Ventilation and the SARS-CoV-2 Coronavirus

Analysis of outbreaks in a restaurant and on a bus in China, and at a Call Center in South Korea

Björn Birnir*
Center for Complex and Nonlinear Science
Department of Mathematics
University of California, Santa Barbara
Santa Barbara, CA 93106

August 2020

Abstract

In a previous paper [10] a model of the distribution of respiratory droplets and aerosols by Lagrangian turbulent air-flow was developed. It is used to show how the SARS-CoV-2 Coronavirus can be spread by the breathing of single infected person. The model shows that the concentration of viruses in the cloud, exhaled by one person, can increase to infectious levels within a certain amount of time, in a confined space where the air re-circulates. In [10] the model was used to analyze the air-flow and SARS-CoV-2 Coronavirus build-up in a restaurant in Guangzhou, China [19, 18]. In this paper, we add the analysis of two more cases, an outbreak among lay-Buddhists, on a bus [26], traveling to a ceremony in Zhejiang province, China, and an outbreak in a Call Center in Seoul, Korea [20]. The analysis and comparison of these three cases, leads to the conclusion that the SARS-CoV-2 Coronavirus attacks in two steps: The first step is a linear spread between individuals with a couple of days delay. The second step is an exponential spread effected by the air-conditioning system affecting a much larger number of people. Thus in the second step, the ventilation becomes the super-spreader.

1 Introduction

The understanding of the transmission of the SARS-CoV-2 Coronavirus has evolved considerably during the current pandemic. Initially, it was thought that virus was mainly spread by infected people coughing or speaking, by large drops that quickly fell to the ground. This understanding lead to the 2 meter (6 feet) physical distancing rule that has been used effectively all around the world to limit the transmission of the disease. It was then shown that the droplets could travel by a turbulent cloud when a person forcefully coughs and that this cloud could travel up to a distance

*and the University of Iceland, School of Natural Sciences, 107 Reykjavík, Iceland

of 7 to 8 meters (25 feet) [11, 25, 12]. It was also argued that smaller droplets and aerosols could be infectious, [4] and the virus was found in small droplets and aerosols in the ventilation system in hospitals in Wuhan [15] and in the air in hospital rooms where Covid-19 patients were being treated [22, 23]. It has also been understood for some time now that the boundary between droplets and aerosols is not sharp, but the droplets and aerosols form a continuum, and evaporation can decrease the size of larger droplets and turn them into airborne droplets and aerosols. This process is of course aided by the ventilations system, in particular when it is heating the air.

The discussion of small droplets and aerosols has mostly been been centered on coughing and sneezing, and speaking, and it has not been sufficiently emphasized that small droplets and aerosols are spread by the breathing of an infected person and their concentration can increase over time, in a confined space. In [10] we developed a model, based on Lagrangian fluid dynamics, of how the cloud of small droplets and aerosols spreads after being exhaled by an infected person and how the concentration of the droplets and aerosols containing the SARS-CoV-2 Coronavirus, can increase over the time the infected person spends in a confined space. The method was used in [10] to analyze an outbreak in a restaurant in Guangzhou, China, on Chinese New Year in January 2020, see [19] and [18]. In this paper we use the method to analyze two more cases, an outbreak among lay-Buddhist traveling to ceremony in Ningbo city, Zhejiang province, in China, in January 2020, see [26], and an outbreak in a Call Center in Seoul, Korea, at the end of February beginning of March 2020, see [20]. These three cases have become examples of outbreaks where there physical distancing rules do not seem to suffice to prevent the infection of a large number of people, see https://english.elpais.com/spanish_news/2020-06-17/an-analysis-of-three-covid-19-outbreaks-how-they-happened-and-how-they-can-be-avoided.html.

The paper is organized in the following way: In Section 2 we briefly recall the analysis of the restaurant in Guangzhou, China, in [10], in Section 3, we explain the method, in Section 4 we apply the method to the buses in Ningbo city, China, and in Section 5, to the Call Center in Seoul, Korea. Section 6 contains our discussion and conclusions.

2 The Restaurant in Guangzhou

On January 24th four members of a family, that had travelled the previous day from Wuhan, ate lunch at a restaurant, in Guangzhou, China. Two other families where present, see Figure 1, in the same part of the restaurant, see [19]. The first family contained one person (A1) who fell ill later the same day and went to the hospital. 12 days later 9 other members of the three families had fallen ill with Covid-19. The infection of these people is consistent with droplet or aerosol transmission because no one else at the restaurant nor the servants fell ill. Only the persons in the direct airstream of the air-conditioner fell ill, most in spite of the fact that the distance between them and the infected person was greater than 2 meters.

In [10] we developed a method to analyze the concentration of the droplets and aerosols containing the SARS-CoV-2 Coronavirus. The method is based on the observation that the small droplets and aerosols can be considered to be passive scalars, or particles that are carried by the flow but do not influence it, in the turbulent Lagrangian airflow in the restaurant, see [10].

The first step in the analysis is to figure out the volume of air in the restaurant. This we get by simply using the dimensions of the space were the three families sat. Then we must compute the volume of the SARS-CoV-2 Coronavirus cloud that the infected person exhales over time



Figure 1: A sketch showing the arrangement of restaurant tables and air conditioning airflow at the site of an outbreak of 2019 coronavirus, in Guangzhou, China, 2020. Red circles indicate where patients that developed the disease were located; yellow-filled red circle (A1) indicates the location of the infected patient. The figure is taken from [19].

and divide the volume of the cloud by the total volume of the air in the restaurant. This gives the concentration of the small droplets or aerosols that every person in the restaurant is exposed to, assuming that we have normalized the concentration to be one at the infected person. This assumes that if a person is exposed to a concentration one over a sufficiently long time interval, if suffices for that person to become infected, as experience has shown.

