medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.19.20248493; this version posted December 30, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

Minimizing cumulative risk to control airborne transmission of SARS-CoV2 in schools

Alessandro Zivelonghi[1,2*], Massimo Lai[3]

[1] Lecturer of Applied Mathematics, ITCS Lorgna-Pindemonte, Verona
[2] Power-Consulting Studio, San Pietro in Cariano, Verona
[3] Senior Research Scientist, Certara, UK

Abstract

School classrooms are enclosed settings where students and teachers spend prolonged periods of time and therefore risky environments for airborne transmission of SARS-CoV2. While countries worldwide have been pursuing different school reopening strategies, most EU countries are planning to keep schools open during the whole winter season 2020/21. Open schools in winter in highly epidemic areas pose a controversial issue: ventilation of classrooms (an essential mitigation factor for airborne transmission) is expected to sensibly decrease due to outdoor temperatures getting colder. More specifically, personnel and students will comprehensibly request window closure to maintain thermal comfort and regulators are going to allow less restrictive policies on windows closure. Fundamental questions therefore arise which urge to be addressed: to which extent can we contain airborne risk in schools during the cold season while reducing air ventilation? What would be the best mitigation strategy considering also the risk for other seasonal diseases and the fact that most schools are not provided with mechanical ventilation systems? To try answering these questions the theoretical link between intervals of ventilation (natural or mechanical) and the lowering of aerosol contagion risk is explored based on a mathematical model. A safety risk-zone and a theoretical optimum are presented which are based solely on face mask wearing and optimization of air change intervals.

**alessandro.zivelonghi@itcspindemonte.edu.it, ing.zivelonghi@gmail.com*

Keywords:

- airborne transmission
- school classrooms
- natural ventilation
- SARS-Cov2
- GN-model
- optimization

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.19.20248493; this version posted December 30, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

Introduction

Currently, tense debates are raging on schools as possible contagion triggers of SARS-CoV-2 (both direct and indirect). In the middle of the second pandemic wave, it is important to shed more light on this crucial matter for the issue of (re-)opening schools. That is, it is necessary to explore the link between airborne contagion risk and possible mitigation strategies, in particular by adopting natural ventilation cycles, which are the cheapest and most feasible NPI (non-pharmaceutical intervention). As stated in a study by Morawska (2020-2), "inhaling small airborne droplets is a probable third route of infection," in addition to transmission via larger respiratory droplets and direct contact with infected people or contaminated surfaces. According to past and recent publications (e.g., Leung [2020], Morawska [2020-1], and Escombe [2007]), oral transmission of infectious diseases in confined environments can be significantly reduced by proper ventilation. That is, particularly indirect oral transmission is believed to be effectively curbed through the frequent opening of windows or by mechanical HVAC systems (Morawska 2020-2). Although most of the relevant literature has focused on the spread of tuberculosis or influenza in hospitals, the general principle of dilution of viral load by means of natural ventilation is valid and pertinent for the SARS-CoV-2 virus in the context of schools. Notably, mechanical ventilation systems, when adequately configured, can be equally or even more effective (Morawska 2020-2, ASHRAE 2020). However, unlike hospitals, the vast majority of schools worldwide are not equipped with such systems and will not be, at least for the foreseeable future (including the 2020/2021 school year). Groups of students, which can potentially include tens of individuals, share the same premises for hours with potentially insufficient ventilation. This greatly increases the likelihood of coming into contact with virus-loaded aerosol droplets generated by even only one infected student or teacher in the same classroom. This issue is of concern even when social distancing is correctly implemented. Together, these facts suggest that SARS-CoV-2's indirect transmission with infective aerosol particles is a plausible scenario in all kind of schools where students are exposed to each other for hours in relatively small environments. On the other hand, frequent natural ventilation could help dilute the viral load by allowing fresh air from the outside to enter classrooms. The extent to which natural ventilation cycles may reduce the airborne contagion risk by decreasing the total viral load is the subject of the present study. Moreover, we show that the duration of lesson intervals (breaks) is one of the most critical parameters during winter, since only during breaks one can can imagine the viral load be diluted by fully opening windows. Otherwise, during lessons the ambient temperature will drop dramatically and increase the risks of other diseases. Therefore, having windows open in classrooms must be carefully planned and controlled during the winter season. This motivates a theoretical/computational framework aiming to investigate and optimize the impact of air change cycles in classrooms on the aerosol contagion risk. The strategy illustrated in the present analysis is based on natural ventilation, which is simple, efficient, and virtually free to implement. The same modelling framework, however, can be employed with mechanical ventilation cycles (since what counts is ultimately the air exchange rate, not its source). This approach may therefore be useful also for the adoption of more sophisticated engineering solutions based on HVAC systems and/or be extended in combination with air cleaning systems. For a number of situations of the present time, however, it appears necessary to focus on an appropriate *natural* ventilation strategy, which may take an effective role in the mitigation of infections in schools.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.19.20248493; this version posted December 30, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .



Figure 1. *Evolution of viral charge and cumulative risk in a classroom with a positive subject for a time span of 3,5 hours with one break of 20 min at the end of 100 min lesson. a) starting point b) end of first lecture (t=100min)) c) end of first break (t=120min) and air change/dilution through windows opening d) end of second lecture with a new probable infected person. All presents are supposed to wear face masks half of the time.*

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.19.20248493; this version posted December 30, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

Extended GN-model

The infection risk model used in the present analysis is essentially based on the Gammaitoni-Nucci (GN) model, which is adequate for confined, ventilated environments [Gammaitoni 1997]. This model is based on the assumption that newly-produced viral particles are instantly diluted over the whole environment volume (perfect-mixing) and that the emission rate parameter ER_q (number of viral particles generated per hour by each infectious subject) is known. A recent paper, authored by several experts in the field [Morawska 2020], elucidated how a possible mechanism for transmission of SARS-Covid2 in confined spaces would be the formation of "light" aerosol droplets (i.e. < 5 μm in diameter, unlike "heavy" droplets, over 5 μm) that diffuse in the environment after being produced by an infected person, therefore justifying the assumption of an emission rate and a saturation in closed environments.

Classical non-threshold models, such as this, assume that the probability of infection is given by the ratio between infectious subjects (C) and exposed subjects (S), therefore the probability of infection is not proportional to number of exposed subjects. The rationale for this approximation can be traced back to the hypothesis of perfect mixing and the fact that the model explicitly represents only "indirect" transmission (i.e. via aerosol droplets), while omitting "direct" transmission (i.e. by sneezing or by two subjects A and B breathing in close proximity). In the GN model, if the number of viral sources (i.e. infectious subjects) remains constant, the probability of infection for each subject at a given time *t* will only depend on the total concentration of viral particles in the volume *V,* where it is supposed isotropically distributed. This probability follows an exponential law for increasing exposure time t, and obviously depends on the parameter ER_q and the ventilation ratio *p/Q*, where *p* is the average inhalation flow (related to pulmonary capacity) and *Q* is the inflow of clean air provided by natural or mechanical ventilation. The risk factor R, in the original RMR model (by Riley, Murphy and Riley) can be written as:

$$R^{RMR}(t) = \frac{C(t)}{S_0} = 1 - e^{\left[-\frac{ER_q p\, t}{Q}\right]} = 1 - e^{\left[-\frac{ER_q p\, t}{NV}\right]} \qquad (1)$$

In the dynamical GN model, Eq. 1 can be improved by considering the variation of the number of viral particles over time. According to the GN model, the risk of infection in a volume V, where one infective subject is present and the initial number of viral particles is n_0 (which can be different from zero) is given by the general formula for the solution of this class of differential equations (which we omit for brevity):

$$R^{GN}(t) = 1 - e^{\left[-\frac{p\, ER_q}{V}\, \frac{Nt + e^{-Nt} - 1 - \left(\frac{Nn_0}{ER_q}\right)e^{-Nt} + \left(\frac{Nn_0}{ER_q}\right)}{N^2}\right]} = 1 - e^{\left[-\frac{p\, ER_q}{V}\, \varphi(t, n_0)\right]} \qquad (2)$$

Where $\varphi = Nt + e^{-Nt} - 1 - \left(\frac{Nn_0}{ER_q}\right)e^{-Nt} + \left(\frac{Nn_0}{ER_q}\right)$ and the ventilation rate N is also a function of time N(t) varying according to the profiles in Fig. 2. In Eq. (2), N represents the number of air renewal events per hour (supposed constant during one lesson or one break), and is related to the air renewal flow by the relation N =Q/V (not to be confused with the parameter n, lowercase, which in the present work represents the total number of viral particles in the environment volume. In

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.19.20248493; this version posted December 30, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

other articles on the same subject, the notation may vary). The risk of infection R is affected by the ventilation ratio p/Q = p/NV.

In Eq. (1) and Eq. (2) another underlying assumption is that the initial risk is zero at time equal zero, i.e. $R_{lec}(0) = 0$. This is equivalent to assume (intuitively) that independently of the number of viral particles in the volume V, zero time of exposure entails zero risk.

To account for the effect of PPE (personal protective equipment, in this case, face masks) in reducing both the number of viral particles generated by infectious subjects, and also reducing the likelihood of inhalation of viral particles by exposed subjects, we propose a modification to Eq (2) whereby the viral inhalation term $ER_q\ p/Q$ is multiplied by two scaling factors:

$(1- f_{out})$, which represents the fractional reduction of the generated viral load, and

$(1- f_{in})$, which represents the fractional reduction of inhaled viral load,

under the assumption that all subjects are wearing a mask. Eq. (2) can then be rewritten as:

$$R^{mask}(t) = 1 - e^{\left[-(1-f_{out})(1-f_{in})\frac{p\,ERq}{V}\ \varphi(t)\right]} \qquad (3)$$

If masks are not being worn, f_{in} and f_{out} are both zero.

