

1

2

3 Full Title: From classic to rap: Airborne transmission of
4 different singing styles, with respect to risk assessment of a
5 SARS-CoV-2 infection

6

7 Short Title: Airborne transmission of singers

8

9 Bernhard Richter^{1,2}, Anna Hipp^{1,2}, Bernd Schubert³, Marcus Rudolf Axt⁴, Markus Stratmann⁴,
10 Christian Schmölder⁴, Claudia Spahn^{1,2}

11

12

13 ¹ Freiburg Institute for Musicians' Medicine, Medical Centre University of Freiburg,
14 University of Music Freiburg, Faculty of Medicine at the Albert-Ludwigs-University of
15 Freiburg, Germany

16 ² Freiburg Centre for Research and Technology in Music, Germany

17 ³ Tintschl BioEnergie und Strömungstechnik AG, Tintschl Unternehmensgruppe, Erlangen,
18 Bavaria, Germany

19 ⁴ Bamberg Symphony, Bamberg, Bavaria, Germany

20

21

22 Corresponding author: anna.maria.hipp@uniklinik-freiburg.de; Dr. Anna Maria Hipp,
23 Elsässerstr. 2m, 79110 Freiburg i.Br.

24 **1. Abstract**

25 Since the Covid-19 virus spreads through airborne transmission, questions concerning the risk
26 of spreading infectious droplets during singing and music making has arisen.

27 To contribute to this question and to help clarify the possible risks, we analyzed 15 singing
28 scenarios (1) qualitatively – by making airflows visible, while singing – and (2) quantitatively
29 – by measuring air velocities at three distances (1m, 1.5m and 2m). Air movements were
30 considered positive when lying above 0.1 m/s, which is the usual room air velocity in venue,
31 such as the concert hall of the Bamberg Symphony, where our measurements with three
32 professional singers (female classical style, male classic style, female popular music style)
33 took place.

34 Our findings highlight that high measurements for respiratory air velocity while singing are
35 comparable to measurements of speaking and – by far – less than coughing. All
36 measurements for singing stayed within a reach of 1.5m, while only direct voiceless blowing
37 achieved measurements at the 2m sensor. Singing styles that use plosive sounds, i.e. using
38 consonants more often as in rap, produced the highest air velocities of 0.17 m/s at the 1m
39 sensor. Also, singing while wearing a facemask produces no air movements over 0.1 m/s.

40 On the basis of our recent studies on measurements of airflows and air velocities of
41 professional singers and wind instrument players, as well as further studies on CO₂
42 measurements in room settings of music activities, we publish our results – in consideration
43 of further up-to-date research – in our frequently updated risk assessment (first published in
44 April 2020). On this behalf, we suggest 2m radial distances for singers, especially in choirs.

45

46

47 **2. Keywords:**

48 SARS-CoV-2 pandemic, Covid-19 virus infection, singers, dispersion of airborne
49 transmissions, airflow, air velocity

50

51 **3. Introduction**

52 The coronavirus pandemic has had and still has a great impact on singing, especially while
53 performing in groups, since the SARS-CoV-2 virus infection is transported through droplets
54 from the respiratory system and can emit from the mouth opening to the surrounding air [1].
55 Hence, prevailing questions concern mostly distance regulations and the fundamental
56 questions as to whether and how individual lessons or ensemble and choir rehearsals (in
57 different settings, levels of profession, as well as amateur choirs) can take place. Since it is
58 known that music making in general, and therefore singing, has an extended influence on a
59 person's well-being [2, 3, 4], these questions concern 4 million people in Germany who sing
60 in a choir, of which 2.2 million amateur singers are registered in a choir union [5].

61 In the following, we need to know at what distance air movements are being produced while
62 singing and how these air velocities can be evaluated in comparison to usual air movements,
63 such as speaking or coughing, as well as considering usual room air velocities.

64 The measurements of our study took place in the concert hall of the Bamberg Symphony (see
65 Appendix 1) at the beginning of May 2020, when singing in choirs indoors was mainly
66 prohibited. Up to then, there were no general recommendations on choir rehearsals, singing in
67 smaller ensembles or single teaching situations, due to the lack of well-founded scientific
68 medical studies.

69 Considering up-to-date research, there are those looking into singers and/or wind instruments,
70 focusing either on their respiratory airflows or measuring aerosol clouds.

71 The study by the Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München and the University of Erlangen
72 [6, 7] investigated different forms of speaking and singing with 10 professional singers of the
73 Bavarian Radio Choir. They made respiratory flows visible by exhaling the smoke of e-
74 cigarettes (not containing nicotine). Tests were conducted in a shaded room and documented
75 the exhaled aerosol clouds with the help of a high-speed camera and laser light. Comparing
76 different settings (singing text, speaking text and singing without text, once with soft and once
77 with loud phonation), they found out that singing text and speaking text reaches comparable
78 mean distances of up to 0.85m, while singing without text reached the lowest values of
79 0.63m. Even though the mean measurements stayed within a reach of 1m, some singers
80 reached distances of up to 1.4m. These measurements were then compared to coughing,
81 which turns out to reach even further, with a mean of 1.3m and a maximum of 1.9m. On the
82 basis of their study, they announce a suggestion for distance regulations of at least 2m to the
83 front.

