medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.30.21253126; this version posted April 6, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

High SARS-CoV-2 attack rates following exposure during singing events in the Netherlands, September-October 2020

Authors:

Anita A. Shah[1, 2], Florien Dusseldorp[3], Irene K. Veldhuijzen[1], Margreet J.M. te Wierik[1], Alvin Bartels[1], Jack Schijven[4, 5], Lucie C. Vermeulen[1], Mirjam J. Knol[1]

Affiliations:

1. Center for Infectious Disease Control, National Institute for Public Health and Environment (RIVM), Bilthoven, The Netherlands
2. European Programme for Intervention Epidemiology Training (EPIET), European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control (ECDC), Stockholm, Sweden
3. Department of Infectious Disease Control, Public Health Service Hollands Midden (GGD), Hollands Midden, The Netherlands
4. Department of Statistics, Informatics and Modelling, National Institute for Public Health and Environment (RIVM), Bilthoven, The Netherlands
5. Chair Quantitative Microbial Water Safety, Environmental Hydrogeology Group Department of Earth Sciences, Utrecht University, The Netherlands

Corresponding author:

Anita A. Shah

Email: anita.shah@rivm.nl

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.30.21253126; this version posted April 6, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Abstract

Previous reports indicate that there may be an increased risk of severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) transmission during singing events. We describe SARS-CoV-2 transmission in six singing events from September–October 2020, across the Netherlands, with attack rates from 25–74%. We investigated potential routes of SARS-CoV-2 transmission for each event. Events included 9–21 persons, aged 20–79 years. SARS-CoV-2 transmission likely took place during five out of six events; a possible index case could be identified in four out of five clusters. Limited sequencing data was available, hampering interpretation of results. Indirect contact and droplet transmission (<1.5m) may have caused some cases, but are unlikely to explain the high attack rates. The previously published AirCoV2 model indicated that airborne transmission (via infectious droplets/ aerosols over longer distances (>1.5m)) due to singing is possible in case of supershedder presence ($\geq 10^{10}$ RNA copies/mL). Also, airflow expelling respiratory droplets over longer distances (>1.5m) may have influenced transmission. In conclusion, a combination of transmission routes probably caused these five clusters. Proportions attributable to each route cannot be deduced. It is possible that airborne transmission of SARS-CoV-2 due to singing (partly) led to the high attack rates observed in these clusters.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.30.21253126; this version posted April 6, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Introduction

Several outbreaks with a high attack rate among singing groups, including several in the Netherlands, were described in literature and media from March until September 2020 [1-6] suggesting a possible elevated risk of singing for severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) transmission. It was unclear whether the outbreaks were the result of frequent and prolonged social contact (<1.5m) before, during, or after the singing event, or whether singing itself was a risk [7]. Singing groups stopped practicing from March 2020 in the Netherlands due to widespread transmission of SARS-CoV-2 alongside other lockdown measures. Due to the decreasing incidence of coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) in the summer and easing of restrictions, singing in groups was allowed again in the Netherlands from July 2020. General national advice included quarantining at home following contact with a positive case, staying at home when experiencing COVID-19-like symptoms until the test result was known and keeping 1.5m distance from persons other than household members. Specific recommendations for singing in groups included singing in a zigzag formation and following ventilation advice guidelines, including using a room with mandatory ventilation rates for gatherings and regular venting when people were not in the room (e.g. during breaks) [7]. Face mask use in public places was not obligatory during this period. In the Netherlands, approximately one million singers participate in 24 000 choirs [8] and an estimated 70% of choirs resumed practicing from September 2020. From September through October 2020, there was a rapid increase in the weekly incidence of COVID-19 in the Netherlands from 31.4 to 391 per 100 000 [9].

Outbreak detection

From September through October 2020, we investigated six clusters of COVID-19 cases among attendees of singing events that were reported to the National Institute for Public Health and Environment (RIVM) in the Netherlands. Four clusters were reported to relate to choir rehearsals, one to a choir performance and one to a singing ensemble during a church service. An investigation was carried out to establish whether singing increased the risk of SARS-CoV-2

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.30.21253126; this version posted April 6, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

transmission during these events. Here, we describe the outbreaks in terms of person, place and time and depict potential routes of SARS-CoV-2 transmission for each event.

Methods

Epidemiological investigations

Data on the six singing events were retrospectively first collected from a focal point by phone or email and then from singing group members via an online questionnaire. Information was consolidated with data from the National Notifiable Diseases Surveillance System. Formation diagrams were provided which illustrated the position of singing group members for each event. Diagrams were simplified and information was aggregated to protect data confidentiality.

Laboratory detection

During the investigation period, the testing policy in the Netherlands was that persons experiencing COVID-19-like symptoms could be tested free of charge. However, several, but not all, asymptomatic persons were also tested on their own accord. We followed up on laboratory specimens for all confirmed cases for whole SARS-CoV-2 genome sequencing to identify possible source cases and to assess sequence clustering.

Outbreak case definitions

An outbreak confirmed case was defined as a person who was a singing group member* (singer, conductor or musician) and with a respiratory sample testing RT-PCR positive for SARS-CoV-2.