The extent of efficacy of face masks in reducing airborne transmission is the subject of still ongoing debate, although a general wide agreement on their importance as mitigation factor has been accepted. Some recent results [Leung 2020] strongly supported the effectiveness of face masks in reducing the spread of infected aerosol droplets during exhalation, under the condition that the mask is correctly and permanently worn by both the infected and the susceptible subjects. The estimated efficacy of surgical masks in filtering the airborne viral load upon inhalation, represented by fin, varies in the available literature. Some authors (e.g. [Smereka 2020]) estimate the value to be close to zero, claiming that masks can only filter "large" droplets (>5μm), but more recent measurements suggest that surgical masks may actually be able to filter even "small", i.e. sub-micrometric, droplets [Mueller 2020]. In the present analysis, we considered a possible range of values 0 - 0.3 for fin which is in line for surgical masks. As for the efficacy in filtering the exhaled viral load, the parameter f could have a value as high as 0.95 [Leung 2020], in the case of a perfectly-adhering surgical mask worn the whole time. In a classroom environment, however, it will be difficult to ensure complete and continuous compliance over the many hours of a typical school day. The recent case of a pupil in Terni (Italy), who suffered from respiratory distress after wearing a mask for an extended period of time (in compliance with the school internal policy), suggests that in a realistic scenario, students will be occasionally removing their masks while maintaining social distancing. For instance, a recommendation by some EU local scientific committees as of October 2020, is to wear masks for as long as possible, but to allow their occasional removal as long as social distancing is respected. In the scenario of a real classroom, more "cautious" values of 0.85 for wearing masks 100% of the time and 0.45 for wearing it half of the time were adopted.

The total viral load in the environment volume, in the presence of one infectious subject with a rate of emission ERq > 0, is given by:

$$n(t) = \frac{ER_q}{N} + \left[n_0 - \frac{ER_q}{N}\right] e^{-Nt} \qquad (4)$$

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.19.20248493; this version posted December 30, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

Cumulative Risk

In the present work, the GN-model was extended in order to account for cumulative risk. In a scenario where the infectious source is removed from the environment (e.g. student or teacher leaving the classroom), the ER_q parameter in Eq (3) and (5) would become zero. However, we can observe that even when ER_q=0 in (3), the infection risk $R_q^{GN}(t)$ would remain greater than zero, because of the multiplicative factor $\varphi_q(t)$ (and intuitively, due to the viral load already present in the environment). Hence, equations (3) and (4) become:

$$R_{ERq=0}^{mask}(t) = 1 - e^{\left[-(1-f_{out})(1-f_{in})\frac{pn_0}{NV}(e^{-Nt}-1)\right]} \tag{5}$$

$$n_{ERq=0}(t) = n_0 e^{-Nt} \tag{6}$$

The probability of infection during the i-th lecture of duration t_{lec}, followed by the i-th break of duration t_{brk}, assuming that one infectious subject is present and the starting viral load is n_0) is then a composed function:

$$R_i(t) = \begin{cases} R_{lec,i}(t) = 1 - e^{\left[-\frac{p\,ERq}{V}\,\varphi_i(t, n_{0,i},\ N)\right]} & if\ \ 0 \le t \le t^{lec} \\ R_{brk,i}(t) = 0 & if\ \ t^{lec} < t < \ t^{lec} + t^{brk} \end{cases} \tag{7}$$

And the same for the total viral charge in a classroom:

$$n_i(t) = \begin{cases} n_{lec,i}(t) = \frac{ERq}{N} + \left[n_0 - \frac{ERq}{N}\right] e^{-Nt} & if\ \ 0 \le t \le t^{lec} \\ n_{brk,i}(t) = \left[n_{lec,i}(t^{lec})\right] e^{-N(t+t^{lec})} & if\ \ t^{lec} < t < \ t^{lec} + t^{brk} \end{cases} \tag{8}$$

The ventilation profile N(t) appears in $\varphi_i\left(t,\ n_{0,i}, N(t)\right)$ in equation (7) and in equation (8). It is a two-values function given by:

$$N_i(t) = \begin{cases} N_{min} & if\ \ 0 \le t \le t^{lec} \\ N_{max} & if\ \ t^{lec} < t < \ t^{lec} + t^{brk} \end{cases} \tag{9}$$

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.19.20248493; this version posted December 30, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

The different N profiles employed are illustrated in Fig. 2 where N_{max} changes depending on the ventilation system (mechanical or natural).

During a break, if students/pupils will leave the environment where the viral aerosol has gradually accumulated, it is logical to assume that R would not increase (in that classroom) and will therefore remain constant. This is also reasonable in the light of the fact that during lesson time the number of subjects in the corridors is very small in comparison to classrooms, and generated viral load in corridors would also be diluted in a much larger total volume than that of a single classroom.