84 Mürbe et al. [8] pre-published a study on the increase of aerosols during professional singing.
85 Testing 8 professional singers (two female sopranos, two female altos, two male tenors and
86 two male baritones) of the RIAS chamber choir Berlin, they measured particle emission rates
87 with the help of a laser particle counter during breathing, reading, singing and holding long
88 tones. They confirmed their assumptions of singing producing higher emission rates than
89 speaking, with mean measurements of 4.71 – 84.75 P7s during speaking and 753.4 – 6093.14
90 P7s during singing. Women also produced higher particle emission rates than men, leading to
91 the assumption that high voices produce higher sound pressure level than lower voices. On
92 the basis of their findings, they assume that singing produces more emission rates of aerosols

93 than speaking or breathing and that an increase of aerosol rates can be observed with an
94 increasing sound pressure level during singing, especially while holding long tones.

95 In consideration of their study, Mürbe et al. [9], Kriegel & Hartmann [10], and Hartmann et
96 al. [11] published various assessments on the risk of infection with the virus-loaded aerosols,
97 while singing indoors during the SARS-CoV-2-pandemic. They assume that different styles
98 of singing – e.g., singing vs. speaking – as well as different intensities of voice can lead to
99 various sizes and density of droplets and aerosols [9] and that room situations of choir
100 rehearsals have to be taken into account [10, 11].

101 Furthermore, Mürbe et al. found out that child voices emit fewer aerosols during singing than
102 adults [12]. In this study they tested 8 children (four girls and four boys) of semiprofessional
103 children's choirs (Staats- und Domsingknaben Berlin and a girl's choir of the Berlin
104 Singakademie), who were all 13 years old (except one girl was 15 years old). The study was
105 conducted the same way as their previous study on professional adult singers as mentioned
106 above. Their mean measurements show emission rates of 16 – 267 P/s for speaking 141 –
107 1240 P/s for singing, and 683 – 4332 P/s for shouting.

108 In 2019, before the Coronavirus infection started, the study by Asadi et al. [13] observed
109 different speaking situations regarding their particle rate of normal speech in correlation with
110 loudness. They support the hypotheses that coughing and sneezing are emphasizing airborne
111 infectious disease transmissions and point out that loudness of voice is related to the particle
112 rate of aerosols, but also assume that further factors have to be considered.

113 Asahi et. al furthermore emphasize that the generation of aerosols increases with the
114 amplitude of vocalization depending on loudness, but the language spoken (English, Spanish,
115 Mandarin, or Arabic) showed no difference.

116 A study conducted by the University of the German Armed Forces in Munich, which was pre-
117 published in May 2020 [14], analyzed larger droplets when singing and speaking, as well as
118 the flow-related small droplets when singing and playing wind instruments. The study was
119 conducted with a professional singer, two amateur choir singers, five professional musicians
120 (clarinet, flute, oboe, bassoon, and trumpet), and an amateur brass player (trumpet, trombone,
121 and euphonium). This study observed the motion of droplets and air leaving either mouth or
122 outlet during exhalation, which was then illuminated with laser and recorded with a digital
123 camera, producing a series of images that were quantitatively analyzed afterwards. The
124 analysis points out that while singing, airflows at a distance of 0.5m were no longer detectable
125 regardless of volume, pitch or whether the singer was a professional or an amateur. In
126 conclusion, they recommend a minimal radial distance of 1.5m between singers and/or wind
127 instrumentalists.

128 Another recent publication [15] conducted at the Bauhaus-Universität Weimar observed the
129 spread of exhaled air while playing wind instruments and singing using the schlieren imaging
130 with a schlieren mirror and the background oriented schlieren method (BOS) as a way to
131 make respiratory air visible. Two professional singers (baritone and soprano) and eleven wind
132 instruments (woodwinds: oboe, bassoon, Bb clarinet, bass clarinet, grand flute, piccolo, alto
133 flute; brass: Bb trumpet, tenor trombone, French horn, F tuba) of the orchestra Thüringen
134 Philharmonic Gotha, Eisenach, were positioned in front of the schlieren mirror while playing
135 or singing. The findings show that the spreading range, as well as the angle at which the air
136 escapes the mouth or outlet, varies strongly from instrument and player, depending on the
137 structure of the instrument, the structure of the mouthpiece, the way an instrument is blown
138 and individual blowing or breathing capacities.

139 Based on our own studies, we updated our risk assessment for the fifth time, which was first
140 published in April 2020 [17]. Herein we suggest a 2m radial distance between singers, as well

141 as consideration of other factors for safe singing settings, such as social behavior and frequent
142 ventilation to refresh CO₂ emissions [18]. Our study on CO₂ measurements in instrumental
143 and vocal closed room settings showed that singers have lower emission rates than speaking
144 or listening, leading to recommendations on frequent ventilation breaks of 5 to 10 minutes.