An outbreak probable case was a person who was a singing group member* (singer, conductor or musician) and developed at least one of the following symptoms: cough, fever, sore throat, runny nose, increased or sudden loss of taste, loss of smell, fatigue, and shortness of breath, within 14 days prior, or 14 days following the singing event.

*In one singing event, a preacher was also considered a member of the singing group due to being in close proximity of the singing group members.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.30.21253126; this version posted April 6, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Route of transmission definitions

Droplet transmission is infection spread through exposure to virus-containing respiratory droplets (i.e., larger and smaller droplets and particles) exhaled by an infectious person [10]. Transmission is most likely to occur when someone is close to the infectious person, generally within 1.5m distance (e.g. contact with respiratory droplets after a cough). Respiratory droplets can be expelled further than 1.5m because of air currents or forceful ejections (e.g. violent sneeze) [11, 12]

Indirect contact transmission is infection after contact with an article or surface that has become contaminated [10].

Airborne transmission is infection spread through exposure to those virus-containing respiratory droplets comprised of smaller droplets and particles that can remain suspended in the air and, therefore be transported over longer distances (several metres) and time (typically hours) [10].

Aerosol transmission model

We used model AirCoV2 (version 1.5) described by Schijven et al. [13] to assess under which circumstances aerosols production by singing could have led to the attack rates observed in the six singing events. The scenarios developed are based on the event circumstances, although insufficient information was available to exactly simulate the circumstances. The model assumes an even distribution of aerosols containing virus particles across the space, and relatively high, estimates of virus infectivity [13]. The model was applied for 20 scenarios encompassing a small and large room (300 vs 3000m^3), exposure times of 30, 60 and 120 minutes, no ventilation, one or six air exchanges per hour (ACH). The model also includes concentration of 10^7 or 10^{10} virus RNA copies per mL mucus (where 10^{10} represents the presence of a supershedder) [13, 14].

Ethical statement

The outbreak investigations were carried out in accordance with the Dutch Public Health Act. Participation in the questionnaire was voluntary and online informed consent was obtained.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.30.21253126; this version posted April 6, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Results

Description of the singing events

We report on six separate singing events across the Netherlands with attack rates from 25–74% (Table 1). The response rate to the online questionnaires ranged from 58–100%. Events included 9–21 persons, aged 20–79 years (Table 1).

Singing event 1

In singing event 1, 14 confirmed cases developed COVID-19 within 12 days of the event, of whom 12 experienced symptoms (Figure 1). One confirmed case was hospitalised. Transmission likely occurred during the event for these 14 cases as this was the common place of exposure. A single index case could not be clearly identified as seven persons had their symptom onset three days following the event (Figure 1). No one reported contact with a positive case in the 14 days prior to the event, two persons had contact with a positive case in the 14 days following the event, and one person did not specify the date (Table 2). Three pairs travelled to and from the event together by car. In one pair, one person may have infected the other via droplet transmission outside of the event as there were eight days between their symptom onset and they lived together. In the other two pairs, only one person in each pair tested positive. Movement during the break was limited as singing group members remained in place and staff served coffee. Droplet transmission between singing group members during the event and break was less likely due to reduced movement and singing group members stated that they kept 1.5m distance throughout the event (Table 2). Indirect contact transmission was not likely due to limited common contact of surfaces. Doors to the event room were kept open and thus, there was limited touching of door handles. The room size of 14x14x2.6m (510m^3) was adequate for 19 singing group members including three rows of six to seven persons and an additional row with the conductor to keep 1.5m distance from each other (Table 1). Natural ventilation through open doors was in place as well as a system to expel indoor air to outside through a heat exchanger. A few singing group members felt a cold draft on one side of the room, however, cases were widely dispersed throughout the room (Figure 2). The fact that cases were widely dispersed throughout the room could be consistent with airborne transmission

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.30.21253126; this version posted April 6, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

(Table 3). Additionally, transmission through a possible directional airflow with respiratory droplets cannot be ruled out.

Singing event 2

In singing event 2, 13 confirmed cases developed COVID-19 within eight days of the event, of whom 11 experienced symptoms (Figure 1). One probable case was also reported. Transmission likely occured during the event. Two possible index cases with symptom onset two days following the event were identified (Figure 1). No one reported contact with a positive case in the 14 days prior to the event and one person had contact with a positive case in the 14 days following the event (Table 2). Six singing group members travelled together by bicycle, and two pairs by car. Of the six who travelled by bicycle, two were confirmed cases. Among the two pairs who travelled by car; one pair included two confirmed cases and the other pair included one confirmed case. Singing group members used their own sheet music and toilets were spacious. As shared surfaces that could be touched were limited, it is less likely that indirect contact transmission occurred. All singing group members stated that they kept 1.5m distance from each other during the event (Table 3), therefore droplet transmission via close contact is less likely. The room size of 80m^2 (and pointed roof of ~8m) may not have been sufficient for 21 singing group members in six rows including two to five persons and an additional row with the conductor to keep 1.5m distance from each other. Only natural ventilation through open doors and windows (which were tilted open) was used throughout the event. Airborne transmission is a possible route of transmission. The widely dispersed cases throughout the room could be consistent with airborne transmission (Table 3).

