Optimizing ventilation cycles to control airborne transmission risk of SARS-CoV2 in school classrooms

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 and regulators going to allow less restrictive policies on windows closure. Fundamental questions to be addressed are therefore: to which extent can we contain airborne risk in schools with natural ventilation ? what would be the optimal ventilation cycle during the cold season considering the fact that most schools are not provided with mechanical ventilation systems? And, finally, what are the safety ranges to keep the infection risk below the threshold values for new infections within a classroom? To try answering these questions a risk model for airborne transmission of covid-19 in classrooms has been develped based on previous models for tubercolosis and influenza. The separate cases of infectious student and infectious teacher are investigated. The study explored the influence of 3500 different air ventilation cycles on the cumulative airborne risk function throughout a school day. A numerical optimization of the risk function was carried out. Safety risk-zones for breaks and lessons duration were calculated based solely on surgical masks worn by all exposed and optimal windows opening intervals.

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

Keywords:

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

Table 1 – *Model parameters and related value ranges. In brackets the controllable parameters.*

Parameters	Description	Units	Range
t	*duration exposure to infection*	*h*	*0-5*
t_{brk}	*breaks duration*	*min*	*[5-30]*
t_{lec}	*lecture duration*	*min*	*[30-100]*
S	*Number of susceptible persons*	*persons*	
C	*Number of infected persons (contagions)*	*persons*	
$R=C/S$	*infection risk*	*-*	*0-100%*
ER_q	*quanta emission rate by infective source*	*quanta* h^{-1}	*[5-25]*
p	*average inhalation flow*	m^3h^{-1}	*0.6*
V	*classroom volume*	m^3	*170*
$Q(t)$	*clean air inflow*	m^3h^{-1}	*85-1700*
$AER(t)_{NV,MV}$	*air exchange rate provided by natural (NV) or mechanical ventilation (MV)*	h^{-1}	*0-2 (NV), 0-9.5 (MV)*
AER_{max}	*max air changes per hour*	h^{-1}	*2 (NV), 9.5 (MV)*
λ	*inactivation rate*	h^{-1}	*0.5*
k	*deposition rate*	h^{-1}	*0-0.25*
$IVRR\ (t)$	*infectious virus removal rate* $N+\lambda+k$	h^{-1}	*0-2.5 (NV), 0-10 (MV)*
$n(t)$	*viral quanta in ambient at time t*	*quanta*	*0-50*
n_0	*viral quanta at time zero*	*quanta*	*0 (>0 at each lesson reprise)*
f_{in}	*mask reduction of inward viral load (susceptible person)*	*-*	*[15-30%] surgical*
f_{out}	*mask reduction of outward viral load (source)*	*-*	*[45-90%] surgical*

1. 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. Very recent results from the Italian Regional Environmental Agency "ARPA Piemonte", confirms this assumption [Repubblica 2021]. 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.


a
Airborne risk simulation in a classroom with the Gammaitoni-Nucci model
0h 00 min
Cumul. Risk - $R_c(t)$
1 infection threshold
Tempo (ore)
viral charge n(t)
n(t) [quanta]
t [ore]
Hyp:
$\overline{ER_q}$ = 7 quanta h^{-1}
S_0 = 20 exposed subjects
1 asyntomatic source
T_{brk}=20 min, t_{lec}=100min
$f_{in,out,\ surgical}$ = (50%,15%)*
average values over 5h
N_{brk} = 2.5 vol/h
Ing. Alessandro Zivelonghi - «Il rischio di contagio aereo indiretto nelle aule scolastiche» - Webinar Ordine INGVR


b
Airborne risk simulation in a classroom with the Gammaitoni-Nucci model
1h 40 min
Cumul. Risk - $R_c(t)$
1 infection threshold
Tempo (ore)
viral charge n(t)
n(t) [quanta]
t [ore]
Ing. Alessandro Zivelonghi - «Il rischio di contagio aereo indiretto nelle aule scolastiche» - Webinar

Figure 1. *Evolution of viral charge and cumulative risk in a classroom with a positive student. Lesson-break cycle: one break of 20 min every 100 min lesson (t_{brk}=20, t_{lec}=100). All presents are supposed to wear face masks half of the time. a) viral charge in classroom after 5 min from t=0 and b) at the end of the first lecture (t=100min)*



