

1 Exposure assessment for airborne  
2 transmission of SARS-CoV-2 via breathing,  
3 speaking, coughing and sneezing  
4  
5

6 Jack Schijven\*<sup>§,a,b</sup>

7 Lucie C. Vermeulen\*<sup>a</sup>

8 Arno Swart<sup>a</sup>

9 Adam Meijer<sup>a</sup>

10 Erwin Duizer<sup>a</sup>

11 Ana Maria de Roda Husman<sup>a,c</sup>

12

13 \* shared first author

14

15 <sup>a</sup> Centre for Infectious Disease Control, National Institute for Public Health and the  
16 Environment (RIVM), Bilthoven, the Netherlands

17 <sup>b</sup> Department of Earth Sciences, Utrecht University, Utrecht, the Netherlands

18 <sup>c</sup> Institute for Risk Assessment Sciences, Utrecht University, Utrecht, the Netherlands

19

20 <sup>§</sup> corresponding author: Jack Schijven, [jack.schijven@rivm.nl](mailto:jack.schijven@rivm.nl), National Institute for  
21 Public Health and the Environment, P.O. Box 1 , 3720 BA Bilthoven, the Netherlands

22

23 *The authors declare they have no actual or potential competing financial interests.*

## 24 Abstract

25

### 26 Background

27 Evidence for indoor airborne transmission of SARS-CoV-2 is accumulating. If SARS-CoV-2 also spreads  
28 via aerosols, this has implications for measures taken to limit transmission.

### 29 Objectives

30 The aim of this study is to assess exposure to airborne SARS-CoV-2 particles from breathing,  
31 speaking, coughing and sneezing in an indoor environment.

### 32 Methods

33 An exposure assessment model was developed to estimate numbers of SARS-CoV-2 particles in  
34 aerosol droplets, expelled during breathing, speaking, coughing and sneezing by an infected person  
35 in an unventilated indoor environment, and subsequent inhalation by one or more persons.  
36 Scenarios encompass a range of virus concentrations, room sizes and exposure times.

### 37 Results

38 The calculated total volume of expelled aerosol droplets was highest for a sneeze, followed by a  
39 cough and speaking for 20 minutes, and lastly breathing for 20 minutes. A few to as much as tens of  
40 millions of virus particles were expelled. Exposure probability strongly depends on the viral  
41 concentration in mucus, as well as on the scenario. Exposure probabilities were generally below 1%  
42 at a virus concentration in mucus below  $10^5$  per mL for all scenarios, increasing steeply at different  
43 higher concentrations. According to nose / throat swab data collected from patients, 75%, 50% and  
44 5% of infected individuals carry an estimated number of SARS-CoV-2 per mL mucus of at least  $10^5$ ,  
45  $10^6$  and  $10^8$ , respectively.

### 46 Discussion

47 Exposure to SARS-CoV-2 via aerosols generated during breathing, speaking, coughing and sneezing in  
48 an unventilated indoor environment is possible. This study forms a basis to estimate probabilities of  
49 exposure to SARS-Cov-2 by airborne transmission in indoor spaces. As long as it is uncertain what  
50 fraction of the airborne virus particles is infectious and as long as a dose response relation is lacking,  
51 it is recommended to be precautious.

52

53 Key words: COVID-19, coronavirus, severe acute respiratory syndrome, aerosol, cough, sneeze,  
54 speech, breathe, respiration, risk assessment, QMRA, droplet, indoor

55

## 56 1. Introduction

57 The fate of droplets in the air is mostly determined by their size; larger droplets deposit quickly while  
58 smaller droplets can stay airborne for longer periods, in so-called aerosols (a suspension of droplets  
59 in air). Aerosols can arise from 'violent expiratory events' such as coughing and sneezing (Bourouiba  
60 et al. 2014), but also from breathing and speech (Asadi et al. 2019; Leung et al. 2020). A dry cough is  
61 a predominant symptom of coronavirus (CoV) disease 2019 (COVID-19) (Wang et al. 2020). The WHO  
62 defines a cut-off of  $5\ \mu\text{m}$  to distinguish airborne ( $<5\ \mu\text{m}$ ) from droplet ( $>5\ \mu\text{m}$ ) transmission (World

63 Health Organization 2014, 2020). The existence of a cut-off is contested, other organizations use  
64 different terminology and cut-off values (Kohanski et al. 2020; Tellier et al. 2019). Infectious particles  
65  $<5 \mu\text{m}$  can penetrate more deeply into the lungs, while larger particles most likely impact the upper  
66 airways (Gralton et al. 2011; Tellier et al. 2019). While it is true that the large majority of the volume  
67 of fluids that is expelled during, for example, coughing and sneezing, is in droplets that deposit  
68 quickly, this does not imply that airborne transmission is highly unlikely (Nicas et al. 2005).  
69 Furthermore, research suggests that the cut-off size of droplets (aerodynamic diameter) which  
70 deposit quickly is higher than  $5 \mu\text{m}$ , and not static but dependent on a number of factors, such as  
71 relative humidity (Liu et al. 2017). In the absence of turbulence, droplets with an initial diameter  
72 larger than  $80 \mu\text{m}$  will be deposited on the floor from an initial height of 2 m at a distance away from  
73 the mouth of around 1 m (Liu et al. 2017). The droplet with an initial diameter of  $60 \mu\text{m}$  can reach  
74 about 4 m, with a size of 0.32 times its initial diameter at a relative humidity (RH) of 0%, whereas it  
75 can travel a distance of 1.85 m at a RH of 90% due to its larger droplet size of 0.43 its initial diameter  
76 (Liu et al. 2017). In the case of turbulence, even initially larger particles could likely travel even  
77 further. Therefore, airborne and droplet transmission occur on a continuum, and airborne  
78 transmission can potentially occur in the size fraction of all particles less than about  $60 \mu\text{m}$  (Gralton  
79 et al. 2011; Kohanski et al. 2020; Tellier et al. 2019).

80 Droplets and aerosols can harbour pathogens such as bacteria e.g. *Coxiella burnettii*, and viruses  
81 such as influenza viruses (Milton et al. 2013; Stein et al. 2005). Evidence exists for airborne  
82 (bioaerosol) transmission of multiple viral respiratory diseases, including SARS, MERS and influenza  
83 (Adhikari et al. 2019; Kulkarni et al. 2016; Weber and Stilianakis 2008; Yu et al. 2004; Zhang et al.  
84 2013). Airborne transmission has also been suggested as probable for SARS-CoV-2 (Anderson et al.  
85 2020; Asadi et al. 2020; Chia et al. 2020; Correia et al. 2020; Li et al. 2020; Morawska and Cao 2020;  
86 Richard et al. 2020; Setti et al. 2020; Shen et al. 2020; Stadnytskyi et al. 2020; Wang and Du 2020;  
87 Yao et al. 2020), although other studies contest this and suggest airborne transmission does not take  
88 place (Xu et al. 2020).

89  
90 SARS-CoV-2 has been observed to be remarkably stable in aerosols generated under laboratory  
91 conditions (Fears et al. 2020), with little decline in infectivity after 16 hours of aerosol suspension.  
92 Similarly, van Doremalen et al. (2020) also found that SARS-CoV-2 remained viable for hours in  
93 experimentally generated aerosols (reduction in infectious virus particles from 3100 to 500 per litre  
94 air in 3 hours).

95 There is much discussion about the potential for airborne transmission of SARS-CoV-2. The World  
96 Health Organization so far maintains that COVID-19 is not airborne ([https://who.africa-  
97 newsroom.com/press/coronavirus-fact-check-covid19-is-not-airborne](https://who.africa-newsroom.com/press/coronavirus-fact-check-covid19-is-not-airborne)). Eissenberg et al. (2020)  
98 discuss the evidence cited by WHO and conclude that it remains prudent to consider airborne  
99 transmission of COVID-19 as an explanation for the rapid spread of the virus. If SARS-CoV-2 also  
100 spreads via airborne transmission, this has implications for the measures that are being taken to  
101 limit transmission, such as advice to keep a certain distance from other people. If SARS-CoV-2 is also  
102 airborne, transmission would be plausible beyond the often advised 1.5 meters.

