might have contributed to transmission through emission of
330 aerosols, which is affected by loudness of vocalization ¹⁹. This is even more relevant considering
331 that attack rate of 53.3% (based on 33 confirmed cases) could represent a conservative estimate,
332 since other 20 probable cases were mentioned by Hamner et al.³⁵.

333 As regard the heating and ventilating system, limited information is available: the Fellowship Hall
334 is heated by a relatively new commercial forced-air furnace with supply and return air grills
335 situated high on a single wall. The furnace is installed to have both make-up and combustion air,
336 but it is not known how much fresh air was provided on that evening. During the entire rehearsal
337 no exterior doors were open. We applied a retrospective assessment to the case of the Skagit

338 Valley choir through eqs. (2) and (3), using the following input data: i) room volume of 810 m^3 ; ii)
339 documented probability of infection, i.e. attack rate, equal to 53%; iii) exposure time of 2.5 h; iv)
340 singing at a light activity level for all people; and v) natural ventilation with an AER = 0.5 h^{-1} .


341 **3. Results and Discussions**

342 **3.1 Statistics of quanta emission rates**

343 Figure 1 and Table 2 show the statistics relating to the quanta emission rates for the four emission
344 profiles considered in section 2.1. As shown in Buonanno et al.¹⁹, there are large differences
345 between the emission profiles. Obviously the lowest values are found under the oral breathing
346 condition during resting (median value of $0.36 \text{ quanta h}^{-1}$), followed by the oral breathing
347 condition during heavy activity as the inhalation rate increases ($2.4 \text{ quanta h}^{-1}$), and reaching 4.9
348 quanta h^{-1} for the increase in aerosol emitted during vocalization⁶ and, finally, peaking during
349 singing/speaking loudly (31 quanta h^{-1}). Indeed, the rate of particle emission during normal human
350 speech is positively correlated with the amplitude of vocalization³⁶.

351 The probability density functions of the quanta emission rates (P_q) were also determined. In
352 particular, the log-transformed ER_q values obtained from the Monte Carlo simulations resulted in a
353 normal distribution (Shapiro-Wilk test, $p < 0.01$). Table 2 shows the average and standard
354 deviation values of the $\log_{10}(ER_q)$.

355 We point out that the estimated values present two main uncertainty contributions clearly related
356 to the limited data currently available for the SARS-CoV-2: i) a still low number of experimental
357 data for the viral load in the mouth, c_v , of SARS-CoV-2 infected subjects, ii) unavailable infectivity
358 conversion factors, c_i , for SARS-CoV-2; indeed, as mentioned in the methodology section, the c_i
359 parameter was estimated on the basis of data available for other coronaviruses challenging
360 humans (only in the case of HCoV-229E) and animals (for all other types of coronavirus).



361

362 **Figure 1** - Statistics of quanta emission rates (ER_q) for the four expiratory activities considered in the
363 exposure scenarios. Data reported represent 1st, 25th, 50th, 75th, and 99th percentiles.

364 **Table 2** - ER_q (quanta h^{-1}) and $\log(ER_q)$ statistics for SARS-CoV-2 as a function of the expiratory activity and
365 activity level. The log-transformed ER_q values follow a log-normal distribution; thus, the average and
366 standard deviation values of the $\log_{10}(ER_q)$ are provided.


| | Resting, oral breathing | Heavy activity, oral breathing | Light activity, speaking | Light activity, singing (or speaking loudly) | |
|-------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------|--|----------------------|
| ER_q | 5 th percentile | 2.5×10^{-2} | 1.7×10^{-1} | 3.4×10^{-1} | 2.1×10^0 |
| | 25 th percentile | 1.2×10^{-1} | 8.1×10^{-1} | 1.6×10^0 | 1.0×10^1 |
| | 50 th percentile | 3.6×10^{-1} | 2.4×10^0 | 4.9×10^0 | 3.1×10^1 |
| | 75 th percentile | 1.1×10^0 | 7.2×10^0 | 1.5×10^1 | 9.3×10^1 |
| | 95 th percentile | 5.2×10^0 | 3.0×10^1 | 7.1×10^1 | 4.5×10^2 |
| | 99 th percentile | 1.6×10^1 | 1.1×10^2 | 2.2×10^2 | 1.4×10^3 |
| $\log_{10}(ER_q)$ | Average | -4.4×10^{-1} | 3.9×10^{-1} | 6.9×10^{-1} | 1.5×10^0 |
| | Stand. dev | 7.1×10^{-1} | 7.1×10^{-1} | 7.1×10^{-1} | 7.1×10^{-1} |

