

Community Transmission of SARS-CoV-2 by Fomites: Risks and Risk Reduction Strategies

Ana K. Pitol¹, Timothy R. Julian^{2,3,4}

¹ Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, Imperial College London, United Kingdom

²Eawag, Swiss Federal Institute of Aquatic Science and Technology, Dübendorf, Switzerland

³Swiss Tropical and Public Health Institute, Basel, Switzerland

⁴University of Basel, Basel, Switzerland

23 Abstract

24 SARS-CoV-2, the virus responsible for the COVID-19 pandemic, is perceived to be primarily
25 transmitted via person-to-person contact, through droplets produced while talking, coughing, and
26 sneezing. Transmission may also occur through other routes, including contaminated surfaces;
27 nevertheless, the role that surfaces have on the spread of the disease remains contested. Here we use
28 the Quantitative Microbial Risk Assessment framework to examine the risks of community
29 transmission of SARS-CoV-2 through contaminated surfaces and to evaluate the effectiveness of hand
30 and surface disinfection as potential interventions. The risks posed by contacting surfaces in
31 communities are low (average of the median risks 1.6×10^{-4} - 5.6×10^{-9}) for community infection
32 prevalence rates ranging from 0.2-5%. Hand disinfection substantially reduces relative risks of
33 transmission independently of the disease's prevalence and the frequency of contact, even with low
34 (25% of people) or moderate (50% of people) compliance. In contrast, the effectiveness of surface
35 disinfection is highly dependent on the prevalence and the frequency of contacts. The work supports
36 the current perception that contaminated surfaces are not a primary mode of transmission of SARS-
37 CoV-2 and affirms the benefits of making hand disinfectants widely available.

38

39 Introduction

40 SARS-CoV-2, the virus responsible for the COVID-19 pandemic, is transmitted primarily via person-
41 to-person pathways such as prolonged exposures to respiratory droplets produced while talking,
42 coughing, and sneezing ^{1,2}. Based on the assumption of respiratory-droplet transmission, infection
43 control recommendations include maintaining social/physical distances, wearing masks, case
44 isolation, contact tracing, and quarantine ³. Due to the possibility of transmission through other routes,
45 including airborne and surface-mediated transmission, the WHO recommends taking airborne

46 precautions for particular settings where aerosols are generated and emphasizes the importance of
47 hand hygiene². Nevertheless, the role that airborne and surface-mediated transmission have on the
48 spread of the disease remains contested^{1,2,4–7}.

49

50 Indirect transmission via fomites (contaminated surfaces) contributes to the spread of common
51 respiratory pathogens^{8–10} and evidence-to-date suggests fomite transmission is possible for SARS-
52 CoV-2. People infected with SARS-CoV-2 shed the virus into the environment, as evidenced by
53 extensive SARS-CoV-2 RNA detected on surfaces in cruise ships, hospitals, and public spaces in
54 urban areas such as bus stations and public squares^{11–15}. Infective coronavirus persists in the
55 environment, with experimental evidence of persistence on surfaces ranging from 3 hours to 28 days,
56 depending on environmental factors such as surface material and temperature^{16–18}. Viruses readily
57 transfer from contaminated surfaces to the hand upon contact^{19–21} and from hands to the mucous
58 membranes on the face^{21–23}. People touch their faces frequently, with studies reporting average hand-
59 to-face contacts ranging from 16 to 37 times an hour^{24–26}. Taken together, this suggests surface
60 contamination could pose a risk for indirect SARS-CoV-2 transmission, similar to other respiratory
61 viruses⁸.

62

63 Despite the potential importance of indirect transmission, it is difficult to estimate its role relative to
64 direct transmission. Quantitative Microbial Risk Analysis (QMRA) provides a framework for
65 understanding health risks from indirect transmission and provides insights into potential impacts of
66 infection control recommendations. Mechanistic models of transmission events within the context of
67 QMRA frameworks have been used to identify risks for a number of scenarios including children
68 playing with fomites²⁷, sanitation workers collecting and processing urine for nutrient recovery²⁸,
69 and people sharing a houseboat.²⁹ Within the context of the current COVID-19 pandemic, QMRA has
70 been adapted to evaluate and compare transmission risks for MERS-CoV and SARS-CoV-2 through