145 On behalf of this background, our study aims to provide evidence to the field of singing and
146 music making, by providing funded data on velocity, direction and distance of respiratory air
147 while singing different styles and pitches in comparison to speaking, as well as usual room air
148 velocities.

149

150 **4. Materials and Methods**

151 **4.1 Sample**

152 A professional classically trained free-lance female singer of the Bamberg area, a professional
153 female singer trained in different popular music styles of the Popakademie Baden-
154 Württemberg, and a professional classically trained male singer of the Freiburg University of
155 Music voluntarily took part in the study.

156 For the study, consent was given by the Ethics Committee of the University Medical Center
157 Freiburg.

158 In order to exclude infectious persons, before the measurements the singers were questioned
159 as to whether they had or were still suffering from typical symptoms of the Covid-19 virus
160 disease such as a cough, loss of taste, fever or fatigue. Additionally, the temperatures of the
161 three singers were taken with an electronic fever thermometer directly before entering the
162 concert hall. No one reported suspicious symptoms and the measurements of the temperature
163 showed values under the cut-off of 37,5°C in all persons. Beyond measurements, singers

164 completely covered their mouth and nose with facemasks. The technical staff ensured mouth-
165 nose protection by wearing facemasks during the entire measurements.

166

167

168 **4.2 Design and procedure**

169 The measurements were conducted at the beginning of May 2020 and were initiated by the
170 Bamberg Symphony Orchestra during the first lockdown of the SARS-CoV-2-pandemic in
171 Germany. The three professional singers were singing different styles, speaking or blowing.

172 For the qualitative analysis, the measurements were also filmed on a digital camera,
173 producing videos that were qualitatively analyzed afterwards.

174 The different singing styles of the male classical baritone singer were an excerpt of a music
175 piece and performing utterances including plosives. He was also tested while wearing a
176 facemask, wearing no face mask, while speaking and while blowing directly at the sensors.

177 The female classical singer sang an excerpt of a classical music piece, tried out high pitches,
178 plosive tones and blew directly in the direction of the sensors.

179 The female non-classically trained singer sang an excerpt of a rock song, pop lyrical, musical
180 belting and rap. Furthermore, she was also measured while speaking and directly blowing at
181 the sensors.

182

183 **4.3 Flow visualization**

184 The flow visualization by using artificial mist is one option for on-site inspection of airflows.
185 Using the technique of flow visualization with the FlowMaker™, swirls have been made
186 visible and qualitative at the mouth of the singers [19, 20].

187 Coming into operation was a harmless artificial fog of SAFEX®-Chemie GmbH [21] (also
188 used for germicides in hospitals, due to containing the active component `Thriethylenglycol`),
189 which consists of water droplets and is usually used as stage fog [22]. The fog droplets have a
190 size smaller than 5µm (see Appendix 2) and can therefore be compared to the core droplets
191 potentially carrying the SARS-CoV-2 virus [1].

192 The artificial fog was transported through a system called “Hydra” using a flexible tube to the
193 release spot of the airborne particles. Through the application tube installed on a stand, the
194 fog escaped into the free space of the room and created a cloud of fog. It was oriented towards
195 the mouth of the singers, who sang directly into the cloud.

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

198

199 **4.4 Measurement of air velocity (anemometry)**

200 For the measurement of air velocity, omnidirectional (independent of direction) hot film
201 probes type DISA 54N50 Low Velocity Air Flow Analyzer, manufactured by DANTEC, were
202 used. The probes have a measuring area of 0 – 1 m/s with an accuracy of 0.2 – 0.4 % full
203 scale. The corresponding electronics (LVFA) give a linear voltage signal of 0 – 2 Volts,
204 according to its velocity, which is recorded with a 20 bit-AD converter on the computer.
205 Before the measurements, the measurement chain, sensor – electronic measurement
206 equipment – signaling cable – converter – computer, was verified in the company-owned
207 wind tunnel using a Laser-Doppler-Anemometer (LDA).

208 With a distance of 1m, 1.5m and 2m from the exhaust opening, ball tubes were put on stands
209 and placed in a line. All sensors were at a height of about 1.5m and were adjusted according
210 to the different heights of the singers and their singing direction (see Appendices 3, 4).

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

213

214 **4.5 Measurement report**

215 Among circles of experts on air technology, room air velocities are part of indoor climate
216 discussions. The indoor climate of habitable rooms is called comfort climate: “A climate of
217 comfort persists when people feel thermal at ease in habitable rooms” [23]. Whether a person
218 is feeling comfortable within a room is – amongst other components, like temperature, etc. –
219 dependent on-air velocities, since a comfortable climate is free from draught. Draught is the
220 undesired cooling of the body through air movement. It can be felt from a merit of 0.15 m/s
221 and depends on the size of a room and its ventilation system [23].