367 3.2 Risk management in prospective assessment applications

368 3.2.1 Illustrative example of probability of infection and individual risk evaluation

369 In Figure 2 an illustrative example of quanta concentration $n(t)$, dose of quanta (D_q), and
370 probability of infection (P_i) trends as a function of time (here shown for 2 h) resulting from the
371 Monte Carlo simulation for exposure scenario D (singing exhibition, conference speaker) with an
372 AER = 0.5 h^{-1} is shown. In particular, the trends of different percentiles are reported. The example
373 shows that a person singing/speaking loudly in such a microenvironment can lead to a median $n(t)$
374 value after 2 hours equal to 0.027 quanta h^{-1} (with a 5th–95th percentile range of <0.002–
375 0.38 quanta h^{-1}). Such concentrations lead to a median dose of quanta received by the subject
376 exposed for 2 h in a sedentary activity equal to 0.029 quanta (with a 5th–95th percentile range of
377 <0.002–0.42 quanta), then resulting in a median probability of infection, P_i , of 2.8% (with a 5th–
378 95th percentile range of 0.2%–33.0%). Thus, if higher quanta emission rates are considered, the
379 indoor quanta concentrations and the consequent probability of infection can be more than 10-
380 fold the median values.

381




382

383 **Figure 2** - Trends of quanta concentration (a), dose of quanta (b), and probability of infection (c) as a
384 function of time (here shown for 2 h of exposure) resulting from the Monte Carlo simulation for exposure
385 scenario D with an AER = 0.5 h⁻¹. Different percentiles are reported.

386 In view of the application of a conservative approach that could be essential to reduce the risk of
387 contagion in indoor environments, using the highest quanta concentration and probability of
388 infection values can be misguiding. Indeed, the probability of occurrence of such high values is
389 extremely low. Thus, as described in section 2.2, a proper evaluation of the individual infection risk
390 (R) can be obtained by applying eq. (4), i.e. multiplying the probability of infection (P_I) by the
391 corresponding probability of occurrence (P_P). In Figure 3 the probability density functions of
392 individual infection risk (pdf_R), probability of infection (pdf_P), quanta concentration (pdf_n), and
393 dose of quanta (pdf_D) after 2 hours of exposure are reported (in terms of R , P_I , n and D_q values for
394 each percentile) for the illustrative example discussed above (i.e. scenario D, AER = 0.5 h⁻¹). The
395 individual infection risk (R) presents a maximum value (R_{max}) at the 85th percentile (2.2%) due to a
396 probability of infection $P_I = 14.5\%$ and a probability of occurrence $P_P = 15\%$. In other words, the R
397 value at the 85th percentile is the most probable individual infection risk for a healthy susceptible
398 subject (i.e., the one with the highest chance of occurring). Due to the similarity of the probability
399 density functions of the four expiration activities resulting from the calculation of the quanta
400 emission rates ($\log_{10}(ER_q)$ reported in Table 2), the pdf_R for all the exposure scenarios tested here
401 was similar to that of the exposure scenario shown in Figure 3 (i.e. the R_{max} value occurs in the
402 narrow range of 84th–90th percentile).