103 The aim of this study is to assess exposure to airborne SARS-CoV-2 particles from breathing,  
104 speaking, coughing and sneezing in an indoor environment. Figure 1 shows a schematic overview of  
105 the processes modelled in this study. The exposure assessment entailed estimating the numbers of  
106 SARS-CoV-2 particles in aerosol droplets, expelled during breathing, speaking, coughing and sneezing  
107 by an infected person in an unventilated indoor environment, and subsequent inhalation by one or  
108 more persons in that environment. Exposure assessment is part of a Quantitative Microbial Risk  
109 Assessment (QMRA), in which exposure assessment is followed by a risk characterisation. In risk

110 characterisation, estimates of risk of infection and/or illness are made using dose response relations  
111 (Haas et al. 1999). In this study, risks of infection/illness were not estimated because dose response  
112 relation data are lacking for SARS-CoV-2. Literature and laboratory data on SARS-CoV-2 virus  
113 concentrations from nasopharyngeal and oropharyngeal swab samples (hereafter: nasal and throat),  
114 numbers of expelled aerosol droplets and their size distributions were used as input for the model  
115 calculations. This study focused on modelling airborne transmission and thus did not model larger  
116 droplet transmission, e.g. the probability of coming into contact with large droplets that fall directly  
117 on mucosa or surfaces.

118

119

## 120 2. Methods

121

### 122 2.1 Scenarios

123 Table 1 shows the scenarios that were applied. All scenarios consist of two parts. The first part is the  
124 expelling part, where an infected, (a)symptomatic person enters a room and stays there for 20  
125 minutes. Two differently sized rooms were considered, one room with the dimensions of 12 x 2.55 x  
126 3.05 m<sup>3</sup> = 93 330 litres, which corresponds with the dimensions of a Dutch public transport bus with  
127 two axles (GVB <https://over.gvb.nl/ov-in-amsterdam/feiten-en-cijfers/bus-in-cijfers/>), and the other  
128 room with dimensions of 15 x 15 x 3 m<sup>3</sup> = 675 000 litres. Such a room may be a small restaurant,  
129 fitness room, or meeting room, etcetera. For convenience the two rooms are denoted as bus and  
130 room. The infected person expels virus particles through 20 minutes of breathing, 20 minutes of  
131 speaking, one cough, or one sneeze. The bus and room are not ventilated, and it is assumed that the  
132 virus particles that are contained in aerosol droplets are evenly distributed in the rooms. In the  
133 second part of the scenarios, the exposure part, one or more persons are exposed to the virus  
134 contained in the aerosol droplets. In the case of the bus, one or thirty other persons enter for 20  
135 minutes and in the case of the room, ten persons enter for 1 hour or 4 hours.

136 One reason for using different scenarios for expelling virus was because of inconsistencies in the  
137 literature regarding the number and size distribution of the aerosol droplets from speaking,  
138 coughing and sneezing. For speaking, two scenarios, low and high, include the data from size  
139 distributions from Asadi (2019), reading an English passage aloud at intermediate loudness (85 dB),  
140 and Duguid (1946), speaking loudly. Similarly, two scenarios encompass the data from size  
141 distributions for coughing, denoted as low and high from Lindsley et al. (2012) and Duguid (1946),  
142 respectively. Likewise, two scenarios, low and high, encompass the data from the size distributions  
143 in a sneeze as reported by Gerone et al. (1966) and Duguid (1946), respectively. In the selection of  
144 data from literature, studies concerning bacterial infections were not included. Size distribution data  
145 for breathing were based on the study by Fabian et al. (2011). Fabian et al. (2011) concerned human  
146 rhinovirus-infected subjects, Gerone (1966) concerned coxsackie virus-infected subjects, Lindsley et  
147 al. (2012) concerned influenza virus-infected subjects, and all other studies listed in Table 1  
148 concerned studies on healthy individuals. The Supplementary material contains more discussion on  
149 the choice of the size distribution data.

150

151 Exposure assessment was conducted with each value of the following decimal range of the virus  
152 concentration in mucus: 10<sup>3</sup>, 10<sup>4</sup>, 10<sup>5</sup>, 10<sup>6</sup>, 10<sup>7</sup>, 10<sup>8</sup>, 10<sup>9</sup>, 10<sup>11</sup> virus particles per mL. This range in

153 virus concentrations as estimated from viral RNA detection reflects those observed in nasal and  
154 throat swabs (own data, 2020) (Zou et al. 2020).

155

## 156 2.2 Exposure assessment model

157

### 158 **Virus concentration**

159 Viral concentration from throat and nasal swabs were determined for the first 729 SARS-CoV-2 E-gen  
160 positive diagnostic samples sent in from municipal health services and hospitals to the National  
161 Institute for Public Health and the Environment of the Netherlands (RIVM) for COVID-19 diagnosis,  
162 analysed as described (Corman et al. 2020). For quantification, the RdRp gene fragment was used.  
163 These data and data from Zou and co-workers (Zou et al. 2020) were fitted to a left-censored  
164 lognormal distribution using a Bayesian fit in RStan (R Core Team 2019; Stan Development Team  
165 2020), in which the logarithm of the virus concentration was assumed to be normally distributed and  
166 from the onset of symptoms to decrease in time:

$$167 \text{Log}_{10}c \sim N(\mu, \sigma) \quad (1)$$

$$168 \mu = a_0 + a_1 t \quad (2)$$

169 where  $c$  is the virus concentration [numbers per mL mucus] with mean  $\mu$ , standard deviation  $\sigma$ ,  
170 coefficients  $a_0$  and  $a_1$  and time  $t$  [days] from onset symptoms. Note that, in the Zou-data, a  
171 distinction between the data from nasal and throat swabs was made, but this was not possible in the  
172 RIVM-data where most samples were combined nose-throat swabs. SARS-CoV-2 concentrations are  
173 determined as Ct values, which are inversely related to viral RNA copy number. Viral RNA copy  
174 number in mucus was estimated from Ct values, as detailed in Supplementary material S1.

### 175 **Total volume of aerosol droplets**

176 The total initial volume of aerosol droplets per cough, sneeze, 20 minutes speaking and 20 minutes  
177 breathing was calculated from the number of aerosol droplets and their size distribution. Following  
178 Liu et al. (2017), in collecting literature data of the size distribution of expelled droplets by breathing,  
179 speaking, coughing and sneezing, expelled droplets smaller than 60  $\mu\text{m}$  were considered, when  
180 measured directly in front of the mouth, assuming little evaporation had happened. Liu et al. (2017)  
181 reported that the droplet nuclei size at a relative humidity of 90% (25°C) could be 30% larger than  
182 the size of the same droplet at a relative humidity of less than 67.3% (25°C). In the case of a distance  
183 of about 0.5 m or more, the size distribution of droplets of 20  $\mu\text{m}$  or less was considered, and for  
184 these droplets, their initial size distribution (at the point of leaving the mouth) was estimated by  
185 multiplying their diameter by a factor of three, to correct for evaporation (Liu et al. 2017).