Figure 1 *c) windows opening and air change/dilution throughout the first break of 20 min duration until t=120min d) situation at the end of the second lecture (t=210min) with a new probable infected person. The viral charge is supposed isotropically distributed within the GN model.*

2. Materials and Methods

2.1 GN-model with perfect mixing and face masks

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 (emission rate, i.e. number of viral particles generated per hour by each infectious subject) is known, at least as an averaged value over the exposure time $\overline{(ER_q)}$. 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 simply given by the ratio between infectious subjects (C) and exposed subjects (S), therefore the probability of a single infection is not proportional to the 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 supposed isotropically distributed in the volume *V*. This probability follows then an exponential law for increasing exposure time t, which strictly depends on the parameter $\overline{ER_q}$ 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 which takes into account also deactivation of viral load (see later). It is important to stress that the present study already assumes a contagious person inside a classroom (number of infectious individuals I = 1) and focus on the contagion risk inside a classroom with a positive source within it. Thus, to perform large-scale risk assessments in schools (which goes beyond the scope of the present work), the probability of having one or more asymptomatic individuals in a classroom should be additionally estimated. The risk factor R, intended here as a collective measure of risk referred to a group of S susceptible individuals, in the original RMR model (by Riley, Murphy and Riley) can be written as:

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

In the dynamical GN model, Eq. 1 can be improved by considering the variation of the number of viral particles over time, becoming the solution of two coupled first order differential equations:

$$\begin{cases} \frac{dS}{dt} = -\frac{p}{V} n(t) S(t) \\ \frac{dn}{dt} = -Nn(t) + q \end{cases} \quad (2)$$

In order to account for the complex phenomenon of viral inactivation and gravitational deposition on surfaces [Yang and Marr, 2011], the ventilation rate N in (2) is better indicated as the *infectious virus removal rate (IVRR)* which is the sum of the air exchange rate (AER), a viral inactivation factor (λ) and a particle deposition factor (k). For the purpose of this demonstration the small contribution of particle deposition on surfaces was neglected (k values are found in literature below 0.25 vol/h [Chatoutsidou and Lazaridis 2019]) whereas a constant value for λ = 0.5 vol/h was applied, on the basis of the SARS-CoV-2 half-life close to 1h as detected in [van Doremalen 2020].

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 then given by the general formula:

$$R^{GN}(t) = 1 - e^{\left[-\frac{p\,\overline{ER_q}}{V}\,\frac{IVRR\cdot t + e^{-IVRR\cdot t} - 1 - \left(\frac{IVRR\cdot n_0}{\overline{ER_q}}\right)e^{-Nt} + \left(\frac{IVRR\cdot n_0}{\overline{ER_q}}\right)}{IVRR^2}\right]} = 1 - e^{\left[-\frac{p\,\overline{ER_q}}{V}\,\varphi(t,n_0)\right]} \quad (3)$$

Where $\varphi = IVRR \cdot t + e^{-IVRR\cdot t} - 1 - \left(\frac{IVRR\cdot n_0}{\overline{ER_q}}\right) e^{-Nt} + \left(\frac{IVRR\cdot n_0}{\overline{ER_q}}\right)$.

2.2 Influence of windows opening function on the infectious virus removal rate (IVRR)

Windows opening implies a periodic activation of air exchanges per hour, which are supposed to occur only during lesson breaks. Therefore, the IVRR function in (3) become a periodic rectangular wave function over the full lesson time, with peaks influenced by higher values of the air exchange rate (AER) as due to complete windows opening (2vol/h) or mechanical ventilation (up to 10 vol/h). In the case of static natural ventilation, the range of values commonly found in the literature lies between 0.2 and 3 vol/h (based on experimental measurement of CO2 concentrations before and after opening windows in a room [Marr 2012, Escombe 2007]). It must be pointed out, however, that natural ventilation would be also affected by other factors, such as the difference of air temperature between the indoor and outdoor space, the wind direction and average wind speed, and geometric factors such as window size and position, etc. [Marr 2012]. As for thermal effects, in winter a high temperature difference between outdoor and indoor is expected (ΔT up to 25 °C, assuming +20°C as room temperature and -5°C as the worse-case ambient temperature). This certainly increase the ventilation flow as reported e.g. here [EN 16798] and justify the assumption of a rather high AER of 2 vol/h (we investigate the winter condition since it is the most critical for airborne transmission risk due to the natural tendency to reduce windows opening in closed places). Moreover, the exact calibration of windows 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 the present work. In this study we explore the influence on the classroom risk function of different cycles (and levels) of the AER within the IRVV function by changing the time duration of lecture and breaks. Fig. 2 report only two exemplary cycles (long and short windows opening cycles) taken as input for the results shown in Fig. 3-4,

whereas optimization of the risk function shown in Fig. 5-6 considered 390 different combination of t_{brk} and t_{lec} with a time resolution of 2 min which generated 390 different cycles.