403 Furthermore, as discussed in section 2.2, the probability density function of the probability of
404 infection (pdf_P) is mostly influenced by the probability density function of the quanta emission rate
405 (pdf_q) when moving backwards in the four-step approach; indeed, once the exposure scenario is
406 defined, all the parameters contributing to the calculation of P_I (ventilation, room volume, subject

407 activity, etc.) can be considered as constant values. Thus, for a simplified estimate of R_{\max} , the
408 simplest calculation can be applied (instead of the Monte Carlo method) by just adopting the 85th
409 percentile of the quanta emission rate in the four-step calculation using eqs. (2-4).



410
411 **Figure 3** – Probability density functions of individual infection risk, probability of infection, quanta
412 concentration, and dose of quanta at t = 120 min for the illustrative example reported in Figure 2 (exposure
413 scenario A with an air exchange rate of 0.5 h⁻¹). The probability density functions are reported as quanta
414 concentration (n), dose of quanta (D_q), probability of infection (P_i), and individual infection risk (R) for each
415 percentile. The maximum individual infection risk (R_{\max}) is 1.9% and occurs at the 85th percentile
416 ($P_i = 14.5\%$, $P_q = 15\%$).

417 3.2.2 Estimate of the maximum individual risk versus exposure time in indoor environments

418 Figure 4 and Table 3 show the results of the Monte Carlo simulations for the four exposure
419 scenarios analyzed. The exposure time–risk relationships reported in Figure 4 are essential as they
420 can be used by choosing either the exposure time or the maximum risk R_{\max} as the independent
421 variable. In the first case, knowing the exposure time of the healthy subject in the environment in
422 question, the corresponding individual infection risk can be evaluated and then compared to an


423 acceptable infection risk. In the second case, once an acceptable infection risk has been imposed,
424 the corresponding maximum exposure time value can be easily assessed. The four scenarios are
425 examined assuming an acceptable risk value of 10^{-3} as discussed in section 2.3. Since the maximum
426 value of individual risk occurs roughly at the 90th percentile, the corresponding probability of
427 occurrence of the risk (P_P) is 10%; thus, an acceptable individual infection risk of 10^{-3} will roughly
428 correspond to a probability of infection of $P_I = 1\%$. For indoor environments characterized by high
429 crowding indexes a $P_I < 1\%$ is essential as it can assure a $R_0 < 1$ when crowded with up to 100
430 people. Therefore, assuring an individual infection risk of 10^{-3} also guarantees the control of the
431 epidemic with an $R_0 < 1$ for a maximum number of exposed healthy people $S < 100$.

432 For the exposure scenario discussed above (scenario D, AER = 0.5 h⁻¹) the maximum exposure time
433 to reach an accepted risk of $R = 10^{-3}$ is very short (16 min); this is due to the high viral load emitted
434 during singing or speaking loudly leading to high quanta concentrations despite the large volume
435 available. Obviously, the exposure time can increase with higher ventilation rates, e.g. reaching
436 38 min in the case of mechanical ventilation at 10 h⁻¹. The crowding index of such an indoor
437 environment (800 m³) ranges from 0.75 m² (auditorium) to 2 m² (conference room) per person³⁷;
438 thus, for a room height of 4 m a corresponding floor area of 200 m² will be available, then
439 resulting in a total number of people simultaneously present in the room (S) ranging from 100
440 (conference room) to 267 (auditorium). Therefore, after 16 min of exposure in the case of natural
441 ventilation (or 38 min in the case of mechanical ventilation with AER = 10 h⁻¹), the value of R_0 will
442 be higher (auditorium) or equal (conference room) to 1. Thus, in the management of the
443 epidemic, reducing the crowding index could be essential. Accepting higher R_{max} values would
444 clearly increase the maximum exposure time; indeed, in the case of $R_{max} = 10^{-2}$, the exposure time
445 values would be 62 min and 392 min, for an AER equal to 0.5 h⁻¹ and 10 h⁻¹, respectively. However,

446 in this case, the corresponding value of R_0 would be lower than 1 only for a number of exposed
447 subjects lower than 10.

