

1

2

3

4 Full title: Airflow and air velocity measurements while
5 playing wind instruments, with respect to risk assessment of a
6 SARS-CoV-2 infection

7

8 Short Title: Airflow of wind instruments

9

10 Claudia Spahn¹, Anna Hipp¹, Bernd Schubert², Marcus Rudolf Axt³, Markus Stratmann³,
11 Christian Schmölder³, Bernhard Richter¹

12

¹³ Freiburg Institute for Musicians' Medicine, Medical Center University of Freiburg,
¹⁴ University of Music Freiburg, Faculty of Medicine at the Albert-Ludwigs-University of
¹⁵ Freiburg, Freiburg Centre for Research and Teaching in Music, Freiburg, Baden-
¹⁶ Württemberg, Germany

¹⁷ ² Tintschl BioEnergie und Strömungstechnik AG, Tintschl Unternehmensgruppe, Bamberg,
¹⁸ Bavaria, Germany

19 ³ Bamberg Symphony, Bamberg, Bavaria, Germany

20

21

22 ENOVA This document represents new research that has not yet been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

23 **Abstract**

24 Due to airborne transmission of infection with the coronavirus, the question arose as to how
25 high the risk of spreading infectious particles can be while playing a wind instrument.

26 To contribute to this question and to help clarify the possible risks, we analyzed 14 wind
27 instruments, first qualitative by making airflows visible while playing and second quantitative
28 by measuring air velocities at three distances (1m, 1.5m and 2m) in direction of the
29 instrument's bell.

30 Measurements took place with wind instrumentalists of the Bamberg Symphony in their
31 concert hall.

32 Our findings highlight that while playing all wind instruments no airflow escaping from the
33 instruments – from the bell with brass instruments, from the mouthpiece, keyholes and bell
34 with woodwinds – was measured beyond a distance of 1.5m from the instruments' bell,
35 regardless of volume, pitch or what was played. With that, air velocity while playing
36 corresponded to the usual value of hall-like rooms, of 0.1 m/s. For air-jet woodwinds, alto
37 flute and piccolo, significant air movements were seen close to their mouthpieces, which
38 escaped directly into the room without passing through the instrument and therefore
39 generating directed air movements.

40

41 **Introduction**

42 The coronavirus pandemic has had and continues to have a grave impact on music making,
43 especially concerning the playing of wind instruments and singing. Airborne transmission
44 plays an important role for the spread of the SARS-CoV-2 virus [1]. Thus, forms of musical
45 sound generation that involve breathing are suspected of being risky. In this regard, it seems

46 of great importance to learn more about airflow and air velocity produced by playing wind
47 instruments and singing that could contain infectious droplets or aerosols and spread them in
48 indoor situations.

49 Up-to-date research looked into air dispersion, while playing wind instruments or singing,
50 using different forms of measuring.

51 In a recent publication, conducted at the Bauhaus-Universität Weimar [2] the spread of
52 breathing air while playing wind instruments and singing was observed, using the Schlieren
53 imaging with a Schlieren mirror and the Background Oriented Schlieren method (BOS), as a
54 way to make respiratory air visible. Two professional singers (baritone and soprano) and
55 eleven wind instruments (woodwinds: oboe, bassoon, Bb clarinet, bass clarinet, flute, piccolo,
56 alto flute, and brass: Bb trumpet, tenor trombone, French horn, F tuba) of the philharmonic
57 orchestra Thüringen Philharmonic Gotha – Eisenach, were positioned in front of the Schlieren
58 mirror while playing or singing. The findings show that the spreading range as well as the
59 angle at which the air escapes mouth or outlet, varies strongly from instrument and player,
60 depending on the structure of the instrument, the structure of the mouthpiece, the way an
61 instrument is blown and individual blowing or breathing capacities. In general their
62 measurements with wind instruments reached a maximal distance of 1.12m, measured by
63 side-air movements of the piccolo.

64 The authors also discovered that special barrier caps – used with brass instruments – do have
65 a significant impact on the spread of air, which can strongly reduce the dispersion, while
66 hardly interfering with the sound of the instrument. Furthermore, they found out that the
67 escaping air ascends due to natural convection or mixes with the surrounding room air [3].

68 A study by the Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München and the University of Erlangen [4],
69 pre-published in July 2020, investigated different forms of speaking and singing with 10
70 professional singers of the Bavarian Radio Choir. They made respiratory flows visible by

71 exhaling smoke of e-cigarettes (not containing nicotine). Tests were conducted in a shaded
72 room, documenting the exhaled aerosol clouds with the help of a high speed camera and laser
73 light. Comparing different settings (singing text, speaking text and singing without text, once
74 with soft and once with loud phonation) they learned that singing text and speaking text
75 reaches comparable mean distances of dispersion at up to 0.85m, while singing without text
76 reached the lowest values of airflow at 0.63m. Even though the mean measurements of air
77 dispersion stay within a reach of 1m, some singers reached airflow distances of up to 1.4m.
78 These measurements were then compared to coughing, which turns out to reach farther
79 distances, with a mean of 1.3m and a maximum of 1.9m. On the base of their study, they
80 announce a suggestion for distance regulations of at least 2m to the front [5].

81 First insights on their second study on wind instruments, using the same test setting are
82 published online [6]. They point out, that respiratory clouds to the front reach farther than to
83 the side, with instrument-specific outcomes. For an alto flute they recommend 3m spaces to
84 the front and 2m to the side, for all other wind instruments they recommend 2m to the front
85 and 1.5m to the side [7].

86 Another study conducted by the University of the German Armed Forces in Munich [8],
87 which was pre-published in May 2020, analyzed larger droplets, when singing and speaking,
88 as well as flow-related small droplets when singing and playing wind instruments. The study
89 was conducted with a professional singer, two amateur choir singers, five professional
90 musicians (clarinet, flute, oboe, bassoon, and trumpet) and an amateur brass player (trumpet,
91 trombone, and euphonium). The motion of droplets and air leaving either mouth or outlet was
92 observed during exhalation, which was then illuminated with laser and recorded with a digital
93 camera, producing a series of images that were subsequently quantitatively analyzed. The
94 analysis points out that while singing no more airflow was detectable at a distance of 0.5m,
95 regardless of volume, pitch or if the singer was a professional or an amateur. As for wind

96 instruments the analysis of brass instruments showed strong air movements in front of the
97 instrument, which did not reach farther than 0.5m. Woodwinds produced comparably more
98 airflow, reaching a distance of around 1m. Concluding, they recommend a minimal radial
99 distance of 1.5m between singers and wind instrumentalists [9].

100 They furthermore point out the risks of infection in choir singing by the fact that there are
101 social contacts between choir members that are usually part of choir repetitions, e.g. during
102 breaks [10].

103 In addition, there is another study by Parker and Crookston [11] (pre-published in July 2020)
104 which measured aerosols while playing brass instruments and singing. The authors analyzed 7
105 brass instruments (cornet, horn, baritone, euphonium, trombone, Eb tuba and Bb tuba),
106 investigating the effect that playing for a more extended period of time has on the release of
107 particles with comparison to singing, breathing and using a special barrier cap. To investigate
108 the particles released, they were size sorted and counted with a six-channel laser particle
109 counter. It is figured out that breathing produces more respiratory droplets than playing, and
110 the authors state that the use of a barrier reduces the release of aerosols by 95%. They also
111 found that within variation of time the production of aerosols increases again and fresh air
112 conditioning is required [12].