Figure 2 *Infectious virus removal rate (IVRR = AER + k + λ) profiles as determined by periodic windows opening used as input for the risk estimations in a classroom. Left profiles are for 50-min lecture time alternated with 10-min breaks, whereas right profiles are the case of 100-min lesson duration and 20-min breaks.*

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 (3) 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. (3) can then be rewritten as:

$$R^{mask}(t) = 1 - e^{\left[-(1-f_{out})(1-f_{in})\frac{p\,\overline{ER_q}}{V}\,\varphi(t)\right]} \tag{4}$$

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:

$$n(t) = \frac{\overline{ER_q}}{IVRR} + \left[n_0 - \frac{\overline{ER_q}}{IVRR}\right] e^{-IVRRt} \tag{5}$$

2.2 Average emission rate for SARS-CoV2

A correct estimation for the emission rate parameter ER_q is not trivial and mostly based on a semi-empirical approach combining viral load measurements from clinical trials and reverse engineering from observed outbreaks. Recently [Buonanno 2020 B] suggested also a distribution for the quanta emission rates (ERq), obtained applying the Monte Carlo method, i.e.

a probability density function of ER_q (pdf_{ERq}). This was not considered here, assuming for ER_q already averaged values selected from the variability ranges indicated in [Buonanno 2020 A], for appropriate typical student and teachers' behaviours, i.e. resting and standing persons with moderate and more pronounced vocal activity, respectively (cfr. Appendix A). An averaged-over-exposure-time emission rate $\overline{ER_q}$ was then assumed constant throughout the 5h exposure time in the simulation, but different for the case of infective student as compared to the infective teacher, according to the following formula (with index j referring to the specific source - resting student or standing teacher):

$$\overline{ER_q}_j = \overline{c_{v_j}} \cdot c_i \cdot \overline{p} \cdot \overline{V}_{dr,j} \approx \overline{c_{v_j}} \cdot c_i \cdot \overline{p} \cdot \sum_{D=1}^{4} dr_{D,j}\, V_{D,j} \qquad (6)$$

In (6) the parameter c_v is the viral load in the sputum (RNA copies mL^{-1}), c_i is a conversion factor having units in quanta RNA copies^{-1} (ratio between one infectious quantum and the infectious dose expressed in viral RNA copies), $\overline{p}$ is the average pulmonary rate (m^3 h^{-1}), and V_{dr} is the average droplet volume concentration expelled by the infectious person (mL m^{-3}). As shown in [Morawska 2009], V_{dr} can be approximated considering only four classes of average microdroplet diameters D and the corresponding average droplet concentrations dr_D (part. cm $^{-3}$) and droplet volume V_D . Empirical estimations of c_v for SARS-CoV2 resulted from recent clinical assessments of viral loads in symptomatic and asymptomatic subjects and can be found here [Pan et al. 2020, To et al. 2020,] whereas c_i values are referred to SARS-CoV1 as explained in [Buonanno 2020 A, von Doremalen 2020, Watanabe 2010]. It is important to stress the critical importance of the values chosen for the parameter ER_q in Eq. (4-6). Very recent studies [Buonanno 2020 A] 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, in this study we calculated different scenarios assuming low (optimistic) and high (pessimistic) values of ER_q for the two distinct cases of infectious student and infectious teacher.