448 In scenario C, the infected subject in light activity speaks in a 300 m^3 environment, along with the
449 healthy subject. The simultaneous reduction of both the quanta emission rate and the volume
450 compared to scenario D makes the maximum exposure times for an acceptable infection risk of 10^{-3}
451 comparable to the previous case (15 min and 36 min for ventilation of 0.5 h^{-1} and 10 h^{-1} ,
452 respectively). Additionally, in this case, the estimated exposure times would guarantee an $R_0 < 1$
453 with $S < 100$ subjects.

454



455

456 **Figure 4** – Relationship between time of exposure and individual risk (R) as a function of the air exchange
457 rate (0.5 h^{-1} , 3 h^{-1} , and 10 h^{-1}) for the exposure scenarios investigated in the prospective approach and
458 summarized in Table 1.

459 In scenario A (patient emitting at rest in oral breathing), the maximum exposure time in a hospital
460 room of 100 m^3 for both a medical staff member (scenario A-1) and a patient at rest without
461 infection (scenario A-2) is evaluated. In both cases the exposure times increase significantly with
462 the ventilation rate, reaching 36 min and 157 min (scenario A-1), and 72 min and 455 min
463 (scenario A-2) with AER values of 0.5 h^{-1} and 10 h^{-1} , respectively. However, despite the small size

464 of the room, the ER_q was extremely small (Table 2); thus, unless a large number of infected
465 subjects is simultaneously present in the room, the concentration of viral load in a hospital room
466 can be considered low; nonetheless, the overall risk may become relevant due to the long
467 exposure times (of 36 and 157 min). Finally, in exposure scenario B (the gym with infected and
468 healthy subjects during heavy activity with oral breathing), although there is no vocalization in the
469 subject's activity, the high inhalation rate produces considerable ER_q values, then increasing the
470 individual risk; thus, in order to guarantee an acceptable infection risk of 10^{-3} the maximum
471 exposure times resulted quite short, i.e. 14 min and 29 min for 0.5 h^{-1} and 10 h^{-1} , respectively.
472 Thus, for all the scenarios investigated, the ventilation conditions strongly influence the risk (or
473 the exposure time) of the exposed subject: this difference increases as the accepted risk increases
474 as shown in the trends presented in Figure 4. In contrast, if a lower risk was accepted (i.e. 10^{-4} or
475 10^{-5}), increasing the air exchange rate is not leading to the significant reduction of the risk, and
476 local exhaust ventilation would be more effective.

477 **Table 3** – Maximum exposure time (min) for the different exposure scenarios to reach an acceptable
478 maximum individual infection risk (R_{\max}).

| Exposure scenarios | AER (h^{-1}) | Maximum individual infection risk (R_{\max}) | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|-------------------------|--|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| | | 1×10^{-1} | 1×10^{-2} | 1×10^{-3} | 1×10^{-4} | 1×10^{-5} |
| Scenario A-1 - Hospital room | 0.5 | 2797 | 212 | 36 | 10 | 3 |
| Emitting subject: patient | 3.0 | 7968 | 600 | 56 | 11 | 3 |
| Exposed subject: Medical staff | 10.0 | 22430 | 1727 | 157 | 17 | 3 |
| Scenario A-2 - Hospital room | 0.5 | 8039 | 597 | 72 | 17 | 5 |
| Emitting subject: patient | 3.0 | 21739 | 1678 | 159 | 21 | 5 |
| Exposed subject: patient | 10.0 | 64333 | 4671 | 455 | 46 | 6 |
| Scenario B – Gym | 0.5 | 519 | 55 | 14 | 4 | 1 |
| Emitting subject: Exercising person | 3.0 | 1500 | 110 | 16 | 4 | 1 |

| | | | | | | |
|------------------------------------|------|------|-----|----|---|---|
| Exposed subject: Exercising person | 10.0 | 4119 | 314 | 29 | 5 | 1 |
| Scenario C – Public indoors | 0.5 | 627 | 60 | 15 | 5 | 1 |
| Emitting subject: Speaking person | 3.0 | 1812 | 137 | 19 | 5 | 1 |
| Exposed subject: Speaking person | 10.0 | 4807 | 372 | 36 | 6 | 1 |
| Scenario D – Conference room | 0.5 | 652 | 62 | 16 | 5 | 1 |
| Emitting subject: Singer | 3.0 | 1826 | 138 | 19 | 5 | 1 |
| Exposed subject: Spectator | 10.0 | 5187 | 392 | 38 | 6 | 2 |