Therefore, the risk of airborne infection during breaks in Eq. (5) has been assumed to be zero. When considering the total number of infections at a given time point t (after a certain number of classes and breaks) this is given by the product $R(t)S_0$, where S_0 represents the number of susceptible subjects in the classroom from t = 0. In this situation, the variable of practical interest is not the risk of infection during a single lecture, $R_{lec,i}(t)$, (which would become zero after each break), but rather the *cumulative risk* $R_{c,i}(t)$ at the time t, which keeps into account the whole "history" of infection risk up to that point:

$$R_{c,i}(t) = \frac{C_i\left(t - (i-1)(t^{lec} + t^{brk})\right) + \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} C_j\left(t^{lec}, n_{0j}\right)}{S_0} =$$

$$= R_{lec,i}\left(t - (i-1)(t^{lec} + t^{brk})\right) + \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} R_{lec,j}\left(t^{lec}, n_{0j}\right) \qquad (10)$$

In (10), $C_j(t)$ represents the number of infections in the previous hours and the index j spans all the "cycles" of lecture+break before the current i-lesson (j=1 to i-1). The underlying assumption, which is valid at least in Italian secondary schools, is that the susceptible subjects at the beginning (S_0) remain always the same and do not vary over the course of the school day. To better understand the importance of cumulative risk, we introduce a practical example. If the classroom were to be completely sanitised and the air completely renewed during the first lecture break, it may seem intuitive to reset the infection risk to zero at the beginning of the subsequent lecture. However, based on the definition of infection risk after an exposure time t as $C(t)/S_0$, where C(t) is the total number of infected subjects at time t, this would be equivalent to neglecting possible infections that occurred in the previous hour, and monitoring only new ones. In our view, the risk factor R needs to be the answer to the following question: *"What is the probability of S_0 initial susceptible subjects to be infected, after sharing the same space for a given number of hours?".* Hence the need to account for the whole fraction of infections from time zero, and not the probability of infections during one single teaching hour. The same logic applies when one wants to compare risk curves with infection probability thresholds in a classroom with n students / pupils. For at least one infection to occur, the cumulative risk $R_c(t) = C(t)/S_0$ must be greater than 1/n. Therefore, the condition for zero infections to occur over the total time spent in the classroom is:

$$R_c(t) < 1/n \qquad (11)$$

as opposed to R_{lec},i (t) < 1/n as suggested in other analyses, while the condition to exclude k likely infections will be:

$$R_c(t) < k/n \qquad (12)$$

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.19.20248493; this version posted December 30, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

Influence of lecture and break durations on the total risk of contagion

At the end of a typical school day, which can be assumed to last 5 hours (300 min), if one positive student was in the classroom during all lectures, one obtains the total risk of infections as:

$$R_c\left(t = 5h\,, t^{lec}, t^{brk}\right) = R_{c,5h}\left(t^{lec}, t^{brk}\right) =$$

$$= \sum_{j=1}^{k}\left(1 - e^{\left[-\frac{p\,ERq}{V}\,\varphi\left(t^{lec},\, n_{0j}\left[j\left(t^{lec}+t^{brk}\right)\right]\right)\right]}\right) + \left(1 - e^{\left[-\frac{p\,ERq}{V}\,\varphi\left(5h - k\left(t^{lec}+t^{brk}\right),\, n_{0,k}\right)\right]}\right) \qquad (13)$$

In (12), $k = \left\lfloor \frac{5h}{t^{lec}+t^{brk}} \right\rfloor$ is the integer number of periods (lesson + break) before the last period. One may observe that the last lecture window could be less than t^{lec} in order not to overcome 5h of total lectures+breaks time. This is the reason why the last contribution to R_c is written separately and the last lecture window is then calculated over a time interval t = $5h - (i-1)(t^{lec} + t^{brk})$ in order to complete the 5 hours.

Equation (9) shows that for a given classroom at the end of a school day, the only variables influencing the cumulative risk of airborne contagion (and the total number of infections) are: 1. the time duration of lectures (t^{lec}) and 2. the time duration of breaks (t^{brk}), since the other model parameters (*V, N, p, ERq,* f_{out}, f_{in}) are fixed for a given classroom.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.19.20248493; this version posted December 30, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

Influence of ventilation rate (N)

The influence of natural ventilation in the GN model is summarised by the parameter N in equation (2). It must be pointed out that natural ventilation and therefore N are in turn affected by several factors, such as the difference of air temperature between the indoor and outdoor space, the wind direction and average wind speed, as well as geometric factors such as window size and position, etc. [Marr 2012]. The exact calibration of such parameters would be specific to each individual building, or even to each individual classroom within a given building. Such detail however lies outside the scope of this paper. In the present study we will simply explore the quantitative relationship between different levels of natural ventilation (summarised by different values of N) and the infection risk factor R. In the case of static natural ventilation, the range of values commonly found in the literature lies between 0.2 and 1 vol/h, with peaks of 1.5 vol/h (based on experimental measurement of CO2 concentrations before and after opening windows [Marr 2012, Escombe 2007]).