222 The perception of comfortableness of concert halls is therefore closely related to ventilation
223 systems of the hall. So-called “well-like ventilations” coming from the floor are usually used
224 nowadays [24]. In floor ventilation the velocity in which the air exits the ventilation system
225 has to be taken into account, since it is regulating how comfortable the audience feels. For
226 concert halls, exit velocities of 0.2 m/s are recommended (in relation to a room temperature of
227 20°C) to not surpass an air velocity of 0.15 m/s at the height of 1m (where the audience is
228 sitting) and to stay in the comfort zone of 0.1 – 0.2 m/s [25]. Hence, for concert halls that
229 have a room temperature of 20°C, room air velocities of 0.1 – 0.16 m/s are usually estimated
230 [23, 26].

231 Looking at the circumstances of the concert hall of the Bamberg Symphony where our
232 measurements took place, the ventilation system was analyzed in 2017 to understand draught
233 appearances on stage, giving our study funded data on the room air conditions, including the
234 room temperature of 22,3°C. Hence, the draught risk – where people start to feel
235 uncomfortable – was stated at 0.15 m/s as the limit, and therefore an area of comfortableness
236 is considered to be from 0.1 – 0.15 m/s [25].

237 These numbers show that measurements under a merit of 0.1 m/s cannot be recognized by
238 people and are comparable to “background noises”. Simultaneously, they point out that a
239 merit of 0.15 m/s is already felt as draught, making the range of room comfortableness

240 between 0.1 – 0.15 m/s. These numbers help to understand the measurements of the air
241 velocities of singers, giving them a relation and comparability. Merits under 0.1 m/s are
242 therefore not considered, while merits of 0.15 or even 0.2 m/s can be understood as
243 remarkable.

244 As a basis for the analysis, charts were produced for every singer, indicating the findings of a
245 singing scenario. These charts compare the airflow visualizations of the video sequences to
246 the measured numbers of airflows at all the three distances (1m, 1.5m, 2m) (see Appendices
247 3, 4).

248 Making use of the descriptive analysis, the measurements of the singing scenarios were also
249 put into a table (see Table 1), comparing air velocities of different singers and styles at the
250 three different distances. This overview showed the maximum values of every singer at every
251 distance, which were compared and put into a relation to the numbers of room
252 comfortableness lying between 0.1 – 0.15 m/s. As mentioned above, a value of 0.3 m/s is felt
253 like a strong draught, whereas a value of 0.1 m/s is not felt at all. Air velocities produced by a
254 performer that are lying under a value of 0.1 m/s do not have an impact on the compartment
255 air and “disappear” amongst “background noises”, meaning velocities. On the other hand, air
256 velocities with a value of over 0.3 m/s are comparable to strong draughts or coughing and
257 therefore have a strong impact on dispersion of air, and therefore on the dispersion of core
258 droplets, such as SARS CoV-2 virus-carrying aerosols.

259

260 **5. Results**

261 **5.1 Qualitative flow visualizations by use of artificial fog**

262 The qualitative observations served the analysis of airflows while singing and gave a first
263 insight into the movement of airflows while singing, speaking and blowing. Aside from that,

264 these qualitative observations were significant to the question of whether different singing
265 styles has an impact on the dispersion of respiratory airflows.

266 During the observations of singing, strong and clear air movements were seen especially
267 while singing plosive tones or rap, and while blowing, aiming for the farthest sensor.

268 Only small movements were seen during singing an excerpt of a classical music piece or
269 different modern styles.

270 In comparison, speaking, singing or even blowing while wearing a facemask caused no
271 visible extraordinary airborne transmission at all. The videos of directly blowing with a face
272 mask show that the mask lifts off the singer's face, making visible that some air movements
273 happen directly at the singers' mouth, but no further movements were visible in the artificial
274 fog.

275 What all qualitative observations have in common, is that they were made close to the body of
276 the three singing persons.

277 Consequently, the qualitative analysis shows that singing does influence respiratory air
278 movements, especially with regard to what is performed. Hence, the question arises on the
279 precise measurements at different distances, and furthermore, at what distance singing can be
280 made possible even during the SARS-CoV-2- pandemic.

281

282 **5.2 Quantitative measurements of air velocity (anemometry)**

283 Air velocity measurements were taken with three singers, performing a total of 15 different
284 scenarios of singing styles and speaking (see Table 1), with and without a facemask, while
285 singing an excerpt of a classical music piece, singing a rock song, pop lyrical, musical belting,
286 performing a rap song, using plosive tones or directly blowing at the sensors or speaking. The
287 numbers point out that directly blowing and aiming for one of the sensors, which is

288 comparable to coughing, reached the highest measurements of air velocities of 0.7 m/s from
289 the classically trained baritone singer, 0.27 m/s from the classically trained soprano singer and
290 0.63 m/s from the non-classically trained singer. The highest measurements for singing
291 reached a value of 0.17 m/s while singing a classical music piece (see Appendix 5),
292 performing high pitches or musical belting (see Appendix 6). These measurements compare
293 to the measurements of speaking (see Table 1 and Appendices 5, 6).