71 droplets, aerosolized particles, and doffing personal protective equipment in hospitals³⁰⁻³² and to
72 evaluate the effectiveness masks at reducing the risk of SARS-CoV-2 infection³³.
73
74 In this study, two mechanistic models of indirect transmission within the QMRA framework are used
75 to estimate the risk of infection for SARS-CoV-2 in community settings and inform guidance on
76 potential intervention strategies. Specifically, a model is developed to estimate the risk of infection for
77 single contacts with contaminated surfaces, with the concentrations of SARS-CoV-2 RNA on the
78 surfaces informed by literature investigating surface contamination in public spaces (bus stations, gas
79 stations, stores, playgrounds). A second model is used to estimate risks from surface-mediated
80 community transmission as a function of the prevalence of COVID-19 cases in the community and to
81 test the efficacy of feasible intervention strategies of hand disinfection and surface disinfection.

82

83 Methods

84 Model 1. Risks from contaminated surfaces

85 A stochastic-mechanistic model was developed to estimate the infection risk for a single hand-to-
86 surface followed by hand-to-face contact (Figure S1). The concentration of SARS-CoV-2 RNA on
87 public surfaces [gene copy number (gc) cm⁻²] was obtained from literature^{13,15}. Conversion of SARS-
88 CoV-2 RNA to infective virus was assumed to follow a uniform distribution with range 100 and 1000
89 (gc per infective virus, with infective virus measured using Plaque Forming Units (PFU)). The
90 gc:PFU ratio is based on the sparsely available information of SARS-CoV-2 found in literature^{18,34,35},
91 data from enveloped respiratory RNA viruses³⁶ (seasonal influenza A(H1N1), A(H3N2), and
92 influenza B have mean ratios of 708, 547, and 185 gene copies per TCID₅₀ respectively), and
93 a ratio of 0.7 to convert TCID₅₀ to PFU³⁷. The transfer of virus from surface-to-hand and from hand-
94 to-mucous membranes was assumed to be proportional to the concentration of virus on the surface

95 and the transfer efficiency of virus at both interfaces³⁸. An exponential dose-response model³⁹ was
96 used to estimate the probability of infection for a given dose. This model is based on the pooled data
97 of studies of SARS-CoV⁴⁰ and Murine hepatitis virus (MHV-1)⁴¹ infection in mice. The upper bounds
98 of the dose-response curve are consistent with the infectivity of two different variants of SARS-CoV-
99 2 in mice, hamsters, and ferrets⁴². Monte Carlo simulations were used to incorporate the uncertainty
100 and variability of the input parameters. The model was simulated 50,000 times. Results are presented
101 as the median risk values with 5th and 95th percentiles. The equations used, the probability
102 distributions for the input parameters, and a diagram of the model can be found in the Supporting
103 Information (Figure S1-S3, Table S1).

104

105 Model 2. Risks from surface-mediated community transmission

106 Contamination of SARS-CoV-2 on surfaces in public spaces (e.g., traffic light buttons, train buttons)
107 was modeled as a function of disease prevalence in the community and frequency of contact with the
108 surface. Estimates obtained in the model describe the probability of infection for people contacting the
109 surface across a period of seven days. In the model, surface inoculation happens when infected
110 individuals use their hand to cover their mouth while coughing and subsequently touching a surface.
111 Viral loads [gc mL⁻¹] in the saliva or sputum of symptomatic COVID-19 patients within the first 14
112 days of symptom onset were used as input to the model^{35,43-45}. The concentrations of SARS-CoV-2 in
113 saliva and sputum samples measured in genome copies^{35,43-45}, align with concentrations of samples
114 measured in TCID₅₀³⁴ once they are adjusted by the previously mentioned genome copies to
115 infectivity ratio.

116

117 The frequency of surface contamination was determined by the prevalence of the disease in the
118 population⁴⁶⁻⁵⁰. A cough was assumed to spread particles conically⁵¹. Therefore, virus inoculation on
119 hands was modeled as a function of the concentration of virus in the saliva, the volume of saliva


120 expelled per cough, the distance between the mouth and the hand, and the right circular cone angle of the
121 ejected particles, α (Figure S2, Table S1). Transfer from surface-to-hand and from hand-to-mucous
122 membranes was assumed proportional to the concentration of virus on the surface and the transfer
123 efficiency of virus at both interfaces³⁸ (Figure S1). The concentration of virus in the contaminated surface
124 was assumed to decay exponentially⁵². Decay rate was obtained from research on SARS-CoV-2 survival
125 on various surfaces¹⁸. An exponential dose-response model³⁹ was used to estimate the probability of
126 infection for a given dose. The concentration on the contaminated surface and on the hand was
127 reduced according to the \log_{10} reduction values for the scenarios of surface and hand disinfection.
128 Alcohol-based hand sanitizer was selected as hand disinfection strategy due to the widespread
129 availability and portability of hand-sanitizers. Although hand-washing was not considered, based on
130 the log reductions of enveloped viruses achieved by handwashing⁵³, we assume effectiveness of
131 handwashing is similar to hand sanitizer for the reduction of SARS-CoV-2 on hands.