Singing event 3

In singing event 3, a cluster was reported to be related to the event, however further investigations revealed that SARS-CoV-2 transmission most likely occurred outside of the event. Three out of four confirmed cases likely had close contact outside of the event. The index case of the cluster was identified by earliest date of symptom onset, however there may have been two potentially infectious persons present at the event according to their symptom onsets (Figure 1). Sequencing revealed two identical strains between one singing group member and a close contact (who was

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.30.21253126; this version posted April 6, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

not part of the singing group) who were both likely secondary cases of the index case. A fourth confirmed case, who was not related to the cases that had likely close contact outside of the event, was also reported. The transmission route of this fourth case could not be clearly identified. Additionally, sequencing was not available for this case so it is unclear if a link was present. The event took place during a church service which lasted 60 minutes and included only 20 minutes of singing without a break. Singing group members stated that they kept 1.5m distance from each other during the event. There were limited common surfaces that could have been touched by singing group members, it is less likely that indirect transmission occurred with relation to the fourth case (Table 3). Natural ventilation was in place during the event. The size of the church hall is unknown. Airborne transmission is less likely as there were no reported cases in between the fourth case and the cases who had close contact outside of the event (Table 3).

Singing event 4

In singing event 4, eight confirmed cases developed COVID-19 within seven days, of whom six experienced symptoms (Figure 1). Transmission most likely occurred at the event for these cases. A possible index case was identified with symptom onset on the day after the event (Figure 1). This case also mentioned contact with a positive case, however, the date was not specified. An additional person reported contact with a positive case in the 14 days prior to the event however, this person's symptom onset was seven days following the event, therefore they are unlikely to be an index case. No persons had contact with a positive case in the 14 days following the event (Table 2). Singing group members stated that they may not have kept 1.5m distance between each other throughout the break (Table 3). Droplet transmission may have occurred via close contact during these moments. Two pairs travelled together by car, and both tested positive in one pair, whereas the other pair included one person who was negative and one person who was not tested. Common surfaces were limited with spacious and separate toilets for men and women. Therefore, indirect contact transmission is less likely to have occurred (Table 3). The room size of 11x8.5x6m^3 (561m^3) was just adequate for 15 singing group members to keep 1.5m distance from each other in a zigzag semi-circle formation. Natural ventilation through open windows and a door, and a ceiling ventilation system was in place during the event. Airborne transmission is a possible route

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.30.21253126; this version posted April 6, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

of transmission (Table 3). Cases were widely dispersed throughout the room which may be consistent with airborne transmission. Six singing group members, of whom four were confirmed cases felt a cold air draft, however, the exact direction is not known. Transmission through the presence of a possible directional airflow cannot be ruled out.

Singing event 5

In singing event 5, seven confirmed cases developed COVID-19 within six days of the event and all experienced symptoms (Figure 1). One probable case was also reported. A possible index case was identified who had symptom onset on the day of the event (Figure 1). No one reported contact with a positive case in the 14 days prior to the event and no persons had contact with a positive case in the 14 days following the event (Table 2). Six singing group members travelled together; two pairs by bicycle (all tested positive) and one pair by car (one tested positive, and the other was not tested, nor had symptoms). Singing group members stated that they kept 1.5m distance throughout the event, therefore droplet transmission is less likely (Table 3). During the break, a coffee machine was used which required pushing a button. Three to four singing group members assisted with stacking chairs. The occurrence of indirect contact transmission cannot be ruled out in these situations and may have been possible. The room size of ~320m^3 was adequate for 14 singing group members in three rows of two to five persons and an additional row with the conductor to keep 1.5m distance from one another. Natural ventilation through open doors and windows was used and mechanical ventilation may have possibly been in place during the event. Two persons reported feeling a cold air draft, however specific information is lacking about airflow in the room. Respiratory droplet transmission further than 1.5m due to airflow cannot be ruled out. Even though ventilation measures were in place, airborne transmission is a possible mode of transmission. Cases were widely dispersed throughout the room which may be consistent with possible airborne transmission (Table 4). Additionally, available sequencing revealed two identical strains in two persons who were positioned on opposite sides of the room (Table 1, Figure 2).

Singing event 6

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.30.21253126; this version posted April 6, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

In singing event 6, six confirmed cases developed COVID-19 within eight days of the event and all experienced symptoms (Figure 1). A possible index case was identified with symptom onset on the day after the event (Figure 1). This case was likely to have had contact with positive cases during work in the week prior to the event. As singing group members stated that they kept 1.5m distance, droplet transmission is less likely to have occurred (Table 3). No common objects were reported to have been touched and microphones were used by the same individual throughout the event. Indirect contact transmission is less likely to have occurred (Table 3). Sequencing revealed four out of five identical strains in persons who were positioned near each other. The room size of 20x15x10m^3 (3000m^3) seemed adequate for the eight singing group members, one preacher and attendees of the church service. Screens were placed in front of the singing group members and in between attendees of the service. It is not known how use of screens influenced transmission. Data was available for 58% of church service attendees (morning and afternoon). A maximum of 30 attendees were allowed at each service and singing group members were only present in the afternoon. Only one positive case is known among the attendees with possible exposure at the afternoon service and it is unclear whether the case is linked to the confirmed cases among the singing group members as sequencing was not done. Natural ventilation and air heating was used throughout the event. Airborne transmission remains possible as even though singing group members were distanced, persons positioned up to three persons away from the possible index case were still infected.