479 3.3 *Retrospective assessment application: the outbreaks in a restaurant in Guangzhou and at a
480 choir rehearsal in Skagit Valley*

481 Figure 5 shows the trends of quanta concentration and probability of infection (P_I) evaluated for
482 the retrospective cases defined in section 2.4 (a restaurant in Guangzhou and the Skagit Valley
483 choir). The retrospective analysis applied to the restaurant in Guangzhou (Figure 5a) revealed that,
484 under the boundary conditions considered in the simulation (in terms of room volume, ventilation,
485 number of exposed people; see section 2.4.1), a probability of infection (P_I) after 1 hour of
486 exposure equal to the attack rate (45%) can be reached for a quanta emission rate of
487 $ER_q = 61 \text{ quanta h}^{-1}$. This emission rate, for an emitting subject speaking during light exercise,
488 occurs at the 93rd percentile of the probability density function of ER_q (P_q).

489 Similarly, for the retrospective analysis applied to the Skagit Valley choir (Figure 5b), in order to
490 reach an attack rate of 53% after 2.5 hours of exposure under the simulation boundary conditions
491 reported in section 2.4.2, a quanta emission rate of $341 \text{ quanta h}^{-1}$ is needed. Additionally, in this
492 case, such an emission rate occurs at the 92nd percentile of the probability density function (P_q) of
493 an infected subject while singing.

494 Therefore, for both the analyzed cases in the retrospective analyses, the required ER_q values to
495 obtain the documented R_e fall perfectly within the possible values of the emission profiles under
496 consideration (i.e. speaking and singing/speaking loudly in light activity reported in Table 2).

497 Moreover, such emission values incur high individual infection risks as they are around the 90th
498 percentile, i.e. at the percentile maximizing the individual infection risk (R_{\max}). Indeed, the R values
499 for the restaurant at Guangzhou and the Skagit Valley choir were 3.2% and 3.7%, respectively –
500 more than one order of magnitude higher than the acceptable risk of 10^{-3} . In these two cases, an
501 individual risk of $< 10^{-3}$ would have been obtained with a probability of infection $P_I = 1.3\text{-}1.4\%$:
502 such a P_I is not actually achievable by varying and optimizing the room ventilation (e.g.
503 $AER > 100 \text{ h}^{-1}$ would be required), and is achievable only by reducing the exposure time of the
504 susceptible subjects and the quanta emission rates.



505
506 **Figure 5** – Quanta concentration (n) and probability of infection (P_I) evaluated for the retrospective cases
507 applied at the documented outbreaks at (a) the restaurant in Guangzhou and (b) the Skagit Valley choir.
508 To summarize, the retrospective assessment of the two SARS-CoV-2 outbreaks investigated
509 demonstrate that the documented number of infected people can be explained by means of the
510 airborne transmission route; indeed, the most probable of the expected events occurred. The
511 approach and consequent calculation reported here clearly highlights that the explanation of such
512 a high number of infected people does not necessarily require the presence of a superspreadер in
513 the environment (i.e. an infected person with the highest viral load, c_v , and infectious dose, c_i), but

514 rather a co-existence of conditions, including emission and exposure parameters, leading to a
515 highly probable event, which can be defined as a “superspreading event”.

