The role of classroom volume, natural ventilation and voice reduction in transmission risk 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 countries are planning to keep schools open during the whole winter season 2020/21. This poses 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. Moreover, most schools are not provided with mechanical ventilation/filtartion systems to date. Fundamental and urgent questions to be addressed are therefore: to which extent can we contain the airborne transmission risk in schools through natural ventilation only? can we reduce the airborne risk with easy to implement countermeasures like lowering the speaking volume? To answer these questions a theoretical risk model based on the emission rate of viral charge from an infective subject has been developed extending previous models for tubercolosis and influenza. The case of an infective student or an infective teacher in a classroom, as well as an infective teacher with microphone have been investigated and compared with infection thresholds for different group sizes. The model also considers the influence of indoor-outdoor temperature difference on the air exchange rate, which seems to be particularly strong during winter.

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

Keywords:

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

1. Introduction

Currently, tense debates are still ongoing on schools as possible contagion triggers of SARS-CoV-2 (both direct and indirect) while it is well known that the issue of school re-opening has many socio-economical implications in all countries. In the middle of the second pandemic wave and waiting for a probable third wave, it is important to shed more light on effective mitigation strategies to control airborne contagion risk in schools. Airborne infections originate from viral aerosol formation and the cumulative nature of air saturation. As stated in studies like [1] and recently recognized by WHO, "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. Many evidences of airborne transmission causing outbreaks in enclosed environments were reported from the early stage of Covid-19 pandemics [2]. Several outbreaks in schools have also been reported in different countries [3-5]. In a study on Israeli schools based on extended slub-testing on scholars, the occurrence of airborne transmission as probable main cause of infection in crowded classes has been well documented [6]. Although most of the relevant past literature has focused on the spread of tuberculosis or influenza in hospitals, the general principle of airborne transmission is valid and pertinent also for SARS-CoV2 in the context of school classrooms since these are enclosed settings which may host asymptomatic sources. Proper ventilation was proven to significantly reduce long distance oral transmission of infective diseases like tuberculosis and influenza in confined environments (e.g., [7-9]). Hence, indirect oral transmission of SARS-CoV2 is also believed to be effectively curbed through the frequent opening of windows or by mechanical "heating,ventilatingHVAC systems [8,27]. Very recent (although still unpublished) measurements of SARS-CoV2 air concentrations in ventilated and non-ventilated hospital rooms performed by the Italian Regional Environmental Agency "ARPA Piemonte" would confirm this statement [10]. Compared to natural ventilation, mechanical ventilation systems, when adequately configured, could be equally or even more effective [8, 11]. 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). Mobile air purifiers have been also proven effective in reducing the aerosol viral load in classrooms [12]. However, compared to windows opening they require careful positioning and handling, HEPA filtering and additional pre-filter stages which have some impact on costs and overall energy efficiency. Such systems are mostly recommended (and investigated) in countries where winter outside temperatures are so low that opening windows would cause excessive discomfort.

In the real context of school classrooms, 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 one infective student or teacher source in the same classroom. This issue is of concern also when social distancing is correctly implemented because of the volumetric nature of aerosol clouds. On the other hand, as suggested also by intuition, frequent natural ventilation could help dilute the viral load by allowing fresh air from the outside to enter classrooms. A preliminary numerical investigation by one of the authors [13] showed the case of an infective student source in a classroom. However, thermal effects affecting the ventilation airflow as well as the infective teacher case and ffp2 masks were not investigated. In the present work we present the infective teacher case and its important implications on the airborne risk mitigation strategy. Furthermore, we improved the general GN-model introducing the indoor/outdoor thermal gradient affecting the airflow during windows opening and the effective volume of dilution to account for a more realistic aerosol physics. In the present study we investigate a comprehensive mitigation strategy which include the novelties of a voice amplification system to reduce the source emission rate, the impact of overall voice reduction by all subjects in a classroom as well as the impact of splitting large class groups. An appropriate scheduling of lesson intervals (breaks) is particularly critical during the winter season, since only during breaks one can imagine to fully open the windows and dilute the viral load. On the other hand, complete windows opening during lesson time may increase the risk of other diseases. This motivates a theoretical/computational framework to compare short and long ventilation cycles as well as all different risk mitigation factors, including class splitting and microphones. The strategy illustrated in the present analysis is based on natural ventilation combined with facemasks and reduction of the emission rate at the source level. Although designed as a temporary solution, this strategy has the advantage to be immediately feasible and low cost. The same modelling framework, however, could also be employed for schools adopting HVAC systems (since what counts is ultimately the air exchange rate, not its source).