Aerosol transmission model

The AirCoV2 model showed that the mean risk of illness of one person was 86% (54-100%) in case of a smaller room (300m^3), 120 minutes of exposure time, one ACH, and presence of a supershedder (Table 4, Scenario 8). In a 10-fold larger room (3000m^3), the mean risk of illness of one person was approximately four fold lower (24%; Table 4, Scenario 18). Room sizes for the singing events ranged from 320-3000m^3. Halving the exposure time (60 minutes), reduced the mean risk of illness by one-third (58%;Table 4, Scenario 5). Singing events ranged from 60-150 minutes with singing duration lasting from 20-120 minutes. Also increasing the ventilation to six ACH (9L/sec/person) reduced the dose and risk by approximately one-third (54%; Table 4,

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.30.21253126; this version posted April 6, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Scenario 9). Exact information on the number of ACH for each singing event was not known. Based on the received information about the ventilation measures, events 1 and 5 could have had three ACH or more. For other events, one ACH or less is more likely. The mean risk of illness in case of presence of a supershedder was 94% with no ACH, exposure time of 120 minutes, in a small room (Table 4, Scenario 7) compared to 0.48% with no supershedder present (Table 4, Scenario 10). Information on CT values for cases was not known, and therefore the presence of a supershedder among the six events is unknown.

Outbreak control measures

Due to the higher COVID-19 incidence among the population during this period and several clusters of SARS-CoV-2 cases occurring among singing groups from September to October 2020, the National Outbreak Management Team (OMT) in the Netherlands advised against group singing in any context on 3 November 2020, which was supported by the Dutch government [15]. The OMT advised that group singing can be allowed if the risk level is 'Vigilant' (Rt < 1 and incidence ≤7/100.000/day), as the risk of contracting SARS-CoV-2 by singing in groups is small, mostly based on the likely absence of an active shedder.

Discussion

All events had high attack rates ranging from 25-74% demonstrating the high risk in these settings. Based on available epidemiological information, it is likely that transmission for most singing group members took place at the singing events itself except for singing event 3 and those living together. In these five events, cases had little to no contact outside of the events except for those who lived and travelled together to the event. At least 10 persons lived together and seven of these were confirmed cases. In all events, at least one singing group member reported their symptom onset between 0–3 days following the event (Figure 1). These singing group members were potentially contagious during the events and this corresponds with known transmission dynamics of SARS-CoV-2 with higher levels of shedding just prior to development of symptoms [16, 17]. A

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.30.21253126; this version posted April 6, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

possible index case could be identified in four out of five clusters according to available information. Different transmission routes including droplet, indirect contact and airborne transmission may have led to cases.

Droplet and indirect contact transmission

The main transmission routes for SARS-CoV-2 include droplet and indirect contact transmission [10, 18]. The Dutch national advice for singing groups as well as in other countries is directed at preventing these transmission routes [7, 19]. In general, the six singing groups tried to adhere to this advice. From available information, droplet transmission through prolonged social contact during the singing event itself seemed unlikely. Air currents from person to person because of open windows and doors or mechanical ventilation may have increased SARS-CoV-2 droplet transmission during these events, as droplets could have moved over longer distances (>1.5m) [20]. It remains possible that even if there is adequate ventilation but air currents are present, the increased dispersion of droplets produced by singing may be sufficient to increase droplet transmission. Although there is insufficient evidence regarding air currents, this possibility cannot be ruled out. The European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control (ECDC) and Dutch national guidelines on ventilation discourage the opening of doors and windows against each other when persons are present in the room in order to prevent airflows from person to person [21, 22].

Another possible transmission route may have been through indirect contact transmission via contaminated shared surfaces as SARS-CoV-2 has been detected on surfaces for up to 72 hours in various environmental conditions [23]. Limited shared surfaces were present and only several singing group members reported touching common surfaces; the high attack rates are also difficult to explain solely through this transmission route.

Airborne transmission

Singing expels approximately 10–15 times as much aerosols as speaking [13]. Additionally, singing increases aerosol dispersion compared to speaking and the amount of aerosols expelled increases with voice loudness [13, 24-27]. In the AirCoV2 model, the mean probability of illness fell within the range or was higher than the observed attack rates for the singing events described in this

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.30.21253126; this version posted April 6, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

outbreak investigation in scenarios with at least 60 minutes of singing in a small room, and in scenarios with 120 minutes of singing in a large room with no or little ventilation, with presence of a supershedder. Insufficient information was available on the precise circumstances of the singing events to exactly simulate the clusters using the model. The number of ACH was not obtained and the event descriptions did not provide enough information to determine its role. Overall, the model indicated that high virus concentrations, i.e. as in the presence of a supershedder, are required in order to explain high attack rates via this transmission route. The model assumes equal spread of aerosols in the room, however, this is not likely in large spaces. The singing event rooms were generally large in size. If the air was not fully mixed, it may have been possible that the air in the exhaled plume of the infectious person would have higher viral concentrations than the air in the far corner of the room, and thus gave rise to higher exposure closer to the infectious person. In the events, cases were dispersed throughout the room which may be consistent with airborne transmission.