Figure 2 *Ventilation profiles used in the present analysis. N_1, $N_3(t)$ assumed 50-min lectures alternated with 10-min breaks, whereas N_2, $N_4(t)$ assumed 100-min lessons and 20-min breaks. $N_{1,3}$ peaked at 2.5 Vol/h (windows open), and $N_{2,4}$ peaked at 10 Vol/h. The latter value can only be achieved through mechanical ventilation*

Influence of source emission rate and choice of ER_q values

It is important to stress the critical importance of the parameter ER_q in Eq. (2). Very recent studies [Buonanno 2020] suggest that the value of ER_q can span at least two orders of magnitude, between 0.7 and 70 quanta/h for a resting person (student) and 0.9 and 80 quanta/h for a standing person (teacher) who can be required to talk for several hours a day. Given the uncertainty surrounding the exact value of ER_q, we explored several scenarios assuming low (optimistic) and high (pessimistic) values for ERq, all carefully chosen in a range suggested by recent literature [Buonanno 2020], [Pan 2020)], [Watanabe 2010].

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.19.20248493; this version posted December 30, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

Simulation results

Simulation results are reported in Figs. 3 and 4, where cumulative risk curves $R_c(t)$ were calculated with the extended dynamic single-zone GN model comparing different scenarios in a typical high school classroom of volume 8 * 7 * 3 ≅ 170 m^3. Two situations were separately considered: First, one positive student (Fig. 3) remained for 5 h in the same classroom of volume V (except for break intervals). Second, a teacher positive for infection in the same classroom (Fig 4) was supposed to remain for 2 hours only with different ERq levels. On average, a high school teacher stays in the same classroom not more than two hours a day, and after this time she/he usually moves to a new classroom. Importantly, estimated risk levels by definition with Equations (5)–(6) are independent from "classroom crowding"—that is, from the number of individuals S_0 at t = 0 (when lectures begin). This is due to the GN-model assumptions, which include 1. instantaneous, perfect (isotropic) mixing of the viral charge emitted by the source and 2. all susceptible persons equally exposed to the airborne risk (since the viral cloud after some time is perfectly mixed in the volume). However, other contagion channels like coughing and surface contact were neglected in this analysis.

Red curves show the lowering effect of pure natural ventilation (opening windows), and orange curves show that of mechanical ventilation at high power during breaks (air change rate N increasing almost to a factor of 10). In these curves, face masks were intentionally not included in order to isolate the net contribution of air ventilation. The additional contribution of surgical face masks is then shown in the blue curves (natural ventilation + face masks worn 50% and 100% of the time, respectively). For each mitigation factor, two different lecture + break profiles are compared in terms of single-time-period duration. That is, continuous plots refer to more frequent but shorter breaks $(t^{lec},\ t^{brk})_1 = (50,\ 10)\ min$, whereas dashed plots refer to doubled break and lecture times: $(t^{lec}, t^{brk})_2 = (100,\ 20)\ min$. Remarkably, as shown in the dashed curves of Fig. 1 and Fig. 2, shorter but more frequent breaks $(t^{lec},\ t^{brk})_1$ perform better in terms of risk, and one may achieve the desired goal of zero infections even after 5 h (blue dashed curves) by combining frequent window opening at sufficiently high N (full aperture) with mask wearing. The deviation of red curves from the reference curve (denoted in black, showing the absence of any mitigation/dilution factor) shows the very significant impact of natural ventilation alone, quantifiable in an average reduction of risk of almost 50% at a lecture's end.

The important mitigation effect of surgical masks (under the assumption they are worn by all subjects) can be quantified in an additional reduction of 30–45 % from the reference curve (depending on the effective time they are properly worn). Again, only a combination of masks and natural ventilation may reduce risk levels below the one-contagion threshold (grey horizontal lines in Fig. 3). In fact, to completely eliminate any airborne contagion in a typical classroom of 15, 25, or 30 students where an infectious subject is present, the value of R at the end of all lectures must stay below 1/15, 1/25, or 1/30, respectively (= 6.7%, 4%, or 3.3%). In addition, this clearly indicates the need to keep the number of students per classroom as low as possible because the contagion threshold lowers as S_0 increases.