113 At the University of Minnesota a study on aerosol generation from different wind instruments
114 analyzed 15 musicians from the Minnesota Orchestra [13] (playing trumpet, bass trombone,
115 French horn, tuba, piccolo, bassoon, oboe, clarinet and bass clarinet) while playing their
116 instruments, breathing and speaking. By use of an aerodynamic particle sizer, the aerosol
117 concentration and size was measured. In comparison to the aerosol generation of speaking and
118 breathing, the instruments are thereafter categorized into low, intermediate and high-risk
119 levels. They point out that air-jet instruments (piccolo and flute) produce aerosols at the outlet
120 and the other half near the embouchure. Bassoon also produces aerosols at the keyholes, as

121 well as the bell. For woodwinds, in general, the mouthpiece and tube structure play a
122 significant role in the generation of aerosols. For brass instruments they find, that the total
123 length of the tube correlates with the concentration of aerosols (trumpet > bass trombone >
124 French horn > tuba) [14].

125 Furthermore, Mürbe et al. [15] pre-published a study on the increase of aerosols during
126 professional singing. Testing 8 professional singers (two female soprano, two female alto, two
127 male baritone and two male tenor) of the RIAS chamber choir Berlin, they measured particle
128 emission rates with the help of a laser particle counter, during breathing, reading, singing and
129 holding a long tone. They confirm their assumption of singing producing higher emission
130 rates than speaking, with mean measurements of 4.71 – 84.76 P/s during speaking and 753.4 –
131 6093.14 P/s during singing. Women also produced more particle emission rates than men,
132 leading to the assumption that high voices produce a higher sound pressure level than lower
133 voices. On the base of their findings, they assume that singing produces more emission rates
134 of aerosols than speaking or breathing and that an increase of aerosol rates can be observed
135 with an increasing sound pressure level during singing, especially while holding long tones
136 [16].

137 In consideration of their study, Mürbe et al. [17], Kriegel and Hartmann [18], and Hartmann,
138 et al. [19] publish various risk assessments on the risk of infection with virus-loaded aerosols,
139 while singing indoors during the SARS-CoV-2-pandemic, assuming that different styles of
140 singing – e.g. singing vs. speaking – as well as different intensity of voice can lead to various
141 sizes and density of droplets and aerosols [20] and that room situations of choir rehearsals
142 have to be taken into account [21, 22].

143 They also found out that child voices emit fewer aerosols during singing than adults [23]. The
144 study tested 8 children (four girls and four boys) of semiprofessional children's choirs (Staats-
145 und Domsingknaben Berlin and a girls choir of the Berliner Singakademie), who were all 13

146 years old (except one girl was 15 years old). The study was conducted the same as their
147 previous study on professional adult singers, as mentioned above. Their mean measurements
148 show emission rates of 16 – 267 P/s for speaking, 141 – 1240 P/s for singing, and 683 – 4332
149 P/s for shouting [24].

150 These up-to-date studies looked into the spreading of air or aerosols, while playing wind
151 instruments or singing, focusing on different instruments, singing styles or using different
152 forms of measuring and making airflows visible. They give similar results focusing the
153 visualization of airflows while playing wind instruments and singing. Accordingly different
154 methods were used like the Schlieren method to make respiratory airflows visible [25], the
155 visualization of airborne transmission of professional singers and wind instruments by use of
156 e-cigarette smoke [26, 27], the observation of large and small droplets from wind instruments
157 and singers, on the basis of illuminating airflows with laser and analyzing picture series [28],
158 the release of respiratory aerosols, while speaking and playing brass instruments, as well as
159 for using barrier caps [29], the generation of aerosols of different wind instruments, measured
160 with an aerodynamic particle sizer [30] and the measurement of particle emission rates of
161 professional singers [31] and children [32], leading to several risk assessments of singing
162 indoors during the SARS-CoV-2-pandemic [33, 34, 35].

163 The measurements of our study took place at the beginning of May 2020, when wind
164 instrumentalists had to maintain distances of 12m following official instructions and
165 recommendations by statutory accident insurance. With this background it was tremendous to
166 bring evidence into the field of music making. In this respect, our study aimed to provide
167 funded data on velocity, direction and distance of respiratory air while playing wind
168 instruments.

169

170 Materials and Methods

171 Sample

172 Players of brass instruments (trumpet, trombone, horn and tuba), as well as woodwind players
173 (alto flute, piccolo, oboe, English horn, clarinet, bass clarinet, bassoon and contrabassoon) of
174 the Bamberg Symphony voluntarily took part in the study. Two further professional
175 musicians – tenor saxophone and recorder players who are not part of the classical orchestra –
176 have also been included, leading to a total sample of 14 wind instrument players.

177 All persons were asked by the administration of the Bamberg Symphony to take part in the
178 measurements. At this time of lockdown musicians were highly motivated to contribute to
179 research in order to make playing possible again.

180 Consent for the study was given by the Ethics Committee of the Universitätsklinikum
181 Freiburg.

182 In order to exclude infectious persons, all players were questioned before the measurements if
183 they had typical symptoms of the Covid-19 disease. Additionally, everyone's temperature was
184 taken with an electric fever thermometer, directly before entering the concert hall. No one
185 indicated suspicious symptoms and the measurements of the temperature showed values
186 under the cut-off of 37.5°C in all persons.

187

188 Design and procedure

189 At the beginning of May 2020 measurements were conducted, which were initiated by the
190 Bamberg Symphony Orchestra during the first lockdown of the Covid-19 pandemic in
191 Germany. All solo players for wind instruments of the orchestra (brass: trumpet, trombone,
192 horn and tuba; woodwinds: bassoon, contrabassoon, alto flute, piccolo, oboe, clarinet, bass

193 clarinet and English horn), and an additional professional tenor saxophone and a recorder
194 player, were examined, while playing their instruments.

195 The measurements took place in a typical surrounding for classical musicians, using the stage
196 of the Bamberg Symphony (see S1 Appendix). The aim of the measurements was to first
197 make respiratory air visible and then to measure air velocities at and coming from the
198 instruments' bell, as well as other outlets (e.g. keyholes or side airs). We wanted to find out
199 where air velocities can be measured, at what value and to what extent. Therefore, special air
200 velocity sensors were put at the bell of the instrument, at the distances of 1m, 1.5m and 2m
201 (see S2 Appendix, S3 Appendix). For the qualitative analysis, the measurements were also
202 filmed on a digital camera, producing videos. For all wind instruments except recorder,
203 qualitative and quantitative measurements could be analyzed. Due to technical disruptive
204 factors for the recorder only qualitative observations are available.

205 All wind instrumentalists played scales, excerpts of music pieces and long tones with different
206 pitches and dynamics (pp – ff), as well as different articulations (e.g. staccato). Particular to
207 the instrument, the measurement focused on the escape of air through tone holes and outlets
208 specifically. Since warming up is different for every instrument and concerning brass winds
209 usually includes a lot of blowing through the mouthpiece (without using the whole
210 instrument), these situations were analyzed as well.

211

212 **Visualization of airflow**

213 The flow visualization, by use of artificial mist, is one option for on-site-inspection of
214 airflows. Using the technique of flow visualization with the FlowMakerTM, swirls have been
215 qualitatively made visible, at the outlet of wind instruments [36, 37].

