Covid-19 Risk Among Airline Passengers: Should the Middle Seat Stay Empty?

By Arnold Barnett[1]

Recent research results and data generate the approximation that, when all coach seats are full on a US jet aircraft, the risk of contracting Covid-19 from a nearby passenger is currently about 1 in 7,000. Under the "middle seat empty" policy, that risk falls to about 1 in 14,000. Risks are lower in flights that are not full. These estimates imply Covid-19 mortality risks to uninfected air travelers are higher than those associated with plane crashes but probably less than one in one million.

1. George Eastman Professor of Management Science/Professor of Statistics

MIT Sloan School of Management

Cambridge, Massachusetts, USA

abarnett@mit.edu E62-568, MIT, Cambridge MA 02142 1 617 253-2670

Introduction

As of 7/1/20, the US air carriers American, Spirit, and United Airlines will fill all seats on their flights when demand warrants, while Alaska, Delta, jetBlue, and Southwest Airlines will keep middle seats empty. While Delta Airlines plans to continue its policy well beyond September 2020, United Airlines CEO Scott Kirby stated that there is no such thing as social distancing on a plane, implying that limited distancing confers no real benefit compared to none. What does the evidence suggest about the wisdom of a "middle seat" policy as a safety measure?

Answering that question entails major complications and uncertainties, which can easily lead one to throw up one's hands. But even a rough approximation of the risks at issue seems preferable to clashes of unsubstantiated conjectures. This paper strives for such an approximation, with an emphasis on the word "rough."

To estimate the risk to an uninfected passenger from a passenger experiencing Covid-19, it is necessary to consider three questions:

- What is the probability that a given passenger on board is contagious with Covid-19?
- What is the probability that universal masking can prevent a contagious passenger from spreading the disease?
- How does the risk of infection depend on the locations on the aircraft of both the contagious and uninfected passenger?

The general formula for combining the answers to these questions is:

$$P = Q * Q_M * Q_L \quad (1)$$

where P= the probability that a particular uninfected passenger contracts Covid-19 during the flight

Q = the probability that a given passenger on the flight has covid-19

(It is assumed the Q is small enough that having two or more contagious passengers near the uninfected one is a remote risk.)

Q_M = the probability that universal mask-wearing on aircraft *fails to preven*t transmission of Covid-19

Q_L = the conditional probability that a contagious passenger transmits Covid-19 to the uninfected one

Q_L and thus P can depend on whether the operating policy is "fill all seats" or "middle seat empty"

The Estimation of Q

For a given passenger from a particular American state, the risk of contagiousness is estimated in several steps:

- First, one finds N_7, the number of confirmed new Covid-19 infections in that state over the last seven days (1) Seven days is chosen because that is the approximate length of the contagiousness period for someone experiencing Covid-19. (The average such period is a bit below seven days in asymptomatic cases and higher than seven in symptomatic ones.)

- Then, in accordance with recent findings from the US Centers for Disease Control (2) , one multiplies N_7 by *ten* to approximate the actual number of new infections in the state over the previous week.

- Then one recognizes that people with Covid-19 who board airplanes are presumably either asymptomatic, pre-symptomatic, or mildly symptomatic. (Those with severe symptoms are unlikely to be flying.) Because of evidence that asymptomatic Covid-19 carriers are only

about half as contagious as others (3), one multiplies the prior product by a factor of ¾. (This factor of ¾ arises if one assumes that asymptomatic Covid-19 passengers constitute about half of those Covid-19 passengers who board a flight, while the other half have the usual level of contagiousness.)

- Then one multiplies by a factor of ½ to reflect the likelihood that passengers who fly are generally more affluent (and less likely to encounter Covid-19 risks) than the citizenry at large.

- Finally, one divides by N_{POP}, the state's estimated population in 2020, yielding N_7/N_{POP} as the state's per capita rate of new confirmed cases over the last week.

The estimate of Q consistent with these specifications is:

$$Q \approx (N_7 * (10) * \left(\frac{3}{4}\right) * \left(\frac{1}{2}\right))/N_{POP} = 3.75N_7/N_{POP}$$

For Texas, which has a high number of recent Covid-19 cases, N_7 as of 6/28/20 was 38,642, while N_{POP} was 29.1 million. With those numbers, $Q \approx \frac{1}{201}$. In New York, which is well past the peak of its epidemic, the corresponding numbers are $N_7 = 5{,}523$ and $N_{POP} = 19.5$ million, yielding $Q \approx \frac{1}{942}$.

The Estimation of Q_M

For Q_M, a meta-analysis in *The Lancet* (4) estimated that mask wearing cuts transmission risk given contagiousness from 17.4% to 3.1%, a reduction of 82%. Ignoring the possibility that the masks under study were more effective than those worn by airline passengers, one can estimate Q_M as 1 - .82 = .18.