The case of the infectious teacher (Figs. 4a and 4b) shows remarkable differences in the shape of risk curves compared with those of the positive student case (Figs. 3a and 3b). For the teacher case, higher levels of ER_q were required in order to account for a higher (average) speak activity. Even if staying in a classroom for only two hours, an infectious teacher speaking most of that time will be a much greater viral source than a student (on average), and the corresponding risk curves will increase more steeply in the first 2h. After a teacher left the room, the ER_q in that room dropped to zero, but the viral charge emitted by him/her was still present (although it lowered after a number of hours—see the n(t) curves of Figs. 4c and 4d). A resting load, however, would cause a further (although lower) increase of R_c during the next hours, even if the teacher were no longer present in that classroom. In addition, the one-infection threshold via airborne transmission for a class of 30 students wearing masks half of the time (a realistic scenario) was reached much faster in the case of an infectious teacher. That is, the time-to-one-contagion was about 1 h in the optimistic scenario (low ER_q level) and even less than 1 h with a high ER_q level. For subjects

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.19.20248493; this version posted December 30, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

exposed to an infectious student, the time-to-one-contagion was much higher, varying from about 2.4 h (pessimistic case, high ER_q) to 4.5 h (optimistic case, low ERq). Notably, all ER_q values employed were compatible with published data [Buonanno 2020] for standing and resting people (reported also in appendix - Fig. A1).



Figure 3 *Top: cumulative risk curves of indirect airborne transmission as a function of exposure time, considering a standard classroom (V = 170 m3). a) Pessimistic scenario calculated with high ERq. b)Optimistic scenario with low ERq. Natural and mechanical ventilation profiles refer to Fig.2. Bottom: time evolution of viral charge in classroom in natural (open windows) cases and with mechanical ventilation.*

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.19.20248493; this version posted December 30, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .



Figure 4 *Top: cumulative risk curves for the case of an infected teacher in a classroom of volume V = 170 m3 for 2 hours as a function of exposure of subjects. Pessimistic (left) vs optimistic (right) scenarios calculated with high* ER_q *(a) and low* ER_q *(b), respectively. Natural and mechanical ventilation profiles refer to Fig.2. Bottom: time evolution of viral charge in classroom in natural (open windows) cases and with mechanical ventilation*

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.19.20248493; this version posted December 30, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

Comment on Mechanical Ventilation

Obviously, mechanical ventilation would be an even more desirable option in winter to increase N without opening the windows, but the vast majority of school buildings worldwide do not have HVAC systems. In addition, Fig. 3 shows that mechanical ventilation alone (active during breaks) is not enough to reduce the risk below the one-contagion threshold, even at N = 10 vol/h. Furthermore, reducing the airborne risk without masks through mechanical ventilation systems only would require permanently cutting the power of air ejectors at high speeds during classes (to keep high values of N while lowering R). This would require a complete redesign of current HVAC systems in schools (if present) while posing challenges for acoustic insulation. For these reasons, the scenario of permanent mechanical ventilation at high N was excluded from the present analysis.

Optimum ventilation profiles and safety zones

As previously stated, a significant risk reduction could be obtained with more frequent ventilation, even without face masks. In fact, for a given classroom, the risk at the end of a school day (usually after five hours of classes) can be expressed as a function of two variable parameters, t^{lec} (lecture time) and t^{brk}(duration of breaks), as illustrated in Equation (10). Thus, there is motivation for finding an optimal set of t^{lec}, t^{brk} that would minimize $R_{c,5h}(t^{lec}, t^{brk})$, noting that only limited actions can be undertaken to change the other exogenous parameters. Beyond this, classroom volumes are mostly fixed (except for the very few cases in which new spaces have been allocated in the current year). Second, acting on mask filter capabilities has also been limited. That is, one may think it would improve the mask parameters fout and fin by requesting students to wear fpp2 masks all of the time, but this prescription has been excluded by most regulators. This is because wearing high-filtering masks in school contexts for long periods appears inappropriate and may expose students to other risks. Finally, ERq and p cannot be controlled: whereas "p – average pulmonary inflation rate" is fixed in the human body and reasonably known, the critical parameter ERq depends on actual habits/behaviors, and its values are parametrically varied in bounded ranges to limit uncertainty. In any case, both ERq and p cannot be controlled by legislation or by feasible countermeasures. Instead,, acting on ventilation (N) is feasible and can be effective, as shown in this study. However, maximizing N in winter would require mechanical ventilation and operating HVAC systems, lacking in most schools. One can act now only by opening windows for significant periods of time to increase the air exchange and dilution of the viral load. To act on the duration of breaks (t^{brk})—when N is the maximum—and the duration of lectures (t^{lec})—when N is the minimum—one must aim at identifying an optimum ventilation schedule $N_{opt}(t)$ that minimizes the cumulative risk within certain boundaries. The two-variable risk function to be minimized is therefore z = $R_{c,5h}(t^{lec}, t^{brk})$ and is represented in Fig. 5 a, b, c, and d and the related contour plot of Fig. 6. As evident, a minimum exists at around $(t^{lec}, t^{brk}) \approx (30min, 50min)$, since the z function shows a clear monotonic behavior in the surrounding of the x=y direction. This would imply an unusual recommendation: class breaks should last longer than the classes themselves. This fact is eventually unsurprising, since opening more windows during breaks implies a higher N-level than during classes, which was considered in this analysis (Fig. 2). In addition, this fact is dictated by practical requirements. That is, with low outdoor temperatures (particularly in January–February in schools located in the Northern Hemisphere) and a concurrent risk for other seasonal diseases, it is only during lesson "breaks" that one could realistically increase N by fully opening the windows in a classroom.