516

517

518 **References**

- 519 (1) Ai, Z. T.; Melikov, A. K. Airborne Spread of Expiratory Droplet Nuclei between the Occupants of
520 Indoor Environments: A Review. *Indoor Air* **2018**, *28* (4), 500–524.
521 <https://doi.org/10.1111/ina.12465>.
- 522 (2) Holmgren, H.; Ljungström, E.; Almstrand, A.-C.; Bake, B.; Olin, A.-C. Size Distribution of Exhaled
523 Particles in the Range from 0.01 to 2.0 μ m. *Journal of Aerosol Science* **2010**, *41* (5), 439–446.
524 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jaerosci.2010.02.011>.
- 525 (3) van Doremalen, N.; Bushmaker, T.; Morris, D. H.; Holbrook, M. G.; Gamble, A.; Williamson, B. N.;
526 Tamin, A.; Harcourt, J. L.; Thornburg, N. J.; Gerber, S. I.; Lloyd-Smith, J. O.; de Wit, E.; Munster, V. J.
527 Aerosol and Surface Stability of SARS-CoV-2 as Compared with SARS-CoV-1. *N Engl J Med* **2020**.
528 <https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMc2004973>.
- 529 (4) Ai, Z. T.; Hashimoto, K.; Melikov, A. K. Airborne Transmission between Room Occupants during
530 Short-Term Events: Measurement and Evaluation. *Indoor Air* **2019**, *29* (4), 563–576.
531 <https://doi.org/10.1111/ina.12557>.
- 532 (5) Ai, Z. T.; Huang, T.; Melikov, A. K. Airborne Transmission of Exhaled Droplet Nuclei between
533 Occupants in a Room with Horizontal Air Distribution. *Building and Environment* **2019**, *163*, 106328.
534 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.buildenv.2019.106328>.
- 535 (6) Morawska, L.; Johnson, G. R.; Ristovski, Z. D.; Hargreaves, M.; Mengersen, K.; Corbett, S.; Chao, C. Y.
536 H.; Li, Y.; Katoshevski, D. Size Distribution and Sites of Origin of Droplets Expelled from the Human
537 Respiratory Tract during Expiratory Activities. *Journal of Aerosol Science* **2009**, *40* (3), 256–269.
538 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jaerosci.2008.11.002>.
- 539 (7) Morawska, L.; Cao, J. Airborne Transmission of SARS-CoV-2: The World Should Face the Reality.
540 *Environment International* **2020**, *139*, 105730. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envint.2020.105730>.
- 541 (8) Chao, C. Y. H.; Wan, M. P.; Morawska, L.; Johnson, G. R.; Ristovski, Z. D.; Hargreaves, M.; Mengersen,
542 K.; Corbett, S.; Li, Y.; Xie, X.; Katoshevski, D. Characterization of Expiration Air Jets and Droplet Size

- 543 Distributions Immediately at the Mouth Opening. *Journal of Aerosol Science* **2009**, *40* (2), 122–133.
544 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jaerosci.2008.10.003>.
545 (9) Morawska, L. Droplet Fate in Indoor Environments, or Can We Prevent the Spread of Infection?
546 *Indoor Air* **2006**, *16* (5), 335–347. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1600-0668.2006.00432.x>.
547 (10) Hickey, A. J.; Mansour, H. M. *Inhalation Aerosols: Physical and Biological Basis for Therapy*, *Third
548 Edition*; Taylor & Francis Ltd, 2019.
549 (11) Duguid, J. P. The Numbers and the Sites of Origin of the Droplets Expelled during Expiratory
550 Activities. *Edinburgh Medical Journal* **1945**, *LII* (II) (II), 385–401.
551 (12) Jennison, M. W. Atomizing of Mouth and Nose Secretions into the Air as Revealed by High Speed
552 Photography. *Aerobiology* **1942**, *17*, 106–128.
553 (13) Wells, W. F. On Airborne Infection: Study II. Droplets and Droplet Nuclei. *American Journal of
554 Epidemiology* **1934**, *20* (3), 611–618. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordjournals.aje.a118097>.
555 (14) Tang, J. W.; Noakes, C. J.; Nielsen, P. V.; Eames, I.; Nicolle, A.; Li, Y.; Settles, G. S. Observing and
556 Quantifying Airflows in the Infection Control of Aerosol- and Airborne-Transmitted Diseases: An
557 Overview of Approaches. *Journal of Hospital Infection* **2011**, *77* (3), 213–222.
558 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhin.2010.09.037>.
559 (15) Myatt, T. A.; Minegishi, T.; Allen, J. G.; Macintosh, D. L. Control of Asthma Triggers in Indoor Air with
560 Air Cleaners: A Modeling Analysis. *Environ Health* **2008**, *7*, 43. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1476-069X-7-43>.
562 (16) Rudnick, S. N.; Milton, D. K. Risk of Indoor Airborne Infection Transmission Estimated from Carbon
563 Dioxide Concentration. *Indoor Air* **2003**, *13* (3), 237–245. <https://doi.org/10.1034/j.1600-0668.2003.00189.x>.
565 (17) Sze To, G. N.; Chao, C. Y. H. Review and Comparison between the Wells–Riley and Dose-Response
566 Approaches to Risk Assessment of Infectious Respiratory Diseases. *Indoor Air* **2010**, *20* (1), 2–16.
567 <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1600-0668.2009.00621.x>.
568 (18) Wagner, B. G.; Coburn, B. J.; Blower, S. Calculating the Potential for Within-Flight Transmission of
569 Influenza A (H1N1). *BMC Medicine* **2009**, *7* (1), 81. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1741-7015-7-81>.