294

295 **Table 1, Maximum measurements of all test settings**

Tests	Test person	Singing style	1m	1.5m	2m
		<i>Male Classical Singer: Baritone</i>			
1	1	Excerpt music piece	0.17m/s	0.12m/s	□0.1m/s
2		Plosive tones	0.13m/s	0.12m/s	□0.1m/s
3		Direct Blowing	0.7m/s	0.34m/s	0.22m/s
4		Singing with a facemask	□0.1m/s	□0.1m/s	□0.1m/s
5		Speaking	0.1m/s	□0.1m/s	□0.1m/s
	2	<i>Female Classical Singer: Soprano</i>			
6		Excerpt music piece	0.15m/s	0.12m/s	<0.1m/s
7		Plosive tones	0.17m/s	0.12m/s	□0.1m/s
8		High pitches	0.15m/s	<0.1m/s	□0.1m/s
9		Direct blowing	0.27m/s	0.21m/s	0.18m/s
		<i>Female popular music styles Singer</i>			
10	3	Rock	0.16m/s	0.12m/s	<0.1m/s
11		Pop lyrical	0.13m/s	0.12m/s	□0.1m/s
12		Musical Belting	0.17m/s	0.13m/s	□0.1m/s
13		Rap	0.15m/s	0.11m/s	□0.1m/s
14		Direct Blowing	0.63m/s	0.33m/s	0.27m/s
15		Speaking	0.17m/s	0.12m/s	0.1m/s

296

297 **5.2.1 Classically trained baritone singer**

298 *Excerpt of music piece*

299 When the baritone singer was singing without a facemask, maximal measurements reached
 300 values of up to 0.17 m/s at the 1m sensor. At 1.5m it reached a maximum number of 0.12 m/s,
 301 and at 2m there were no more measurements above 0.1m/s.

302 *Using plosive tones*

303 The measurements of plosive tones reached a merit of 0.13 m/s at 1m, 0.13 m/s at 1.5m and
 304 stayed below 0.1 m/s at 2m.

305 *Blowing*

306 While blowing the baritone singer did directly target the sensors at the 2m mark.
307 Measurements reached air velocities of 0.7 m/s at 1m, 0.34 m/s at a distance of 1.5m and still
308 had 0.22 m/s at a distance of 2m.

309 *Singing and blowing with face mask*

310 While wearing a facemask all measurements stayed under a value of 0.1m/s, independent of
311 blowing in the direction of the sensor, singing an excerpt of a music piece, or trying out
312 plosive tones. The measurements therefore mixed with the usual room air velocity.

313 *Speaking*

314 When the baritone singer was speaking while not wearing a facemask, measurements also
315 stayed at 0.1 m/s, the same merit as the usual room air velocity. At a distance of 1m the
316 measurements were reaching 0.1 m/s; at a distance of 1.5m they stayed below 0.1 m/s and
317 showed no signal at a distance of 2m.

318

319 **5.2.2 Classically trained soprano singer**

320 *Excerpt of a music piece*

321 While singing an excerpt of a classical music piece, the classical soprano singer sang high
322 pitches, reaching air movement measurements of 0.15 m/s at 1m and 0.12 m/s at 1.5m, while
323 at 2m the sensor no longer showed any air movements.

324 *Plosive tones*

325 At 1m the measurements of plosive tones reached air velocities of 0.17 m/s and at 1.5m
326 0.12m/s, while no air movement was measured at 2m above 0.1m/s.

327 *High pitches*

328 When the female singer tried out high pitches, air velocities at 1m showed 0.17 m/s, at 1.5m
329 reached 0.12 m/s, and at 2m stayed under 0.1 m/s.

330 *Blowing*

331 Direct blowing to the front, aiming at the farthest mark, lead to the highest measurements of
332 the classical soprano singer. At 1m the air velocity measurements showed up to 0.27 m/s, at
333 1.5m they reached 0.21 m/s, and at 2m they reached 0.18 m/s.

334

335 **5.2.3 Non-classically trained singer**

336 *Rock*

337 While singing a part of a rock song, the measurements at 1m reached a merit of 0.16 m/s, at
338 1.5m they reached 0.12 m/s, and at 2m they stayed below 0.1 m/s.

339 *Pop lyrical*

340 The measurements for the pop lyrical song reached 0.13 m/s at 1m, 0.12 m/s at 1.5m, and
341 stayed below 0.1 m/s at 2m.

342 *Musical belting*

343 When performing musical belting the measurements reached 0.17 m/s at 1m, 0.13 m/s at 1.5m
344 and stayed below 0.1 m/s at 2m.

345 *Rap*

346 Measurements for rap reached 0.15 m/s at 1m, 0.11 m/s at 1.5m and stayed below 0.1 m/s at
347 2m.

348 *Blowing*

349 When the non-classical singer was directly blowing, she aimed for the farthest sensor,
350 reaching measurements of 0.63 m/s at 1m, 0.33 m/s at 1.5m and 0.27 m/s at 2m.

351 *Talking*

352 While only talking, the non-classical singer reached merits of 0.17 m/s at a distance of 1m,
353 0.12 m/s at 1.5m and 0.1 m/s at 2m.