216 Coming into operation was a harmless artificial fog of SAFEX®-Chemie GmbH [38], which
217 consists of water droplets and is usually used as stage fog [39]. The fog droplets have a size
218 smaller 5µm (see S4 Appendix) and can therefore be compared to the dangerous core droplets
219 of the coronavirus [40].

220 The artificial fog was transported through a system called „Hydra“, using a flexible tube, to
221 the release spot of the instruments, embouchure area, bell, and key openings. Through the
222 application tube, installed on a stand, the fog escaped into the free space of the room and
223 created a cloud of fog. It was oriented towards the musicians, who placed the outlet of their
224 instrument directly into the cloud (see S5 Appendix, showing the horn player).

225 The movement of the fog was filmed with a video camera and qualitatively analyzed
226 afterwards.

227

228 **Measurement of air velocity (anemometry)**

229 For the measurement of air velocity, omnidirectional (independent of direction) hot film
230 probes type DISA 54N50 Low Velocity Air Flow Analyzer, manufactured by DANTEC were
231 used. The probes have a measuring area of 0 - 1 m/s with an accuracy of 0.2 – 0.4 % full
232 scale. The corresponding electronics (LVFA) give a linear voltage signal of 0 – 2 Volts,
233 according to its velocity, which is recorded with a 20 bit-AD converter in the computer.
234 Before the measurements, the measurement chain (sensor – electronic measurement
235 equipment – signaling cable – converter – computer) was verified in the company-owned
236 wind tunnel against a laser-Doppler anemometer.

237 With a distance of 1m, 1.5m and 2m from the exhaust opening, ball tubes were put on stands
238 and placed in a line. All sensors were at a height of 1m above ground and were adjusted
239 according to the different instruments and their outlet holes (see S3 Appendix).

240 The linear output signal of the controller was mapped with a 20 bit AD converter and
241 recorded on the cable-connected computer every second.

242 The relation of the measuring signal and the actual velocity was verified according to the
243 measurements of the in-house calibration wind tunnel, in the area of 0.15 – 0.7 m/s.

244 Parallel to the measurements of the velocity, video recordings with a manual camera were
245 also conducted.

246 The quantitative measurements were used to support the qualitative observations by focusing
247 the distances of 1m, 1.5m and 2m, measuring air velocities in direction of the instruments'
248 outlets. The video sequences of the qualitative observations were timed with the
249 measurements of the velocity measurement probes, to get the relation of distance, direction
250 and velocity of the emitted air. Hereinafter, the findings are presented by selected measuring
251 charts (e.g. see S6 Appendix). These charts were used as basis for the analysis and were
252 compared to data numbers and video sequences, in order to understand what air velocities
253 were measured where and while doing what kind of playing or warming up.

254

255 **Measurement report**

256 Among circles of experts on air technology, room air velocities are part of indoor climate
257 discussions. The indoor climate of habitable rooms is called comfort climate: “A climate of
258 comfort persists, when people feel thermally at ease in habitable rooms” [41]. Whether a
259 person is feeling comfortable within a room is – amongst other components, like temperature,
260 etc. – dependent of air velocities, since a comfortable climate is free from draught. Draught is
261 the undesired cooling of the body through air movement. It can be felt from a merit of 0.15
262 m/s, and depends on the size of a room and its ventilation system [42].

263 The perception of comfortableness of concert halls is therefore closely related to ventilation
264 systems of the hall. So-called “well-like ventilations”, coming from the ground, are usually
265 used nowadays [43]. In this relation, the velocity, in which the air exits the ventilation system
266 has to be taken into account, since it is regulating how comfortable the audience feels. For
267 concert halls exit velocities of 0.2 m/s are recommended (in relation to a room temperature of
268 20°), to not surpass an air velocity of 0.15 m/s at the height of 1m (were the audience is
269 sitting) and to stay in the comfort zone of 0.1 – 0.2 m/s [44]. Hence, for concert halls, which
270 have a room temperature of 20°, room air velocities of 0.1 – 0.16 m/s are usually estimated
271 [45].

272 Looking at the circumstances of the concert hall of the Bamberg Symphony, the ventilation
273 system was analyzed in 2017 to understand draught appearances on stage, giving our study
274 funded data on the room air conditions, including the room temperature of 22.3°. Hence, the
275 draught risks – where people start to feel uncomfortable – was stated at 0.15 m/s the highest
276 and therefore considered an area of comfortableness at 0.1 – 0.15 m/s [46].

277 These numbers show that measurements under a merit of 0.1 m/s cannot be recognized by
278 people and are comparable to “background noises”. Simultaneously, they point out that a
279 merit of 0.15 m/s is already felt as draught, leading to a range of room comfortableness
280 between 0.1 – 0.15 m/s. These numbers help to understand the measurements of the air
281 velocities of wind instruments, giving them a relation and comparability. Merits under 0.1 m/s
282 are therefore not considered, while merits of 0.15 or even 0.2 m/s can be understood as
283 remarkable.

284 As a basis for the analysis graphs for every instrument were produced, indicating the findings
285 of an instrument. These charts compare the airflow visualizations of the video sequences to
286 the measured numbers of airflows within the three distances (1m, 1.5m, 2m) in direction of
287 the instruments’ outlet (see S6 Appendix, Appendix S7).

288 Making use of the descriptive analysis, the measurements of every instrument were also put
289 into a table, comparing air velocities of different instruments, at the three different distances.
290 This overview showed the maximum values of every instrument, at every distance – which
291 were compared and put into a relation to the numbers of room comfortableness. Air velocities
292 produced by a wind instrument that are lying under a value of 0.1 m/s do not have an impact
293 on the compartment air and “disappear” amongst “background noises”, meaning velocities.
294 Whereas air velocities with a value over 0.3 m/s are comparable to strong draughts or
295 coughing and therefore have a strong impact on dispersion of air, and in the following, on the
296 dispersion of core droplets, such as SARS-CoV-2 virus droplets.

297

298 **Results**

299 **Qualitative flow visualizations by use of artificial fog**

300 The qualitative observations served the analysis of airflows while playing (see S8 Appendix)
301 and gave a first insight into the movement of airflows from the different outlets of the
302 instruments. Aside from that, these observations were significant to the position of the sensor
303 for the air velocity measurements, showing precisely at what spot of the instrument airflows
304 escaped the instrument. The sensor of the tuba, for example, was positioned above the
305 instrument, since its outlet directs upwards, whereas the outlet of the oboe points to the floor
306 and the output of the horn points backwards. The main outlet for the observed brass
307 instruments (trumpet, trombone, horn and tuba) was the bell, whereas for woodwinds
308 keyholes as well as airflows close to the mouthpiece have to be considered.

309 *Brass*

310 Next to airflows, which escaped at the bell of the brass instruments, further air movements
311 were seen while deflating the instrument, which concerned mainly the trumpet and trombone.
312 This procedure is part of warming-up and generates visible airflows, which can only be seen

313 within a distance of 1m. Comparing these air movements to directed blowing (in direction of
314 the sensors), blowing without the instrument showed stronger and faster air movements in the
315 artificial fog. While the trumpet and trombone players were playing an excerpt of a music
316 piece, only very small air movements were made visible, which mixed with the surrounding
317 room air velocity quickly. As for the tuba and horn no air movements were made visible,
318 while playing.

319 *Air-jet woodwinds*

320 For the piccolo and alto flute side airflows could be made visible, escaping the mouth close to
321 the mouthpiece, directly reaching to the ground and staying visibly close to the player's body.
322 Aside from these significant observations no further airflows could be seen at the bell of these
323 two air-jet instruments.