132
133 Monte Carlo simulations were used to incorporate uncertainty and variability of the input parameters
134 in the risk characterization. Convergence was tested for the baseline scenario by running five times 5
135 000, 10 000, 20 000, 50 000, and 100 000 simulations. There was minimal variation after 50 000
136 simulations (Supplementary Figure 2). Based on the results, all the models were simulated 50,000
137 times. For each of the 50,000 simulations, the risks were calculated across time, for a period of seven
138 days. Therefore, each simulation has a time profile of contaminations and risks. The median, 25th and
139 75th quartiles of the seven day simulations were recorded for each of the 50,000 simulations and the
140 average values of the median, 25th and 75th quartiles are reported (Figure 2). A sensitivity analysis was
141 performed to investigate how the variability and uncertainty of the parameters in the model influenced
142 the estimated risks. The sensitivity was estimated using the Spearman's correlation coefficients
143 between the inputs and outputs of the model. A detailed description of the model and model
144 parameters are found in the Supporting Information (Figure S1, Table S1).

145 Results and discussion:

146 Risks from contaminated surfaces

147 Risks of SARS-CoV-2 infection from contact with a fomite in community settings are estimated to be
148 low (Figure 1) and influenced by both infection prevalence rate in the community and the frequency
149 with which the fomite is contacted (Figure 2). Median risk of infection from interaction with a
150 contaminated fomite is linearly related to surface contamination, ranging from 2×10^{-8} for a surface
151 with 0.01 RNA genome copies (gc) cm^{-2} to approximately 1 for a surface with $\geq 10^6$ RNA gc cm^{-2}
152 (Figure 1). Previous studies of surface contamination on public spaces have detected 0.1 to 102
153 SARS-CoV-2 gc cm^{-2} ^{13,15}. In the two studies only 3 of 1281 (0.2%) surfaces sampled were associated
154 with risks of infection greater than 1 in 10,000. The average risk of infection for the sampled surfaces
155 was of 8.5×10^{-7} , assuming negligible risks for samples with SARS-CoV-2 RNA below the LOD (1203
156 out of 1281 surfaces).



157
158 **Figure 1. Risk of SARS-CoV-2 infection (unitless, from 0 to 1) as a function of virus concentration on**
159 **surfaces (genome copies (gc)/cm²)**. Median risk of infection is shown in a continuous black line; Gray lines
160 display the 5th and 95th percentiles. Orange circles¹³ and green diamonds¹⁵ represent the median risk estimates
161 for point values of surface contamination in public spaces with whiskers from the 5th to the 95th percentiles. Data
162 from Abrahao et al., orange circles, shows the risk for the 6 quantifiable samples out of the 49 RNA positive
163 samples. Data from Harvey et al., green diamonds, shows the risk of 3 quantifiable samples out of the 29 RNA
164 positive samples.

165 Risks from surface-mediated community transmission


166 When modeling risks of surface contamination within communities, average median value [IQR] risks
167 range from approximately 1.6×10^{-4} [2.0×10^{-5} , 1.4×10^{-3}] for the highest risk scenario (5% infection
168 prevalence rate, object contacted once every 1-20 minutes) to 5.6×10^{-9} [7.4×10^{-12} , 1.6×10^{-6}] in the
169 lowest risk scenario (0.2% prevalence rate, object contacted once every 1-4 hours) (Figure 2). The
170 overwhelming majority of interactions with fomites modeled were associated with risks $< 10^{-4}$ (Table
171 S2). The low risks of community transmission of SARS-CoV-2 via fomites is in accordance with
172 previous studies and opinions of fomite-mediated transmission in hospitals⁴⁻⁷.

173 According to the sensitivity analysis, the model parameters most influencing estimated infection risks
174 within a community are transfer efficiency between the surface and the hand, TE_{sh} , and concentration
175 of SARS-CoV-2 in sputum or saliva, C_{sp} (Table S1, Figure S4). TE_{sh} was inversely correlated with
176 risk (Spearman's rank correlation, $\rho = -0.58$) and C_{sp} was directly correlated ($\rho = 0.29$). Correlation
177 was low with all other modeled parameters ($\rho < 0.05$).