354

355 **6. Discussion**

356 This study observed three professional singers: a classically trained male baritone singer, a
357 classically trained female soprano singer and a non-classically trained female singer, who all
358 performed 15 different singing scenarios: different singing styles, speaking and blowing.
359 Since the measurements consider various singing styles as well as comparative measurements,
360 it has a high external validity. The findings are very representative of a high level of
361 professional singing, with limited transferability to the amateur sector.

362 In order to evaluate the results of our study, in relation to recently published articles on the
363 generation of airflows or aerosol clouds while singing, our main finding reveals that directed
364 blowing – which is comparable to coughing – reaches much higher measurements of air
365 velocities than singing, with the highest value of 0.7 m/s at the 1m sensor (performed by the
366 baritone singer). At 1.5m the value dropped to 0.34 m/s and at 2m still reached a
367 measurement of 0.22 m/s – which is a value that lies above the usual room air velocity of 0.1
368 – 0.15 m/s. Therefore, the risk of infection is higher while coughing rather than singing. This
369 is a finding that is also supported by Asadi et al. [13] and Echternach et al. [6].

370 When comparing the measurements for singing and speaking, they show the same maximal
371 measurements of air velocities of up to 0.17 m/s at a distance of 1m, dropping to 0.12 – 0.13
372 m/s at the 1.5m sensor, and staying below the usual room air velocity of 0.1m/s at the 2m

373 sensor. In the following, for both settings of speaking and singing, air movements were no
374 longer measurable at a distance of 2m and can therefore be considered as insignificant
375 airflows [23].

376 Hence, significant airflows were measured only at 1m, with low measurements at the 1.5m
377 sensor, which decline within or below the usual room air velocity of 0.1 – 0.15 m/s, a finding
378 supported by Becher et al. [15], Kähler & Hain [14], Mürbe et al. [8, 12] and Echternach et al.
379 [6].

380 With regard to the relation between loudness of voice and the dispersion of aerosols, our
381 study did not find any relation, whereas other studies did, such as Asadi et al. [13] or Mürbe
382 et al. [8, 12].

383 Taking into account different styles of singing, we observed that they make almost no
384 difference at all in the generation of increasing airflows. A significant difference between
385 blowing and singing or speaking was observed, but not by use of different singing styles. In
386 this case, we compared mainly the highest merits of measurements of a sequence.

387 All qualitative observations were made close to the body of the singing person, which lead to
388 the presumption of low measurements at the sensors, especially in distances beyond 1.5m.
389 Quantitative measurements supported these observations, showing that respiratory air
390 movements while singing are not dependable on volume, pitch or style of singing, but rather
391 on individual singing habits and possibilities, which was also observed in the study of Becher
392 et al. [15].

393 It is remarkable and interesting that we found differences in our assumptions after seeing the
394 qualitative observations and having the merits from the quantitative measurements. On the
395 basis of the qualitative observations only, it was assumed that plosive tones or rap singing
396 would produce higher air velocities than other singing styles. The measured results showed

397 differently: We could not find a difference if a singer is singing a song, speaking or using
398 plosive tones – all measurements stay at the same level for all three test persons. Other studies
399 found out otherwise, observing differences between different speaking and singing, especially
400 while holding long tones [8], or a difference between singing with or without text, but no
401 difference between singing or speaking text [6].

402 Comparing the findings on respiratory air movements while singing with our own recent
403 study on woodwinds, it was found out that singers reach higher air velocities than woodwinds
404 [16]. These measurements of airflows for singers stay within a reach of 1.5m, which were
405 only surpassed during directed blowing. The highest air movement measurements for
406 woodwinds were produced by the oboe (with a maximal value of 0.15 m/s at 1m) and the tuba
407 (with a maximal value of 0.13 m/s at 1m), while singers reached 0.17 m/s at 1m while
408 performing an excerpt of a music piece. Particular to instrument playing was that air-jet
409 woodwinds, such as alto flute or piccolo, also produced side air movements of up to 0.15 m/s
410 (alto) and 0.13 m/s (piccolo). For the other wind instruments room air movements above 0.1
411 m/s were no longer measurable at 1.5m while playing. They only surpassed usual room air
412 velocities when blowing out or warming up (reaching maximal values of 0.5 m/s at 1m).

413 With regard to our risk assessment [17], we suggest a radial distance regulation of 2m for
414 singers, especially when singing in groups. Only then, droplet infection due to direct contact
415 can be excluded. This recommendation also supports the fact that strong airflows can
416 transport heavy droplets even further than 1.5m. On the basis of our findings, though,
417 measurements of airflows beyond 1.5m while singing were not visible. We were furthermore
418 unable to measure jet-stream droplet effects of light droplets, which would have been visible
419 in the artificial fog. Furthermore, we suggest frequent ventilation breaks, as mentioned in our
420 study on CO₂ measurements [18], to prevent a coronavirus infection while performing
421 musical activities.

422 Aside from our findings and risk assessments, some limitations of our study have to be taken
423 into account.

424 First, the study was conducted with highly professional singers, and the results can therefore
425 not automatically be transferred to other settings or amateur singers.