324 For the recorder (early baroque in g, and soprano) small air movements were visible at the
325 labium of the instrument, at a distance of max. 20 cm (see S9 Appendix). Further airflows
326 were not visible at the bell of the recorder, leading to the presumption that the labium can be
327 understood as the instruments' main outlet (see S10 Appendix).

328 *Reed woodwinds*

329 Further reed woodwind instruments, which were measured (single reeds: clarinet, bass
330 clarinet, saxophone and double reeds: bassoon, contra bassoon, oboe and English horn)
331 mainly showed airflows escaping the instruments' bell, with little observations at the
332 keyholes. Even though these instruments showed airflows escaping from the keyholes as well,
333 these air movements showed only little dispersions in the artificial fog.

334 While playing the clarinet, for example, small airflows were visible at the bell of the
335 instrument, which were thereafter compared to blowing without the instrument. This
336 comparison showed how small the air movements with the instrument were, in comparison to

337 the fast and strong airflows, produced by blowing from the mouth of the clarinetist without
338 the instrument.

339

340 **Measurements of air velocity (anemometry)**

341 The air velocity measurements with all wind instruments mostly did not surpass a value of 0.1
342 m/s (see Table 1), while playing an excerpt of a music piece, scales, or different pitches and
343 volumes. Even though air movements were qualitatively seen at the bell of some wind
344 instruments, these qualitative observations did not reach measurements of more than 0.1 m/s,
345 which is the value of usual room air velocities in hall-like rooms. Hence, some little air
346 movements were measurable at the 1m sensor (concerning tuba: 0.13 m/s, oboe: 0.15 m/s and
347 contrabassoon: 0.11 m/s – at the 1m sensor), not surpassing measurements of 0.1 m/s at the
348 1.5 or 2m sensor.

349 **Table 1. Maximum measurements of all test instruments, while playing an excerpt from a music piece:**

Instruments	1m	1.5m	2m
<u>brass</u>			
trumpet	<0.1m/s	<0.1m/s	<0.1m/s
trombone	<0.1m/s	<0.1m/s	<0.1m/s
horn	<0.1m/s	<0.1m/s	<0.1m/s
tuba	0.13m/s	<0.1m/s	<0.1m/s
<u>woodwinds</u>			
1) air-jet			
alto flute	<0.1m/s	<0.1m/s	<0.1m/s
piccolo	<0.1m/s	<0.1m/s	<0.1m/s
2) single reed			
clarinet	<0.1m/s	<0.1m/s	<0.1m/s
bass clarinet	<0.1m/s	<0.1m/s	<0.1m/s
saxophone	<0.1m/s	<0.1m/s	<0.1m/s
3) double reed			
oboe	0.15m/s	0.12m/s	<0.1m/s
bassoon	<0.1m/s	<0.1m/s	<0.1m/s
contrabassoon	0.1m/s	<0.1m/s	<0.1m/s
English horn	<0.1m/s	<0.1m/s	<0.1m/s

350

351 **Brass instruments**

352 The playing of trumpet, trombone, horn and tuba showed only little or no airflows in the
353 artificial fog. However, there was a difference between playing and warming up. Since brass
354 players often use only mouthpieces while warming up, direct airflows are produced, which
355 can reach measurements higher than 0.1 m/s. In comparison, loudness or pitch did not have an
356 impact on the air velocities (see S6 Appendix, S7 Appendix).

357 *Trumpet*

358 While playing different scales, high and medium pitches, all measurements of the trumpet
359 stayed under 0.1 m/s at any distance, which corresponds with the usual room air velocity.

360 However, when the player deflated the instrument air velocities reached 0.14 m/s at a distance
361 of 1m from the bell, while at 1.5m and 2m they stayed under 0.1 m/s. Comparing these
362 numbers to the values of blowing without the instrument, the measurements were much
363 higher, producing air movements of 0.52 m/s to the front, at a distance of 1m. At 1.5m during
364 blowing without the instrument they dropped to 0.15 m/s and at a distance of 2m they stayed
365 under 0.1 m/s.

366 *Trombone*

367 Similar to the measurements of the trumpet, air velocities of the trombone did not surpass a
368 value of 0.1 m/s while playing scales and different pitches, and even while deflating, at any
369 distance.

370 When the person only blowing, without the instrument or the mouthpiece, the highest
371 measurements were made, reaching a value of 0.4 m/s at 1m, 0.18 m/s at 1.5m to the front and
372 0.1 m/s at 2m.

373 *Horn*

374 For the horn all measurements stayed under a value of 0.1 m/s at all three distances,
375 regardless of whether they were playing an excerpt from a music piece, different pitches or
376 volumes.

377 *Tuba*

378 The tuba did reach the highest measurements of all brass instruments during playing a music
379 piece or warm up with the instrument. While playing scales and while deflating they did not
380 surpass a value of 0.1 m/s, at every distance. But, when the player did an excerpt of a music
381 piece or warmed up the instrument, the measurements reached 0.13 m/s at a distance of 1m
382 upwards (in the direction of the bell), and stayed again under 0.1 m/s at 1.5m and 2m.

383

384 **Wood-wind instruments**

385 For some wood-winds, the measurements indicate that air movements were not only visible at
386 the bell of the instrument, but also at other outlets, such as side-air observations or airflows
387 escaping tone holes – concerning difference between air-jet woodwinds and reed woodwinds.
388 As for single reed and double reed woodwinds, there were no significant differences in the
389 measurements.

390 Air-jet woodwinds

391 Since there were qualitative observations of side-air movements for both air-jet woodwinds,
392 another sensor was put up at 0.5m to the side of the player, measuring side-air velocities.

393 *Alto flute*

394 Regardless of what the flute player was playing all measurements to all sides and distances
395 stayed under 0.1 m/s. The additional measurements to the side reached a value of 0.15 m/s at
396 a distance of 0.5m.

397 *Piccolo*

398 The measurements at the bell of the piccolo stayed under a maximal value of 0.1 m/s and
399 therefore mixed with the usual room air velocity of the concert hall. Other than the flute, side-
400 air measurements for the piccolo showed a slightly smaller value of 0.13 m/s.

401 *Single reed woodwinds*

402 The qualitative observations showed air movements at the keyholes of several reed
403 woodwinds, which were considered due to the front sensor at 1m.

404 *Clarinet*

405 The measurements for the clarinet, at all distances did not surpass a value of 0.1 m/s,
406 regardless of whether they were playing scales, different pitches or an excerpt from a music
407 piece.

408 *Bass clarinet*

409 Air velocity measurements for the bass clarinet did not surpass a value of 0.1 m/s, with no
410 difference of what was played (an excerpt from a music piece, long tones or staccato), at a
411 distance of 1m in the direction of the bell, and stayed under a value of 0.1 m/s at 1.5m and
412 2m.

413 *Tenor saxophone*

414 The measurements for tenor saxophone playing did not reach a measurement of air velocity
415 over 0.1 m/s at all distances – regardless of what the player was playing.

416 *Double reed woodwinds*

417 *Oboe*

418 The measurements of the oboe reached a value of 0.15 m/s at a distance of 1m, 0.12 m/s at
419 1.5m and stayed under the usual room air movement of 0.1 m/s at 2m.

420 *Bassoon*

421 All measurements of the bassoon stayed under a value of 0.1 m/s at all distances,
422 independently of what was played.