178

179 Effectiveness of hand and surface disinfection

180 Hand hygiene was consistently the most effective intervention. Alcohol-based hand disinfectants are
181 portable, widely available, and effective at inactivating coronavirus^{54,55}. Even with low compliance,
182 representative of only 1 in 4 people disinfecting hands after surface contact, median infection risks
183 from fomite contact were reduced by $0.6\text{-}2.2 \log_{10}$. Under high compliance, representing 3 of every 4
184 people disinfecting, median risks decreased by $3.8\text{-}4.3 \log_{10}$. Importantly, the impact of hand hygiene
185 also appears to be independent of surface contact frequency and prevalence rates, suggesting a
186 strategy of hand disinfection promotion in community settings is universally applicable. Our findings
187 re-affirm the existing strategies of promoting hand hygiene and making hand disinfect products
188 widely available in shared community settings⁵⁶.



189

190 **Figure 3. Predicted community-based risk of SARS-CoV-2 infection due to hand-to-surface followed by**
 191 **hand-to-face contact.** The plot shows the average median risk of infection, with whiskers from the 25th to the
 192 75th percentiles. Two interventions were tested (hand disinfection [green] and surface disinfection [orange]) in
 193 parallel to no intervention control [black]. Compliance for hand disinfection was set to 25, 50, and 75% of the
 194 population. Surface disinfection regimes were: every day at 7am, 12pm, or 7am and 12pm. The horizontal black
 195 dotted line illustrates the median risk of infection without intervention. Two contact frequencies and three
 196 prevalence levels (percentage of the population sick at any given time) were modeled: high contact frequency
 197 [1-20 min] and low contact frequency [60-240 min] and low [0.2%], medium [1%], and high [5%] prevalence.
 198 The risk of infection of 10^{-6} is equivalent to one person sick as a result of hand-to-mouth contact every million
 199 people touching the surface.

200 Although the risks of SARS-CoV-2 transmission via fomites are estimated to be low, they are
201 possible and may contribute a small number of new cases during outbreaks. For both surfaces with
202 quantified contamination and modeled surfaces within a community, infection risk estimates are very
203 low when people interact with a single fomite. However, a person's infection risk increases when
204 accounting for the hundreds of objects contacted every hour, and the thousands of frequently
205 contacted objects (crosswalk buttons, public transportation buttons, ATMs, and railings) within a city.
206 Each interaction provides an opportunity for SARS-CoV-2 transmission. Risk of infection from
207 multiple contacts with fomites – as compared to a single contact with a fomite – is substantially
208 higher. Nevertheless, in our models the risk of infection from a fomite is orders of magnitude lower
209 than the prevalence rates, suggesting the relative contribution of fomite-mediated transmission might
210 be small compared to other transmission routes.

211
212 The data used to quantify risks from measured concentrations of SARS-CoV-2 RNA on surfaces in
213 public spaces were obtained from two locations: Somerville, Massachusetts, USA¹⁵, and Belo
214 Horizonte, Minas Gerais State, Brazil¹³. The sampling collection for both studies occurred throughout
215 a COVID-19 outbreak from March-June 2020. Both places had control measures when the collection
216 took place, including mandatory use of masks in public spaces. The mask use requirement may have
217 influenced surface contamination, with the measured SARS-CoV-2 RNA concentrations lower than
218 what could be observed without a mask requirement. Our modeled interventions included hand
219 disinfection and surface disinfection, but given the widespread use of masks within a
220 community, masks may also help to curb fomite-mediated transmission. Masks are repeatedly shown
221 to be effective at reducing transmission of SARS-CoV-2⁵⁷ through the proposed mechanism of
222 limiting both production of and exposure to aerosolized droplets. Masks may also influence fomite-
223 mediated transmission by reducing hand or surface contamination from droplets and/or reducing
224 hand-to-mouth contact frequency. As there is currently insufficient data on the effectiveness of masks

225 against droplet production and on the frequency of hand-to-mouth contacts, mask use could not be
226 considered as an intervention here.