According to the AirCov2 model, the presence of a supershedder in the room is needed to achieve relevant risks of illness by aerosol transmission [20, 28-30]. From September to October 2020, 1.4% persons were infected in the Dutch population. Given that 2.7% of infected persons may have been a possible supershedder (10^{10} virus mL in mucus) [13], then an estimated 95 supershedders of 3528 contagious persons would have been present among 252 000 singing group members (~15 singers in each singing group) from September to October 2020. Therefore, the presence of supershedders among the five singing events is plausible. We cannot confirm the presence of a supershedder since we did not have information on CT-values for confirmed cases. It is also possible that multiple source cases may have been present in at least two events which could have contributed to the high attack rates.

Strengths and limitations

Our study has several strengths; this is the first outbreak investigation which investigates COVID-19 clusters in several singing groups worldwide. Second, the overall high response rate provided a good indication of the circumstances in which the singing events took place. Third, the

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.30.21253126; this version posted April 6, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

questionnaire included questions aimed at identifying direct, indirect and airborne transmission routes. A limitation of this study is the low number of specimens on which we could perform phylogenetic analysis due to limited specimen storage time (usually one week) during the period of the outbreak investigation. Also, a large number of laboratories were involved coupled with a high work load for the public health services. Additionally, asymptomatic cases may have been missed as not all persons were tested. Therefore, we could not identify the number of possible source cases present at the events and/or confirming that the singing group members were infected by a common source. Thirdly, the exact circumstances regarding airflow direction for each of the events was not known, and could not be accounted for in the model. It was also dependent on the weather of that day for the events using natural ventilation. Lastly, due to the retrospective nature of the questionnaires, recall bias could have affected the responses of the participants which indicated the likeliness of dropet or indirect contact transmission. However, almost all singing group members did describe similar circumstances in which the events took place.

Conclusions

These outbreaks with high attack rates demonstrate the potential for SARS-CoV-2 transmission linked to singing events. In conclusion, our findings suggest that the described outbreaks were possibly caused by a combination of different transmission routes as none of the possible transmission routes could be ruled out. Due to the observational nature of this study, it was difficult to reconstruct the exact circumstances of the clusters and the proportions attributable to each possible transmission route could not be deduced. Indirect contact and droplet transmission (<1.5m) may have occurred and may have been the cause of some of the cases, but it is unlikely to explain the high attack rates. The described AirCoV2 model indicated that airborne transmission (via infectious droplets/ aerosols over longer distances) was possible if a supershedder was present. Additionally, multiple index cases may have been present. However, the airflow as reported may also have expelled respiratory droplets over longer distances and previous studies have shown that directional airflow may possibly influence transmission [12, 31]. Further research

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.30.21253126; this version posted April 6, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

is needed into the role of airflow and the transmission dynamics of SARS-CoV-2 in singing groups. Additionally, increased phylogenetic analysis should be performed to identify potential source cases to better assess clusters. Serology could also be performed to identify susceptible cases.

In the clusters described here, it is possible that singing itself increased the risk of SARS-CoV-2 transmission through airborne transmission. Therefore, when COVID-19 measures are eased and group gatherings are allowed, specific recommendation regarding singing in groups may be needed.

References

1. Hamner L, Dubbel P, Capron I, Ross A, Jordan A, Lee J, et al. High SARS-CoV-2 Attack Rate Following Exposure at a Choir Practice - Skagit County, Washington, March 2020. MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep. 2020;69(19):606-10.

2. Gelderland O. Koor Heerde verloor zes leden aan corona: 40 procent werd ziek 2020 [Available from: https://www.omroepgelderland.nl/nieuws/2448308/Koor-Heerde-verloor-zes-leden-aan-corona-40-procent-werd-ziek.

3. Gelderlander D. Ook veel 'coronagevallen' bij vrouwenkoor Between Two rivers dat in Elst repeteerde 2020 [Available from: https://www.gelderlander.nl/overbetuwe/ook-veel-coronagevallen-bij-vrouwenkoor-between-two-rivers-dat-in-elst-repeteerde~ac080406/.

4. Oost R. Corona in Hasselt | Musicalkoor extra zwaar getroffen: dirigent ging door oog van de naald 2020 [Available from: https://www.rtvoost.nl/nieuws/328138/Corona-in-Hasselt-Musicalkoor-extra-zwaar-getroffen-dirigent-ging-door-oog-van-de-naald.

5. Times T. Did singing together spread COVID-19? 2020 [Available from: https://www.taipeitimes.com/News/world/archives/2020/05/18/2003736628.