423 *Contrabassoon*

424 All measured data of the contrabassoon stayed at 0.1 m/s, with no difference between long
425 tones or an excerpt from a music piece, at all distances from the bell.

426 *English horn*

427 While playing the English horn, regardless of what was played, all measurements in direction
428 of the bell stayed under a value of 0.1 m/s.

429

430 **Woodwind and brass instruments, with ambient noises**

431 As a counter phase to the individual measurements, situations with ambient noises were also
432 considered, since they happen frequently during orchestra rehearsals or concerts, e.g. while
433 setting up, rebuilding the stage or simply while everyone walks to their seats. Within these
434 test set-ups the musicians were also playing, while someone walked across the room or other
435 people were talking to each other.

436 During these measurements we tried to differentiate between air velocities coming from the
437 players or the surroundings. Hence, it was shown that the air velocities could clearly be
438 separated, since they stayed very close to the instrument's player (see S11 Appendix) or came
439 from the disturbing noises, which rose instantly as soon as someone passed the measurement
440 points or spoke to the player. Simply raising a hand making a very small movement did show

441 air velocity measurements at the closest sensor, making it very sensitive to airflow
442 movements.

443 The measurements concerning ambient noises are obviously higher than those of measuring
444 individual instrumentalists. They rose up to 0.55 m/s, when people around the players were
445 talking and stayed within a measurement range of 0.18 – 0.55 m/s, when someone walked
446 pass the person playing.

447

448 **Discussion**

449 This study observed 14 wind instruments played by soloists of the Bamberg Symphony:
450 trumpet, trombone, horn, tuba, alto flute, piccolo, oboe, clarinet, bass clarinet, bassoon, contra
451 bassoon, English horn, saxophone and recorder (the last two instruments by external
452 professional players). Since the measurements with all players were conducted in the concert
453 hall of the Bamberg Symphony, it has a high external validity for professional classical music
454 settings.

455 On the basis of our air velocity measurements, we find that distance regulations of 2m to the
456 front and 1.5m to the side are maintainable. A finding that is supported by Becher, et al. [47],
457 Kähler and Hain [48], He, et al. [49], Echternach, et al. [50], and Mürbe, et al [51]. The values
458 of the analyzed wind instruments mostly did not surpass a value of 0.1 m/s at all distances
459 while playing an excerpt from a music piece, scales, or different pitches and volumes, with
460 exceptions for the tuba: reaching a value of 0.13 m/s at 1m, oboe: 0.15 m/s at 1m and
461 contrabassoon: 0.11 m/s at 1m. These exceptions concern measurements at the 1m sensor, all
462 of them not surpassing measurements of 0.15 m/s, which is still considered to be part of the
463 comfortable room air climate [52]. Furthermore, some slight air movements were
464 qualitatively seen at the bell of some wind instruments. These qualitative observations did not

465 reach measurements of more than 0.1 m/s, which is the value of usual room air velocities in
466 hall-like rooms.

467 Only one study, conducted at the LMU [53] suggests a farther distance regulation of 3m to the
468 front and 2m to the side for alto flute players, since the investigators observed farther
469 respiratory air clouds for this instrument especially. On the basis of our observations as well
470 as the measurements, air-jet woodwinds produce strong side air movements, which did, in our
471 case, stay within a reach of 1m to the player. Therefore, we cannot relate to the suggestion of
472 3m to the front and 2m to the side, but agree with the fact that side air movements have to be
473 seriously considered.

474 Due to their production of side air movements, the air-jet woodwinds alto flute and piccolo
475 receive a special position in our findings. They reached high measurements of 0.13 m/s
476 (piccolo) and 0.15 m/s (alto flute) to the side at a distance of 0.5m, which escaped directly
477 into the room. This observation highlights the importance of the structure and the mouthpiece
478 of wind instruments and that it is relevant which wind instrument is taken into account.
479 Becher et al. [54] support this finding, by observing a maximal value of air dispersion at
480 1.12m from the mouth of the piccolo player into the room. The measurement from the bell of
481 the piccolo though was around 0.2m. The high number of 1.12m came from the side air,
482 which was released due to way the instrument is overblown. This finding also corresponds
483 with Becher et al.'s [55] finding on the importance of individual blowing techniques for air
484 movements. We thus affiliate with Becher et al.'s [56] as well as He et al.'s [57] assumption
485 that the structure on an instrument as well as the way a mouthpiece is blown has a significant
486 influence on the generated air velocity while playing, the distance it reaches, and in the
487 following, its generation of aerosols [58].

488 Hence, our findings do point out that there is a difference between playing the instrument and
489 warming up the instrument, by simply using a mouthpiece – a typical practice for brass winds.

490 As with the study of Kähler and Hain [59], we observed that pitch or volume do not have a
491 significant impact on the velocity of air movements. Thereinafter, we found out that using
492 only a mouthpiece for warm-up-playing, produces strong and fast airflows. Measurements of
493 up to 0.5 m/s were made for warming up, in relation to 0.13 m/s for playing (at the 1m
494 sensor), confirming the suggested visual observations. These warm-ups usually take place in
495 single rooms, before the concert, but they are often conducted as well during a concert or
496 rehearsal. Regarding the high air velocities produced we strongly suggest, to not blow through
497 a mouthpiece (without the instrument), when other musicians are around.

498 Comparing brass and woodwinds, it was qualitatively seen as well as quantitatively measured
499 that professional brass players do not produce air movements at the mouthpiece, but at the
500 bell of the instruments. Unlike Kähler and Hain [60], we did not observe a severe difference
501 between the production of respiratory air movements between woodwinds or brass winds. The
502 difference we observed lies more within the structure of the instrument and its mouthpiece, as
503 mentioned above. He et al. [61] also point out the difference between brass and woodwinds,
504 which we can relate to but not support to its full content, since air velocity measurements did
505 not diversify significantly.

506 As for woodwinds, a difference between so-called air-jet woodwinds and reed woodwinds
507 was not only qualitatively observed, but also quantitatively measured.

508 The difference between reed and double reed woodwinds was not significant according to our
509 measurements, and is therefore not taken into account. But it has to be mentioned, that reed
510 woodwinds produce little air movements at their tone holes. These air movements were seen
511 in the qualitative observations, but did not reach significant values that would surpass usual
512 room air velocities of 0.1 m/s.

513 As for the measurements of the oboe, which are comparably high (0.15 m/s at 1m and 0.12
514 m/s at 1.5m), we assume that surrounding air velocities lead to these values. Otherwise, the

515 values are not plausible, considering the way the instrument and the mouthpiece are played
516 and also regarding our qualitative observation. It can be expected that the measurements
517 should be similar to those of other double reed instruments, such as bassoon or contrabassoon,
518 which reach a merit of 0.1 m/s at 1m (for the contrabassoon) and stay below 0.1 m/s beyond
519 1.5m (for both double reeds).

520 Aside from our findings, some limitations of our study have to be taken into account.

521 First, the study was conducted with highly professional classical wind instrumentalists and the
522 results can therefore not automatically be taken into account for other musical genres and
523 settings or amateur musicians.

524 Second, the test situation was rather specific. We took into account different test settings:
525 playing setting up the stage (concerning noises and movements of the surrounding) and
526 playing with nothing else happening around. Furthermore, the difference between playing and
527 warming-up was considered. Therefore, the findings are very representative for orchestras and
528 a high level of playing, with restricted transferability for the amateur music sector. Since the
529 players have been a part of the analysis and know their instruments very well, relevant airflow
530 outputs were identified, for each instrument. This seems to be one of the strengths of our
531 study.