186 For the total aerosol droplet volume by breathing, the data reported by Fabian et al. (2011) were  
187 used. Fabian et al. (2011) reported a box-whisker chart of the logarithm of the number of aerosol  
188 droplets per litre of exhaled air for six aerosol droplet size classes from 0.3  $\mu\text{m}$  to >10  $\mu\text{m}$ . For each  
189 size class the average diameter was used, for >10  $\mu\text{m}$  the value of 15  $\mu\text{m}$  was chosen. From box-  
190 whisker chart mean and quantile values were extracted to estimate mean and standard deviation of  
191 the logarithm of the number of aerosol droplets per litre of exhaled air for each of the six aerosol  
192 droplet size classes. It was realised that a correlation between the numbers of droplets expelled in  
193 the different size classes may exist that was not apparent from this chart (e.g. a subject that expels

194 above average droplets in one size class is perhaps likely to also expel above average in other size  
195 classes). The total volume of aerosol droplets per minute of exhaled air,  $v_{br}$  was calculated as  
196 follows:

$$197 \quad v_{br} = 10^{N(\mu_{br}, \sigma_{br})} 10^{-12} \frac{\pi}{6} \sum_{i=1}^6 (d_i * 10^{N(\mu_i, \sigma_i)})^3 \quad (3)$$

198 where  $d_i$  is the diameter [ $\mu\text{m}$ ] of aerosol droplets in the  $i$ -th class of six aerosol droplet diameters, of  
199 which the logarithm of their concentration in air is normally distributed with mean  $\mu_i$  and standard  
200 deviation  $\sigma_i$ . The volumes of each aerosol droplet size were summed, then converted from  $\mu\text{m}^3$  to  
201 millilitres by a scaling factor of  $10^{-12}$  and multiplied by the tidal breathing rate that is normally  
202 distributed on log-scale with mean  $\mu_{br}$  and standard deviation  $\sigma_{br}$  (Table 2).

203 The numbers of expelled aerosol droplets  $n_{sp,co,sn}$  during speaking, coughing or sneezing, respectively,  
204 were assumed to be lognormally distributed:

$$205 \quad n_{sp,co,sn} \approx \text{LogNormal}(\mu_{sp,co,sn}, \sigma_{sp,co,sn}) \quad (4)$$

206 The  $\approx$  sign denotes rounding to integer values. Values of parameters  $\mu_{sp}$  and  $\sigma_{sp}$  are given in Table 2  
207 and represent the range of numbers of aerosol droplets as reported by Duguid (1945) and Asadi et  
208 al. (2019) per litre and per minute of speaking loudly. In the case of Asadi et al. (2019), these  
209 numbers needed to be scaled to the volume of air a person exhales during speaking a minute using  
210 the values for tidal breathing increased by 13.5% (Bunn and Mead 1971). Duguid reported data for  
211 subjects counting from 1 to 100, it was assumed this represented an observed speaking time of 1.5  
212 minutes. Values of parameters  $\mu_{co}$  and  $\sigma_{co}$  represent the range of numbers of coughed aerosol  
213 droplets as reported by Duguid (1945) and Lindsley et al. (2012). Values of parameters  $\mu_{sn}$  and  $\sigma_{sn}$   
214 represent the range of numbers of sneezed aerosol droplets as reported by Duguid (1945) and  
215 Gerone et al. (1966).

216 For each study, the total volume of aerosol droplets per 20 minutes of speaking, per cough and per  
217 sneeze,  $v_{sp,co,sn}$  [millilitres] was calculated by summing  $n_{sp,co,sn}$  samples of each diameter data set as  
218 follows:

$$219 \quad v_{sp,co,sn} = 10^{-12} \frac{\pi}{6} \sum (d_i * n_{sp,co,sn})^3 \quad (5)$$

220 The size distributions of aerosol droplets expelled by speaking were from Duguid (1946) and Asadi et  
221 al. (2019). Asadi et al. counted particles between 0.5 – 20  $\mu\text{m}$  with highest counts around 1  $\mu\text{m}$ ,  
222 while Duguid reported underestimation of particles less than about 1  $\mu\text{m}$  with highest counts around  
223 2-4  $\mu\text{m}$ . The size distributions of aerosol droplets expelled by coughing were taken from Lindsley et  
224 al. (2012) and Duguid (1946). Both reported counts of particles for the various aerosol droplet  
225 diameters. The size distributions of aerosol droplets expelled by sneezing were taken from Gerone  
226 et al. (1966) and Duguid (1946). Gerone et al. (1966) did not count particles larger than 15  $\mu\text{m}$ , and  
227 Duguid reported underestimation of particles less than about 1  $\mu\text{m}$ .

228 See Supplementary material S2 for more detailed discussion on data selection, and the counted  
229 aerosol droplet diameter ranges, method of counting and subjects investigated in the selected  
230 studies.

231

232 **Dose and exposure probability**

233 It was assumed that the expelled aerosol droplets were instantaneously evenly dispersed in the  
234 room. The dose  $D$  was computed as follows:

$$235 \quad D \sim \text{Pois}\left(\frac{c v_{br,sp,co,sn}}{v_r} v_{inh} s\right) \quad (6)$$

236 where  $v_r$  is the volume of the room [litres], and  $v_{inh}$  is the inhaled volume of an exposed person  
237 during 20 minutes using the same tidal breath rate as in equation (3),  $s$  is a sensitivity factor.

238 In equation (6),  $s*c$  can be interpreted as a change in  $c$  by factor  $s$ . Similarly,  $s*v_{br,sp,co,sn}$ ,  $s/v_r$  and  
239  $s*v_{inh}$  can be interpreted as a change in  $v_{br,sp,co,sn}$ ,  $1/v_r$  and  $v_{inh}$ . In other words, any change in these  
240 variable or combination of these variables by factor  $s$  has the same effect on the dose and  
241 probability of exposure. Factor  $s$  can also be interpreted as the number of exposed persons, or the  
242 number of persons expelling virus. Also note that a factor  $s$  change in  $v_{inh}$  can be due to a change in  
243 exposure time.

244 In the scenario with one exposed person in a bus for 20 minutes,  $s=1$ . This is the reference scenario.  
245 In the scenario with 30 exposed person in a bus for 20 minutes,  $s=30$ . In the larger room with 10  
246 persons for 1 hour,  $s=1/7*10*3=4$ , and in that room for 4 hours,  $s=16$ . For the sensitivity analyses  
247 two extra scenarios were added with factor  $s=0.1$  and  $s=100$ .

248 Finally, the probability of exposure  $P_{exp}$  was computed as one minus the Poisson probability of  
249 exposure to zero particles:

$$250 \quad P_{exp} = 1 - e^{-D} \quad (7)$$

251 All volumes of aerosol droplets, the dose and probability of exposure were computed by drawing 10  
252 000 Monte Carlo samples. All computations were conducted using Mathematica (Wolfram Research  
253 Inc. 2019).

254 Because short time frames are considered, and SARS-CoV-2 has been observed to remain infectious  
255 in aerosols for hours (Fears et al. 2020; van Doremalen et al. 2020), decay over time is not modelled  
256 in this study. The exposure assessment will, in that regard, be conservative.

## 257 3. Results

258

### 259 3.1 Parameter values

260 Table 2 shows the parameter values as obtained for the different equations. For speaking, coughing  
261 and sneezing, the particle size distribution could not be described properly by a lognormal, gamma,  
262 or normal distribution as indicated by an Anderson-Darling test. Therefore, Monte Carlo simulation  
263 entailed direct random sampling from the size distribution data.

264

### 265 3.2 Exhaled volumes of aerosolized droplets

266 The total volume of expelled aerosolized droplets as calculated for the different scenarios for  
267 breathing, speaking, coughing and sneezing (eqs. 3 and 5) is shown in Figure 2. Variation is observed  
268 both within and between scenarios. For sneezing there is about one order of magnitude difference  
269 between the low and high scenarios (mean from 5 000 to 30 000 picolitres per sneeze). For coughing  
270 there is about two orders of magnitude difference between the low and high scenario (mean from  
271 30 to 4 000 picolitres per cough). For speaking, the two scenarios are similar (mean from 200 to 300  
272 picolitre per 20 minutes). The breathing scenario varies about seven orders of magnitude (mean 6,

273 range from 0.004 to 30 000 picolitres per 20 minutes), the speaking and coughing scenarios vary  
274 about three orders of magnitude and the sneezing scenarios vary about two orders of magnitude.  
275 The total aerosol volume from speaking loudly for 20 minutes is in between that of the low and high  
276 scenarios from one cough.