It makes sense that if an infected person is in a confined space and continues to exhale a cloud of droplets and aerosols, over time, the concentration of the virus-laden drops and aerosols will increase. But how much depends on how often the infected person breathes and what the dimensions of the exhaled cloud are. To determine this one has to use the (Lagrangian) velocity of the air and the dimension of the room to determine two fundamental quantities: These are the Taylor-Reynolds number Re_λ and the energy dissipation ε of the turbulent cloud. These will in turn determine the time-scale and the rate at which the cloud is expanding and propagating.

We will now summarize the analysis of the restaurant in [10]. The volume of the section of the restaurant, where the infected persons sat, is 3 by 6 by 3.14 meters $=$ 56.52 m^3, see [18]. The Lagrangian air velocity is 0.25 because the air-conditioners are set so that the restaurant guests experience this wind velocity, see [1]. The system size is 3 meters: the distance from the infected person to the wall where the air-conditioner is mounted, see Figure 1. This makes the Taylor-Reynolds number $Re_\lambda = 705$, assuming the temperature is around 20 degrees C^o. The energy dissipation $\varepsilon = 1.2$, is taken from the experimental and simulation data in [5], it gives the Kolmogorov time scale $\tau_\eta = 3.55$ ms (milliseconds). This means that the turbulent cloud containing the SARS-CoV-2 Coronavirus is evolving very fast. The infected person exhales approximately 5

times a minute and each exhale event last 1.2 seconds, or 1/10 of the breathing cycle that lasts 12 seconds. This is the most extreme exhale event, where the infected person coughs and the cough lasts 1.2 seconds, see [13]. It creates the greatest concentration of droplet/aerosols that we will normalize to one. Multiplying this time period with the Lagrangian velocity 0.25 m/s, we get the spacial length of the exhaled cloud, 0.3 m. The width of the cloud is obtained from the Richardson distribution as explained in the methods Section, it is 0.53 m, see the figure on the left in Figure 3. The width and the length of the cloud give the volume of a cylinder-like cloud. The infected person keeps exhaling a new droplet/aerosol cloud every 12 seconds and since the extent of these clouds are 0.3 meters he needs to exhale 20 clouds to fill the 6 meter long cylinder. This cylinder would extend from the wall where the air-conditioner is mounted to the opposite wall, see Figure 5. This takes 240 seconds or 4 minutes. In one hour he has filled the cylinder 15 = 60/4 times. The volume of this cylinder is $(0.53)^2 \times \pi \times 6 \ = 5.29\ m^3$.

Now we should be able to get the concentration of the droplet/aerosols by dividing the volume of the cylinder by the volume of the room (section of the restaurant). But it turns out that we know more because in [18] a computational fluid dynamics simulation was performed and an experiment in the restaurant, to determine how the contamination cloud spread. A pyramid with base on the wall opposite the air-conditioner mostly contains the blue contamination cloud, see Figure 4. Thus the air space that is contaminated has roughly the volume $56.52/3 \ = \ 18.84\ m^3$ of this pyramid, see Figure 5. The droplet/aerosols in the cylinder now get spread to the pyramid, by the air-conditioning and heat conduction, see Figure 5. This decreases their concentration by a factor of $18.84/5.33 \ = \ 3.54$. The exhaust fans in the restaurants were closed, see [18], thus with no droplet/aerosols lost, the resulting concentration in the pyramid is $15 \ \times \ 1/3.54 \ = \ 4.23$ times what it was in the cylinder, the first time it was filled. In other words, the concentration for everyone sitting at the three tables A, B and C, in Figure 1, in less than 15 minutes, is what it would be if they were sitting next to the infected person. In one hour, the concentration is more than four times, what it was initially, if every person on the three table was sitting next to the infected person. This makes the build-up of the concentration of the droplet/aerosols containing the SARS-CoV-2 virus the likely reason for the outbreak in the restaurant in Guangzhou.

It is also shown in [10] that fixing the air-conditioning in the restaurant does not solve the problem. If the recommended amount of fresh air, which is 8 liters per second, per person, is added, the time until the concentration is one everywhere in the contaminated section of the restaurant only increases from 15 to 21 minutes. After one hour the concentration is almost 2.5 times what it would be initially sitting next to the infected person. Moreover, in [10], it is shown that 10 times the recommended amount of air has to be injected, into the section of the restaurant where the three families were sitting, for the concentration of the small droplets and aerosols not to build up.

3 Method

We use the Richardson distribution of passive scalars to understand the shape and extent of the cloud of small droplets and aerosols, exhaled by a person infected by the SARS-CoV-2 Coronavirus, see Appendix A, in [10]. The theory of passive scalars and the leading form of the Richard-



Figure 2: The Richardson distribution for the particle separation. The Figure is taken from [10].



Figure 3: (Left) The total distribution of droplet displacement after 1.2 seconds of exhaling. This is the shape of the exhaled cloud and its subsequent propagation, up to 2.4 seconds. We call the first part (blue) the Lagrangian part of the cloud and the second part (red) the Eulerian part of the cloud. (Right) The average, in space (inside the pyramid), droplet concentration as a function of time, in minutes, normalized by the concentration at the infected person. The steps indicate the additional droplet/aerosols exhaled every 4 minutes. The Figure is taken from [10].