532 Further limitations concern the fact that the measurements were conducted with one person
533 per instrument only, while being sensitive to individual differences of blowing or lung
534 volume, etc. And they were only performed once for every instrument, whereas more
535 repetitions of the same sequence played, would have given more information on
536 reproducibility of the test setting.

537 Another limitation for the measurement is the fact that the air velocity measurements are very
538 sensitive to surrounding movements, with the waving of a hand already influencing the
539 measurements at the sensors.

540

541 Conclusion

542 The test results have pointed out that most wind instruments do not have any visual or
543 measureable influence on the movement of compartment air. Merely while playing alto flute
544 light flow movements were visible, close to the musician's body. Regarding all wind
545 instruments, beyond a distance of 1.5m to the front, no airflows could be measured and
546 therefore no difference compared to usual airflows of hall-like rooms (e.g. movie theatres,
547 theatres, auditoriums, opera, etc.) could be located.

548 Since no respiratory air movements – of any wind instrument analyzed – were measured at
549 the 2m sensor, we find distance regulations of 2m to the front of wind instrument players
550 maintainable.

551 In order to maintain a responsible risk management, we find it crucial that besides distance
552 regulations and line-up (e.g. large ensembles), constant fresh air conditioning and the social
553 behavior are being considered. Starting from April 2020, the Freiburg Institute of Musicians'
554 Medicine constantly updated an official paper on “risk assessment of a coronavirus infection
555 in the field of music” (updated: 2020 May 19, 2020 July 1, 2020 July 17, 2020 December 14),
556 stating the findings of our various studies publicly [62] and establishing a permanent
557 consultation on questions concerning the relationship between the coronavirus and music
558 making.

559

560

561 Acknowledgements

562 We thank all musicians who voluntarily took part in the study.

563

564 References

- 565 [1] Morawska L, Cao J. Airborne transmission of SARS-CoV-2: The world should face
566 the reality. *Environment International*, Vol. 139. 2020 June. [Cited 2020 Nov 24]. doi:
567 10.1016/j.envint.2020.105730.
- 568 [2] Becher L, Gena AW, Richter B, Voelker C. 1st update. Risk assessment of the spread
569 of breathing air from wind instruments and singers during the COVID-19 pandemic.
570 ResearchGate. [preprint] 2020 July. [Cited 2020 September 9]. doi:
571 10.13140/RG.2.2.18313.67683/1.
- 572 [3] Becher L, Gena AW, Richter B, Voelker C. 1st update. Risk assessment of the spread
573 of breathing air from wind instruments and singers during the COVID-19 pandemic.
574 ResearchGate. [preprint] 2020 July. [Cited 2020 September 9]. doi:
575 10.13140/RG.2.2.18313.67683/1.
- 576 [4] Echternach M, Gantner S, Peters G, Westphalen C, Benthaus T, Jakubaß B, Kuranova
577 L, Döllinger M, Kniesburges S. Impulse dispersion of aerosols during singing and
578 speaking. medRxiv [Preprint]. 2020 July 22 [Cited 2020 Sept 9]. doi:
579 10.1101/2020.07.21.20158832.
- 580 [5] Echternach M, Gantner S, Peters G, Westphalen C, Benthaus T, Jakubaß B, Kuranova
581 L, Döllinger M, Kniesburges S. Impulse dispersion of aerosols during singing and
582 speaking. medRxiv [Preprint]. 2020 July 22 [Cited 2020 Sept 9]. doi:
583 10.1101/2020.07.21.20158832.
- 584 [6] Kempe T. Musiker in Corona-Zeiten: Aerosolstudie mit den Bläsern des BRSO.
585 BR24. 2020 Nov 11. [Cited 2020 Nov 24]. Available from:
586 [https://www.br.de/nachrichten/wissen/musiker-in-corona-zeiten-aerosolstudie-mit-](https://www.br.de/nachrichten/wissen/musiker-in-corona-zeiten-aerosolstudie-mit-den-blaesern-des-brso,SHGxEve)
587 [den-blaesern-des-brso,SHGxEve](https://www.br.de/nachrichten/wissen/musiker-in-corona-zeiten-aerosolstudie-mit-den-blaesern-des-brso,SHGxEve).
- 588 [7] Kempe T. Musiker in Corona-Zeiten: Aerosolstudie mit den Bläsern des BRSO.
589 BR24. 2020 Nov 11. [Cited 2020 Nov 24]. Available from:
590 [https://www.br.de/nachrichten/wissen/musiker-in-corona-zeiten-aerosolstudie-mit-](https://www.br.de/nachrichten/wissen/musiker-in-corona-zeiten-aerosolstudie-mit-den-blaesern-des-brso,SHGxEve)
591 [den-blaesern-des-brso,SHGxEve](https://www.br.de/nachrichten/wissen/musiker-in-corona-zeiten-aerosolstudie-mit-den-blaesern-des-brso,SHGxEve).
- 592 [8] Kähler CJ, Hain R. Singing in choirs and making music with wind instruments – Is
593 that safe during the SARS-CoV-2 pandemic? ResearchGate [Preprint]. 2020 [Cited
594 2020 Sept 9]. doi: 10-13140/RG.2.2.36405.29926.
- 595 [9] Kähler CJ, Hain R. Singing in choirs and making music with wind instruments – Is
596 that safe during the SARS-CoV-2 pandemic? ResearchGate [Preprint]. 2020 [Cited
597 2020 Sept 9]. doi: 10-13140/RG.2.2.36405.29926.
- 598 [10] Kähler CJ, Hain R. Singing in choirs and making music with wind instruments
599 – Is that safe during the SARS-CoV-2 pandemic? ResearchGate [Preprint]. 2020
600 [Cited 2020 Sept 9]. doi: 10-13140/RG.2.2.36405.29926.
- 601 [11] Parker A, Crookston, K. Investigation into the Release of Respiratory Aerosols
602 by Brass Instruments and Mitigation Measures with Respect to Covid-19. medRxiv
603 [preprint]. 2020, [Cited, Oct 20]. Doi: 10.1101/2020.07.31.20165837. Forthcoming.