277

### 278 3.3 Viral concentration data from swabs

279 Observed SARS-CoV-2 concentrations in mucus spanned a wide range, from  $10^2$  to  $10^{11}$  copies / mL  
280 (corresponding to a range of Ct values from 40 to 10.5). Observed concentrations in mucus were on  
281 average 2 orders of magnitude higher for the RIVM data ( $\sim 10^6$  copies / mL) than in the Zou data  
282 ( $\sim 10^4$  copies / mL, Figure 3 bottom panels). SARS-CoV-2 virus concentrations from the nasal swabs of  
283 Zou et al. (2020) were, on average, higher than those from throat swabs, and both decreased over  
284 time (days since symptom onset) (Supplementary material S1). This decrease in concentration from  
285 the onset of symptoms was also observed in the own data. The bottom panels of Figure 3 show the  
286 probability densities of the virus concentrations in swabs from infected persons in parallel with the  
287 range of virus concentrations applied in the scenarios. This way it is possible to read the probability  
288 that a person expels virus at a certain concentration. It was chosen to show the probability densities  
289 instead of the raw data, as this allowed for including non-detects in the fits and gives a better view  
290 of the mean and 95% of the data.

291

### 292 3.4 Numbers of expelled virus particles and dose

293 The number of viral particles that is expelled by an infected individual is dependent on the virus  
294 concentration and the volume expelled. At lower virus concentrations (e.g.  $<10^5$  copies / mL in the  
295 mucus), there is a large probability that no viruses are expelled, especially during breathing and  
296 speaking. At higher virus concentrations, the range of virus particles that are expelled varies hugely  
297 from a few to more than ten million virus particles. Corresponding concentrations of virus in the air  
298 of the room ranged from  $10^{-4}$  to  $10^2$  per litre of air. Due to the variability in expelled volume, the  
299 expelled numbers of virus particles vary about a factor of one hundred for a given virus  
300 concentration for breathing, and about a factor of ten for the other scenarios. The numbers of  
301 expelled virus particles correspond to the expelled droplet volumes and vary about a factor of ten  
302 between the low and high scenarios for speaking and sneezing, and about a factor of one hundred  
303 between the low and high coughing scenarios. The dose follows a similar pattern, but numbers of  
304 virus particles are about a factor of one thousand lower because the inhalation volume is about one  
305 thousandth of the volume of air in the bus. Graphical details on the numbers of expelled virus  
306 particles and the associated dose are given in the Supplementary material S3 (Figure S1).

### 307 3.5 Probability of exposure

308 Figure 3 summarizes the probability of exposure for all scenarios. The exposure probability can be  
309 read from the curves, for a certain virus concentration. Note that the figure shows the mean  
310 probabilities, and these probabilities vary one to two orders of magnitude, like the number of  
311 expelled virus particles. Generally, low probability of exposure is observed at a virus concentration  
312 below  $10^5$  per mL for all scenarios, except the 100x reference scenario. Furthermore, of course  
313 directly related to the volume of expelled aerosol droplets (Figure 2), it is observed that the  
314 probability starts to increase steeply at different concentrations for each of the scenarios. Going  
315 from the high sneezing scenario to the low sneezing scenario and the high coughing scenario, then  
316 to both speaking scenarios, followed by the low coughing scenario, and finally, the breathing



317 scenario, for each these steps, about a ten times higher virus concentration is required for the same  
318 exposure probability. Going to a scenario with more exposed persons, longer time for exposure, or  
319 smaller room, the probability of exposure curves all shift to the left.

320 For example, at a virus concentration of  $10^6$  per mL mucus and in the high sneeze scenario, in the  
321 bus with one exposed person, figure 3 indicates a probability of exposure of about 4%. In the same  
322 scenario, but with 30 exposed persons, the probability of exposing at least one person amounts to  
323 60%. In the larger room, with 10 exposed persons, the exposure probability is 14% and 41% for the  
324 1-hour and 4-hours exposure times, respectively. In a full bus and nobody speaking, coughing or  
325 sneezing, the probability of exposure is about 6% when an infected person expelled virus at a  
326 concentration of  $10^8$  per mL. And if in that bus an infected person would sneeze heavily (the high-  
327 sneeze scenario), at a virus concentration of  $10^8$  per mL, probability of exposure of at least one  
328 persons would be equal to one. At a concentration of  $10^6$ , this probability is 60%.

329 Visually comparing with the probability density distributions of the measured virus concentrations in  
330 the bottom panels, (own data, 2020 ) (Zou et al. 2020) one can get an impression of the probability  
331 of the corresponding virus concentration occurring. For example, following the RIVM data, a virus  
332 concentration of  $10^8$  per mL or more in the mucus occurs in about 5% of infected individuals.

333

## 334 4 Discussion

335

336 The probability of exposure of at least one person to SARS-CoV-2 particles contained in aerosol  
337 droplets that were expelled by an infected person was estimated in various scenarios wherein the  
338 infected person was expelling virus by breathing, speaking, coughing or sneezing. An important  
339 assumption was that the initial aerosol droplets have the same virus concentration as measured in  
340 mucus from nasal and throat swab samples, and that the numbers of virus particles in mucus were  
341 evenly distributed. Moreover, it was assumed that the expelled aerosol droplets were  
342 instantaneously and evenly distributed in the air of the room. For the sake of simplicity for this first  
343 study, it was assumed that an infected person leaves the room before one or more susceptible  
344 persons enter. In further work, this could evolve to a dynamic model with rates at which virus is  
345 expelled and inhaled, as was done by Buonanno et al. (2020). Although the approach is similar, our  
346 results cannot directly be compared to the work by Buonanno et al., as they presented calculated  
347 risks for very specific scenarios.

348 The range of observed SARS-CoV-2 concentration in swab samples of  $10^2 - 10^{11}$  RNA copies / mL is  
349 similar to the range found in another Dutch study by van Kampen et al. (2020), who observed a  
350 range of  $10^3 - 10^{10}$  RNA copies / mL. The calculated range of viral concentrations in the air (from  $10^{-4}$   
351 to  $10^2$  per litre of air, section 3.4) does encompass the values of observed airborne SARS-CoV-2  
352 concentrations in hospital rooms with SARS-CoV-2 patients (Chia et al. 2020; Guo et al. 2020; Liu et  
353 al. 2020; Ong et al. 2020; Santarpia et al. 2020). Chia et al. (2020) observed total airborne SARS-CoV-  
354 2 concentrations ranging from 1.8 to 3.4 RNA copies/ L air. About half of the RNA was found in  
355 droplets sized 1 – 4  $\mu\text{m}$ , and the other in half particles sized > 4  $\mu\text{m}$ . Santarpia et al. (2020) similarly  
356 observed 0.98 to 8.7 copies / L air in hallway air samplers, and higher concentrations of 5.4 to 67  
357 copies / L air with personal air samplers. From one of the samples, it was indicated that it contained  
358 culturable SARS-CoV-2, suggesting that not only RNA in inactivated virus was emitted to the air, but  
359 also infectious virus. Liu et al. (2020) measured air in COVID-19 patient areas, staff areas and public  
360 areas in two Wuhan hospitals. In all three areas positive samples were found with low

361 concentrations, ranging from  $10^{-3}$  to  $10^{-1}$  RNA copies / L for patient areas,  $10^{-3}$  to  $4 \times 10^{-2}$  for staff  
362 areas, and  $10^{-3}$  to  $10^{-2}$  for public areas. Highest SARS-CoV-2 concentrations were detected in droplet  
363 size ranges of 0.25 – 1  $\mu\text{m}$  and  $>2.5 \mu\text{m}$ . Guo et al. (2020) similarly found air samples positive for  
364 SARS-CoV-2 RNA both in patient isolation wards but also the doctor's office in a hospital. In contrast,  
365 Faridi et al. (2020) and Ong et al. (2020) were unable to detect SARS-CoV-2 RNA in the air in hospital  
366 wards. Ong et al. measured in well-ventilated airborne infection isolation rooms and their  
367 anterooms (12 air changes per hour). Although air samples were negative, the air outlet fan was  
368 found positive for SARS-CoV-2 RNA. This shows the importance of ventilation.