Figure 4: A CFD simulation of the contagion in the restaurant in Guangzhou China. The blue gas models the contamination by the droplet/aerosols. The infected persons are colored red. Notice that the contaminated region roughly forms a pyramid with base on the wall opposite to the air-conditioner. The figure is taken from [18].



Figure 5: A cartoon (not to scale) of the volume (red cylinder) where the droplet/aerosol clouds propagate and the volume (blue pyramid) that the droplet/aerosol clouds get spread to by the air-conditioning. This figure is taken from [10].

son distributions have been known for some time, see see [17] and [3]. It is

$$P_{Ric}(r,t) = \frac{C_2^{9/2}\varepsilon^3 r^2}{\langle(\delta u)^2\rangle^{9/2}} \exp\left(-\frac{9}{4}\frac{\varepsilon^{2/3}C_2 r^{2/3}}{D\langle(\delta u)^2\rangle}\right). \tag{3.1}$$

r is the distance between the particles (droplet/aerosols), C_2 is the coefficient of the second structure function of turbulence, ε is the energy dissipation, δu is the velocity difference (in the structure functions), and D is the coefficient in the Richardson law, see [10], Appendix A. For r large, the additional terms in the Richardson distribution are small, see [24].

There are two problems with the formula (3.1) that make it less explicit than it seems: First, it requires a formula for the average of velocity differences $\langle(\delta u)^2\rangle$, that is the second structure function of turbulence, as a function of Lagrangian time. Second, one must be able to evaluate the coefficient in the exponential part of (3.1). The numerical form of $\langle(\delta u)^2\rangle$ has also been available for some time, see [24], but in [2] the author and his collaborator were able to develop a theoretical model inspired by [8] and [14]. We employ the theoretical structure function S_2 from [2] and use the stochastic closure theory (SCT), see [6, 7, 9], to compute the coefficient C_2 in the exponential of the formula for the Richardson distribution (3.1). This computation, that interpolates the coefficients computed in [16] for the Reynolds number $Re_\lambda = 705$, is explained, in Appendix B, in [10]. This value of Re_λ gives the coefficient in the Richardson distribution $d = 9/4D = 9/(2C_2^{1/3}\varepsilon^{1/3}) = 5.376$.

The results of the simulations for the restaurant in Guangzhou are shown in Figures 2-3. In Figure 2 we show the Richardson distribution as a function of time and space. The distribution is plotted in unitless temporal and spatial variables. But each temporal unit is $\tau_\eta = 3.55$ ms (milli-seconds) and the exhale event takes 1.2 seconds $=$ 3.55×340 unit steps. The time scale is computed from the dissipation rate ε by the formula $\tau_\varepsilon = (\nu^3/\varepsilon)^{1/4}$, where ν is the viscosity in air at 20 C^o. Figure 3 (left) is a cross-section of the exhaled cloud of droplet/aerosols from the center to the boundary. The blue part is the emitted Lagrangian part the cloud, the Lagrangian eddies spin up to the maximum radius (particle separation) of the cloud and then begin their slow decay in the Richardson cascade. However, at the maximum a faster process of vortex stretching associated with a different scaling, see [2], begins and the radius of the cloud shrinks, eventually the cloud runs into the Eulerian eddies (red part of cloud) and the Eulerian eddies build, reach their maximum and then start shrinking by the vortex stretching of the Eulerian eddies. We call the first part of the cloud the Lagrangian (extensive) part of the cloud and the second part the Eulerian (less extensive) part. Figure 3 (left) shows the radial extent (y-coordinate) of the cloud as it is created by the velocity of the exhaled breath (1.5 m/s). To get the spatial extent (x-coordinate) of the cloud we have to compute how far the particles are translated in a given time interval. This is determine by the Lagrangian velocity of the cloud, that is 0.25 m/s, or in 1.2 seconds the particles are translated $1.2 \times 0.25 = 0.3$ meters. This means that the length of the cloud in Figure 3 (left) is $2 \times 0.3 = 0.6$ meters. On the right hand of Figure 3, we show how the concentration, inside the pyramid in Figure 5, builds up over time. The steps indicate the build-up every 4 minutes. Notice that one, the normalized level at the infected person, is reached after 15 minutes. After one hour the concentration has reach 4.23 times that level.

4 The Bus with the Lay-Buddhists

On January 19, 2020, 128 persons, lay-Buddhists and 2 bus drivers, took two buses from a neighborhood in Ningbo city, Zhejiang province, in China, to a temple in Ningbo city, 50 min. each way, for a total round trip of 100 min., see [26]. They attended a 150 min. ceremony at the temple that included an indoor lunch, in a spacious room, that lasted 15-30 min. In addition, 172 lay-Buddhists that traveled themselves (did not take the two buses) to the ceremony, and participated in it, along with five Buddhist monks for a total of 300 persons.

Of the two buses, Bus 1 contained 60 people, none of whom got sick, Bus 2 contained 68 people, including the infected person a female lay-Buddhist that had shared a meal the previous night with 4 people that had traveled to Hubei province (where Wuhan is located). She was asymptomatic during the trip to the temple but began to feel symptoms that night. Three days later her whole family had become sick and went to the hospital. On the day of the trip, January 19th, there had been no reported cases of the coronavirus in Ningbo city.

