

1 **Practical Indicators for Risk of Airborne Transmission in Shared Indoor Environments**
2 **and their Application to COVID-19 Outbreaks**

3
4 **Z. Peng,¹ A.L. Pineda Rojas,² E. Kropff,³ W. Bahnfleth,⁴ G. Buonanno,⁵ S.J. Dancer,^{6,7} J.**
5 **Kurnitski,⁸ Y. Li,⁹ M.G.L.C. Loomans,¹⁰ L.C. Marr,¹¹ L. Morawska,¹² W. Nazaroff,¹³ C.**
6 **Noakes,¹⁴ X. Querol,¹⁵ C. Sekhar,¹⁶ R. Tellier,¹⁷ T. Greenhalgh,¹⁸ L. Bourouiba,¹⁹ A.**
7 **Boerstra,²⁰ J.W. Tang,²¹ S.L. Miller,²² and J.L. Jimenez^{1*}**

8
9 *Affiliations*

- 10 1. Dept. of Chemistry and CIRES; University of Colorado, Boulder, CO, USA
11 2. CIMA, UMI-IFAECI/CNRS, FCEyN, Universidad de Buenos Aires—UBA/CONICET, Buenos Aires, Argentina
12 3. Leloir Institute—IIBBA/CONICET, CBA, Buenos Aires, Argentina
13 4. Dept. of Architectural Engineering, The Pennsylvania State University, University Park, PA, USA
14 5. Dept. of Civil and Mechanical Engineering, University of Cassino and Southern Lazio, Italy
15 6. Dept. of Microbiology, NHS Lanarkshire, Scotland, UK
16 7. School of Applied Sciences, Edinburgh Napier University, Scotland, UK
17 8. REHVA Technology and Research Committee, Tallinn University of Technology, Tallinn, Estonia
18 9. Dept. of Mechanical Engineering, the University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong, China
19 10. Dept. of the Built Environment, Eindhoven University of Technology, Eindhoven, the Netherlands
20 11. Dept. of Civil and Environmental Engineering, Virginia Tech, Blacksburg, VA, USA
21 12. International Laboratory for Air Quality and Health, Queensland University of Technology, Brisbane, Australia
22 13. Dept. of Civil and Environmental Engineering, University of California, Berkeley, CA, USA
23 14. School of Civil Engineering, University of Leeds, Leeds, UK
24 15. Institute of Environmental Assessment and Water Research, IDAEA, Spanish Research Council, CSIC, Barcelona, Spain
25 16. Dept. of the Built Environment, National University of Singapore, Singapore
26 17. McGill University, Montreal, QC, Canada
27 18. Dept. of Primary Care Health Sciences, University of Oxford, Oxford, UK.
28 19. The Fluid Dynamics of Disease Transmission Laboratory, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, MA, USA
29 20. REHVA (Federation of European Heating, Ventilation and Air Conditioning Associations), BBA Binnenmilieu, the Netherlands
30 21. Respiratory Sciences, University of Leicester, Leicester, UK
31 22. Dept. Mechanical Engineering, University of Colorado, Boulder, CO, USA
32 *: corresponding author: <jose.jimenez@colorado.edu>

33

34 **Abstract.** Some infectious diseases, including COVID-19, can be transmitted via aerosols that
35 are emitted by an infectious person and inhaled by susceptible individuals. Most airborne
36 transmission occurs at close proximity and is effectively reduced by physical distancing, but as
37 time indoors increases, infections occur in those sharing room air despite maintaining
38 distancing. There have been calls for quantified models to estimate the absolute and relative
39 contribution of these different factors to infection risk. We propose two indicators of infection risk
40 for this situation, i.e., relative risk parameter (H_r) and risk parameter (H). They combine the key
41 factors that control airborne disease transmission indoors: virus-containing aerosol generation
42 rate, breathing flow rate, masking and its quality, ventilation and particulate air cleaning rates,
43 number of occupants, and duration of exposure. COVID-19 outbreaks show a clear trend in
44 relation to these factors that is consistent with airborne infection. The observed trends of
45 outbreak size (attack rate) vs. H (H_r) allow us to recommend values of these parameters to
46 minimize COVID-19 indoor infection risk. Transmission in typical pre-pandemic indoor spaces is
47 highly sensitive to mitigation efforts. Previous outbreaks of measles, flu, and tuberculosis were
48 assessed along with recently reported COVID-19 outbreaks. Measles outbreaks occur at much
49 lower risk parameter values than COVID-19, while tuberculosis outbreaks are observed at much
50 higher risk parameter values. Since both diseases are accepted as airborne, the fact that
51 COVID-19 is less contagious than measles does not rule out airborne transmission. It is
52 important that future outbreak reports include information on the nature and type of masking,
53 ventilation and particulate-air cleaning rates, number of occupants, and duration of exposure, to
54 allow us to understand the circumstances conducive to airborne transmission of different
55 diseases.

56

57 **Key words**

58 COVID-19; airborne transmission; indoor air; risk assessment; mitigation

59

60 **Synopsis**

61 We propose two infection risk indicators for indoor spaces and apply them to COVID-19

62 outbreaks analysis and mitigation.

63

64

65 **Introduction**

66

67 Some respiratory infections can be transmitted through the airborne pathway, in which aerosol
68 particles (< 100 μm) are shed by infected individuals and inhaled by others, causing disease in
69 susceptible individuals.¹⁻⁴ It is widely accepted that measles, tuberculosis, and chickenpox are
70 transmitted in this way,^{5,6} and acceptance is growing that this is a major and potentially the
71 dominant transmission mode of COVID-19.⁷⁻¹³ There is substantial evidence that smallpox,¹⁴
72 influenza,³ SARS,¹⁵ MERS,⁶ and rhinovirus¹⁶ are also transmitted via aerosols.