369 The assumption that expelled aerosol droplets are instantaneously and evenly distributed in the air  
370 of the room implies that there is an immediate dilution of the expelled virus concentration, which  
371 lowers its concentration in the air, but also spreads the virus. Obviously, dilution will not really occur  
372 instantaneously, it highly depends on the aerodynamics in the room. An exposed person directly in  
373 front of the infected person, or in a flow path of the contaminated air, may inhale a much larger  
374 dose than average. Clearly, air ventilation is very important. It may be surmised that in outdoor  
375 spaces exposure probability will be much less, due to much more dispersion and dilution.

376 In the exposure assessment, virus inactivation was not included. According to van Doremalen et al.  
377 (2020) the infectious virus concentration should have decreased 20 (8-30)% after 20 minutes, 47 (23-  
378 66)% after one hour and 92 (65-99)% after 4 hours. Including virus inactivation should require  
379 accounting for the virus decline time during exposure, on the other hand, in several situations,  
380 viruses are continuously expelled. Furthermore, it should be noted that it is unknown what fraction  
381 of airborne RNA-copies is infectious virus. Observational data on infectious virus in aerosols in  
382 various settings are needed to validate modelling efforts. No dose-response model is, as of yet,  
383 available for SARS-CoV-2. In future work, an existing dose-response model for a highly infectious  
384 agent analogous to the approach by Schijven et al. (2016) could be applied, to make a first estimate  
385 of risk to be infected, or the dose-response model for SARS 1 (Watanabe et al. 2010) could be taken  
386 as a starting point. Additionally, the probability of illness when infected is also unknown. For other  
387 respiratory viruses, e.g. adenovirus, the dose-response model quickly approaches a 100% infection  
388 rate at a dose of  $\sim 10$  viral particles, but 100% illness is not attained (Teunis et al. 2016). This should  
389 be further studied for SARS-CoV-2. The location of infection, in relation to the size of the droplets  
390 might also be of importance with respect to illness outcomes. Droplets  $<5 \mu\text{m}$  can penetrate more  
391 deeply into the lungs where SARS-CoV-2 can infect airway epithelium. SARS-CoV-2 entry factors  
392 were also found to be highly expressed in nasal epithelium meaning that infection can likely  
393 establish there as well (Sungnak et al. 2020). SARS-CoV-2 prevalence in the population of course  
394 influences the probability that an infected person is present in a bus or room, this was not  
395 accounted for in the model. Similarly, immunity in the population influences the probability that  
396 susceptible persons are present.

397 The current study was entirely focused on estimating probabilities of exposure to SARS-CoV-2 in  
398 aerosolized droplets that are small enough to be distributed in the air farther than 1.5 meter. From  
399 this study, the relative importance of aerosol and droplet transmission cannot be determined. To  
400 put this in perspective, Duguid et al (1946), also captured droplets with an initial diameter of more  
401 than 60  $\mu\text{m}$  when speaking, coughing or sneezing, of which the total volume can be 3-5 orders of  
402 magnitude higher than the total volume of the smaller droplets  $<60 \mu\text{m}$ . However, for droplet  
403 transmission, different factors govern the probability of exposure, such as the probability of  
404 expelling droplets directly onto the mucosa of another person, hand hygiene, hand-mouth contact  
405 virus transfer rates, etcetera. It should be noted that, although transmission at short distances is  
406 commonly thought to be droplet transmission, Chen et al. (2020) found that the short-range

407 airborne route actually dominates at most distances during both talking and coughing. Chen et al.  
408 studied airborne transmission in general, not specifically SARS-CoV-2 or another virus.

409 The highest numbers of viruses were expelled in aerosol droplets from a sneeze, followed by the  
410 high coughing scenario. Persons that are sneezing and/or coughing are advised by governments to  
411 stay at home. However, it is also reported that symptoms can start acutely and that the day before,  
412 and first days with, symptoms, the highest virus loads are found in naso-pharyngeal swabs (Kimball  
413 et al. 2020; Pan et al. 2020; Zou et al. 2020). Therefore, an occasional sneeze or cough could easily  
414 occur before one realizes one should have stayed at home. Somsen et al. (2020) found that sneezing  
415 only produces large drops and not so much aerosols, which is in contrast with our findings of the  
416 potential importance of sneezing. As coughing is a predominant symptom of COVID-19 (Wang et al.  
417 2020), it can be envisioned that the scenario of a single cough is not realistic, and persons might  
418 cough many times in a row. This would render coughing perhaps more important than sneezing.  
419 Furthermore, singing, speaking loudly (speaking is commonly directed to other persons), breathing  
420 heavily because of intense activity, all may expel as many virus particles as coughing. Reports on high  
421 SARS-CoV-2 attack rates during choir practices exist, e.g. (Hamner et al. 2020). Singing is reportedly  
422 associated with tuberculosis outbreaks (Mangura et al. 1998), and Loudon and Roberts (1968) found  
423 the number of airborne droplet nuclei after singing to be higher than after talking, nearly as high as  
424 after coughing. Other studies also suggest that airborne transmission of infectious diseases is  
425 possible without coughing or sneezing, but simply from exhaled breath from individuals who barely  
426 show any symptoms (Asadi et al. 2019; Yan et al. 2018).

427 The observed droplet size distribution peak is different for studies measuring specifically in smaller  
428 size ranges (0.5 – 20  $\mu\text{m}$ ) (Asadi et al. 2019; Fabian et al. 2011), than in studies measuring in larger  
429 size ranges for both airborne and larger droplets (2-1000  $\mu\text{m}$ ). Studies measuring in the small range  
430 generally report the peak (highest numbers of particles) around 1  $\mu\text{m}$ , while studies measuring in  
431 the larger range report the peak  $\sim 15 \mu\text{m}$  (Chao et al. 2009; Duguid 1946). Difference in the  
432 sensitivity of the equipment for certain size classes might account for this discrepancy.

433 It is thought that for many infectious diseases that superspreaders drive a large part of the  
434 transmission in the population; for SARS 1 the 20% most infectious individuals were estimated to  
435 cause 80-90% of the transmission (Galvani and May 2005; Lloyd-Smith et al. 2005), and also for  
436 SARS-CoV-2 this has been suggested (Endo et al. 2020). This study underpins the idea of  
437 superspreading events via aerosols. High virus concentrations in mucus of infected individuals  
438 appear to be necessary for high probabilities of exposure for persons in the same room. Most mucus  
439 samples are currently analysed by RT-PCR based methods for which the results do indicate a measure  
440 on the quantity of viral RNA. Since in an efficient PCR, a Ct value that is 9-10 cycli lower represents a  
441 virus RNA load that is 500-1000 higher, this information can be used to indicate a warning for those  
442 that may possibly shed much more than the average person. In the own data set the average  
443 detection is at Ct 26.1 cycli and about 2.5% shedders at Ct $\leq$ 17 cycli were found, that can be indicated  
444 as probable supershedders.