Whereas no one on Bus 1 got infected with the coronavirus, on Bus 2, 24 individuals got infected. Of the 172 additional lay-Buddhists attending the event 7, all of whom reported close contact with infected person, got infected. None of the monks got infected. During the event, the passengers in Bus 1 (in fact, both buses) were randomly dispersed among the other participants in the ceremony.

The analysis of the airflow in the bus is analogous to the analysis of the airflow in the restaurant in [10]. The air-conditioning on both buses was in re-circulation mode, so no outside air was taken in the through the air-conditioning. The air outside was a chilly 0-10 C^o, so the air-conditioning was heating and the air rose towards the ceiling of the buses, being re-circulated through wents under the windows, see Figure 6. One can assume that the four windows that could be opened, on each bus, were open, but not widely, and did not let in too much air due to the cold temperature outside. Still, this outside air seems to have protected the passengers sitting next to the windows, see Figure 6, and this must be taken into account.

The concentration of small droplets/aerosols, containing the coronavirus, that the passengers in the bus are exposed to can be computed by using the ratio of the total volume of air in the bus to the volume of the cloud exhaled by the infected person, as in [10]. The useful reference concentration is that experienced by the person sitting next to the infected person in the bus, C15, C28 and C22 in Figure 6, after the infected person has exhaled. This concentration is clearly sufficient for these passengers to become infected over the span of those two 50 min. bus rides. The person sitting next to the open window in row seven and the persons sitting next to the aisle in rows eight and nine are presumably being protected by the (sinking) cold air coming through the window. The cloud exhaled by the infected person forms a bulb-shaped cylinder with radius shown in Figure 3. This cylinder is directed towards the center and rear of the bus (passenger C18), by the cold and warm airflow in row seven and aided towards the ceiling by the warm air flow in row nine, see Figure 7. The length of this cylinder is 2.75 meters, assuming that the width of the bus is 2.55 m. and the passengers are tightly packed with three rows measuring 2 m. and the space between the passengers being 0.75 m.

We know that the bus is close to 12 m. long and 3 m. wide, but unfortunately the exact dimensions of the bus are not available. Thus instead we use the dimensions of typical bus (Man Lion's Coach) of this size, see https://www.dimensions.com/element/coach-buses, they are length 12 m., width 2.55 m. and height 3.81 m. Assuming that the height of the passenger compartment

is 2/3 of the height of the bus, or 2.54 m., we get the volume 77.72 m^3 for the interior of the bus.

Now the warm air vents under the windows are creating a flow across the bus, so the system length is the width of the bus, and we assume that the flow is the standard 0.25 m/s recommended for air-conditioning. This means that the Taylor Reynolds number is almost the same as that of the restaurant $Re_\lambda = 705$, so we can use the parameters computed in [10] for the restaurant. We extend the cylinder in the bus another 3 rows until it hits the ceiling and the air is sucked into the inlet of the air-conditioning, see Figure 7. Thus we get a cylinder of length close to 6 m. and radius 0.53 m. containing the droplets/aerosols exhaled by the infected passenger. This cylinder is mixed with the air from the rest of the bus and then blown out through the warm air vents since the air-conditioning is on re-circulation mode. Now the volume of the cylinder is 5.29 m^3 and the total volume of the air in the bus is 77.72 m^3 so the concentration gets decreased by a factor of 77.72/5.29 =14.69. Thus if the infected person has filled that cylinder once, by the time the air is blown through the warm vents, each passenger in the bus is exposed to a concentration of droplet/aerosols that is 1/14.69 of the exposure of the six passengers, sitting inside the bulb-like half of the cylinder, close to the infected person. However, the infected person fills the cylinder every 4 minutes and during the 50 min. ride, she has filled the cylinder 12.5 times. That means that the concentration that every passengers is exposed to is at the end of the ride 12.5/14.69 = 0.85 of what the people sitting next the infected person were exposed to initially, if no fresh air is entering the bus. At the end of the bus ride, it is almost as if everyone was sitting next to the infected person.

However, fresh air is entering the bus through the four windows that can be opened and the persons sitting next to open windows seem to have been protected by the fresh air. Most of them did not get infected and of the two that did, their symptoms were mild, see Figure 6. If we assume that the airflow through the windows was enough to give half of the passengers the recommended fresh air 8 l/s then the airflow during the 4 min. it took the fill the cylinder was 1.92 m^3 times 34 = 65.28 m^6. This means that the ratio of total to contaminated air is 143/5.29 = 27 and 12.5/27 = 0.46 is the concentration that each passenger is exposed to after 50 minutes. The fresh air cuts the concentration almost in half but still leaves it high enough for people to get infected. If everyone on the bus was getting the recommended dose of fresh air the concentration goes down to 0.3, that might be enough to avoid infection by most of the passengers.

In [26] the outbreak on the bus is blamed on the re-circulating air-conditioning and the above analysis confirms that finding. One can look at the infection on the bus as a two-step process. First the infected person infects the passengers seating next to her or in the cloud she exhales and while it expands during the 1.2 second exhale event, in [10] this is called the Lagrangian part of the cloud and forms a large bulb-shaped initial part of the cloud, see Figure 7. This part is highly infectious, may contain large droplets laden with the coronavirus, in addition to the small droplet/aerosols. It will infect anyone who is susceptible and exposed to it for a sufficiently long time. However, a limited number of people are infected and there is a delay time of 24-48 hours before they become infectious. We call this step one or the linear part of the contagion. The passengers are tightly crammed into the bus, with 0.75 m. between them, and the infected person infects 6 people (C15, C17,C18, C19,C22 and C26) exposed to her Lagrangian cloud.