426 Second, the test results are rather specific. We took into account different singing styles and
427 three different singers from two different musical backgrounds. Therefore, the findings are
428 very representative for professional classical singers as well as modern rock/pop singers, with
429 restricted transferability to the amateur music sector and large choir groups. Since the test
430 singers have been part of the study and know their voices very well, relevant lung capacity or
431 ways of singing were identified for every test person. This seems to be one of the strengths of
432 our study.

433 Further limitations concern the fact that the measurements were conducted with three singers
434 only, while being sensitive to individual differences of singing, lung volume, etc. They were
435 also performed only once for every singer, whereas more repetitions of the same sequence or
436 analyzing more persons would have given more information on reproducibility of the test
437 setting.

438 Another limitation of the measurements is the fact that air velocity measurements are very
439 sensitive to surrounding movements, with the waving of a hand already influencing the
440 measurements at the sensor.

441

442 **7. Conclusion**

443 The test results show that singing is less dangerous than coughing and comparably produces
444 the same air velocity as speaking. In our study, results do not depend on volume, pitch or the
445 style of singing. In this spectrum, the highest measurement of singing lies at 0.17m/s at a

446 distance of 1m to the singer. At 2m, measurements over the usual room air velocity of 0.1m/s
447 were no longer visible, while frontal and direct blowing, which is comparable to coughing,
448 rise up to 0.7 m/s at the most at 1m.

449 Since no respiratory air movements – of any singing style – were measured at the 2m sensor,
450 we find distance regulations of 2m to the front of the singing person to be maintainable.

451 In order to maintain a responsible risk assessment, we find it crucial that besides a regulated
452 distance setup (e.g., small or large ensemble), constant fresh air ventilation and social
453 behavior should also be taken into account. Starting from April 2020, the Freiburg Institute of
454 Musicians' Medicine constantly updated an official paper on “risk assessment of a
455 coronavirus infection in the field of music” (updated May 19, July 1, July 17, and December
456 14, 2020), stating the findings of our various studies publicly [17] and establishing a
457 permanent consultation on questions concerning the relationship between the coronavirus and
458 music making.

459

460 **8. Acknowledgements**

461 Thanks to the singers who voluntarily took part in the study.

462

463 **9. References**

- 464 [1] Morawska L, Johnson GR, Ristovski ZD, Hargreaves M, Mengersen K, Corbett S,
465 Chao CYH, Ktoshevs LD. Size distribution and sites of origin of droplets expelled
466 from the human respiratory tract during expiratory activities. *Journal of Aerosol*
467 *Science*, Vol. 40(3), 2009, pp. 256-269.
- 468 [2] Macdonald, R, Kreutz G, Mitchell L. *Music, Health & Wellbeing*. Oxford: Oxford
469 University Press. 2012.
- 470 [3] Ginsborg J, Spahn C, William A. Health Promotion in Higher Music Education. In:
471 Macdonald, R, Kreutz G, Mitchell L. *Music, Health & Wellbeing*. Oxford: Oxford
472 University Press. 2012, pp. 356-366.