227

228 The model findings are influenced by the model implementation and assumptions, and changes in
229 assumptions may shift some of our conclusions. First, absolute infection risks from QMRA may be
230 unreliable due to the uncertainty and/or variability in the estimates of the parameters⁵⁸. The
231 exponential dose-response model in particular suffers from a number of limitations: the model is
232 based on data of SARS-CoV and Murine hepatitis virus (MHV-1) infection in mice by intranasal
233 administration^{40,41}. Extrapolating the model from mice to people and from MHV-1 and SARS-CoV to
234 SARS-CoV-2, introduces uncertainty in infection risk estimates, but – in accordance with current best
235 practice⁵⁹ – we did not consider this here. Nevertheless, dose-response relationships derived from
236 animal studies tend to be more conservative⁶⁰. An additional limitation is that the dose-response
237 relationship was determined using virus as measured in units of Plaque Forming Units (PFU) and
238 therefore a ratio of genome copies to PFU is needed. The assumed range of ratios of 1:100 to 1:1000
239 for genome copies to viable virus is based on Influenza, along with the sparse data currently available
240 for SARS-CoV-2. Data quantifying viable virus on fomites in communities would be the “gold
241 standard”, but detection of viable virus is unlikely given previously observed concentrations of
242 SARS-CoV-2 RNA align with estimates of viable virus of <1 / 100 cm². Because of the uncertainties
243 in parameter estimates, QMRA estimates of relative risk reduction from interventions are viewed as
244 more reliable because potential biases in data are incorporated into both the intervention and control
245 risk estimates⁵⁸.

246

247 Additional model characteristics likely influence risk estimates. Model parameters used for virus
248 transfer and decay rates are determined experimentally in laboratory conditions and could be different
249 in environmental conditions. Also, prevalence rates modeled here are assumed to correspond directly

250 with the percent of people who are infected and contact the surface with a hand contaminated by
251 coughing. In reality, an unknown fraction of infected people would likely either: 1) stay at home (i.e.,
252 quarantine and/or isolation), or 2) not cough directly on their hand. In this regard, the modeled
253 infection risks are likely higher (more conservative) than would be expected at the stated community
254 infection prevalence rates.

255

256 Despite the limitations of the underlying model, Quantitative Microbial Risk Assessment remains a
257 valuable tool to understand and characterize risks of surface-mediated transmission of SARS-CoV-2
258 within communities and test the effectiveness of different interventions. Epidemiological
259 investigations and/or structured experimental designs (i.e., randomized controlled trials) are infeasible
260 given that fomite-mediated transmission is likely a rare event and is difficult to decouple from other –
261 more likely – transmission routes. The results presented here add to the evidence supporting the
262 relatively low contribution of fomites in the transmission of SARS-CoV-2¹⁵, and can inform guidance
263 on potential intervention strategies.

264

265

266 Acknowledgements

267 We thank Danilo Cuccato, Emmanuel Froustey for their inputs on the model, and Diego Marcos,
268 Sunil K. Dogga, Gabriele Micali, Esther Greenwood, Sital Uprety and Elyse Stachler for reviewing
269 the manuscript. A.K.P. was supported by Swiss National Science Foundation – SNSF.

270 Author contributions

271 T.R.J. and A.K.P designed the study. A.K.P. performed the modeling. T.R.J. and A.K.P wrote the
272 manuscript.

273 Competing interests

274 We have no competing interests to declare.

275

276

277 References

- 278 1. Centers for Disease Control (CDC). Scientific Brief: SARS-CoV-2 and Potential Airborne
279 Transmission. 4–7 (2020).
- 280 2. World Health Organization. Transmission of SARS-CoV-2: implications for infection
281 prevention precautions. Scientific brief. 1–10 (2020).
- 282 3. Ferretti, L. *et al.* Quantifying SARS-CoV-2 transmission suggests epidemic control with
283 digital contact tracing. *Science* (80-.). **368**, 0–8 (2020).
- 284 4. Goldman, E. Exaggerated risk of transmission of COVID-19 by fomites. *Lancet Infect. Dis.*
285 **20**, 892–893 (2020).
- 286 5. Mondelli, M. U., Colaneri, M., Seminari, E. M., Baldanti, F. & Bruno, R. Low risk of SARS-
287 CoV-2 transmission by fomites in real-life conditions. *Lancet Infect. Dis.* **3099**, 30678 (2020).
- 288 6. Colaneri, M. *et al.* Lack of SARS-CoV-2 RNA environmental contamination in a tertiary
289 referral hospital for infectious diseases in Northern Italy. *J. Hosp. Infect.* **105**, 474–476 (2020).
- 290 7. Colaneri, M. *et al.* Severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 RNA contamination of
291 inanimate surfaces and virus viability in a health care emergency unit. *Clin. Microbiol. Infect.*
292 **26**, 1094.e1-1094.e5 (2020).
- 293 8. Boone, S. A. & Gerba, C. P. Significance of fomites in the spread of respiratory and enteric
294 viral disease. *Appl. Environ. Microbiol.* **73**, 1687–1696 (2007).