The Estimation of Q_L

This quantity depends on the airline's seating policy, as well as the

duration of the flight. Chu et al (4) estimated that transmission risk given contagion is about 13% assuming direct physical contact and drops by ½ for each meter further apart. Under this pattern of exponential decay, transmission risk R_T can be modeled by the equation:

$$R_T \approx 0.13 * e^{-.69d} \qquad (2)$$

Where d = distance between contagious and uninfected person

e= 2.718, the base of the natural logarithms

This formula assumes no barriers between the infected and uninfected persons. If there were (say) a layer of plexiglass between the two, then transmission risk would essentially drop to zero.

In this exercise, we focus on the coach sections of the two widely-used jet planes, the Airbus 320 and Boeing 737. There are six seats in each coach row, consisting two sets of three seats separated a center aisle. The individual seats are approximately 18 inches wide, while the aisle width is about 30 inches. If the seats are labeled A/B/C and D/E/F, where A and F are the window seats, B and E the center seats, and C and D the aisle seats then, under the "fill all seats" policy on a flight that is full, all six seats will be occupied. Under "no middle seats," A/C and D/F will be occupied on a full flight but not B/E.

We first consider the transmission risk to an uninfected passenger in the window seat A, under each policy *and full flights*. In doing so, we first make the strong assumption that the only passengers who could possibly infect that passenger are those *in the same row*. While imperfect, this assumption could be plausible because (i) the air in the aircraft cabin is constantly refreshed, so the cabin does not constitute a closed indoor space (ii) the seatbacks in Row 16 can

block infectious emissions from contagious passengers in Rows 17 and behind, while the opposite happens for rows ahead of Row 16. It then follows that the transmission probability for the A-seat passenger would be obtained by adding the risks related to the other passengers seated in the same row:

$$Q_L(A) \approx \begin{cases} R_T(A,C) + R_T(A,D) + R_T(A,F) \; under \text{ middle seat open} \\ R_T(A,B) + R_T(A,C) + R_T(A,D) + R_T(A,E) + R_T(A,F) \; under \text{ "}fill\ all\ seats\text{"} \end{cases} \quad (3)$$

where $R_T(A,X) =$ transmission probability *absent masks* given a contagious passenger in seat X of a given row and an uninfected passenger in seat A of that row (treating multiple contagious passengers in the same row as a remote possibility)

$$R_T(A,X) \text{ is approximated by } R_T(A,X) \approx .13e^{-.69d(A,X)} \quad (4)$$

where d(A,X) = distance from a person's head in the *middle* of seat A to another person's in the middle of seat X. In inches, this distance is 18 inches for seat B, 18+18= 36 inches for seat C, 36 + 9 + 30 + 9 = 84 inches for seat D, 84+18= 102 inches for seat E, and 102 + 18= 120 inches for seat F. Because a meter is 39.37 inches, d(A,B) in meters is 18/39.37 = .457. Similarly, d(A,C) = = .914, d(A,D) = 2.13, d(A,E) = 2.59, and d(A,F) = 3.05.

One can use (3) and () to obtain:

$$Q_L(A) \approx \begin{cases} 0.115 \text{ under middle seat open} \\ 0.232 \quad \text{under "fill all seats"} \end{cases}$$

Using similar reasoning, one can likewise determine that:

$$Q_L(B) \approx .282 \text{ under "fill all seats"}$$

$$Q_L(C) \approx \begin{cases} 0.155 & \text{under middle seat open} \\ 0.291 & \text{under "fill all seats"} \end{cases}$$

$$Q_L(D) = Q_L(C); \qquad Q_L(E) = Q_L(B); \qquad Q_L(F) = Q_L(A)$$

One might expect that the risk of infection would vary with the duration of the Flight, perhaps in proportion to the time spent with a contagious person (5). Unfortunately, it is unclear how to incorporate flight time into the risk analysis. The papers that Chu et. al. synthesized in their meta-analysis that led to (1) involve varying (and unreported) times of exposure, with an unknown relationship to the two-hour flight time for an average US domestic flight. Absent further information, the analysis here will not consider any differences between flight times and the exposure times in the studies synthesized by Chu et. al. Thus, the calculations will use the expressions for $Q_L(A)$ and kindred quantities as estimated above. Readers uncomfortable with this assumption can linearly adjust the results presented, in a form of sensitivity analysis. If one believes, for example, that (2) is appropriate for one hour of exposure, then one might consider doubling the transmission-risk estimates used here.

Overall Risk Calculations

The various estimates can be combined via (1) to achieve an approximate probability of infection for coach passengers on full flights. Given a focus on US domestic jet flights, one might approximate Q by taking the average of the estimates for higher-infection-rate Texas and lower-rate New York, which yields $Q \approx \frac{1}{331}$. Even on a flight from Dallas to New York City, there will be Texas natives, New York natives, and transfer passengers who originated elsewhere, so a mid-range estimate seems suitable. As noted, Q_M is estimated as 0.18, while

the various $Q_L(Z)$ values above when Z = A, B, ..F are treated as transmission probabilities absent masks. In consequence, one reaches

$$P(infection) \approx \begin{cases} \frac{1}{6{,}900} \text{ on full flights under "fill all seats)} \\ \frac{1}{13{,}700} \text{ on full flights under "middle seat empty"} \end{cases}$$

The first of these risk estimates is the average for passengers in the six filled seats in each row. The second is the average for the four seats occupied under "middle seat empty."