2.3 Cumulative risk

In the present work, the GN-model is based on the concept of 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 (4) and (6) would become zero. However, we can observe that even when ER_q=0 in (4), 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 (4) and (5) become:

$$R_{ERq=0}^{mask}(t) = 1 - e^{\left[-(1-f_{out})(1-f_{in})\frac{pn_0}{IVRR \cdot V}\left(e^{-IVRR \cdot t}-1\right)\right]} \qquad (6)$$

$$n_{ERq=0}(t) = n_0 e^{-IVRR \cdot t} \qquad (7)$$

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:

$$R_i(t) = \begin{cases} R_{lec,i}(t) = 1 - e^{\left[-\frac{p\overline{ER_q}}{V}\ \varphi_i\left(t, n_{0,i},\ N\right)\right]} & if\ \ 0 \le t \le t^{lec} \\ R_{brk,i}(t)\ = 0 & if\ \ t^{lec} < t < \ t^{lec} + t^{brk} \end{cases} \tag{8}$$

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

$$n_i(t) = \begin{cases} n_{lec,i}(t) = \frac{\overline{ER_q}}{N} + \left[n_0 - \frac{\overline{ER_q}}{N}\right] e^{-IVRR\cdot t}\ \ if\ \ 0 \le t \le t^{lec} \\ n_{brk,i}(t)\ = \left[n_{lec,i}\left(t^{lec}\right)\right] e^{-IVRR(t+t^{lec})} & if\ \ t^{lec} < t < \ t^{lec} + t^{brk} \end{cases} \tag{9}$$

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, it is correct to take the additional risk of airborne infection during breaks 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:

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

$$= R_{lec,i}\left(t\ -\ (i-1)(t^{lec} + t^{brk})\right) + \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} R_{lec,j}\left(t^{lec},\ n_{0j}\right) \tag{11}$$

In (11), $C_j(t)$ 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 $1/ S_0$. Therefore, the condition for zero infections to occur over the total time spent in the classroom is:

$$R_c(t\ ) < \frac{1}{S_0} \tag{12}$$

as opposed to $R_{lec,i}$ (t) < 1/n as suggested in other analyses.

Two separate python routines have been implemented to solve eq. (8-9) and (11) for the infective student- as well as the infective teacher case. In the first case, an infective asymptomatic student source is supposed to enter the classroom at time t=0 and to stay for 5 hours, while emitting viral quanta only during lessons (ER_q=0 at each break since the student exits the classroom). On the other hand, an infective teacher source is supposed to teach and stay with students for 2 hours only (this means for instance 100 min of effective lecture and a surveillance break of 20 min). In both cases, however, all suceptible individuals are exposed for a total time of 5 hours (an entire school day) minus the sum of all break times within the 5 hours, but the R function can never became zero for t>0 as previously explained. Thus, at the end of a typical school day, one obtains the cumulative risk of infections with one infective source as given by:

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

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

In equation (13), $k = \left\lfloor\frac{5h}{t^{lec}+t^{brk}}\right\rfloor$ 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. Most importantly, equation (13) 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 the time duration of lectures (t^{lec}) and the time duration of breaks (t^{brk}), since the other model parameters (V, N, IVRR, p, ER_q, f_{out}, f_{in}) can be considered either fixed or not controllable for a given classroom and a given local regulation.

3. Results and Discussion

3.1 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 during breaks (opening windows, AER = 2 h^{-1}), and orange curves show that of mechanical ventilation at high power during breaks (AER increased almost 5 times during breaks). 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 effectively 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 AER (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 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 fully prevent 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 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).


Cumul. Risk - 1 positive student
[ERq=15 quanta/h]
nat. ventil. only
mechan. ventil. only
natur. vent. +
surg. masks 50% of the time
natur. vent. +
surg.masks 100% of the tim
2 on 15 students
NEW INFECTED (thresholds)
1 on 15 students
= 2 on 30 students
1 on 30 students
R(t) = C(t)/S0
t [h]
Cumul. Risk - 1 positive student
[ERq=7 quanta/h]
n(t) - total viral charge - 1 positive student
[ERq=15 quanta/h]
20 min 2.5 vol/h
(full open windows)
20 min MV 10 vol/h (mech. Vent.
n(t) [quanta]
t [ore]
n(t) - total viral charge - 1 positive student
[ERq=7 quanta/h]
20 min 2.5 vol/h
(full open windows)
20 min MV 10 vol/h (mech. Vent.)
t [ore]

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.*





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*

3.2 Comment on Mechanical Ventilation

Obviously, mechanical ventilation would be an even more desirable option in winter to increase AER without opening the windows, but the vast majority of school buildings worldwide do not have HVAC systems. In addition, Fig. 3 and 4 show that mechanical ventilation alone (active only during breaks) is not enough to reduce the risk below the one-contagion threshold without face masks. This goal could eventually be achieved with *permanent* full-power of the HVAC fans and an engineered design of ejector distributors in the 3D space [Abuhegazy 2020]. 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 values of AER was excluded from the present analysis.