- 295 9. Kraay, A. N. M. *et al.* Fomite-mediated transmission as a sufficient pathway: a comparative
296 analysis across three viral pathogens. *BMC Infect. Dis.* (2018). doi:10.1186/s12879-018-3425-
297 x
- 298 10. Xiao, S., Li, Y., Wong, T. wai & Hui, D. S. C. Role of fomites in SARS transmission during
299 the largest hospital outbreak in Hong Kong. *PLoS One* (2017).
300 doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0181558
- 301 11. Ong, S. W. X. *et al.* Air, Surface Environmental, and Personal Protective Equipment
302 Contamination by Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) from a
303 Symptomatic Patient. *JAMA - J. Am. Med. Assoc.* 2–4 (2020). doi:10.1001/jama.2020.3227
- 304 12. Ye, G. *et al.* Environmental contamination of the SARS-CoV-2 in healthcare premises: An
305 urgent call for protection for healthcare workers. *medRxiv Prepr.* 1–20 (2020).
306 doi:10.1101/2020.03.11.20034546
- 307 13. Abrahao, J. S. *et al.* Detection of SARS-CoV-2 RNA on public surfaces in a densely populated
308 urban area of Brazil: A potential tool for monitoring the circulation of infected patients. *Sci.
309 Total Environ.* (2020). doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.142645
- 310 14. Chia, P. Y. *et al.* Detection of air and surface contamination by SARS-CoV-2 in hospital
311 rooms of infected patients. *Nat. Commun.* **11**, (2020).
- 312 15. Harvey, A. *et al.* Longitudinal monitoring of SARS-CoV-2 RNA on high-touch surfaces in a
313 community setting. *Submitted* (2020).
- 314 16. Riddell, S., Goldie, S., Hill, A., Eagles, D. & Drew, T. W. The effect of temperature on
315 persistence of SARS-CoV-2 on common surfaces. *Virol. J.* **17**, 145 (2020).
- 316 17. Chin, A. *et al.* Stability of SARS-CoV-2 in different environmental conditions. *Lancet
317 Microbe* **5247**, 2020.03.15.20036673 (2020).
- 318 18. van Doremalen, N. *et al.* Aerosol and Surface Stability of SARS-CoV-2 as Compared with
319 SARS-CoV-1. *N. Engl. J. Med.* 1–3 (2020). doi:10.1056/NEJMc2004973

- 320 19. Julian, T. R., Leckie, J. O. & Boehm, A. B. Virus transfer between fingerpads and fomites. *J.
321 Appl. Microbiol.* **109**, 1868–1874 (2010).
- 322 20. Lopez, G. U. *et al.* Transfer efficiency of bacteria and viruses from porous and nonporous
323 fomites to fingers under different relative humidity conditions. *Appl. Environ. Microbiol.* **79**,
324 5728–5734 (2013).
- 325 21. Rusin, P., Maxwell, S. & Gerba, C. Comparative surface-to-hand and fingertip-to-mouth
326 transfer efficiency of gram-positive bacteria, gram-negative bacteria, and phage. *J. Appl.
327 Microbiol.* **93**, 585–592 (2002).
- 328 22. Pitol, A. K., Bischel, H., Kohn, T. & Julian, T. R. Virus transfer at the skin-liquid interface.
329 *Environ. Sci. Technol.* **51**, 14417–14425 (2017).
- 330 23. Lu, C. wei, Liu, X. fen & Jia, Z. fang. 2019-nCoV transmission through the ocular surface
331 must not be ignored. *The Lancet* (2020). doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(20)30313-5
- 332 24. Nicas, M. & Best, D. A study quantifying the hand-to-face contact rate and its potential
333 application to predicting respiratory tract infection. *J. Occup. Environ. Hyg.* **5**, 347–352
334 (2008).
- 335 25. Kwok, Y. L. A., Gralton, J. & McLaws, M. L. Face touching: A frequent habit that has
336 implications for hand hygiene. *Am. J. Infect. Control* **43**, 112–114 (2015).
- 337 26. Lewis, R. C., Rauschenberger, R. & Kalmes, R. Hand-to-mouth and other hand-to-face
338 touching behavior in a quasi-naturalistic study under controlled conditions ABSTRACT. *J.
339 Toxicol. Environ. Heal. Part A* **00**, 1–7 (2020).
- 340 27. Julian, T. R., Canales, R. a., Leckie, J. O. & Boehm, A. B. A model of exposure to rotavirus
341 from nondietary ingestion iterated by simulated intermittent contacts. *Risk Anal.* **29**, 617–632
342 (2009).
- 343 28. Bischel, H. N., Caduff, L., Schindelholz, S., Kohn, T. & Julian, T. R. Health Risks for
344 Sanitation Service Workers along a Container-Based Urine Collection System and Resource