445 A superspreading event probably has multiple components. A person producing high levels of virus  
446 in the (upper) respiratory system can be thought of as a superreplicator. If a superreplicator is  
447 average or above average in droplet and aerosol production he or she may be a supershedder: not  
448 only producing high load of virus but also excreting them in transmittable form. If a supershedder  
449 does not follow the mitigation protocols (stay at home when sick, proper coughing and sneezing  
450 hygiene etc.) a supershedder can become a superspreader: someone causing many more infections  
451 than anticipated based on the average  $R_0$ . The exposure assessment of this study demonstrates that

452 viral RNA copy concentrations in mucus above  $10^8$  per mL may easily give rise to very high exposure  
453 probabilities, even during breathing and speaking. SARS-CoV-2 superspreaders might be pre- or  
454 asymptomatic. Kimball et al. (2020) reported no significant difference in observed viral  
455 concentrations (Ct values) in throat/nose swabs between symptomatic, presymptomatic and  
456 asymptomatic individuals. One of the subjects in the study by Zou et al. (2020) was asymptomatic,  
457 and shed viral numbers that were similar to symptomatic subjects.

458 To which extent SARS-CoV-2 can be transmitted via aerosols has implications for intervention  
459 measures such as the advice to revert to community masking. Several meta-analyses have shown  
460 little protective effect to support widespread use of facemasks against COVID-19 (Brainard et al.  
461 2020). However, there is enough evidence to support the use of facemasks for short periods of time  
462 by particularly vulnerable individuals when in transient higher risk situations.

463 The aim of this study was to assess exposure to airborne SARS-CoV-2 particles from breathing,  
464 speaking, coughing and sneezing in an indoor environment. Key findings are:

- 465 1. Data on size distribution, and amounts of aerosol droplets generated by breathing, speaking,  
466 coughing and sneezing that are small enough to stay afloat in the air and be dispersed in  
467 indoor spaces, vary widely. Despite this variation, there is ample evidence that indoor  
468 dispersion of aerosol droplets occurs. Generally, in more recent studies, smaller aerosol  
469 droplets, up to the submicron level, could be detected. Several studies have measured SARS-  
470 CoV-2 in the air, of which two showed infectious virus particles. Detection of viruses  
471 particles in the air is hampered by the fact that concentrations are commonly low, as was  
472 demonstrated in this study. Nevertheless, such concentrations may still give rise to  
473 significant probabilities of exposure (10 persons may inhale 5000 litres of air per hour). To  
474 conclude: aerosol transmission of SARS-CoV-2 is possible and should not be disregarded.
- 475 2. Moreover, according to the RIVM data, 20% of cases carry concentrations as high as at least  
476  $10^7$  RNA copies per mL mucus and 5% at least  $10^8$  RNA copies per mL, probably even in pre-  
477 and asymptomatic persons, adding to the probability of exposure.
- 478 3. According to our results, sneezing leads to highest probabilities of exposure, followed by  
479 coughing and speaking and lastly breathing in the selected scenarios.
- 480 4. The exposure assessment in this study can be used as a basis to estimate probabilities of  
481 exposure to SARS-CoV-2 by airborne transmission in indoor spaces, thereby accounting for  
482 the probability that infected persons are present (prevalence), the number of exposed  
483 persons, the size of the indoor space, duration of expelling virus by the emitter, duration of  
484 exposure to the virus.
- 485 5. As long as it is uncertain what fraction of the airborne RNA copies relate to virus particles  
486 and how much of these are infectious and as long as a dose response relation is lacking, it is  
487 recommended to be precautionous.
- 488 6. The exposure assessment could be improved by including heterogeneity of the (*eg.* directed)  
489 spreading of aerosol droplets, as well as its time dynamics.

490

491

## 492 Acknowledgement

493 We gratefully acknowledge the Dutch COVID-19 response team existing of colleagues from RIVM-  
494 LCI, RIVM-EPI and Erasmus MC. Furthermore, we are grateful to the RIVM COVID-19 molecular  
495 diagnostic team of IDS for use of diagnostic data on Dutch COVID-19 patients. Municipal health

496 services and hospital labs are thanked for sending in specimens of suspect COVID-19 patients and  
497 providing additional clinical data. Special thanks for Harry Vennema for fruitful discussions. This  
498 work was funded by the Dutch Ministry of Health, Welfare, and Sports (VWS).

499

## 500 Literature

501 Adhikari U, Chabrelie A, Weir M, Boehnke K, McKenzie E, Ikner L, et al. 2019. A case study evaluating  
502 the risk of infection from middle eastern respiratory syndrome coronavirus (mers-cov) in a hospital  
503 setting through bioaerosols. *Risk Analysis* 39:2608-2624.

504 Anderson EL, Turnham P, Griffin JR, Clarke CC. 2020. Consideration of the aerosol transmission for  
505 covid-19 and public health. *Risk Analysis* n/a.

506 Asadi S, Wexler AS, Cappa CD, Barreda S, Bouvier NM, Ristenpart WD. 2019. Aerosol emission and  
507 superemission during human speech increase with voice loudness. *Sci Rep* 9:2348.

508 Asadi S, Bouvier N, Wexler AS, Ristenpart WD. 2020. The coronavirus pandemic and aerosols: Does  
509 covid-19 transmit via expiratory particles? *Aerosol Science and Technology*:1-4.

510 Bourouiba L, Dehandschoewercker E, Bush John WM. 2014. Violent expiratory events: On coughing  
511 and sneezing. *Journal of Fluid Mechanics* 745:537-563.

512 Brainard JS, Jones N, Lake I, Hooper L, Hunter P. 2020. Facemasks and similar barriers to prevent  
513 respiratory illness such as covid-19: A rapid systematic review. medRxiv:2020.2004.2001.20049528.

514 Bunn JC, Mead J. 1971. Control of ventilation during speech. *Journal of Applied Physiology* 31:870-  
515 872.

516 Buonanno G, Stabile L, Morawska L. 2020. Estimation of airborne viral emission: Quanta emission  
517 rate of sars-cov-2 for infection risk assessment. *Environment International* 141:105794.

518 Chao CYH, Wan MP, Morawska L, Johnson GR, Ristovski ZD, Hargreaves M, et al. 2009.  
519 Characterization of expiration air jets and droplet size distributions immediately at the mouth  
520 opening. *Journal of Aerosol Science* 40:122-133.

521 Chen W, Zhang N, Wei J, Yen H-L, Li Y. 2020. Short-range airborne route dominates exposure of  
522 respiratory infection during close contact. *Building and Environment* 176:106859.

523 Chia PY, Coleman KK, Tan YK, Ong SWX, Gum M, Lau SK, et al. 2020. Detection of air and surface  
524 contamination by severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (sars-cov-2) in hospital rooms of  
525 infected patients. medRxiv:2020.2003.2029.20046557.

526 Corman VM, Landt O, Kaiser M, Molenkamp R, Meijer A, Chu DK, et al. 2020. Detection of 2019 novel  
527 coronavirus (2019-ncov) by real-time rt-pcr. *Euro Surveill* 25:2000045.

528 Correia G, Rodrigues L, Gameiro da Silva M, Gonçalves T. 2020. Airborne route and bad use of  
529 ventilation systems as non-negligible factors in sars-cov-2 transmission. *Medical Hypotheses*  
530 141:109781.

531 Duguid JP. 1945. The numbers and the sites of origin of the droplets expelled during expiratory  
532 activities. *Edinb Med J* 52:385-401.