3.3 Optimum ventilation profiles and safety zones

As previously stated, a significant risk reduction can be obtained with more frequent ventilation. 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, when ventilation is turned off) and t^{brk}(duration of breaks, when ventilation is active), as shown 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 on 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 is also limited. That is, one may think it would improve the mask parameters f_{out} and f_{in} by requesting students to wear ffp2 masks all of the time, but this prescription for students younger than 18 years has been excluded by most regulators. In fact, wearing high-filtering masks in school contexts for long periods may expose students to other respiratory risks. Finally, ER_q and p cannot be controlled: whereas the average pulmonary inflation rate has not large variation in the school context and is reasonably known for human body, the critical emission rate parameter ER_q depends on actual habits/behaviors, and its values are parametrically varied in bounded ranges to limit uncertainty. In any case, both ER_q and p cannot be controlled by legislation or by technical countermeasures. Instead, acting on ventilation (N) and then on the directly linked IVVR is feasible and can be effective, as shown in this study. On the other hand, maximizing N in winter would require mechanical ventilation and operating HVAC systems, lacking in most schools. We can act only on windows opening for significant periods of time to increase the air exchange and dilution of the viral load. Therefore, an effective risk reduction pathway is the identification of a numerical optimum for the ventilation schedule as a function of time - $AER_{opt}(t)$ - which minimizes the cumulative risk within certain boundaries. The risk function to be minimized is z = $R_{c,5h}(t^{lec}, t^{brk})$ and is represented in Fig. 5 a-b, Fig. 5c-d and the related contour plots of Fig. 6. As evident, a minimum exists at around $(t^{lec}, t^{brk}) \approx (30\,\min\ , 50min)$ since the z function is showing a clear monotonic behavior in the surrounding of the x=y direction. This would imply an unusual recommendation for most schools: class breaks should last longer than the classes themselves. This fact is eventually unsurprising, since opening windows during breaks implies a higher N-level than during classes (Fig. 2). In addition, this fact is dictated by practical requirements. That is, with low outdoor temperatures (particularly in January–March in schools located in the northern hemisphere) and a concurrent risk for other seasonal diseases, it is only during "lesson breaks" with no students inside the classroom, that one could think to increase the AER substantially 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 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. Green regions suggest values for t^{lec}, t^{brk} which would be safe for the infective teacher as well for the infective student case, i.e. regardless of source type. In order to achieve complete safety in a classroom of 30 students exposed for 5 hours, classes should last approximately 45 min but breaks should be very long (about 35 minutes). This would eventually turn into a complex or even unfeasible scheduling challenge for schools (only 3.75 lesson+break cycles would be possible within 5 hours). On the other hand, in a classroom of 15 students only, lessons could last 45-47 min and breaks easily reduced to 15 minutes, allowing 5 entire cycles.



Figure 5 *– a,b) Cumulative risk function after 5h exposure as a function of lecture and break duration for high (a) and low (b) emission rates of the infective source. Hypotheses: classroom volume of 170 m3 and worse case for the effective wearing time of surgical masks (f_{in}=0.15, f_{out}=0.45).*

c)



d)



Figure 5 *– c,d) in the case of an infective teacher in classroom, for high (c) and low (d) emission. rates. Hypotheses: classroom volume of 170 m^3 and worse case for the effective wearing time of surgical masks (f_{in}=0.15, f_{out}=0.45).*



Figure 6 *– Contour plots of the cumulative risk function,* $R_{c,5h}(t^{lec}, t^{brk})$*. a) Positive student and b) positive teacher case. Continuous lines indicate "thresholds for a new infection" (C = 1) for different classroom groups. The regions they define are called "safety zones" for that group size. Green regions suggest values for* t^{lec}, t^{brk} *which would be safe for the infective teacher as well for the infective student case, i.e. regardless of source type. Hypotheses are the same of Fig. 5.*