- 345 Recovery Value Chain. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* **53**, 7055–7067 (2019).
- 346 29. Canales, R. A. *et al.* Modeling the role of fomites in a norovirus outbreak. *J. Occup. Environ.*
347 *Hyg.* **16**, 16–26 (2019).
- 348 30. Adhikari, U. *et al.* A Case Study Evaluating the Risk of Infection from Middle Eastern
349 Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus (MERS-CoV) in a Hospital Setting Through Bioaerosols.
350 *Risk Anal.* **39**, 2608–2624 (2019).
- 351 31. King, M.-F. *et al.* Modelling the risk of SARS-CoV-2 infection through PPE doffing in a
352 hospital environment. *medRxiv* 2020.09.20.20197368 (2020).
353 doi:10.1101/2020.09.20.20197368
- 354 32. Jones, R. M. Relative contributions of transmission routes for COVID-19 among healthcare
355 personnel providing patient care. *J. Occup. Environ. Hyg.* **0**, 1–8 (2020).
- 356 33. Wilson, A. M. *et al.* COVID-19 and use of non-traditional masks: how do various materials
357 compare in reducing the risk of infection for mask wearers? *J. Hosp. Infect.* (2020).
- 358 34. Bullard, J. *et al.* Predicting Infectious Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2
359 From Diagnostic Samples. *Clin. Infect. Dis.* 1–4 (2020). doi:10.1093/cid/ciaa638
- 360 35. Kim, J. Y. *et al.* Viral load kinetics of SARS-CoV-2 infection in first two patients in Korea. *J.*
361 *Korean Med. Sci.* **35**, 1–7 (2020).
- 362 36. Ip, D. K. M. *et al.* The Dynamic Relationship between Clinical Symptomatology and Viral
363 Shedding in Naturally Acquired Seasonal and Pandemic Influenza Virus Infections. *Clin.*
364 *Infect. Dis.* **62**, 431–437 (2015).
- 365 37. ATCC. Converting TCID50 to plaque forming units PFU-124. 1 (2012). Available at:
366 [https://www.lgcstandards-](https://www.lgcstandards-atcc.org/Global/FAQs/4/8/Converting_TCID50_to_plaque_forming_units_PFU-124.aspx?geo_country=gb#)
367 [atcc.org/Global/FAQs/4/8/Converting_TCID50_to_plaque_forming_units_PFU-](https://www.lgcstandards-atcc.org/Global/FAQs/4/8/Converting_TCID50_to_plaque_forming_units_PFU-124.aspx?geo_country=gb#)
368 [124.aspx?geo_country=gb#](https://www.lgcstandards-atcc.org/Global/FAQs/4/8/Converting_TCID50_to_plaque_forming_units_PFU-124.aspx?geo_country=gb#). (Accessed: 20th October 2020)
- 369 38. Wilson, A. M. *et al.* Evaluating a transfer gradient assumption in a fomite-mediated microbial