The second bus and the lay people at the temple that did not arrive by the two buses, form two control groups for the outbreak. Step one cannot occur on Bus 1, because no infectious person was on that bus, and they randomly scanned the 172 lay-Buddhists and 5 monks and did not find any infectious person there. Our infectious person on the other hand, did also effect step one infection at the ceremony, she was in close contact with at least seven persons, and probably sat next to two



Figure 6: A schematic diagram of the bus indicating where the contagious person sat (red) and where the infected paseangers sat (pink, green and yellow). The remaining passengers (white) and the bus driver were not infected. Notice the warm-air vents under the widows (red with white squiggles) and the openable windows colored white, the windows that cannot be opened are colored green.The zones indicate distance from the infected person. The figure is taken from [26].



Figure 7: The cloud of droplets and aerosols emanating from the infected person on the bus. The infectious person is circled and marked as patient 0. The passengers that got infected are colored pink. The figure is taken from El País and modified.

of them during a 30 min. meal, and exposed them to her Lagrangian cloud. Thus step one can and did happen among the lay-Buddhists at the temple.

On Bus 2, there was also an infection involving many more people, that was not effected by close proximity (the Lagrangian part of the cloud) and consists of the infectious person contaminating an environment, such as the interior of the bus (or the section of the restaurant, above). This a super-spreading event and we call it step two or the exponential part of the contagion. In [26] the bus was split into two Zones 1 and 2, see Figure 6. It was argued that the passengers in Zone 2 were outside the contagious vicinity of the infected passenger and had to be infected by airborne droplet/aerosols. Indeed, based on the above analysis, we would argue that the passengers C15, C17,C18, C19,C22 and C26, see Figure 7, were infected by a step one contagion and everyone else infected on the bus was infected by a step two contagion. They were infected by small droplet/aerosols carried by the air being re-circulated through the warm vents, by the air-conditioning on the bus. The air-conditioning thus was the super-spreader in the confined space of the bus interior. Step two cannot happen on Bus 1 because there is no infected person. Step two cannot happen at the temple because the ceremony is outside and the lunch is too short in duration and the lunch hall too spacious for the concentration to build-up.

Our study has several limitations that should be pointed out. First, we do not have the precise dimensions of the bus and the standard bus is designed to carry 50 persons. However, we know that the bus was of roughly the standard size and the passengers tightly crammed in with 0.75 m. between them and three rows extending to 2 m. Thus our guess is probably close. The difference that the correct dimensions would make is that the Taylor-Reynolds number and the energy dissipation, that determines the time scale, would change slightly. The effect would be small. Second, if all the small droplets are heated by the air-conditioner and blown out through the warm vents they would evaporate leaving behind droplet nuclei or aerosols only. However, this is probably an oversimplification, a portion of the contaminated cloud sinks at the back of

the bus and re-circulates along the floor to be mixed-up into what is called in [10] the Eulerian part of the cloud. Thus a portion of the small droplets will continue to survive and form a part of the atmosphere in the bus. It was shown above that injecting the recommended air for all the passengers on the bus reduced the concentration to 0.3 times what a passenger sitting next to the infected person would experience. Putting in twice the recommended amount of air reduces it to 0.2 and slightly more than tripling the recommended amount of air, by opening all the windows wide, reduces the concentration to 0.1 times what sitting next to the infected person is. This may explain why no infections have been registered the New York subway, see https://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2020/08/10/nyregion/nyc-subway-coronavirus.html and https://www.nytimes.com/2020/08/03/nyregion/nyc-subway-coronavirus.html, where the airflow is three times the recommended amount. Most modern buses take fresh air through the ceiling rather than the windows. This is probably also the case for the bus in our study but it does not change the analysis. The cold air still falls to the floor, and protects some of the passengers on the way, whereas the warm air rises and presumably the ventilation system did not let in too much cold air because of the temperature outside.

5 The Call Center in Seoul

On March 8th 2020, the Seoul Metropolitan Government was called to a Call Center in Seoul Korea, where an outbreak of Covid-19 had occurred. On March 9, the Korean CDC and local governments formed a joint response team and launched a epidemiological investigation with contact tracing. The outbreak had occurred on the 11th floor of a 19 story building, the first 11 of which contained commercial offices and the top seven residential apartments. The Call Center occupied four floors, 7th through 9th and the 11th floor. It employed 811 people in total, 216 of whom worked on the 11th floor. There was no regular contact between the people working in different floors of the Call Center. The workers however met casually in the elevators and in the lobby of the building. The investigation revealed a single person on the 10th floor developing symptoms on February 22nd, see Figure 8, the source of this person's infection is unknown; on Febuary 5th a single person on the 11th floor developed symptoms, he or she had presumably been infected by contact with the person on the 10th floor, and three days later, on February 28th, three more people on the 11th floor developed symptoms. On February 29th and on March 12th two more people on the 10th floor and on March 2nd one person on the 9th floor developed symptoms. These infections where presumably caused by contact with people on the 11th floor, but they did not spread further on the 9th and 10th floor and will not be discussed further below.