4. Conclusions

Cumulative airborne risk is the key to understanding airborne infections of SARS-CoV-2 within classrooms. 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 here 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 rate during breaks to prevent thermal discomfort and other seasonal diseases.
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 may cause considerable organizational difficulties in schools and thermal discomfort in the winter season, compromise solutions are necessary. Therefore, specific safety regions for break and lecture durations (i.e., the parameters influencing ventilation profiles) for the different cases of infective teacher and infective student —have been identified. In this optimization, dilution and lowering of contagion risk were based entirely on natural ventilation cycles (i.e., opening windows) rather than on mechanical ventilation. Mechanical ventilation systems are expected at larger scale in future building upgrades but are not currently present in the vast majority of schools worldwide. Results of the minimization of the cumulative risk function indicate f.i. that alternating lectures of 45 min with breaks of 15 min would keep the contagion risk below the one-contagion-threshold in groups of 15 students, but for larger groups of 30 scholars much longer breaks of about 35 minutes would be necessary. Thus, as a general rule it may be wise, as suggested also by intuition, to have smaller class sizes to control airborne transmission in schools. Finally, it is once again remarked that only a combination of optimal air exchange cycles with protection masks worn by all individuals could lower the risk of airborne contagion in school classrooms to a desirable safety level of zero contagions in all conditions.

Acknowledgment

The authors express gratitude to Prof. Buonanno and Prof. Morawska for insightful discussions.

APPENDIX A

Values of the ER_q 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].*

APPENDIX B – Figure 6 “clean” (without triangles)

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.

[Repubblica 2021] C.Zunino reporting on ARPA Piemonte study in cooperation with antiviral research laboratory “San Luigi Gonzaga”, Orbassano– “Virus in quali luoghi ce n’è di più. Inesistente all’ aperto, concentrazioni alte nelle case”. https://www.repubblica.it/scienze/2021/01/12/news/ora_si_potra_avvistare_il_covid_nell_aria-282183617/

[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

[Wei 2020] Li Wei, Ji Lin, Xiaofei Duan, Wenzhi Huang, Xiaojun Lu, Juan Zhou, Zhiyong Zong Asymptomatic COVID-19 Patients Can Contaminate Their Surroundings: an Environment Sampling Study mSphere Jun 2020, 5 (3) e00442-20; DOI: 10.1128/mSphere.00442-20

[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

[EN 16798] Energy Performance of Buildings - Ventilation for Buildings Part 7: Calculation Methods for the Determination of Air Flow Rates in Buildings Including Infiltration (Modules M5-5)

[Buonanno 2020 A] 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.

[Buonanno 2020 B] G. Buonanno, L. Stabile, L. Morawska. Quantitative assessment of the risk of airborne transmission of SARS-CoV-2 infection: Prospective and retrospective applications, Environment International, Volume 145, December 2020, 106112 ISSN 0160-4120, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envint.2020.106112.

[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

[van Doremalen 2020] van Doremalen, N., Bushmaker, T., Morris, D.H., Holbrook, M.G., Gamble, A., Williamson, B.N., Tamin, A., Harcourt, J.L., Thornburg, N.J., Gerber, S.I., LloydSmith, J.O., de Wit, E., Munster, V.J., 2020. Aerosol and Surface Stability of SARS-CoV-2 as Compared with SARS-CoV-1. N. Engl. J. Med. https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMc2004973.

[To 2020] To, K.K.-W., Tsang, O.T.-Y., Leung, W.-S., Tam, A.R., Wu, T.-C., Lung, D.C., Yip, C.C.-Y., Cai, J.-P., Chan, J.M.-C., Chik, T.S.-H., Lau, D.P.-L., Choi, C.Y.-C., Chen, L.-L., Chan,W.-M., Chan, K.-H., Ip, J.D., Ng, A.C.-K., Poon, R.W.-S., Luo, C.-T., Cheng, V.C.-C.,Chan,J.F.-W.,Hung,I.F.-N.,Chen,Z.,Chen,H.,Yuen,K.-Y.,2020.Temporal profiles of viral load in posterior oropharyngeal saliva samples and serum antibody responses during infection by SARS-CoV-2: an observational cohort study. Lancet. Infect. Dis. https://doi.org/10.1016/S1473-3099(20)30196-1

[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

[Abuhegazy 2020] M. Abuhegazy1 e et al. (2020) Num. investigation of aerosol transport in a classroom with relevance to COVID-19 Physics of Fluids 32, 103311, https://doi.org/10.1063/5.0029118

SUPPLEMENTARY FIGURES

Figure S1 – Definition of Safety Zone from the $R_{c,5h}$ function



Figure S2 – Figures 6a and 6b "clean" (no triangles)

b)



a)