- 370 transmission model using an experimental and Bayesian approach. *J. R. Soc. Interface* **17**,
371 (2020).
- 372 39. Watanabe, T., Bartrand, T. A., Weir, M. H., Omura, T. & Haas, C. N. Development of a Dose-
373 Response Model for SARS Coronavirus. **30**, (2010).
- 374 40. DeDiego, M. L. *et al.* Pathogenicity of severe acute respiratory coronavirus deletion mutants in
375 hACE-2 transgenic mice. *Virology* (2008). doi:10.1016/j.virol.2008.03.005
- 376 41. De Albuquerque, N. *et al.* Murine Hepatitis Virus Strain 1 Produces a Clinically Relevant
377 Model of Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome in A/J Mice. *J. Virol.* (2006).
378 doi:10.1128/jvi.00747-06
- 379 42. Zhou, B. *et al.* SARS-CoV-2 spike D614G variant confers enhanced replication and
380 transmissibility. *bioRxiv* (2020). doi:<https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.10.27.357558>
- 381 43. Wölfel, R. *et al.* Virological assessment of hospitalized patients with COVID-2019. *Nature* 1–
382 14 (2020). doi:10.1038/s41586-020-2196-x
- 383 44. Pan, Y., Zhang, D., Yang, P., Poon, L. L. M. & Wang, Q. Viral load of SARS-CoV-2 in
384 clinical samples. *Lancet Infect. Dis.* **20**, 411–412 (2020).
- 385 45. To, K. K. W. *et al.* Temporal profiles of viral load in posterior oropharyngeal saliva samples
386 and serum antibody responses during infection by SARS-CoV-2: an observational cohort
387 study. *Lancet Infect. Dis.* **20**, 565–574 (2020).
- 388 46. Bendavid, E. *et al.* COVID-19 Antibody Seroprevalence in Santa Clara County, California.
389 *medRxiv* 2020.04.14.20062463 (2020). doi:10.1101/2020.04.14.20062463
- 390 47. Perez-Saez, J. *et al.* Serology-informed estimates of SARS-CoV-2 infection fatality risk in
391 Geneva, Switzerland. *Lancet Infect. Dis.* **3099**, 2–3 (2020).
- 392 48. Pollán, M. *et al.* Prevalence of SARS-CoV-2 in Spain (ENE-COVID): a nationwide,
393 population-based seroepidemiological study. *Lancet* **396**, 535–544 (2020).
- 394 49. Erikstrup, C. *et al.* Estimation of SARS-CoV-2 infection fatality rate by real-time antibody

- 395 screening of blood donors. *Clin. Infect. Dis.* (2020). doi:10.1093/cid/ciaa849
- 396 50. Amorim Filho, L. *et al.* Seroprevalence of anti-SARS-CoV-2 among blood donors in Rio de
397 Janeiro, Brazil. *Rev. Saude Publica* **54**, 69 (2020).
- 398 51. Nicas, M. & Sun, G. An integrated model of infection risk in a health-care environment. *Risk
399 Anal.* **26**, 1085–1096 (2006).
- 400 52. van Doremale, N. *et al.* Aerosol and Surface Stability of SARS-CoV-2 as Compared with
401 SARS-CoV-1. *N. Engl. J. Med.* (2020). doi:10.1056/NEJMc2004973
- 402 53. Narendra Kumar Chaudhary *et al.* Fighting the SARS CoV-2 (COVID-19) Pandemic with
403 Soap. *Preprints* **060**, 1–19 (2020).
- 404 54. Rabenau, H. F., Kampf, G., Cinatl, J. & Doerr, H. W. Efficacy of various disinfectants against
405 SARS coronavirus. *J. Hosp. Infect.* **61**, 107–111 (2005).
- 406 55. Golin, A. P., Choi, D. & Ghahary, A. Hand sanitizers: A review of ingredients, mechanisms of
407 action, modes of delivery, and efficacy against coronaviruses. *Am. J. Infect. Control* (2020).
408 doi:10.1016/j.ajic.2020.06.182
- 409 56. World Health Organization (WHO). *Recommendation to Member States to improve hand
410 hygiene practices widely to help prevent the transmission of the COVID-19 virus. Interim
411 guidance* (2020).
- 412 57. Liang, M. *et al.* Efficacy of face mask in preventing respiratory virus transmission: A
413 systematic review and meta-analysis. *Travel Med. Infect. Dis.* 101751 (2020).
414 doi:10.1016/j.tmaid.2020.101751
- 415 58. World Health Organization (WHO). *Quantitative microbial risk assessment. Application for
416 water safety management.* (2016).
- 417 59. Haas, C. N., Rose, J. B. & Gerba, C. P. *Quantitative Microbial Risk Assessment: Second
418 Edition.* John Wiley & Sons, Inc. (2014). doi:10.1002/9781118910030
- 419 60. Haas, C. WikiQMRA: Completed Dose Response Models. Available at:

420 <http://qmrawiki.org/framework/dose-response/experiments>. (Accessed: 1st October 2020)

421

422

423

424

425

426 **Table of Contents (TOC)**



427

428 For Table of Contents Only

429