- 533 Duguid JP. 1946. The size and the duration of air-carriage of respiratory droplets and droplet-nuclei.  
534 J Hyg (Lond) 44:471-479.
- 535 Eissenberg T, Kanj SS, Shidadeh A. 2020. Treat covid-19 as though it is airborne: It may be. AANA  
536 journal 88:29-30.
- 537 Endo A, Abbott S, Kucharski A, Funk S. 2020. Estimating the overdispersion in covid-19 transmission  
538 using outbreak sizes outside china. Wellcome Open Research 5.
- 539 Fabian P, Brain J, Houseman EA, Gern J, Milton DK. 2011. Origin of exhaled breath particles from  
540 healthy and human rhinovirus-infected subjects. J Aerosol Med Pulm Drug Deliv 24:137-147.
- 541 Faridi S, Niazi S, Sadeghi K, Naddafi K, Yavarian J, Shamsipour M, et al. 2020. A field indoor air  
542 measurement of sars-cov-2 in the patient rooms of the largest hospital in iran. Science of The Total  
543 Environment 725:138401.
- 544 Fears AC, Klimstra WB, Duprex P, Hartman A, Weaver SC, Plante KS, et al. 2020. Comparative  
545 dynamic aerosol efficiencies of three emergent coronaviruses and the unusual persistence of sars-  
546 cov-2 in aerosol suspensions. medRxiv:2020.2004.2013.20063784.
- 547 Galvani AP, May RM. 2005. Epidemiology: Dimensions of superspreading. Nature 438:293-295.
- 548 Gerone PJ, Couch RB, Keefer GV, Douglas RG, Derrenbacher EB, Knight V. 1966. Assessment of  
549 experimental and natural viral aerosols. Bacteriological reviews 30:576-588.
- 550 Galton J, Tovey E, McLaws ML, Rawlinson WD. 2011. The role of particle size in aerosolised  
551 pathogen transmission: A review. J Infect 62:1-13.
- 552 Guo Z-D, Wang Z-Y, Zhang S-F, Li X, Li L, Li C, et al. 2020. Aerosol and surface distribution of severe  
553 acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 in hospital wards, wuhan, china, 2020. Emerging  
554 Infectious Disease journal 26.
- 555 Haas CN, Rose JB, Gerba CP. 1999. Quantitative microbial risk assessment. New York, USA:Wiley.
- 556 Hamner L, Dubbel P, Capron I, Ross A, Jordan A, Lee J, et al. 2020. High sars-cov-2 attack rate  
557 following exposure at a choir practice - skagit county, washington, march 2020. MMWR Morb Mortal  
558 Wkly Rep 69:606-610.
- 559 Kimball A, Hatfield KM, Arons M, James A, et al. 2020. Asymptomatic and presymptomatic sars-cov-2  
560 infections in residents of a long-term care skilled nursing facility — king county, washington, march  
561 2020. MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep 2020 69:377-381.
- 562 Kohanski MA, Palmer JN, Cohen NA. 2020. Aerosol or droplet: Critical definitions in the covid-19 era.  
563 International Forum of Allergy & Rhinology n/a.
- 564 Kulkarni H, Smith CM, Hyang Lee DD, Hirst RA, Easton AJ, O'Callaghan C. 2016. Evidence of  
565 respiratory syncytial virus spread by aerosol. Time to revisit infection control strategies? American  
566 Journal of Respiratory and Critical Care Medicine 194:308-316.
- 567 Leung NHL, Chu DKW, Shiu EYC, Chan K-H, McDevitt JJ, Hau BJP, et al. 2020. Respiratory virus  
568 shedding in exhaled breath and efficacy of face masks. Nature Medicine.

- 569 Li Y, Qian H, Hang J, Chen X, Hong L, Liang P, et al. 2020. Aerosol transmission of sars-cov-2 -  
570 evidence for probable aerosol transmission of sars-cov-2 in a poorly ventilated restaurant.
- 571 Lindsley WG, Pearce TA, Hudnall JB, Davis KA, Davis SM, Fisher MA, et al. 2012. Quantity and size  
572 distribution of cough-generated aerosol particles produced by influenza patients during and after  
573 illness. *J Occup Environ Hyg* 9:443-449.
- 574 Liu L, Wei J, Li Y, Ooi A. 2017. Evaporation and dispersion of respiratory droplets from coughing.  
575 *Indoor Air* 27:179-190.
- 576 Liu Y, Ning Z, Chen Y, Guo M, Liu Y, Gali NK, et al. 2020. Aerodynamic analysis of sars-cov-2 in two  
577 wuhan hospitals. *Nature*.
- 578 Lloyd-Smith JO, Schreiber SJ, Kopp PE, Getz WM. 2005. Superspreading and the effect of individual  
579 variation on disease emergence. *Nature* 438:355-359.
- 580 Loudon RG, Roberts RM. 1968. Singing and the dissemination of tuberculosis. *American Review of*  
581 *Respiratory Disease* 98:297-300.
- 582 Mangura BT, Napolitano EC, Passannante MR, McDonald RJ, Reichman LB. 1998. *Mycobacterium*  
583 *tuberculosis* miniepidemic in a church gospel choir. *Chest* 113:234-237.
- 584 Milton DK, Fabian MP, Cowling BJ, Grantham ML, McDevitt JJ. 2013. Influenza virus aerosols in  
585 human exhaled breath: Particle size, culturability, and effect of surgical masks. *PLOS Pathogens*  
586 9:e1003205.
- 587 Morawska L, Cao J. 2020. Airborne transmission of sars-cov-2: The world should face the reality.  
588 *Environment International* 139:105730.
- 589 Nicas M, Nazaroff WW, Hubbard A. 2005. Toward understanding the risk of secondary airborne  
590 infection: Emission of respirable pathogens. *J Occup Environ Hyg* 2:143-154.
- 591 Ong SWX, Tan YK, Chia PY, Lee TH, Ng OT, Wong MSY, et al. 2020. Air, surface environmental, and  
592 personal protective equipment contamination by severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2  
593 (sars-cov-2) from a symptomatic patient. *JAMA* 323:1610-1612.
- 594 Pan Y, Zhang D, Yang P, Poon LLM, Wang Q. 2020. Viral load of sars-cov-2 in clinical samples. *The*  
595 *Lancet Infectious Diseases* 20:411-412.
- 596 R Core Team. 2019. R: A language and environment for statistical computing. Vienna, Austria:R  
597 Foundation for Statistical Computing.
- 598 Richard M, Kok A, de Meulder D, Bestebroer TM, Lamers MM, Okba NMA, et al. 2020. Sars-cov-2 is  
599 transmitted via contact and via the air between ferrets. *bioRxiv:2020.2004.2016.044503*.
- 600 Santarpia JL, Rivera DN, Herrera V, Morwitzer MJ, Creager H, Santarpia GW, et al. 2020. Transmission  
601 potential of sars-cov-2 in viral shedding observed at the university of nebraska medical center.
- 602 Schijven J, Foret JM, Chardon J, Teunis P, Bouwknecht M, Tangena B. 2016. Evaluation of exposure  
603 scenarios on intentional microbiological contamination in a drinking water distribution network.  
604 *Water Res* 96:148-154.