- 604 [12] Parker A, Crookston, K. Investigation into the Release of Respiratory Aerosols
605 by Brass Instruments and Mitigation Measures with Respect to Covid-19. medRxiv
606 [preprint]. 2020, [Cited, Oct 20]. Doi: 10.1101/2020.07.31.20165837. Forthcoming.
- 607 [13] He R, Gao L, Trifonov M, Hong J. Aerosol generation from different wind
608 instruments. *Journal of Aerosol Science* 151 (2021) 105669, p. 1-11. doi:
609 10.1016/j.jaerosci.2020.105699.
- 610 [14] He R, Gao L, Trifonov M, Hong J. Aerosol generation from different wind
611 instruments. *Journal of Aerosol Science* 151 (2021) 105669, p. 1-11. doi:
612 10.1016/j.jaerosci.2020.105699.
- 613 [15] Mürbe D, Fleischer M, Lange J, Rotheudt H, Kriegel M. Erhöhung der
614 Aerosolbildung beim professionellen Singen. DepositOnce. [preprint]. 2020. [Cited
615 2020 Nov 24]. doi: 10.14279/depositonce-10375.
- 616 [16] Mürbe D, Fleischer M, Lange J, Rotheudt H, Kriegel M. Erhöhung der
617 Aerosolbildung beim professionellen Singen. DepositOnce. [preprint]. [Cited 2020
618 Nov 24] doi: 10.14279/depositonce-10375.
- 619 [17] Mürbe D, Bischoff P, Fleischer M, Gastmeier P. Beurteilung der
620 Ansteckungsgefahr mit SARS-CoV-2-Viren beim Singen. DepositOnce [preprint]
621 2020 Mai 11 [Cited 2020 Aug 19]. Available from: <http://audiologie-phoniatrie-charite.de>.
- 622 [18] Kriegel M, Hartmann A. Risikobewertung von Innenräumen zu virenbeladenen
623 Aerosolen. DepositOnce [preprint]. 2020 [Cited 2020 Nov 24]. doi:
624 10.14279/depositonce-10343.2.
- 625 [19] Hartmann A, Mürbe D, Kriegel M, Lange J, Fleischer M. Risikobewertung von
626 proberäumen für Chöre hinsichtlich virenbeladenen Aerosolen. DepositOnce.
627 [preprint] doi: 10.14279/depositonce-10372.
- 628 [20] Mürbe D, Fleischer M, Lange J, Rotheudt H, Kriegel M. Erhöhung der
629 Aerosolbildung beim professionellen Singen. DepositOnce. [preprint]. 2020. [Cited
630 2020 Nov 24]. doi: 10.14279/depositonce-10375.
- 631 [21] Kriegel M, Hartmann A. Risikobewertung von Innenräumen zu virenbeladenen
632 Aerosolen. DepositOnce [preprint]. 2020 [Cited 2020 Nov 24]. doi:
633 10.14279/depositonce-10343.2.
- 634 [22] Hartmann A, Mürbe D, Kriegel M, Lange J, Fleischer M. Risikobewertung von
635 proberäumen für Chöre hinsichtlich virenbeladenen Aerosolen. DepositOnce.
636 [preprint] doi: 10.14279/depositonce-10372.
- 637 [23] Mürbe D, Kriegel M, Lange J, Schumann L, Hartmann A, Fleischer M.
638 Aerosol emission of child voices during speaking, singing and shouting. medRxiv.
639 [preprint]. 2020 Sept 18 [Cited 2020 Nov 24]. doi: 10.1101/2020.09.17.20196733.
- 640 [24] Mürbe D, Kriegel M, Lange J, Schumann L, Hartmann A, Fleischer M.
641 Aerosol emission of child voices during speaking, singing and shouting. medRxiv.
642 [preprint]. 2020 Sept 18 [Cited 2020 Nov 24]. doi: 10.1101/2020.09.17.20196733.
- 643 [25] Becher L, Gena AW, Richter B, Voelker C. 1st update. Risk assessment of the
644 spread of breathing air from wind instruments and singers during the COVID-19
645 pandemic. ResearchGate. [preprint] 2020 July. [Cited 2020 September 9]. doi:
646 10.13140/RG.2.2.18313.67683/1.
- 647 [26] Echternach M, Gantner S, Peters G, Westphalen C, Benthaus T, Jakubaß B,
648 Kuranova L, Döllinger M, Kniesburges S. Impulse dispersion of aerosols during
649 singing and speaking. medRxiv [Preprint]. 2020 July 22 [Cited 2020 Sept 9]. doi:
650 10.1101/2020.07.21.20158832.
- 651 [27] Kempe T. Musiker in Corona-Zeiten: Aerosolstudie mit den Bläsern des
652 BRSO. BR24. 2020 Nov 11. [Cited 2020 Nov 24]. Available from:

- 654 <https://www.br.de/nachrichten/wissen/musiker-in-corona-zeiten-aerosolstudie-mit-den-blaesern-des-brso,SHGxEve>.
- 655
- 656 [28] Kähler CJ, Hain R. Singing in choirs and making music with wind instruments
657 – Is that safe during the SARS-CoV-2 pandemic? ResearchGate [Preprint]. 2020
658 [Cited 2020 Sept 9]. doi: 10.13140/RG.2.2.36405.29926.
- 659 [29] Parker A, Crookston, K. Investigation into the Release of Respiratory Aerosols
660 by Brass Instruments and Mitigation Measures with Respect to Covid-19. medRxiv
661 [preprint]. 2020, [Cited, Oct 20]. Doi: 10.1101/2020.07.31.20165837. Forthcoming.
- 662 [30] He R, Gao L, Trifonov M, Hong J. Aerosol generation from different wind
663 instruments. Journal of Aerosol Science 151 (2021) 105669, p. 1-11. doi:
664 10.1016/j.jaerosci.2020.105699.
- 665 [31] Mürbe D, Fleischer M, Lange J, Rotheudt H, Kriegel M. Erhöhung der
666 Aerosolbildung beim professionellen Singen. DepositOnce. [preprint]. 2020. [Cited
667 2020 Nov 24]. doi: 10.14279/depositonce-10375.
- 668 [32] Mürbe D, Kriegel M, Lange J, Schumann L, Hartmann A, Fleischer M.
669 Aerosol emission of child voices during speaking, singing and shouting. medRxiv.
670 [preprint]. 2020 Sept 18 [Cited 2020 Nov 24]. doi: 10.1101/2020.09.17.20196733.
- 671 [33] Mürbe D, Bischoff P, Fleischer M, Gastmeier P. Beurteilung der
672 Ansteckungsgefahr mit SARS-CoV-2-Viren beim Singen. DepositOnce [preprint]
673 2020 Mai 11 [Cited 2020 Aug 19]. Available from: <http://audiologie-phoniatrie-charite.de>.
- 675 [34] Hartmann A, Mürbe D, Kriegel M, Lange J, Fleischer M. Risikobewertung von
676 proberäumen für Chöre hinsichtlich virenbeladenen Aerosolen. DepositOnce.
677 [preprint] doi: 10.14279/depositonce-10372.
- 678 [35] Kriegel M, Hartmann A. Risikobewertung von Innenräumen zu virenbeladenen
679 Aerosolen. DepositOnce [preprint]. 2020 [Cited 2020 Nov 24]. doi:
680 10.14279/depositonce-10343.2.
- 681 [36] Tintschl. Strömungsvisualisierung in der Medizin. Flowmarker. 2015. [Cited
682 2020 Oct 20]. Available from: <https://www.flowmarker.com/anwendungen/medizin/>.
- 683 [37] Dushin, NS, Mikheev, AN, Mikheev, NI, Molochnikov, VM (2014):
684 Experimental Setup for Visualisation of Pulsating Turbulent Flows. Laboratory
685 Techniques, Vol. 57, No. 4, pp. 499-502.
- 686 [38] Tintschl. FlowMarker II – Technische Daten. Flowmarker. 2015. [Cited 2020
687 Oct 20]. Available from: <https://www.flowmarker.com/services/download/>.
- 688 [39] Safex. 45 Jahre SAFEX – Theaternebel. 2015. [Cited 2020 Oct 20]. Available
689 from: http://www.safex.de/safex2/produkte.php?DOC_INST=277.
- 690 [40] Morawska L, Johnson GR, Ristovski ZD, Hargreaves M, Mengersen K,
691 Corbett S, Chao CYH, Ktoshevsi LD. Size distribution and sites of origin of droplets
692 expelled from the human respiratory tract during expiratory activities. Journal of
693 Aerosol Science, Vol. 40(3), 2009, pp. 256-269.
- 694 [41] Schmidt M. Auf dem Weg zum Nullemissionsgebäude. Grundlagen,
695 Lösungsansätze, Beispiele. Wiesbaden: Springer Verlag. 2013, p. 6.
- 696 [42] Sodec F. Quelllüftung und ihre Anwendungsbereiche. Klimalüftung.
697 Fachjournal 2002/03. pp. 16-23, p. 18.
- 698 [43] Sodec F. Luftführungssysteme für Sanierungen von Versammlungsräumen.
699 www.tab.de 12 2006, pp. 54-57.
- 700 [44] Sodec F. Quelllüftung und ihre Anwendungsbereiche. Klimalüftung.
701 Fachjournal 2002/03. pp.16-23, p. 16.
- 702 [45] Schmidt M. Auf dem Weg zum Nullemissionsgebäude. Grundlagen,
703 Lösungsansätze, Beispiele. Wiesbaden: Springer Verlag. 2013, p. 14.