6. Limburger D. Hoe een gouden jaar een zwart jaar werd: zangkoren recht in het hart getroffen door corona 2020 [Available from: https://www.limburger.nl/cnt/dmf20200517_00160696/hoe-een-gouden-jaar-een-zwart-jaar-werd-voor-zangkoren-gronsveld-en-eijsden.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.30.21253126; this version posted April 6, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

7. RIVM. Koren en zangensembles 2020 [updated 1 July 2020. Available from: https://lci.rivm.nl/koren-zangensembles.

8. Association EC. Singing Europe 2015 [Available from: https://europeanchoralassociation.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/01/singingeurope_report.pdf.

9. RIVM. Wekelijkse update epidemiologische situatie COVID-19 in Nederland 2020 [Available from: https://www.rivm.nl/coronavirus-covid-19/actueel/wekelijkse-update-epidemiologische-situatie-covid-19-in-nederland.

10. CDC. Scientific Brief: SARS-CoV-2 and Potential Airborne Transmission 2020 [updated 5 October 2020. Available from: https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/more/scientific-brief-sars-cov-2.html.

11. Bourouiba L. Turbulent Gas Clouds and Respiratory Pathogen Emissions: Potential Implications for Reducing Transmission of COVID-19. Jama. 2020;323(18):1837-8.

12. Kwon KS, Park JI, Park YJ, Jung DM, Ryu KW, Lee JH. Evidence of Long-Distance Droplet Transmission of SARS-CoV-2 by Direct Air Flow in a Restaurant in Korea. J Korean Med Sci. 2020;35(46):e415.

13. Schijven JF, Vermeulen LC, Swart A, Meijer A, Duizer E, de Roda Husman AM. Quantitative risk assessment for airborne transmission of SARS-CoV-2 via breathing, speaking, singing, coughing and sneezing Environmental Health Perspectives, submitted. medRxiv. 2020:2020.07.02.20144832.

14. Kleiboeker S, Cowden S, Grantham J, Nutt J, Tyler A, Berg A, et al. SARS-CoV-2 viral load assessment in respiratory samples. J Clin Virol. 2020;129:104439.

15. RIVM. Advies naar aanleiding van 83e en 84e OMT 2020 [Available from: https://www.rijksoverheid.nl/onderwerpen/coronavirus-covid-19/documenten/brieven/2020/11/03/advies-nav-83e-en-84e-omt.

16. McAloon C, Collins Á, Hunt K, Barber A, Byrne AW, Butler F, et al. Incubation period of COVID-19: a rapid systematic review and meta-analysis of observational research. BMJ Open. 2020;10(8):e039652.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.30.21253126; this version posted April 6, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

17. Xie Y, Wang Z, Liao H, Marley G, Wu D, Tang W. Epidemiologic, clinical, and laboratory findings of the COVID-19 in the current pandemic: systematic review and meta-analysis. BMC Infectious Diseases. 2020;20(1):640.

18. WHO. Transmission of SARS-CoV-2: implications for infection prevention precautions 2020 [Available from: https://www.who.int/news-room/commentaries/detail/transmission-of-sars-cov-2-implications-for-infection-prevention-precautions.

19. PHE. COVID-19: suggested principles of safer singing 2020 [Available from: https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/covid-19-suggested-principles-of-safer-singing/covid-19-suggested-principles-of-safer-singing.

20. Bahl P, de Silva C, Bhattacharjee S, Stone H, Doolan C, Chughtai AA, et al. Droplets and Aerosols Generated by Singing and the Risk of Coronavirus Disease 2019 for Choirs. Clinical Infectious Diseases. 2020.

21. ECDC. Heating, ventilation and air-conditioning systems in the context of COVID-19: first update 2020 [Available from: https://www.ecdc.europa.eu/en/publications-data/heating-ventilation-air-conditioning-systems-covid-19.

22. RIVM. Ventilatie en COVID-19 2020 [Available from: https://lci.rivm.nl/ventilatie-en-covid-19.

23. van Doremalen N, Bushmaker T, Morris DH, Holbrook MG, Gamble A, Williamson BN, et al. Aerosol and Surface Stability of SARS-CoV-2 as Compared with SARS-CoV-1. N Engl J Med. 2020;382(16):1564-7.

24. Echternach M, Gantner S, Peters G, Westphalen C, Benthaus T, Jakubaß B, et al. Impulse Dispersion of Aerosols During Singing and Speaking: A Potential COVID-19 Transmission Pathway. Am J Respir Crit Care Med. 2020.

25. Asadi S, Wexler AS, Cappa CD, Barreda S, Bouvier NM, Ristenpart WD. Aerosol emission and superemission during human speech increase with voice loudness. Sci Rep. 2019;9(1):2348.

26. Gregson, Watson, Orton, Haddrell, McCarthy, Finnie, et al. Comparing the Respirable Aerosol Concentrations and Particle Size Distributions Generated by Singing, Speaking and Breathing2020.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.30.21253126; this version posted April 6, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

27. Mürbe D KM, Lange J, Rotheudt H, Fleischer M. . Aerosol emission is increased in professional singing. OSF Preprints. 2020.

28. Buonanno G, Morawska L, Stabile L. Quantitative assessment of the risk of airborne transmission of SARS-CoV-2 infection: prospective and retrospective applications. medRxiv. 2020:2020.06.01.20118984.