2. Methods

2.1 GN-model with perfect mixing and face masks

The infection risk model used in the present analysis is based on the Gammaitoni-Nucci (GN) model, originally developed for tubercolosi and influenza which is adequate for confined, ventilated environments [14]. This consolidated 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 infective 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 [1], 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. In the GN model, if the number of infective sources 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 a well known exponential law for increasing exposure time t, which strictly depends on the parameter $\overline{ER_q}$ and the ventilation ratio *p/AER*, where *p* is the average inhalation flow (related to pulmonary capacity) and *AER* is the inflow of clean air provided by natural or mechanical ventilation. To account for the complex phenomenon of viral inactivation and gravitational deposition on surfaces [15], the air exchange rate (AER) in (2-4) is more properly substituted from an *infective virus removal rate* *(*$IVRR = AER + \lambda + k$*)* which adds to the 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 has been neglected also based on the fact that in winter heating systems in a classroom would tend to move air upward. In addition, k values for standard non-heated environments are found in literature below 0.25 vol/h [16]. 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:

$$R_{airborne}(t, I = 1) = 1 - e^{\left[-\frac{p\,\overline{ER_q}}{V}\,\frac{IVRR\cdot t + e^{-IVRR\cdot t} - 1 - \left(\frac{IVRR\cdot n_0}{\overline{ER_q}}\right)e^{-Nt} + \left(\frac{IVRR\cdot n_0}{\overline{ER_q}}\right)}{IVRR^2}\right]} =$$

$$= 1 - e^{\left[-\frac{p\,\overline{ER_q}}{V}\,\varphi(t, n_0)\right]} \qquad (3)$$

Where

$$\varphi = IVRR \cdot t + e^{-IVRR \cdot t} - 1 - \left(\frac{IVRR \cdot n_0}{\overline{ER_q}}\right) e^{-Nt} + \left(\frac{IVRR \cdot n_0}{\overline{ER_q}}\right). \quad (4)$$

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]*
I	*Number of infective sources*	*persons*	*1*
$S = N - I + 1$	*Number of susceptible persons*	*persons*	*15-30*
N	*Number of students per classroom*	*persons*	*15-30*
C	*Number of infected persons (contagions)*	*persons*	*0-30*
$R=C/S$	*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*
V_{eff}	*effective classroom volume*	m^3	*150*
$Q(t)$	*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 [28]*
K^{**}	*deposition rate*	h^{-1}	*0-0.25 [16]*
$IVRR\ (t)$	*infective 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 t=0*	*quanta*	*≥0*
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*

The IVRR in eq. (3) and (4) is dominated by the AER term due to natural ventilation (HVAC systems are not considered here). Different factors affects natural ventilation in a classroom, such as temperature difference between the classroom and the outdoor space during windows opening, wind direction and average wind speed, as well as geometric factors such as window size and position [15]. As for thermal effects in winter conditions, a high temperature difference $|T_i - T_e|$ between indoor and outdoor temperatures is expected. In the present study we investigated a typical winter condition: indoor temperature maintained at $T_i = +20°C$ by the school heating system and an external temperature near to 0 °C, so that $|T_i - T_e|$ = 20 °C. This impacts the through-window ventilation flow. According to the recently revised Euronorm 16798-7:2018 [23] the single-sided airflow Q_w through an open windows with a given T-difference is approximately estimated by the formula (valid for moderate wind velocities): $Q_w = 1800 \cdot \frac{\rho_{a;ref}}{\rho_z} \cdot A_w(0.0035 \cdot h_w \cdot |T_i - T_e|)^{0.5}$ with $A_w, h_w, \frac{\rho_{a;ref}}{\rho_z}$ beeing the total open windows area, the windows height and the air density ratio between reference air density and density of the considered zone. This implies an AER through windows opening which becomes function of the internal-external temperature difference:

$$IVRR \approx AER_w = \frac{1800}{V} \cdot \frac{\rho_{a;ref}}{\rho_z(T_i)} \cdot A_w(0.0035 \cdot h_w \cdot |T_i - T_e|)^{0.5} \quad (5)$$

All curves were calculated for a typical classroom of volume 8 * 7 * 3 ≅ 170 m^3, with an effective volume for aerosol diffusion of 150 m^3. Hence, for such a standard classroom the resulting AER during windows opening results as:

$$AER_w^{winter} \cong 1675\, A_w(0.07 \cdot h_w)^{0.5} \quad (6)$$

Supplementary Fig. S1 indicates the temperature dependence of AER_w assuming two typical values of (A_w, h_w) in high school classrooms where windows were partially open. It is noted that geometrical windows parameters may also change strongly in different school buildings, or even in different classrooms in the same building. Investigating such specific dependencies, however, lies outside the scope of the present work.

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 infective 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:

$$R^{mask}(t) = 1 - e^{\left[-(1-f_{out})(1-f_{in})\frac{p\,\overline{ER_q}}{V}\,\varphi(t)\right]} \tag{7}$$

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 [7] 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. [17]) 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 [24]. 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 [7] 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. For instance, a recommendation by the italian 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. Since mask filtering effectiveness varies from person to person and over the total exposure time, a rather large variation interval (from 50% to 100%) was considered for the filtering effectiveness.

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

$$n(t) = \frac{\overline{ER_q}}{IVRR} + \left[n_0 - \frac{\overline{ER_q}}{IVRR}\right] e^{-IVRRt} \tag{8}$$

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. This parameter is also strongly affected by specific human behaviour. Finally it depends on the different microdroplet populations in the emitted

aerosol which vary based on the specific voice activity (voiced counting, whispered counting, unmodulated vocalization, breathing). The emission rate can then be described by the following formula [18] valid only for one specific expiratory activity indexed with j. Additionally, the formula can be well approximated with a 4 channel particle size distribution [25]:

$$\overline{ER}_q^{j,w} = c_{RNA} \cdot c_i \cdot p^w \cdot \int_0^{10\mu m} N_d^j(D) dV_d(D) \approx c_{RNA} \cdot c_i \cdot p^w \cdot \sum_{i=1}^4 \overline{N}_{D,i}^j \, \overline{V}_{D,i}^j \quad (9)$$

In (9), the parameter c_v is the viral load in the sputum (viral RNA copies mL^{-1}) to be estimated experimentally via clinical assessments of viral loads, c_i is a conversion factor having units in quanta·RNA copies^{-1} (ratio between one infective quantum and the infective dose), p^w is the pulmonary or inhalation rate (m^3 h^{-1}) related to a particular k-th body activity (resting, standing, etc), whereas $\overline{N}_{D,i}^j \, \overline{V}_{D,i}^j$ (related to the voice activity) is the product in (mL m^{-3}) between the average droplet density and the average droplet volume for the 4-modal droplet distribution expelled by a subject during voicing or breathing. For SARS-type viruses, experimental estimations of all parameters in equation (9) are reported in [18,20,21].