- 570 (19) Buonanno, G.; Stabile, L.; Morawska, L. Estimation of Airborne Viral Emission: Quanta Emission Rate
571 of SARS-CoV-2 for Infection Risk Assessment. *Environment International* **2020**.
572 <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.04.12.20062828>.
- 573 (20) Gammatoni, L.; Nucci, M. C. Using a Mathematical Model to Evaluate the Efficacy of TB Control
574 Measures. *Emerging Infectious Diseases* **1997**, 335–342.
- 575 (21) Riley, C.; Murphy, G.; Riley, R. L. Airborne Spread of Measles in a Suburban Elementary School.
576 *American journal of epidemiology* **1978**, No. 107, 431–432.
- 577 (22) Hammersley, J. M.; Handscomb, D. C. *Monte Carlo Methods*; Chapman and Hall: London & New
578 York, 1964.
- 579 (23) Pan, Y.; Zang, D.; Yang, P.; Poon, L. M.; Wang, Q. Viral Load of SARS-CoV-2 in Clinical Samples Yang
580 Pan Daitao Zhang Peng Yang Leo L M Poon Quanyi Wang. *The Lancet* **2020**.
- 581 (24) Rothe, C.; Schunk, M.; Sothmann, P.; Bretzel, G.; Froeschl, G.; Wallrauch, C.; Zimmer, T.; Thiel, V.;
582 Janke, C.; Guggemos, W.; Seilmaier, M.; Drosten, C.; Vollmar, P.; Zwirglmaier, K.; Zange, S.; Wölfel,
583 R.; Hoelscher, M. Transmission of 2019-NCoV Infection from an Asymptomatic Contact in Germany.
584 *N Engl J Med* **2020**, 382 (10), 970–971. <https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMc2001468>.
- 585 (25) To, K. K.-W.; Tsang, O. T.-Y.; Leung, W.-S.; Tam, A. R.; Wu, T.-C.; Lung, D. C.; Yip, C. C.-Y.; Cai, J.-P.;
586 Chan, J. M.-C.; Chik, T. S.-H.; Lau, D. P.-L.; Choi, C. Y.-C.; Chen, L.-L.; Chan, W.-M.; Chan, K.-H.; Ip, J. D.;
587 Ng, A. C.-K.; Poon, R. W.-S.; Luo, C.-T.; Cheng, V. C.-C.; Chan, J. F.-W.; Hung, I. F.-N.; Chen, Z.; Chen,
588 H.; Yuen, K.-Y. Temporal Profiles of Viral Load in Posterior Oropharyngeal Saliva Samples and Serum
589 Antibody Responses during Infection by SARS-CoV-2: An Observational Cohort Study. *The Lancet
590 Infectious Diseases* **2020**. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1473-3099\(20\)30196-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1473-3099(20)30196-1).
- 591 (26) Woelfel, R.; Corman, V. M.; Guggemos, W.; Seilmaier, M.; Zange, S.; Mueller, M. A.; Niemeyer, D.;
592 Vollmar, P.; Rothe, C.; Hoelscher, M.; Bleicker, T.; Bruenink, S.; Schneider, J.; Ehmann, R.;
593 Zwirglmaier, K.; Drosten, C.; Wendtner, C. Clinical Presentation and Virological Assessment of
594 Hospitalized Cases of Coronavirus Disease 2019 in a Travel-Associated Transmission Cluster. *medRxiv*
595 **2020**, 2020.03.05.20030502. <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.03.05.20030502>.