29. Chen PZ, Bobrovitz N, Premji Z, Koopmans M, Fisman DN, Gu FX. Heterogeneity in transmissibility and shedding SARS-CoV-2 via droplets and aerosols. medRxiv. 2020:2020.10.13.20212233.

30. Miller SL, Nazaroff WW, Jimenez JL, Boerstra A, Buonanno G, Dancer SJ, et al. Transmission of SARS-CoV-2 by inhalation of respiratory aerosol in the Skagit Valley Chorale superspreading event. Indoor Air. 2020.

31. Lu J, Gu J, Li K, Xu C, Su W, Lai Z, et al. COVID-19 Outbreak Associated with Air Conditioning in Restaurant, Guangzhou, China, 2020. Emerg Infect Dis. 2020;26(7):1628-31.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.30.21253126; this version posted April 6, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Tables

Table 1. Characteristics for each singing event and their respective venues from September–October 2020.

	Singing event 1	Singing event 2	Singing event 3	Singing event 4	Singing event 5	Singing event 6
Characteristics of singing group members						
Singing group members	19	21	16	15	14	9
Case definitions						
Confirmed	14	13	4	8	7	6
Probable	0	1	0	0	1	0
Attack rate*	74% (14/19)	67% (14/21)	25% (4/16)	53% (8/15)	57% (8/14)	67% (6/9)
Questionnaire response rate	58% (11/19)	95% (20/21)	69% (11/16)	73% (11/15)	100% (14/14)	78% (7/9)
Sex						
Female	11*	12	6	7	8	6*
Male	6*	8	5	4	6	1*
Median age (range)	74 (60-89)*	62.5 (54-74)	69 (39-79)	51 (32-70)	57.5 (32-74)	41 (20-55)*
Specimens sequenced	0	0	1**	0	2	5
Previously tested for SARS-CoV-2 since January 2020						
Positive	0	0	0	0	0	0
Negative	0	2	2	3	3	1
Not tested	10	18	9	8	11	6
Missing	1	0	0	0	0	0
Characteristics of venue where singing event took place						
Venue type	Hall	Hall	Church	Hall	Hall	Church
Size of venue (l x w x h)m^3	510 (14x14x2.6)	80m^2 (+ ~8m roof)	?	561 (11x8.5x6)	~320	3000 (20x15x10)
Duration of event (mins)	90	120	60	150	120	60
Duration of singing (mins)	50	~80	20	120	~90	20
Duration of break (mins)	15	5	NA	15	15	NA
Natural ventilation						
Number of doors open						
Facing inside	1	2	?	1	2	2
Facing outside	1	1	?	0	0	0
Number of windows open	0	2	?	2	6	1
Additional ventilation	None	None	?	Ceiling ventilation	Possible mechanical ventilation	None
Other mechanism	Heat exchanger	None	?	None	None	Air heating

*Data reported here is combined from the National Notifiable Surveillance Disease System and questionnaire responses.

**One additional specimen was sequenced in a secondary case.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.30.21253126; this version posted April 6, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Table 2. Potential exposures within and outside of the singing events for confirmed and probable COVID-19 cases among singing groups from September–October 2020.

		Singing event 1 (n = 8)	Singing event 2 (n = 14)	Singing event 3 (n = 3)	Singing event 4 (n = 8)	Singing event 5 (n = 8)	Singing event 6 (n = 6)
Kept 1.5m distance during the rehearsal/ performance	Yes	8	14	3	7	8	6
	No	0	0	0	1	0	0
Kept 1.5m distance during the break	Yes	?	?	NA	6	8	NA
	No	?	?	NA	2	0	NA
Had contact before/after the rehearsal/ performance	Yes	2	2	0	3	2	2
	No	6	12	3	5	6	4
Kept 1.5m distance before/ after the singing event	Yes	2	2	NA	0	0	2
	No	0	0	NA	3	2	0
Travelled together to/from the singing event	Yes	3	3	0	2	5	0
	No	5	11	3	6	3	6
Kept 1.5m distance during travel	Yes	0	0	NA	0	1	NA
	No	3	3	NA	1	4	NA
Felt (cold) airflow during the singing event	Yes	2*	?*	0	4	2	1
	No	?*	?*	3	4	6	5
Toilet used during the break	Yes	?	?	0	6	1	4
	No	?	?	3	2	7	2
Sang in another singing group 14 days prior to singing event	Yes	1	1	0	0	0	1
	No	7	13	3	8	8	5
Had contact with person tested positive for SARS-CoV-2 in the 14 days prior to singing event	Yes	0	0	1	1	0	1
	No	8	14	2	7	8	5
Had contact with person tested positive for SARS-CoV-2 in the 14 days following the singing event	Yes	2	1	0	0	0	1
	No	6	13	3	8	8	5
Had contact with person tested positive for SARS-CoV-2 (date not specified)	Yes	1	0	0	1	0	0

* Information for these two singing groups was extracted from comments in the singing group member questionnaire. Question investigating airflow was later added to the singing group member questionnaire following spontaneous reporting.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.30.21253126; this version posted April 6, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Table 3. Likelihood of SARS-CoV-2 transmission route causing high attack rate at each singing event from September–October 2020.