In addition, while considering the real behaviour of a teacher or a student one should introduce a further time-average of (9) – which is indeed already a time-average over the kth-body activity. The reason is that both subjects (during teaching or attending lesson) do not behave permanently (i.e., for hours) in one fixed category of vocal activity and pulmonary rate. Therefore, one should better consider a double averaged $\overline{\overline{ER}}_q$ as:

$$\overline{\overline{ER}}_q = \frac{1}{t}\int_0^t \overline{ER}_q(t)dt = c_{RNA} c_i \frac{1}{t}\int_0^t \int_0^{10\mu m} p(t) N_d(D,t) dV_d(D,t) dt \quad (10)$$

One way to estimate $\overline{\overline{ER}}_q$ for the present cases is to consider a student a resting person and a teacher a standing person, which turns in approximating (10) as:

$$\overline{\overline{ER}}_q^{stud,teach} \approx \frac{1}{t}\sum_{j=1}^3 t_j \cdot c_{RNA} \cdot c_i \cdot \overline{p}^{stud,teach} \cdot \sum_{i=1}^4 \overline{N}_{D,i}^j \, \overline{V}_{D,i}^j = \quad (11)$$

$$= \frac{1}{t}(t_{breathing}\overline{ER}_q^{breathing} + t_{sp.loud}\overline{ER}_q^{speak.loud} + t_{sp.quiet}\overline{ER}_q^{speak.quiet})$$

In (11) only two "voice activities" from the source and their related netto times t_j are considered (breathing without speaking and speaking). In fact, during teaching there are speaking periods alternated with pauses. Secondly, voice volume of the teacher may also vary [26]. The same for students attending lectures who may put questions or comments and randomly vary their voice activity and intensity. Estimations of the $\overline{\overline{ER}}_q^{stud,teach}$ used in all

simulations are reported in appendix.

Even if teachers stay in a given classroom in average for two hours only, they are speaking most of this time. In primary and secondary schools they are also speaking loudly and sometimes screaming. This makes them a much greater viral source compared to students. In the present analysis, an $\overline{\overline{ER_q}}$ value of 32± quanta h^{-1} was estimated for an infective teacher speaking at a moderately high volume, whereas a lower value of 16 quanta h^{-1} was derived for the same subject speaking quietly through a microphone. To potentially infective students sitting at their desk most of the time, lower values were calculateded (reported in appendix), as they were considered resting persons speaking less frequently than teachers.

2.3 Influence of windows opening function on the infective 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 (Figure), with peaks influenced by higher values of the air exchange rate (AER) as due to partial windows opening (2vol/h) or almost complete windows opening (up to 10 vol/h). In this study we explored the influence on the classroom risk function of two different cycles of the AER function. Two different ventilation cycles (long and short) were calculated for each curve (Fig. 2). Another factor to be considered is the effective volume to be considered to dilute the aerosol viral cloud under the perfect mixing approximation. According to recent CFD simulations of aerosol cloud in classrooms [22] , aerosol particles from a student source would not be diluted over the entire volume even after a transient of 300s and the viral cloud volume during the first part of the emission transient would be negligible compared to V. For these reasons an effective lower volume V_{eff} = 0.85 V in equation (3) and (4) was considered for the present analysis.







Figure 1. *Evolution of cumulative collective risk and total viral load in a classroom of volume V with a positive teacher source (long breaks of 20 min after lectures of 100 min). All presents are supposed to wear face masks with 80% effective filter efficiency.* ***a)*** *Situation at the beginning of the lesson, white markers indicate R(0) and n(0).* ***b)*** *Air change/dilution due to windows opening after the first break.* ***c)*** *Situation after 3 hours with one probable infection.* ***d)*** *the same as in c) with less intense voicing preventing the contagion (teacher speaking through an amplified microphone).*



Figure 2 *Time profiles of infectious virus removal rate (IVRR = AER + k + λ) as determined by periodic windows opening used as input. a) long cycles: 100-min lessons and 20-min breaks. b) short cycles: 50-min lessons with 10-min breaks.*

3. Results and Discussion

3.1 Simulation results

Airborne risk curves in a classroom of 170 m^3 with one infective source based on the thermally extended GN-model are plotted in Figs. 3a-d in log-scale. The infective teacher case is shown in Figs. 3a and b. Figs 4c and d show the infective student case for comparison (preliminary results were presented in [13]). In both cases, however, the deviation of red curves from the reference curve ("no mitigations") highlights the significant impact of natural ventilation alone (in the red curves, face masks were intentionally not included to isolate the net contribution of air ventilation). This reduction was about 50-60% at the lecture's end. The additional mitigation effect of surgical masks (under the assumption they are worn by all subjects) causes a further risk mitigation of 35–45 % (depending on the effective time they are properly worn). Notably, shorter (but more frequent) breaks perform better than longer ones in all risk curves.