- 596 596 (27) Watanabe, T.; Bartrand, T. A.; Weir, M. H.; Omura, T.; Haas, C. N. Development of a Dose-Response
597 Model for SARS Coronavirus. *Risk Anal* **2010**, *30* (7), 1129–1138. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1539-6924.2010.01427.x>.
- 598 598 (28) Yang, W.; Marr, L. C. Dynamics of Airborne Influenza A Viruses Indoors and Dependence on
599 600 Humidity. *PLOS ONE* **2011**, *6* (6), e21481. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0021481>.
- 601 601 (29) Chatoutsidou, S. E.; Lazaridis, M. Assessment of the Impact of Particulate Dry Deposition on Soiling
602 603 of Indoor Cultural Heritage Objects Found in Churches and Museums/Libraries. *Journal of Cultural
Heritage* **2019**, *39*, 221–228. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.culher.2019.02.017>.
- 604 604 (30) Haas, C. N. Estimation of Risk Due to Low Doses of Microorganisms: A Comparison of Alternative
605 606 Methodologies. *Am J Epidemiol* **1983**, *118* (4), 573–582.
<https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordjournals.aje.a113662>.
- 607 607 (31) Cotruvo, J. A. Drinking Water Standards and Risk Assessment. *Regul Toxicol Pharmacol* **1988**, *8* (3),
608 288–299. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0273-2300\(88\)90016-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/0273-2300(88)90016-5).
- 609 609 (32) World Health Organization. *Guidelines for Drinking-Water Quality - 4th Edition*; WHO Regional Office
610 610 for Europe, 2011.
- 611 611 (33) Toner, G. *Innovation, Science, Environment 08/09*; McGill-Queen's University Press, 2008.
- 612 612 (34) Lu, J.; Gu, J.; Li, K.; Xu, C.; Su, W.; Lai, Z.; Zhou, D.; Yu, C.; Xu, B.; Yang, Z. COVID-19 Outbreak
613 613 Associated with Air Conditioning in Restaurant, Guangzhou, China, 2020. *Emerg Infect Dis* **2020**, *26*
614 614 (7). <https://doi.org/10.3201/eid2607.200764>.
- 615 615 (35) Hamner, L.; Dubbel, P.; Capron, I.; Ross, A.; Jordan, A.; Lee, J.; Lynn, J.; Ball, A.; Narwal, S.; Russell, S.;
616 616 Patrick, D.; Leibrand, H. High SARS-CoV-2 Attack Rate Following Exposure at a Choir Practice - Skagit
617 617 County, Washington, March 2020. *Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report* **2020**, *69*.
- 618 618 (36) Asadi, S.; Wexler, A. S.; Cappa, C. D.; Barreda, S.; Bouvier, N. M.; Ristenpart, W. D. Aerosol Emission
619 619 and Superemission during Human Speech Increase with Voice Loudness. *Scientific Reports* **2019**, *9*
620 620 (1), 2348. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-019-38808-z>.

621 (37) European Committee for Standardisation. UNI EN 15251 - Indoor Environmental Input Parameters
622 for Design and Assessment of Energy Performance of Buildings Addressing Indoor Air Quality,
623 Thermal Environment, Lighting and Acoustics. **2008**.
624