- 473 [4] Norton K. Singing and Wellbeing. Ancient Wisdom, Modern Proof. London:
474 Routledge. 2016.
- 475 [5] Deutsches Musikinformationszentrum. Laienmusizieren in Zahlen – Ergebnisse
476 bundesweiter Studien und Bevölkerungsumfragen. 2014 November. [Cited 2020
477 December 9]. Available from: <http://www.miz.org/statistiken/laienmusizieren-s1516>.
- 478 [6] Echternach M, Gantner S, Peters G, Westphalen C, Benthaut T, Jakubaß B, Kuranova
479 L, Döllinger M, Kniesburger S. Impulse dispersion of aerosols during singing and
480 speaking. medRxiv [Preprint]. 2020 July 22 [Cited 2020 Sept 9]. doi:
481 10.1101/2020.07.21.20158832.
- 482 [7] Gantner S, Echternach M, Veltrup R, Westphalen C, Koeberlin MC, Kuranova L,
483 Peters G, Jakubass B, Benthaut T, Doellinger M, Kniesburger S. Impulse dispersion
484 of aerosols during playing wind instruments. medRxiv [preprint]. 2021 [Cited 2021
485 Jan 27]. Doi: 10.1101/2021.01.25.20248984.
- 486 [8] Mürbe D, Fleischer M, Lange J, Rotheudt H, Kriegel M. Aerosol emission is increased
487 in professional singing. DepositOnce. [preprint]. 2020. [Cited 2020 Nov 24]. doi:
488 10.14279/depositonce-10374.
- 489 [9] Mürbe D, Bischoff P, Fleischer M, Hastmeier P. Beurteilung der Ansteckungsgefahr
490 mit SARS-CoV-2-Viren beim Singen. DepositeOnce[preprint]. 2020 May 11. [Cited
491 2020 Aug 19]. [preprint]. Available from: <http://audiologie-phoniatrie-charite.de>.
- 492 [10] Kriegel M, Hartmann A. Risikobewertung von Innenräumen zu virenbeladenen
493 Aerosolen. DepositOnce [preprint]. 2020 [Cited 2020 Nov 24]. doi:
494 10.14279/depositonce-10343.2.
- 495 [11] Hartmann A, Mürbe D, Kriegel M, Lange J, Fleischer M. Risikobewertung von
496 Proberäumen für Chöre hinsichtlich virenbeladenen Aerosolen. DepositOnce.
497 [preprint] doi: 10.14279/depositonce-10372.
- 498 [12] Mürbe D, Kriegel M, Lange J, Schumann L, Hartmann A, Fleischer M.
499 Aerosol emission of child voices during speaking, singing and shouting. medRxiv.
500 [preprint]. 2020 Sept 18 [Cited 2020 Nov 24]. doi: 10.1101/2020.09.17.20196733.
- 501 [13] Asadi S, Wexler AS, Cappa CD, Barreda S, Bouvier NM, Ristenpart D.
502 Aerosol emission and superemission during human speech increase with voice
503 loudness. Sci Rep. [preprint]. 2019. [Cited, Jan 20]. Doi: 10.1038/s41598-019-38808-
504 z.
- 505 [14] Kähler CJ, Hain R. Singing in choirs and making music with wind instruments
506 – Is that safe during the SARS-CoV-2 pandemic? ResearchGate [preprint] 2020.
507 [Cited 2020 Sept 9]. Doi: 10-13140/RG.2.2.36405.29926.
- 508 [15] Becher L, Gena AW, Alsaad H, Richter B, Spahn C, Voelker C. The spread of
509 breathing air from wind instruments and singers using schlieren techniques.
510 ResearchGate [preprint]. 2021 January. [Cited 2021 Jan 11]. doi:
511 10.1101/2021.06.20240903.
- 512 [16] Spahn C, Hipp A, Schubert B, Axt MR, Stratmann M, Schmölder C, Richter B.
513 Airflow and air velocity measurements while playing wind instruments, with respect
514 to risk assessment of a SARS-CoV-2 infection. medRxiv [preprint]. 2020 December
515 23. [Cited 2021 Jan 11]. doi: 10.1101/2020.12.17.20248234.
- 516 [17] Spahn C, Richter B. Risk assessment of a coronavirus infection in the field of
517 music. 2020 December 14. [Cited 2021 Jan 11]. Available from: [https://www.mh-
518 freiburg.de/en/university/covid-19-corona/risk-assessment](https://www.mh-freiburg.de/en/university/covid-19-corona/risk-assessment).
- 519 [18] Nusseck M, Richter B, Holtmeier L, Skala D, Spahn C. CO₂ measurements in
520 instrumental and vocal closed room settings as a risk reducing measure for a
521 Coronavirus infection. medRxiv [preprint]. 2020 [Cited, Jan 27]. Doi:
522 10.1101/2020.10.26.20218354.

- 523 [19] Tintschl. Strömungsvisualisierung in der Medizin. Flowmarker. 2015. [Cited
524 2020 Oct 20]. Available from: <https://www.flowmarker.com/anwendungen/medizin/>.
- 525 [20] Dushin, NS, Mikheev, AN, Mikheev, NI, Molochnikov, VM. Experimental
526 Setup for Visualisation of Pulsating Turbulent Flows. Laboratory Techniques, Vol. 57,
527 No. 4, 2014, pp. 499-502.
- 528 [21] Safex. 45 Jahre SAFEX – Theaternebel. 2015. [Cited 2020 Oct 20]. Available
529 from: http://www.safex.de/safex2/produkte.php?DOC_INST=277.
- 530 [22] Tintschl. FlowMarker II – Technische Daten. Flowmarker. 2015. [Cited 2020
531 Oct 20]. Available from: <https://www.flowmarker.com/services/download/>.
- 532 [23] Schmidt M. Auf dem Weg zum Nullemissionsgebäude. Grundlagen,
533 Lösungsansätze, Beispiele. Wiesbaden: Springer Verlag. 2013, p. 6.
- 534 [24] Sodec F. Quelllüftung und ihre Anwendungsbereiche. Klimalüftung.
535 Fachjournal 2002/03.
- 536 [25] Dentel A, Dietrich U. Thermische Behaglichkeit – Komfort in Gebäuden. HafenCity
537 University, 2006. [Cited 2020 Dec 16]. Available from:
538 <https://vdocuments.mx/explore.html>.
- 539 [26] Kavgic M, Mumovic D, Stevanovic Z, Young A. Analysis of thermal comfort and
540 indoor air quality in a mechanically ventilated theatre. Energy and Buildings, Vol. 40,
541 Issue 7, 2008, pp. 1334-1343.

542

543


544 **10. Appendices**

545 A1: Test location: Concert hall of the Bamberg Symphony



546

547 A2: Size distribution of droplets (measurements with DANTEC PDA)




548

549

550

551 A3: Distance measurements, while singing, at 1m, 1.5m and 2m



552

553 A4: Test set-up on stage of the Bamberg Symphony hall




554

555


556

557 A5: Measurements: Non-classically trained singer performing different styles



558

559 A6: Measurements: Classically trained soprano singer



560

561

562