Teacher risk curves increase more steeply in the first 2 hours of exposure time when compared to infective student curves (Fig. 3a vs 3c). This is due to the higher average emission rate of a teaching person compared to a student sitting on a desk and speaking less frequently. In case of a microphone connected to a voice amplifier and used by a teacher, a reduced emission rate (by almost 40%) lower the risk levels for the exposed group considerably. This decrease is about -20% if considering natural ventilation as the only mitigation factor besides microphone, and up to -40% when adding the surgical masks (red and blue arrows in the middle of Fig. 3a-b). In case of a positive student source, one can still differentiate between students speaking normally and students speaking at a moderate volume (Fig. 3d). Although a microphone passed from student to student must be excluded as possible direct infection source, a more feasible scenario could be that of scholars expressly required to speak quietly. In this case, the cumulative risk levels would decrease even more: a relative delta of -50% can be observed for all curves after 5 hours exposure time. This fact can be explained with a more prolonged exposure of individuals to the infective source (5h instead of 2h) and, at the same time, a larger timespan for the mitigation effect to act (voice reduction). After the teacher has left the room, the ER_q in that room drops to zero, but the viral charge previously emitted by him/her will still be present for the next hours until the end of the lesson (although it will lower down after several ventilation cycles — as indicated from n(t) plots in Fig. 4). According to the GN risk model, thus, rest viral load is responsible for a further (although lower) increase of R_c during the next hours, even if the teacher source is no longer present.

The case of an infective student shows some important differences in the shape and final level of risk curves. Higher levels are caused by the risk still increasing after half exposure time whereas teacher curves saturate earlier to lower levels (Figs 3c-d). This fact is eventually due to the infective student source re-entering classroom after each break and emitting until the end of the lessons. On the other hand, the one-infection thresholds are reached earlier in case of an infective teacher (blue and black curves intersecting the dotted gray lines in Fig. 3a-c and

3b-d). It is then confirmed that crowded classes with 30 students are a clearly more dangerous situation in case of an infective teacher source. Hence, in such a case equipping the teacher with a microphone plus amplifier would be a valuable mitigation countermeasure. Moreover, due to the lowering of one-contagion-threshold, crowded classes of 30 students in limited volumes (V < 170 m^3) should be avoided. A recommended alternative would be the splitting of the class in smaller groups alternating in face-to-face mode (Fig. 6). As a rule, keep the number of students per classroom as low as possible helps reducing the contagion risk because obviously the infection threshold lowers as N increases.



Figure 3 *Mitigation of airborne risk in a classroom* a *ventilation. a) Infective teacher standing and* b *(V_{eff} = 150 m^3) through face masks and teaching. b) Infective teacher speaking more quietly with mask + microphone + amplifier (-40% ER_q). c) Normal infective student case. d) Infective student speaking at moderate voice volume. Partial ventilation (AER=2 vol/h) was assumed during breaks (continuous plots refer to long ventilation cycles, dashed plots to short cycles).*


n(t) - total viral charge - 1 positive teacher
a
[ERq=25 quanta/h]
20 min 2.5 vol/h
(partial windows opening)
20 min AER 10 vol/h
(full windows opening)
n(t) [quanta]
t [h]
b
[ERq=15 quanta/h]
Teacher speaking
with a microphone
20 min AER=2 vol/h
(partial windows opening)
20 min AER=10 vol/h
(full windows opening)
n(t) - total viral charge - 1 positive student
c
[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
d
[ERq=7 quanta/h]
20 min 2.5 vol/h
(full open windows)
20 min MV 10 vol/h (mech. Vent.)
t [ore]