However, since overly long breaks may also cause practical and organizational difficulties for schools, wider "safety zones" for the variation of t^{lec}, t^{brk} are recommended in Fig. 6. These zones are defined below so-called "one-infection thresholds" (varying for different values of the number S_0 of students per classroom). A certain combination of t^{lec}, t^{brk} from the safety zone would thus provide sufficient ventilation and dilution of the viral load to lower the risk for new indirect

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.19.20248493; this version posted December 30, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

infections below $1/S_0$. That is, no infections would be expected in a group of S_0 susceptible individuals if the room were ventilated for an equal period of time (t_{safe}^{brk}) at every class break. For instance, in a classroom of 30 students, one should require both breaks and classes to last for approximately 50 min to be safe, whereas in a classroom of only 20 students, the wider "safe zone" in Fig. 6 would allow lessons of 55 min, combined with breaks of 25 min.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.19.20248493; this version posted December 30, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .



Figure 5 *– a,b) Cumulative contagion risk function after 5h exposure* $R_{c,5h}$ *as a function of lecture and break duration* (t^{lec}, t^{brk}) *for high (a) and low (b) emission rates of the infective source. Hypothesis: one infective student in a classroom of 170 m3 and face mask effective for 50% of the time (fin=0.15, fout=0.45)*

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.19.20248493; this version posted December 30, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .



Figure 5 *– c,d) Contagion risk function* $R_{c,5h}(t^{lec}, t^{brk})$ *in the case of infective teacher, for high (c) and low (d) emission. rates. Hypothesis: one infective student in a classroom of 170 m³ and face mask effective for 50% of the time (f_{in}=0.15, f_{out}=0.45)*

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.19.20248493; this version posted December 30, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .



Figure 6 *– Contour plots of the contagion risk function after 5 h of exposure,* $R_{c,5h}(t^{lec}, t^{brk})$*. a) Positive student and b) positive teacher cases. Continuous lines indicate "one infection thresholds" for different values of the number of susceptible students per classroom (*S_0*) therefore defining "zero infection areas" enclosed below threshold lines (safety zones) for the parameters* t^{lec} *and* t^{brk}*. Thus, in a class of 30 students, a combination of* t^{lec}*,* t^{brk} *from the safety zone (blue area at the top left) would provide sufficient ventilation and dilution of the viral load to allow the probability of new contagions to stay below one over 30 (3.3%).*

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.19.20248493; this version posted December 30, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

Conclusions

Cumulative risk is the key to understanding airborne SARS-CoV-2 infections in schools. This originates from the cumulative nature of air saturation and viral aerosol formation. Furthermore, students and teachers exposed in schools for long periods of time to possible infection sources and standard sanitation/ventilation cycles during breaks cannot lower the residual viral load in their environment to zero. On the contrary, it has been shown that a small amount of this load would still be present in a classroom even after ventilation cycles at high N, with students leaving classrooms during breaks. On the other hand, an infectious student re-entering a classroom would continue to emit viral quanta, and an infectious teacher remaining in the room for a number of hours could emit sufficient viral quanta to indirectly infect other people, even after she/he exited the classroom. Although the dynamic single-zone model employed contains some approximations, a clear indication arises from this theoretical analysis: Windows in schools should be kept open most of the time to decrease the airborne risk to acceptable levels. Since students may leave classrooms at every break, schools could increase the ventilation during breaks to prevent temperature discomfort and other seasonal diseases from resulting during lectures.

Furthermore, numerical results have indicated that windows should be fully (not partially) open during breaks and that breaks should possibly last as long as possible. However, since these recommendations would cause considerable discomfort in the winter (and would increase the risk of contracting other diseases), a compromise is necessary. Safety regions—aside from the numerical optimum—have been identified for break and lecture durations (i.e., the parameters influencing ventilation profiles and therefore dilution of viral charge have been established). During optimization, dilution and lowering of contagion risk curves in this study were based entirely on natural ventilation cycles (i.e., opening windows) rather than on mechanical ventilation (which is expected in future upgrade of schools but is not currently present in most schools). Results of the minimization of the Rc5h function indicate f.i. that alternating lectures of 55 min with breaks of 25 min would keep the contagion risk below the zero-infection-threshold in groups of 20 students. Since the number of students per classroom also plays a critical role in contagion thresholds, break durations should be longer for larger groups and could be shorter for smaller classes. Thus, it may be wise to have smaller class sizes to control airborne transmission in schools. Finally, as has been confirmed by others, only the combination of optimal air exchange cycles and surgical masks permanently worn by all individuals could lower the risk of airborne contagion within school buildings to the desirable level of zero contagions.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.19.20248493; this version posted December 30, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

APPENDIX

Values of the ERq parameter used in the numerical simulations are taken from [Buonanno 2020] and reported in Fig. A.1 (orange and blue lines).