- 704 [46] Dentel A, Dietrich U. Thermische Behaglichkeit – Komfort in Gebäuden.
705 HafenCity University, 2006. [Cited 2020 Dec 16]. Available from:
706 <https://vdocuments.mx/explore.html>.
- 707 [47] Becher L, Gena AW, Richter B, Voelker C. 1st update. Risk assessment of the
708 spread of breathing air from wind instruments and singers during the COVID-19
709 pandemic. ResearchGate. [preprint] 2020 July. [Cited 2020 September 9]. doi:
710 10.13140/RG.2.2.18313.67683/1.
- 711 [48] Kähler CJ, Hain R. Singing in choirs and making music with wind instruments
712 – Is that safe during the SARS-CoV-2 pandemic? ResearchGate [Preprint]. 2020
713 [Cited 2020 Sept 9]. doi: 10-13140/RG.2.2.36405.29926.
- 714 [49] He R, Gao L, Trifonov M, Hong J. Aerosol generation from different wind
715 instruments. Journal of Aerosol Science 151 (2021) 105669, p. 1-11. doi:
716 10.1016/j.jaerosci.2020.105699.
- 717 [50] Echternach M, Gantner S, Peters G, Westphalen C, Benthaus T, Jakubaß B,
718 Kuranova L, Döllinger M, Kniesburges S. Impulse dispersion of aerosols during
719 singing and speaking. medRxiv [Preprint]. 2020 July 22 [Cited 2020 Sept 9]. doi:
720 10.1101/2020.07.21.20158832.
- 721 [51] Mürbe D, Fleischer M, Lange J, Rotheudt H, Kriegel M. Erhöhung der
722 Aerosolbildung beim professionellen Singen. DepositOnce. [preprint]. 2020. [Cited
723 2020 Nov 24]. doi: 10.14279/depositonce-10375.
- 724 [52] Schmidt M. Auf dem Weg zum Nullemissionsgebäude. Grundlagen,
725 Lösungsansätze, Beispiele. Wiesbaden: Springer Verlag. 2013.
- 726 [53] Kempe T. Musiker in Corona-Zeiten: Aerosolstudie mit den Bläsern des
727 BRSO. BR24. 2020 Nov 11. [Cited 2020 Nov 24]. Available from:
728 <https://www.br.de/nachrichten/wissen/musiker-in-corona-zeiten-aerosolstudie-mit-den-blaesern-des-brso,SHGxEve>.
- 729 [54] Becher L, Gena AW, Richter B, Voelker C. 1st update. Risk assessment of the
730 spread of breathing air from wind instruments and singers during the COVID-19
731 pandemic. ResearchGate. [preprint] 2020 July. [Cited 2020 September 9]. doi:
732 10.13140/RG.2.2.18313.67683/1.
- 733 [55] Becher L, Gena AW, Richter B, Voelker C. 1st update. Risk assessment of the
734 spread of breathing air from wind instruments and singers during the COVID-19
735 pandemic. ResearchGate. [preprint] 2020 July. [Cited 2020 September 9]. doi:
736 10.13140/RG.2.2.18313.67683/1.
- 737 [56] Becher L, Gena AW, Richter B, Voelker C. 1st update. Risk assessment of the
738 spread of breathing air from wind instruments and singers during the COVID-19
739 pandemic. ResearchGate. [preprint] 2020 July. [Cited 2020 September 9]. doi:
740 10.13140/RG.2.2.18313.67683/1.
- 741 [57] He R, Gao L, Trifonov M, Hong J. Aerosol generation from different wind
742 instruments. Journal of Aerosol Science 151 (2021) 105669, p. 1-11. doi:
743 10.1016/j.jaerosci.2020.105699.
- 744 [58] He R, Gao L, Trifonov M, Hong J. Aerosol generation from different wind
745 instruments. Journal of Aerosol Science 151 (2021) 105669, p. 1-11. doi:
746 10.1016/j.jaerosci.2020.105699.
- 747 [59] Kähler CJ, Hain R. Singing in choirs and making music with wind instruments
748 – Is that safe during the SARS-CoV-2 pandemic? ResearchGate [Preprint]. 2020
749 [Cited 2020 Sept 9]. doi: 10-13140/RG.2.2.36405.29926.
- 750 [60] Kähler CJ, Hain R. Singing in choirs and making music with wind instruments
751 – Is that safe during the SARS-CoV-2 pandemic? ResearchGate [Preprint]. 2020
752 [Cited 2020 Sept 9]. doi: 10-13140/RG.2.2.36405.29926.

- 754 [61] He R, Gao L, Trifonov M, Hong J. Aerosol generation from different wind
755 instruments. *Journal of Aerosol Science* 151 (2021) 105669, p. 1-11. doi:
756 10.1016/j.jaerosci.2020.105699.
- 757 [62] Spahn C, Richter B. Risk assessment of a coronavirus infection in the field of
758 music. 2020 Jul 17. [Cited 2020 Sept 14]. Available from: <https://www.mh-freiburg.de/hochschule/covid-19-corona/risikoeinschaetzung>.
- 759

760 **Supporting Information**

761 *Captions:*

762 S1: Test location: Concert hall of the Bamberg Symphony

763 S2: Distance measurements with three sensors in direction of instruments' bell

764 S3: Test set-up on stage of the Bamberg Symphony hall

765 S4: Size distribution of fog droplets (measurements with DANTEC PDA)

766 S5: Artificial fog at the bell of the horn

767 S6: Measurements trumpet: blowing, with and without instrument

768 S7: Measurements trumpet: playing and pitches

769 S8: Cloud of artificial fog at the bell of the tuba

770 S9: Recorder player while playing, with artificial fog at labium

771 S10: Video for alto recorder, while playing, with artificial fog showing airflows

772 S11: Measurements for bass clarinet, with impact of person passing at sensor


773



774

775 S1: Test location: Concert hall of the Bamberg Symphony

776




777

778 S2: Distance measurements with three sensors in direction of instruments' bell



779

780 S3: Test set-up on stage of the Bamberg Symphony hall




781 S4: Size distribution of fog droplets (measurements with DANTEC PDA)




782

783 S5: Artificial fog at the bell of the horn



785

S6: Measurements trumpet: blowing, with and without instrument



787

S7: Measurements trumpet: playing and pitches



788

789 S8: Cloud of artificial fog at the bell of the tuba



790

791 S9: Recorder player while playing, with artificial fog at labium

792




Blockflöte_alt_02.m4

v

793

794 S10: Video for G recorder, while playing, with artificial fog showing airflows



795

796 S11: Measurements for bass clarinet, with impact of person passing at sensor

797