313

Figure 4 *Total viral load in classroom. a) teacher speaking for 2h at normal voice volume. b) teacher speaking more quietly through a microphone + voice amplifier. Partial and full windows opening scenarios are also compared.*

Airborne risk is also strongly affected by classroom volume as illustrated in Fig. 5. In classrooms of doubled volume (300 m^3 instead of 150 m^3) the risk after 5h lessons is almost the half for both cases (infective teacher and infective student). This may be the case of classrooms in historical buildings (at least in Italy), where the room height may increase from standard 3m to almost 5m.



Figure 5 *Effect of classroom volume on the infection risk calculated with the GN model (75% face mask effectiveness, surgical masks, IVRR = 5.5 vol/h at each interval).*



Figure 5 *Classrooms of different volumes: a. school in Italian historical building b. standard Italian school building*

Table 2 *Summary of airborne infection risk values at the end of a school day in different conditions. All presents are wearing surgical masks.*

Source	Ventilation during breaks [Vol/h]	Source emission timepan [h]	Face-mask effectiveness	ERq range* [quanta h-1]	$\overline{\overline{ERq}}$ [quanta h-1]	R_c(5h)
Teacher	2	2h	75%	1-80	32	2.3%
	10	2h	75%			1.15%
Teacher with microphone	2	2h	75%	0.5-30	16	0.9%
	10	2h	75%			
Student	2	5h	75%	0.7-60	13	1.7%

	10	5h	75%			
Student speaking quietly	2	5h	75%	0.2-20	6	0.6%
	10	5h	75%			

4. Conclusions

Cumulative airborne risk is the key to understand indirect infections of SARS-CoV-2 in classrooms (which may eventually turn in outbreaks within a school building). The mitigation of the airborne risk in schools is linked to the main and larger goal of keeping most schools open and safe during the pandemics. Although the dynamic single-zone model employed here contains some important approximations, clear indications arise from the numerical analysis. Firstly, students and teachers are exposed in schools for relatively long time to indirect infections via viral aerosol and standard sanitation/ventilation cycles cannot lower the residual viral load nor the risk to zero. On the other hand, airborne risk values can be mitigated to reasonable levels by a combination of several mitigation factors. In the present situation where most schools are still not equipped with dedicated HVAC systems for controlling air ventilation and filtering at the classroom level, the regular opening of classroom windows at defined intervals can be an effective (although provisional) solution acting as mitigation co-factor which alone almost halves the airborne risk. The model also confirms that only a combination of a precise natural ventilation schedule with protective masks properly worn by all exposed subjects can reduce the airborne transmission risk to acceptable levels. Concerning more specific countermeasures, it has been shown that equipping teachers with microphone and voice amplifier as well as requesting students to



speak quietly during lessons

Figure 6 *Half classes in face-to-face mode (with rotating subgroups) vs full classes on alternate days. In the latter (unrecommended) case one may note the increased number of students in contact with the viral cloud emitted by the infective source*

are effective and feasible mitigation factors which contribute to keep the airborne risk levels below safety thresholds. Finally, splitting crowded classes of 30 students into smaller alternating groups of 15 has a dramatic beneficial effect on the collective contagion risk. This is ultimately due to the volumetric nature of the aerosol cloud (Fig. 5). Combining all these factors, one could achieve the desired goal of zero indirect infections in a classroom during the full exposure time. However, it is remarked that a natural ventilation strategy was suggested as a compromise emergency solution for the vast majority of schools still not equipped with HVAC systems. For the middle and long-term future, equipping schools with dedicated HVAC systems remain a preferrable option for what concerns energy efficiency, thermal comfort and ventilation control.

In regions where the likelihood of one or more asymptomatic source seems particularly high or to increase steeply, a class splitting strategy is recommended, particularly for large groups (≥ 25 students). In this regard, we still need to solve a statistical open problem: the estimation of the local probability function $p^{local}(I \geq 1|N)$ of having at least one asymptomatic source in a given classroom of N students located in a certain region.