All of the infections that we discussed so far have been step one contagion, using the criterion of the analysis of the buses above. They were caused by a close contact with an infected person over a sufficiently long time. However, on March 4th a sharp increase in the number of infections starts and persists for six days, see Figure 8, this increase is multiplicative, not just additive as the cases discussed above, and seems to signal the onset of a step two, exponential, contagion. The other noteworthy thing about the outbreak is that is seems to occur mostly on one side of the building, see Figure 9 as noted in [20] . Of the 94 people infected on the 11th floor, 89 work in a big room, Room 1, on the top of the diagram in Figure 9 (presumably there is a missing row with 10 infected people in Room 1) and 4 work in a smaller room, Room 2, at the bottom. One works in a separate office space at the bottom right corner, see Figure 9. Moreover, all the infected persons



Figure 8: The number of coronavirus infections by date in the Call Center in Seoul, Korea 2020. Yellow denotes 10th floor, blue the 11th floor and green the 9th floor. Notice the exponential increase starting on March 4th. The figure is taken from [20].

in the smaller room are isolated, they do not have other infected people around them. Thus it looks like step one and step two contagions took place in Room 1, but only a step one contagion took place between Room 1 and Room 2, and only a limited (no neighbors infected) step one contagion took place in Room 2. Notice that step one contagion involves a limited number of individuals and has a time delay of 1-2d days, for example Feb. 25 to March 2nd on Figure 8, but step two contagion is much faster and involves a large number of individuals, see March 4 to March 9 on Figure 8, it also ends on March 9th when the building is closed. We will now use the air-flow analysis to try to figure out what the explanation of this could be.

Unfortunately, the exact dimensions of the building where the Call Center is located and the dimensions of Rooms 1 and 2 are not available, but we can make an educated guess that permits a qualitative and approximate, if not quantitative, estimate. We assume that the dimensions of the building are 45 by 30 meters and Room 1 is 45 meters long and 10 meters wide with 2.7 height to the ceiling, Room 2 is then 30 meter long and 10 meter wide also with a 2.7 meter ceiling height. This give the volume 1215 m^3 of Room 1 and 810 m^3 of Room 2. The air-conditioners are blowing across the room, we assume the standard recommended (Lagrangian) wind is 0.25 m/s, the system length is the width of the room and this makes the Taylor-Reynolds number $Re_\lambda = 1575$ for both rooms. Notice that this is three times the Taylor-Reynolds number for the restaurant and the bus. This value of Re_λ gives the coefficient in the Richardson distribution $d = 9/4D = 9/(2C_2^{1/3}\varepsilon^{1/3}) = 11.538$. It implies that there is less difference between the Lagrangian and Eulerian parts of the droplet/aerosols cloud, than for the restaurant and the bus. The energy dissipation rate is estimated from simulations and experiments, [5] and [16], it turns out to be $\varepsilon = 1.0$ so the time scale is almost the same, as for the two cases above. Now the extent of the exhaled cloud is the same 0.25 m., so an infected person has to breathe 10/0.25 = 40 times to fill a cylinder extending 10 meters across the room. The breathing happens every 12 seconds, so the time required is 12 times 40 = 480 second or seven minutes. In one hour the infected person has filled 60/7 = 8.6 cylinders. The volume of the cylinder with the droplet/aerosols containing the virus is $(0.53)^2 \times \pi \times 10 = 8.82\ m^3$. This



Figure 9: A schematic diagram of the Call Center indicating where the infected persons sat (blu). One row of of 13 seats with 10 infected people is missing at the top.The figure is taken from [20].

gives the concentration 8.82/1215 = 1/137.75 in seven minutes, as a fraction of the concentration sitting next to the infected person, in Room 1. In one hour this builds up to be the concentration 8.6/137.75 = 0.062. After an 8 hour workday it is 0.5. The computations for Room 2 are similar. In seven minutes we get 8.82/810= 1/91.84 and in one hour the concentration 8.6/91.84 = 0.094. After 8 hours the concentration in Room 2 has built up to 0.75 of what it would be sitting initially next to the infected person.

The situation is a little better with the recommended air-conditioning, that was present in the Call Center at the time of the outbreak. The concentration in Room 1 becomes 0.05 after one hour and 0.4 at the end of the workday. In Room 2 it is 0.08 after one hour and 0.65 at the end of the workday. We can now construct a reasonable history of the outbreak. The person who became symptomatic on February 25 had infected 3 others at his table by step one contagion, the step one contagion spread around the table where these persons were sitting and several days before March 3rd more than three persons had been infectious simultaneously. This gives the concentration $> 3 \times 0.52 = 1.56$, that is highly contagious at end of each of these workdays. The result is step two contagion on March 3 that grows exponentially in Room 1 and infects half of the workers there. Now why does this not happen in Room 2? The most likely explanation is that the contagion never reached a critical mass in Room 2. The workers in Room 2 probably got infected by casual contact with the workers in Room 1. Once a large number had been infected there, by a step one contagion, they did not have time to build up the concentration in Room 2, before the building was closed, to see a step two contagion. Thus the concentration stayed low in Room 2 and even the step one contagion did spread there.

The analysis above shows that the contagion in Room 1 in the Call Center, spread initially by personal contact or a step one contagion, but once the number of infected people in Room 1 hit a critical mass, with three or more people infectious, it seeded a step two contagion. The infection then quickly spread to the whole room by the air-flow in the room driven by the ventilation. The step two contagion stopped on March 9th, when the building was closed but people continued to be develop symptoms for another 11 days thereafter, some of whom may have been infected by personal contact or step one contagion.