Singing event	Droplet transmission	Indirect contact transmission	Airborne transmission
Singing event 1	Possible	Less likely	Possible
Singing event 2	Less likely	Less likely	Possible
Singing event 3	NA	NA	NA
Singing event 4	Possible	Less likely	Possible
Singing event 5	Possible	Possible	Possible
Singing event 6	Less likely	Less likely	Possible

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.30.21253126; this version posted April 6, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Table 4. Dose and illness risks from simulations with AirCoV2 version 1.5.

					Cumulative dose (virus RNA copies) /person				Illness risk/person/event			
	m^3	Q	T	C	Mean	5%	50%	95%	Mean	5%	50%	95%
1	300	0	30	10	540	140	430	1300	29%	9.4%	26%	60%
2	300	1	30	10	470	120	370	1100	26%	8.1%	23%	54%
3	300	6	30	10	250	66	200	620	16%	4.5%	13%	35%
4	300	0	60	10	2000	530	1600	4800	66%	31%	67%	97%
5	300	1	60	10	1500	390	1200	3700	58%	24%	57%	92%
6	300	6	60	10	610	160	490	1500	32%	11%	29%	64%
7	300	0	120	10	6900	1800	5500	17000	94%	72%	98%	100%
8	300	1	120	10	4300	1100	3400	10000	86%	54%	91%	100%
9	300	6	120	10	1300	350	1100	3200	54%	22%	53%	90%
10	300	0	120	7	6.9	1	5	18	0.48%	0.07%	0.35%	1.3%
11	3000	0	30	10	55	13	43	130	3.7%	0.91%	3%	8.9%
12	3000	1	30	10	47	11	37	110	3.2%	0.77%	2.6%	7.6%
13	3000	6	30	10	26	6	20	62	1.8%	0.42%	1.4%	4.2%
14	3000	0	60	10	200	52	160	490	13%	3.6%	11%	29%
15	3000	1	60	10	150	38	120	370	9.9%	2.6%	8.1%	23%
16	3000	6	60	10	62	15	49	150	4.2%	1%	3.4%	10%
17	3000	0	120	10	700	180	560	1700	35%	12%	32%	70%
18	3000	1	120	10	430	110	340	1000	24%	7.5%	21%	52%
19	3000	6	120	10	130	34	110	330	8.8%	2.4%	7.2%	20%
20	3000	0	120	7	0.7	0	0	3	0.049%	0%	0%	0.21%

m^3: room size, small room 10x10x3=300m^3, large room 20x25x6=3000 m^3;
Q: air exchanges/hour; T: exposure time (minutes); C: virus RNA copies/mL, 10=10^{10} and 7=10^7.

Scenarios:

- Always one person as source, 15 persons exposed.
- Fraction of virus RNA copies infectious to cell culture: 0.0125 (1/80).
- Fraction of those viruses leading to illness: 0.056 (1/18).
- So, fraction of virus RNA copies leading to illness: 0.0007 (1/1440).
- Probability of at least 10^7 RNA copies/ml in mucus is 66%.
- Probability of at least 10^8 RNA copies/ml in mucus is 36%.
- Probability of at least 10^9 RNA copies/ml in mucus is 13%.
- Probability of at least 10^{10} RNA copies/ml in mucus is 2.7%. Used to simulate a supershedder

Model AirCoV2 (version 1.5) parameters described by Schijven et al. [13]

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.30.21253126; this version posted April 6, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Figure 1. Confirmed and probable COVID-19 cases in each singing event, September–October 2020 by date of symptom onset, or alternatively by date of positive test.



*Data is combined from the National Notifiable Surveillance Disease System and questionnaire responses.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.30.21253126; this version posted April 6, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Figure 2. Singing group members in each singing event, September–October 2020 by COVID-19 test result.*



medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.30.21253126; this version posted April 6, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

c. Singing event 3 (n=16)**



d. Singing event 4 (n = 15)



medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.30.21253126; this version posted April 6, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

e. Singing event 5 (n=14)



f. Singing event 6 (n = 9)



*Formation diagrams may not be an accurate representation of the room dimensions. Additionally, diagrams have been simplified and information was aggregated to protect data confidentiality.

**Exact placement of doors and windows is unknown.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.30.21253126; this version posted April 6, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Financial support

No external funding was received.

Conflict of interest

None declared.

Authors' contributions

All authors contributed to the outbreak investigations described in this report. AS wrote the first draft of the manuscript and coordinated the revision of the manuscript. JS and LV contributed to the Aerosol transmission modelling outputs. All authors contributed to the interpretation of the data, critically revised the manuscript and approved the final version.

Acknowledgements

We are thankful to staff at Municipal Health Services, laboratories and clinicians for reporting and investigating COVID-19 cases. We gratefully acknowledge the affected choir focal points for their trustful sharing of information and this study was only possible thanks to the collaboration of affected individuals from the outbreaks. We thank Harry Vennema for carrying out phylogenetic analysis and Atze Boerstra for ventilation advice during this outbreak investigation.