Discussion

For a coach passenger who is infected on a full flight and has a 1% chance of dying from the virus, then the mortality risk based on the estimates above would be about 1 in 700,000 under "fill all seats" and about 1 in 1.4 million under "middle seat empty." Both these estimates are higher than the risk of perishing in a US air crash unrelated to Covid-19, which is about 1 in 34 million (6)). However, data from late June 2020 imply that approximately 1 in 120 Americans have Covid-19 on a given day (i.e., 40,000 confirmed cases per day x 10 x 7 days is about 1/120 of the US population of 330,000,000). Thus, it is not at all clear that the risk of getting infected during a flight is any higher than the risk associated with everyday activities during the pandemic.

Moreover, there is an extremely important caveat to these calculations: they are all contingent on a flight being as full as possible. Even on airlines that will fill every seat if they can, many flights will operate with empty seats. Thus, middle seats (and others) could often be empty even without a policy requirement. It follows that a 1 in 700,000 mortality risk is an

upper bound to the actual risk to a randomly-chosen passenger; one suspects that actual death risk does not exceed one in 1 million.

The risk estimates presented above do not consider the possibility of infection during boarding and leaving the plane, from contagious passengers who walk down the aisle to the lavatory, or within the lavatory itself. There have been reports that, even during the pandemic, passengers form crowds trying to enter and leave the plane quickly (e.g. (7)), which could pose risks beyond those considered here.

Moreover, Equation (2) about infection risk as a function of distance need not literally apply to a passenger flight. The estimates in Chu. Et. al. (4) do not distinguish between people speaking to one another and people who are silent. On the aircraft, nearby passengers probably are largely silent, unless one is seated close to two travelers who spend much of the flight talking. For this reason, Equation (2) could overstate passenger risk. On the other hand, it is assumed here that the equation pertains to individuals not wearing masks, and that one should therefore reduce the risk estimate by 82% via Q_M. Yet some contagious people in the meta-analysis apparently were wearing masks (private correspondence from Dr. Chu), meaning that the equation understates the risk posed by individuals without them. That circumstance would suggest that the factor of 0.13 in Equation (2) is too low, and thus that the overall risk estimate P is too low. It is possible though not certain that these two opposite effects largely cancel one another. This analysis offers a baseline risk estimate using the Chu et al. results at face value, which is a reasonable starting point absent more detailed information about the nature and duration of the exposure to someone contagious.

Calculations like the ones here are highly approximate and, as has been evident during this pandemic, projections about it often fall far of the mark. It is therefore all the more

important that attempts be made to use actual passenger outcomes to estimate what fraction of travelers contracted Covid-19 on their flights. If, averaged over US carriers, the risk level per passenger is estimated as (say) 1 in 12,000, then approximately 50 cases of Covid-19 should emerge each day at a time (like now) when 600,000 passengers are traveling daily. Determining how many such cases actually arise will not be easy: travelers who get asymptomatic Covid-19 (especially younger ones) may never know it, while some passengers who subsequently get Covid-19 may have been infected elsewhere than the airplane. Collating records over widely-diverse localities would be challenging. But when safety is at stake, it is worth some effort to substantiate or refute projections that are tied to strong assumptions.

The calculations here, however rudimentary, do suggest a measurable reduction in Covid-19 risk when middle seats on aircraft are deliberately kept open. The question is whether relinquishing 1/3 of seating capacity is too high a price to pay for the added precaution.

Acknowledgements

I am grateful for immensely valuable suggestions from Edward Kaplan, Richard Larson and Amedeo Odoni.

References

(1)Worldometer.com "Age, Sex, Existing Conditions of COVID-19 Cases and Deaths, data for confirmed cases by day in American states, available at https://www.worldometers.info/coronavirus/coronavirus-age-sex-demographics/

(2) F. Havers et. al. (2020)"Seroprevalence of Antibodies to SARS-Cov-2 in Six Sites in the United States, March 23-May 3, 2020," available at https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.06.25.20140384v1.full.pdf

(3) CSPEC (2020), "Defining High-Value Information for Covid-19 Decision Making," available at https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.04.06.20052506v1.full.pdf

(4) D. Chu et. al.(2020) "Physical Distancing, Face Masks, and Eye Protection, To Prevent Person-to-Person Transmssion of SARS-Cov-2 and COVID-19: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis, *The Lancet,* 395(10242), pp. 1973-1987, June 27, 2020

(5) E. Brundage (2020), "The Risks: Know Them, Avoid Them," available at https://www.erinbromage.com/post/the-risks-know-them-avoid-them

(6) A. Barnett (2020), "Aviation Safety: A Whole New World?" *Transportation Science* 54(1), pp. 84-96, January-February 2020,

(7) D. Gilberson, "Five Flights in Four Weeks: What It's Like to Fly During the Coronvirus Pandemic," *USA Today* 6/30/20, available at https://www.usatoday.com/story/travel/airline-news/2020/06/30/what-its-like-to-fly-during-coronavirus-pandemic-southwest-airlines/3238197001/