The initial explanation, see [20], was different: It was thought that everyone in Room 1 got infected by casual contact, or step one contagion. The problem with that explanation is that it would simply have taken too long a time to spread to all the tables in Room 1. Figure 8 makes this clear. From February 22nd to March 3rd a period of 10 days, 10 onsets of symptoms took place, presumably all by individual contact, see Figure 8. After March 3rd a cascading infection took place that can only be explained by a step two contagion. It resulted in the onset of symptoms for 76 persons and the whole event took place in six days, see Figure 8. After the building was closed on March 9th the rapid rate of infection stops abruptly: Only 11 onsets of symptoms occurred during the subsequent period of 11 days, see Figure 8. Some if these had already been infected but some may have been infected by a much slower step one contagion, caused by individual contacts outside the Call Center. Thus two step one contagions of 21 people took 21 days whereas one step two contagions of 76 people took only 6 days. If the step two contagion had happened at the same rate as the step one contagion, or roughly one person per day, it would have taken 76 days, or more than two months to infect all the people that it infected. Instead it took only a week.

6 Conclusions

The analysis of the three outbreaks of the SARS-CoV-2 Coronavirus infections discussed above shows that all of them involved a close contact infection, step one, and a subsequent step two infection that happened in spite of physical distancing and thus must have been effected by small droplets and aerosols. The reason for the size of the outbreak in all three cases seem to be the build-up of the droplet/aerosols carrying the SARS-CoV-2 Coronavirus in a confined space over time. This has implications for small and large spaces where ventilation may not be sufficiently effective to remove the virus containing droplets and aerosols.

It is also clear that a sufficiently strong ventilation could have prevented the second step contagion for the persons who were sufficiently far away from the infected person. On the bus it might have been enough to open the windows wide to triple the airflow. In the Call Center tripling the recommended fresh air-flow would have cut the concentration down to 0.9 after an eight hour workday, with three infectious persons present. This is probably still an infectious concentration, but could be reduced further by injecting more air. Only in the restaurant does this seem difficult, since 10 times the amount of fresh air is needed to decrease the concentration. But an installation of an additional air-conditioner pushing air, perpendicular to the air-flow in the space where the contagion took place would have changed the situation. Then the whole air-space of the restaurant would have been used, as in the Call Center, and the tripling the amount of fresh air in the whole restaurant might have sufficed to prevent the outbreak.

Finally, we can redo the analysis assuming that everyone in the confined space is wearing a mask. The difference between the amount of drops and aerosols, with and without a mask, is studied numerically in [13]. The study concentrates on coughing with zero ambient fluid velocity but can still be applied to our study, with some assumptions. The striking effect is how much the volume of the large drops is reduced by a quality mask. The droplet volume can be reduced by a factor of 6-7, see [13]. This has important implications for the step one contagion discussed above. If both the infected person and everyone in his or her vicinity wears a mask, the concentration of drops can be reduced from 1 to 0.15. This is probably enough to prevent infections if the exposure time is small. The effect of a mask on the distribution of the small droplets and aerosols is smaller, see [13]. These small droplets and aerosols can still get around the mask but in a reduced volume. We will make the assumption here that their volume is reduced by a factor of 3. This assumption is consistent with the results in [13] but needs more experimental verification. If everyone in the restaurant had been wearing a mask and the air-conditioning had followed recommendations, the concentration of the droplet/aerosols would have been 0.83, after one hour, for everyone sitting at the three tables A, B and C. This is probably high enough to still be contagious. On the bus the concentration of the droplet/aerosols would be reduced to 0.15 after 50 minutes. This is probably enough of a reduction to prevent the step two contagion. In the Call Center with three infectious persons present the concentration is reduced to 0.52 after an 8 hour workday. This may have sufficed to prevent the (step two) outbreak in the Call Center.

The silver lining of our study is that if physical distancing is practiced, everyone wears a quality mask and the ventilation in confined spaces is sufficiently improved, the outbreaks of the types discussed above can be avoided, and perhaps most infections by the SARS-CoV-2 Coronavirus can also be avoided.

In [21] the transmission of the virus droplet/aerosol through an air-conditioning system is discussed with the conclusion that greater volume of outdoor air and MERV-13 or HEPA filters, with

the capacity of filtering out the droplet/aerosols, need to be used. This is consistent with our observations. However, the air-conditioners in current use in most buildings may be unable to use MERV-13 filters or have fans that are not able to handle the required volume of outdoor air. Indeed a new generation of air-conditioners that meet these requirements may be needed.

Acknowledgements: The author wants to thank Klaus Schauser and Albert Oaten for enthusiastic support, Inga Dóra Björnsdóttir for careful editing and Ken Beisser for expert advice on air-conditioning. We also thank Knut Bauer for providing us with the graphic illustration in Figure 6 and the authors of [26] for making their results available. He especially grateful to Luiza Angheluta for reading the manuscript and making useful comments.

References

[1] ANSI/ASHRAE Standard 62.1. *Ventilation for acceptable indoor air quality*. 2019.

[2] L. Angheluta and B. Birnir. The velocity structure functions in Lagrangian turbulence. *To appear*, 2020.

[3] E Balkovsky and V Lebedev. Instanton for the kraichnan passive scalar problem. *Physical Review E*, 58(5):5776, 1998.

[4] Clive B Beggs. Is there an airborne component to the transmission of covid-19?: a quantitative analysis study. *medRxiv*, 2020.

[5] Luca Biferale, Eberhard Bodenschatz, Massimo Cencini, Alessandra S Lanotte, Nicholas T Ouellette, Federico Toschi, and Haito Xu. Lagrangian structure functions in turbulence: A quantitative comparison between experiment and direct numerical simulation. *Physics of Fluids*, 20(6):065103, 2008.