- 605 Setti L, Passarini F, De Gennaro G, Barbieri P, Perrone MG, Borelli M, et al. 2020. Airborne  
606 transmission route of covid-19: Why 2 meters/6 feet of inter-personal distance could not be enough.  
607 Int J Environ Res Public Health 17.
- 608 Shen Y, Li C, Dong H, Wang Z, Martinez L, Sun Z, et al. 2020. Airborne transmission of covid-19:  
609 Epidemiologic evidence from two outbreak investigations.
- 610 Somsen GA, van Rijn C, Kooij S, Bem RA, Bonn D. 2020. Small droplet aerosols in poorly ventilated  
611 spaces and sars-cov-2 transmission. The Lancet Respiratory Medicine.
- 612 Stadnytskyi V, Bax CE, Bax A, Anfinrud P. 2020. The airborne lifetime of small speech droplets and  
613 their potential importance in sars-cov-2 transmission. Proceedings of the National Academy of  
614 Sciences:202006874.
- 615 Stan Development Team. 2020. Rstan: The r interface to stan. . Part R package version 2.19.3.
- 616 Stein A, Louveau C, Lepidi H, Ricci F, Baylac P, Davoust B, et al. 2005. Q fever pneumonia: Virulence  
617 of coxiella burnetii pathovars in a murine model of aerosol infection. Infection and Immunity  
618 73:2469-2477.
- 619 Sungnak W, Huang N, Becavin C, Berg M, Queen R, Litvinukova M, et al. 2020. Sars-cov-2 entry  
620 factors are highly expressed in nasal epithelial cells together with innate immune genes. Nat Med.
- 621 Tellier R, Li Y, Cowling BJ, Tang JW. 2019. Recognition of aerosol transmission of infectious agents: A  
622 commentary. BMC Infect Dis 19:101.
- 623 Teunis P, Schijven J, Rutjes S. 2016. A generalized dose-response relationship for adenovirus  
624 infection and illness by exposure pathway. Epidemiol Infect 144:3461-3473.
- 625 van Doremalen N, Bushmaker T, Morris D, Holbrook M, Gamble A, Williamson B, et al. 2020. Aerosol  
626 and surface stability of sars-cov-2 as compared with sars-cov-1. The New England Journal of  
627 Medicine.
- 628 van Kampen JJA, van de Vijver DAMC, Fraaij PLA, Haagmans BL, Lamers MM, Okba N, et al. 2020.  
629 Shedding of infectious virus in hospitalized patients with coronavirus disease-2019 (covid-19):  
630 Duration and key determinants. medRxiv:2020.2006.2008.20125310.
- 631 Wang J, Du G. 2020. Covid-19 may transmit through aerosol. Irish Journal of Medical Science (1971 -  
632 ).
- 633 Wang Z, Yang B, Li Q, Wen L, Zhang R. 2020. Clinical features of 69 cases with coronavirus disease  
634 2019 in wuhan, china. Clin Infect Dis.
- 635 Watanabe T, Bartrand TA, Weir MH, Omura T, Haas CN. 2010. Development of a dose-response  
636 model for sars coronavirus. Risk Analysis 30:1129-1138.
- 637 Weber TP, Stilianakis NI. 2008. Inactivation of influenza a viruses in the environment and modes of  
638 transmission: A critical review. J Infect 57:361-373.
- 639 Wolfram Research Inc. 2019. Mathematica. Vol. Version 12.0.0.0. Champaign, Illinois:Wolfram  
640 Research Inc.



- 641 World Health Organization. 2014. Guidelines infection prevention and control of epidemic- and  
642 pandemic-prone acute respiratory infections in health care.
- 643 World Health Organization. 2020. Modes of transmission of virus causing covid-19: Implications for  
644 ipc precaution recommendations, version 29 march 2020. World Health Organization.
- 645 Xu P, Qian H, Miao T, Yen H-I, Tan H, Cowling BJ, et al. 2020. Transmission routes of covid-19 virus in  
646 the diamond princess cruise ship. MedRxiv.
- 647 Yan J, Grantham M, Pantelic J, Bueno de Mesquita PJ, Albert B, Liu F, et al. 2018. Infectious virus in  
648 exhaled breath of symptomatic seasonal influenza cases from a college community. Proceedings of  
649 the National Academy of Sciences 115:1081-1086.
- 650 Yao M, Zhang L, Ma J, Zhou L. 2020. On airborne transmission and control of sars-cov-2. Science of  
651 The Total Environment 731:139178.
- 652 Yu ITS, Li Y, Wong TW, Tam W, Chan AT, Lee JHW, et al. 2004. Evidence of airborne transmission of  
653 the severe acute respiratory syndrome virus. New England Journal of Medicine 350:1731-1739.
- 654 Zhang H, Li X, Ma R, Li X, Zhou Y, Dong H, et al. 2013. Airborne spread and infection of a novel swine-  
655 origin influenza a (h1n1) virus. Virology Journal 10:204.
- 656 Zou L, Ruan F, Huang M, Liang L, Huang H, Hong Z, et al. 2020. Sars-cov-2 viral load in upper  
657 respiratory specimens of infected patients. N Engl J Med 382:1177-1179.
- 658
- 659

660 Tables

661

662 **Table 1. Selected scenarios for which aerosol exposure was quantified.**

<i>Expelling of virus by one infected person</i>		
Abbreviation	Source	Reference of size distribution data
Breathe	20 minutes breathing	Fabian et al. (2011)
Speak-Lo	20 minutes speaking	Asadi (2019)
Speak-Hi	20 minutes speaking	Duguid (1946)
Cough-Lo	One cough	Lindsley et al. (2012)
Cough-Hi	One cough	Duguid (1946)
Sneeze-Lo	One sneeze	Gerone et al. (1966)
Sneeze-Hi	One sneeze	Duguid (1946)

<i>Exposure of one or more uninfected persons</i>		
One person in a bus for 20 minutes		
Thirty persons in a bus for 20 minutes		
Ten persons in a room for one hour		
Ten persons in a room for four hours		

663

664

665 **Table 2. Parameter values**

	Unit	Eq.	Parameters	Reference
<i>c</i> (throat and nasal)	N/mL	2	$a_0 = 5.9$ $a_1 = -0.061$ $\sigma = 1.3$	Own data RIVM (2020)
<i>c</i> (throat)	N/mL	2	$a_0 = 3.8$ $a_1 = -0.17$ $\sigma = 1.7$	Zou et al. (2020)
<i>c</i> (nasal)	N/mL	2	$a_0 = 4.56$ $a_1 = -0.17$ $\sigma = 1.7$	Zou et al. (2020)
Tidal breathing	L/minute	3	$\mu_{br} =$ $\text{Log}_{10}(6.8)$ $\sigma_{br} = 0.050$	Fabian et al. (2011)
$v_{br}$	mL	3	$\mu_1 = 1.5$ $\sigma_1 = 1.2$ $\mu_2 = 0.70$ $\sigma_2 = 1.2$ $\mu_3 = 1.0$ $\sigma_3 = 1.2$ $\mu_4 = 0.70$ $\sigma_4 = 0.60$ $\mu_5 = -1.1$ $\sigma_5 = 0.070$ $\mu_6 = -1.3$ $\sigma_6 = 0.15$	Fabian et al. (2011)
$n_{sp}$	-	4	$\mu_{sp} = 5.1$	Duguid (1945), Asadi (2019)

$n_{co}$	-	4	$\sigma_{sp} = 0.67$ $\mu_{co} = 11$ $\sigma_{co} = 0.80$	Duguid (1945) Lindsley et al. (2012)
$n_{sn}$	-	4	$\mu_{sn} = 14$ $\sigma_{sn} = 0.50$	Duguid (1945) Gerone et al. (1966)

---


666

667

668

669 Figures


670



671

672 **Figure 1. Overview of the processes modelled in this study.**


673



674

675 **Figure 2. Box-whisker chart of the log<sub>10</sub> of total aerosol droplet volumes (pL=picolitres) that are**  
 676 **expelled in each scenario (Table 1), showing median values, quartiles (boxes) en minimum and**  
 677 **maximum values (whiskers). Volumes in pL/20 minutes for breathing and speaking and in pL per**  
 678 **cough and per sneeze.**

679



680

681 **Figure 3. Mean probability of exposure to SARS-CoV-2 for different scenarios, in which one**  
 682 **infected person was expelling virus by 20 minutes of breathing, 20 minutes of speaking, one cough**  
 683 **or one sneeze. This happened in a room of 93 m<sup>3</sup> or 675 m<sup>3</sup> with exposed persons (1, 10 or 30**  
 684 **persons) for a certain amount of time (20 minutes, 1 hour, 4 hours) as indicated. In the scenarios**  
 685 **with multiple exposed persons, the shown probability is for at least one person of the group being**  
 686 **exposed. Each mean exposure probability curve is for a given virus concentration in mucus. Below**  
 687 **the exposure probability curves, probability densities of the virus concentration in nasal and**  
 688 **throat swabs (Zou et al. 2020) and of nasal or throat swabs (own data, 2020) are given with mean**  
 689 **and 95-percentiles indicated (vertical lines) to reflect the probability of a given virus concentration**  
 690 **in mucus.**

691

692