Finally, a revision of social distancing norms in schools (currently based on linear distancing) is urgently required. This means introducing the classroom volume as a safety parameter (since airborne transmission in its nature is a volumetric problem). Classrooms compliant for social distancing but small in height, should be furtherly checked to guarantee a minimum height (and volume). If a relatively small volume would cause the risk function to increase above the contagion thresholds, one of the illustrated mitigations should be adopted.

Bibliography

[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

[2] Qian, H, Miao, T, Liu, L, Zheng, X, Luo, D, Li, Y. "Indoor transmission of SARS-CoV-2". Indoor Air. 2020; 00: 1–7. https://doi.org/10.1111/ina.12766

[3] Aiano, Felicity et al. "COVID-19 Outbreaks Following Full Reopening of Primary and Secondary Schools in England: Retrospective, Cross-Sectional National Surveillance" (January 14, 2021). Available atSSRN: https://ssrn.com/abstract=3766014 or http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3766014

[4] Italian Health Institut (ISS) - Report ISS COVID-19 n. 63/2020 "Apertura delle scuole e andamento dei casi confermati di SARS-CoV-2: la situazione in Italia" pp. 16.

[5] Otte im Kampe, Eveline et al. Eurosurveillance, 25, 2001645 (2020), Surveillance of COVID-19 school outbreaks, Germany, March to August 2020 -https://doi.org/10.2807/1560-7917.ES.2020.25.38.2001645.

[6] Stein-Zamir C, Abramson N, Shoob H, et al. A large COVID-19 outbreak in a high school 10 days after schools' reopening, Israel, May 2020. Euro Surveill. 2020;25(29):2001352. doi:10.2807/1560-7917.ES.2020.25.29.2001352

[7] 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

[8] 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.

[9] 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

[10] 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/

[11] 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)

[12] J. Curtius , M. Granzin & J. Schrod (2021): Testing mobile air purifiers in a school classroom: Reducing the airborne transmission risk for SARS-CoV-2, Aerosol Science and Technology, DOI: 10.1080/02786826.2021.1877257

[13] A.Zivelonghi "The airborne risk transmission of SARS-CoV-2 in high- schools estimated with a single zone dynamic model" AiCARR Journal / Vol 64, n. 5, 49 - 54, 2020

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

[15] 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

[16] Chatoutsidou, S.E., Lazaridis, M., 2019. Assessment of the impact of particulate dry deposition on soiling of indoor cultural heritage objects found in churches and museums/libraries. J. Cult. Heritage 39, 221–228. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.culher.2019.02.017.

[17] 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

[18] 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.

[19] 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.

[20] 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

[21] 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

[22] 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

[23] EN16798-7 "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), "6.4.3.5.4 – Calculation of ventilation through windows using wind velocity and temperature difference as input".

[24] 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

[25] Morawska, L., Johnson, G.R., Ristovski, Z.D., Hargreaves, M., Mengersen, K., Corbett, S.,Chao, C.Y.H., Li, Y., Katoshevski, D., 2009. Size distribution and sites of origin ofdroplets expelled from the human respiratory tract during expiratory activities. J.
Aerosol Sci. 40, 256–269. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jaerosci.2008.11.002.

[26] Asadi, S., Wexler, A.S., Cappa, C.D. et al. Aerosol emission and superemission during human speech increase with voice loudness. Sci Rep 9, 2348 (2019). https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-019-38808-z

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

[28] 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.