[6] B. Birnir. The Kolmogorov-Obukhov statistical theory of turbulence. *J. Nonlinear Sci.*, 2013. DOI 10.1007/s00332-012-9164-z.

[7] B. Birnir. *The Kolmogorov-Obukhov Theory of Turbulence*. Springer, New York, 2013.

[8] B. Birnir, L. Angheluta, J. Kaminsky, and X. Chen. Spectral link of the Generalized Townsend-Perry constants in turbulent boundary layers. *Physical Review Research*, Submitted, 2020.

[9] Björn Birnir. *From Wind-Blown Sand to Turbulence and Back*, pages 15–27. Springer International Publishing, Cham, 2016.

[10] Bjorn Birnir and Luiza Angheluta. The build-up of droplet/aerosols carrying the sars-cov-2 coronavirus, in confined spaces. *medRxiv*, 2020.

[11] L. Bourouiba. Turbulent gas clouds and respiratory pathogen emission, potential implications for reducing transmission of covid-19. *JAMA Insights*, 2020.

[12] Lydia Bourouiba, Eline Dehandschoewercker, and John WM Bush. Violent expiratory events: on coughing and sneezing. *Journal of Fluid Mechanics*, 745:537–563, 2014.

[13] Talib Dbouk and Dimitris Drikakis. On respiratory droplets and face masks. *Physics of Fluids*, 32(6):063303, 2020.

[14] G. Gioia, N. Guttenberg, N. Goldenfeld, and P. Chakraborty. Spectral theory of the turbulent mean-velocity profile. *Physical Review Letters*, 105, 2010.

[15] Zhen-Dong Guo, Zhong-Yi Wang, Shou-Feng Zhang, Xiao Li, Lin Li, Chao Li, Yan Cui, Rui-Bin Fu, Yun-Zhu Dong, Xiang-Yang Chi, et al. Aerosol and surface distribution of severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 in hospital wards, wuhan, china, 2020. *Emerg Infect Dis*, 26(7):10–3201, 2020.

[16] J. Kaminsky, B. Birnir, G. Bewley, and M. Sinhuber. Reynolds number dependence of the structure functions in homogeneous turbulence. *Journ. of Nonlin. Sci.*, pages 1–34, 2020.

[17] R. H. Kraichnan. Lagrangian-history closure approximation for turbulence. *Phys. Fluids*, 8:575–598, 1965.

[18] Yuguo Li, Hua Qian, Jian Hang, Xuguang Chen, Ling Hong, Peng Liang, Jiansen Li, Shenglan Xiao, Jianjian Wei, Li Liu, et al. Evidence for probable aerosol transmission of sars-cov-2 in a poorly ventilated restaurant. *medRxiv*, 2020.

[19] Jianyun Lu, Jieni Gu, Kuibiao Li, Conghui Xu, Wenzhe Su, Zhisheng Lai, Deqian Zhou, Chao Yu, Bin Xu, and Zhicong Yang. Covid-19 outbreak associated with air conditioning in restaurant, guangzhou, china, 2020. *Emerging Infectious Diseases*, 26(7), 2020.

[20] SY Park, YM Kim, S Yi, S Lee, BJ Na, CB Kim, JI Kim, HS Kim, YB Kim, Y Park, et al. Coronavirus disease outbreak in call center, south korea. *Emerging Infectious Diseases*, 26(8), 2020.

[21] PENG Renat Manassypov PHD. Evaluating virus containment efficiency of air-handling systems. *ASHRAE Journal*, 62(7):17–23, 2020.

[22] Joshua L Santarpia, Vicki L Herrera, Danielle N Rivera, Shanna Ratnesar-Shumate, Paul W Denton, Jacob WS Martens, Ying Fang, Nicholas Conoan, Michael V Callahan, James V Lawler, et al. The infectious nature of patient-generated sars-cov-2 aerosol. *medRxiv*, 2020.

[23] Joshua L Santarpia, Danielle N Rivera, Vicki L Herrera, M Jane Morwitzer, Hannah M Creager, George W Santarpia, Kevin K Crown, David M Brett-Major, Elizabeth R Schnaubelt, M Jana Broadhurst, et al. Aerosol and surface contamination of sars-cov-2 observed in quarantine and isolation care. *Scientific reports*, 10(1):1–8, 2020.

[24] R Scatamacchia, L Biferale, and F Toschi. Extreme events in the dispersions of two neighboring particles under the influence of fluid turbulence. *Physical review letters*, 109(14):144501, 2012.

[25] BE Scharfman, AH Techet, JWM Bush, and L Bourouiba. Visualization of sneeze ejecta: steps of fluid fragmentation leading to respiratory droplets. *Experiments in Fluids*, 57(2):24, 2016.

[26] Ye Shen, Changwei Li, Hongjun Dong, Zhen Wang, Leonardo Martinez, Zhou Sun, Andreas Handel, Zhiping Chen, Enfu Chen, Mark H. Ebell, Fan Wang, Bo Yi, Haibin Wang, Xiaoxiao Wang, Aihong Wang, Bingbing Chen, Yanling Qi, Lirong Liang, Yang Li, Feng Ling, Junfang Chen, and Guozhang Xu. Community Outbreak Investigation of SARS-CoV-2 Transmission Among Bus Riders in Eastern China. *JAMA Internal Medicine*, 09 2020.