Figure A.1. *Range of variation for ERq for resting and standing individual as published in [Buonanno 2020]. The values chosen in the present study are highlighted in blue and orange. The yellow and green zones originates by the viral parameters c_i and c_v [Pan er al. 2020].*

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.19.20248493; this version posted December 30, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

Bibliography

[Leung 2020] Leung, N.H.L., Chu, D.K.W., Shiu, E.Y.C. et al. Respiratory virus shedding in exhaled breath and efficacy of face masks. Nat Med 26, 676–680 (2020). https://doi.org/10.1038/s41591-020-0843-2

[Morawska 2020-1] Lidia Morawska, Donald K Milton, It is Time to Address Airborne Transmission of COVID-19, *Clinical Infectious Diseases*, ciaa939, https://doi.org/10.1093/cid/ciaa939

[Morawska 2020-2] Lidia Morawska, Julian W. Tang, William Bahnfleth, et al. How can airborne transmission of COVID-19 indoors be minimised? Environment International, Volume 142, 2020, 105832, ISSN 0160-4120, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envint.2020.105832.

[Allen 2020] Allen JG, Marr LC. Recognizing and controlling airborne transmission of SARS-CoV-2 in indoor environments. *Indoor Air*. 2020;30(4):557-558. doi:10.1111/ina.12697

[Escombe 2007] Escombe AR, Oeser CC, Gilman RH, et al. Natural ventilation for the prevention of airborne contagion. PLoS Med. 2007; 4(2):e68. https://doi:10.1371/journal.pmed.0040068

[Buonanno 2020] G. Buonanno, L. Stabile, L. Morawska. Estimation of airborne viral emission: Quanta emission rate of SARS-CoV-2 for infection risk assessment, Environment International, Volume 141,2020, 105794, ISSN 0160-4120, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envint.2020.105794.

[AICARR 2020] AICARR - Protocollo per la riduzione del rischio da diffusione del SARS-CoV-2 nella gestione e manutenzione degli impianti (to be changed with corresponding ASHRAE protocol)

[Gammaitoni 1997] Gammaitoni L., Nucci M.C. 1997. Using a mathematical model to evaluate the efficacy of TB control measures. Emerging Infectious Disease, 3, 335-342.

[Knibbs 2011] Knibbs LD, Morawska L, Bell SC, Grzybowski P. Room ventilation and the risk of airborne infection transmission in 3 health care settings within a large teaching hospital. Am J Infect Control. 2011 Dec;39(10):866-72.. Epub 2011 Jun 12. PMID: 21658810 doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ajic.2011.02.014

[Smereka 2020] Smereka, J., Ruetzler, K., Szarpak, L., Filipiak, K. J., & Jaguszewski, M. (2020). Role of mask/respirator protection against SARS-CoV-2. Anesthesia and analgesia, 10.1213/ANE.0000000000004873. Advance online publication. https://doi.org/10.1213/ANE.0000000000004873

[Pan 2020] Pan, Y., Zhang, D., Yang, P., Poon, L. L. M., & Wang, Q. (2020). Viral load of SARS-CoV-2 in clinical samples. The Lancet Infectious Diseases, 20(4). https://doi.org/10.1016/S1473-3099(20)30113-4

[Watanabe 2010] T. Watanabe, T.A. Bartrand, M.H. Weir, T. Omura, C.N. Haas. Development of a dose-response model for SARS coronavirus Risk Anal., 30 (2010), pp. 1129-1138, 10.1111/j.1539-6924.2010.01427.x

[Mueller 2020] Amy V Mueller, Matthew J. Eden, Jessica J. Oakes, Chiara Bellini, Loretta A Fernandez
Quantitative Method for Comparative Assessment of Particle Filtration Efficiency of Fabric Masks as Alternatives to Standard Surgical Masks for PPE edRxiv 2020.04.17.20069567; doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.04.17.20069567

[Li 2007] Li Y, Leung GM, Tang JW, Yang X, Chao CY, et al. (2007) Role of ventilation in airborne transmission of infectious agents in the built environment—A multidisciplinary systematic review. Indoor Air 17: 2–18.

[Marr 2012] Marr, David; Mason, Mark; Mosley, Ron; Liu, Xiaoyu. 2012 The influence of opening windows and doors on the natural ventilation rate of a residential building. The Free Library (January, 1), https://www.thefreelibrary.com/The influence of opening windows and doors on the natural ventilation...-a0282940533