APPENDIX

Table A1 *Estimations of ERq levels*

	Voice Activity	$ER_{q,min}$	$ER_{q,max}$	$ER_{q,med}$	t_{br}	$t_{sp,low}$	t_{sp_normal}	$\overline{\overline{ER}}q$	±σ
		(quanta/h)			(% time)			(quanta/h)	
Teacher	normal	1	80	40,5	15	10	75	32,1	±6,2
	low	0,5	30	15,25					
	breathing	0,1	2	1,05					
Teacher + microphone	normal	1	80	40,5	15	75	10	15,4	±3,0
	low	0,5	30	15,25					
	breathing	0,1	2	1,05					
Student	normal	0,7	70	35,35	65	0	35	13,1	±2,5
	low	0,2	20	10,1					
	breathing	0,1	2	1,05					
Student speaking quietly	normal	0,7	70	35,35	65	35	0	6,0	±1,2
	low	0,2	30	15,1					
	breathing	0,1	2	1,05					

A.2 Cumulative risk

It is important to stress that the GN-model applied to a classroom situation is based on the concept of cumulative risk. When the infective source is removed from the environment (e.g. student or teacher leaving the classroom during breaks), the ER_q parameter in equations (7) and (9) is espected to become zero. However, even when ER_q=0 in (7), the infection risk $R_q^{mask}(t)$ would remain greater than zero, because it is by definition a "collective measure of risk referred to a group of individuals" and should keep memory of previous contagions. Mathematically, this is assured by the multiplicative factor $\varphi_q(t)$ in (7) which, intuitively, is non-zero bacause of the viral load already present in the environment after the previous lesson.Assuming cyclic lecture+break sequences of the same duration t_{lec} + t_{brk}, the probability of infection at istant t after the i-th lecture followed by the i-th break (assuming an initial viral load n_0) is then a composed function:

$$R_i(t) = \begin{cases} R_{lec,i}(t_i) = 1 - e^{\left[-\frac{p\,\overline{ER_q}}{V}\ \varphi_i(t_i, n_{0,i},\ IVRR)\right]} & if\ \ 0 \le t_i \le t^{lec} \\ R_{brk,i}(t_i) = 0 & if\ \ t^{lec} < t_i < \ t^{lec} + t^{brk} \end{cases} \qquad (12)$$

The same for the viral load in ambient:

$$n_i(t) = \begin{cases} n_{lec,i}(t_i) = \frac{\overline{ER_q}}{IVRR} + \left[n_0 - \frac{\overline{ER_q}}{IVRR}\right] e^{-IVRR \cdot t_i}\ \ if\ \ 0 \le t_i \le t^{lec} \\ n_{brk,i}(t_i) = \left[n_{lec,i}\left(t_i^{lec}\right)\right] e^{-IVRR(t+t_i^{lec})} \qquad if\ \ t^{lec} < t_i < \ t^{lec} + t^{brk} \end{cases} \qquad (13)$$

Most importantly, when considering the total number of infections occurred in a classroom (after a certain number of classes and breaks), the variable of practical interest is not the single risk function during a single lecture, $R_{lec,i}\ (t)$, (which starts from zero after each break), but 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:

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

$$= R_{lec,i}\left(t\ -\ (i-1)(t^{lec} + t^{brk})\right) + \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} R_{lec,j}\left(t_j^{lec},\ n_{0j}\right) \qquad (14)$$

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). During a break, if all students/pupils leave the environment where the viral aerosol has gradually accumulated, $R_{c,i}\ (t)$ will not increase (in that classroom) and the function will 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 so that a residual viral load in corridors just at the beginning of breaks can be fully neglected. Secondly, any new contagion occurring either inside or outside the classroom should not be considered as a new source because of the incubation period for Covid-19 (which is more than some days). The same rationale is valid for the total viral charge which cumulates and (although decreasing during breaks bacuase of absence of viral source) must be updated after each interval. Two python routines which implements equations (12-14) were developed for the infective teacher and the infective student case. For at least one infection to occur, the cumulative group 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 exposure time is:

$$R_c(t\ ) < \frac{1}{S_0} \qquad (15)$$



and not $R_{lec,i}$ (t) < $1/S_0$.

Figure S1 *Effect of indoor/outdoor temperature difference on the air-exchange-rate by windows opening (blue curves) in a typical classroom according to the EN 16798-7 (single-sided ventilation) [23]. Marked blue dots indicate AER values used in simulations at Ti – Te = 20°C. Times for one exchanged volume are also shown.*