73

74 There are three airborne transmission scenarios of interest in which infectious and susceptible
75 people: (a) are in close proximity to each other (< 1-2 m), so-called “short-range airborne
76 transmission,”¹⁷ which is effectively mitigated by physical distancing; (b) share air in the same
77 room, “shared space airborne”; and (c) “longer-distance airborne transmission” in buildings
78 when individuals are not sharing a room (or are in very large rooms), or even between buildings
79 as in the Amoy Gardens SARS outbreak.¹⁵ Often (b) and (c) are lumped together under “long-
80 range transmission,” but in Scenario (c) transport of pathogen-containing air is more complex,
81 so that the approximation of well mixed air is less valid. It is thus useful to separate these
82 scenarios given the substantial differences in the risk of these situations and actions needed to
83 abate the risk of transmission.

84

85 Airborne diseases vary widely in transmissibility, but all of them are most easily transmitted at
86 short range due to the higher concentration of pathogen-containing aerosols close to the
87 infected person. For SARS-CoV-2, a pathogen of initially moderate infectivity (more recently
88 increased by some variants such as Delta), many instances have been reported implicating
89 transmission in shared indoor spaces. Indeed, multiple outbreaks of COVID-19 have been

90 reported in crowded spaces that were relatively poorly ventilated and that were shared by many
91 people for periods of half an hour or longer. Examples include choir rehearsals,¹¹ religious
92 services,¹⁸ buses,¹⁹ workshop rooms,¹⁹ restaurants,^{4,20} and gyms,²¹ among others. There are
93 only a few documented cases of longer-distance transmission of SARS-CoV-2, in buildings.^{22–24}
94 However, cases of longer-distance transmission are harder to detect as they require contact
95 tracing teams to have sufficient data to connect cases together and rule out infection acquired
96 elsewhere. Historically, it was only possible to prove longer-distance transmission in the
97 complete absence of community transmission (e.g. ref ¹⁴).

98

99 Being able to quickly assess the risk of infection for a wide variety of indoor environments is of
100 the utmost importance given the impact of the continuing pandemic (and the risk of future
101 pandemics) on so many aspects of life in almost every country of the world. We urgently need to
102 improve the safety of the air that we breathe across a range of environments including child-
103 care facilities, kindergartens, schools, colleges, shops, offices, homes, eldercare facilities,
104 factories, public and private transportation, restaurants, gyms, libraries, cinemas, concert halls,
105 places of worship and mass outdoor events across different climates and socio-economic
106 conditions. There is very little evidence on the actual ventilation rates and the effectiveness of
107 ventilation systems at reducing risks from viral exposure and other indoor pollutants within the
108 majority of buildings. However, data from COVID-19 outbreaks consistently show that a large
109 fraction of buildings worldwide have very low ventilation rates despite the requirements set in
110 national building standards. A host of policy questions – from how to safely re-open schools to
111 how to prevent transmission in high-risk occupational settings – require accurate quantification
112 of the multiple interacting variables that influence airborne infection risk.

113

114 Qualitative guidance to reduce the risk of airborne transmission has been published.^{25–27}

115 Different mathematical models have been proposed to help manage risk of airborne

116 transmission,^{28,29} and several models have been adapted to COVID-19.^{30–33} It is important to
117 define quantitative infection risk criteria for different spaces and types of events to more
118 effectively manage the pandemic.³⁴ Such criteria could then be used by authorities and policy
119 makers to assist in deciding which activities are permitted under what conditions, so as to limit
120 infection risk across a society. To our knowledge, no such quantitative criteria have been
121 proposed. Besides, often recommendations are complex and vague, e.g., “reduce duration and
122 density of occupancy, and increase ventilation.” However, it is not clear how to combine the
123 different measures together (e.g., is half the duration equivalent to doubling the ventilation?) and
124 it is also not clear what level of mitigation is sufficient to reduce outbreak probability to a low
125 level.

126

127 Here, we use a box model to estimate the viral aerosol concentration indoors, and combine it
128 with the Wells-Riley infection model.²⁸ The combined model is used to derive two quantitative
129 risk parameters that allow comparing the relative risk of transmission in different situations when
130 sharing room air. We explore the trends in infections observed in outbreaks of COVID-19 and
131 other diseases as a function of these parameters. Finally, we use the parameters to quantify a
132 graphical display of the relative risk of different situations and mitigation options.

133

134 **Materials and Methods**

135

136 **Box model of infection**

137

138 The box model considers a single enclosed space, in which virus-containing aerosols are
139 assumed to be rapidly uniformly mixed compared with the time spent by the occupants in the
140 space. This is approximately applicable in many situations, but there are some exceptions such
141 as outbreaks where clear directional flow occurred in a room.^{18,20} The mathematical notation

142 used in the paper is summarized in Table S1. The mass balance equation is first written in
143 terms of c , the concentration of infectious quanta in the air in the enclosed space (units of
144 quanta m^{-3}). Compared with a model written in terms of aerosol or viral particle concentrations, c
145 has the advantage of implicitly including effects such as the deposition efficiency of the aerosol
146 particles in the lungs of a susceptible person, as well as the efficiency with which such
147 deposited particles may cause infection, the multiplicity of infection, etc. The balance of quanta
148 in the space can be written as:

149

$$150 \quad dc/dt = E_p f_e / V - (\lambda_0 + \lambda_{dec} + \lambda_{dep} + \lambda_{cle}) c \quad (1)$$

151

152 where E_p is the emission rate of quanta into the indoor air from an infected person present in the
153 space (quanta / h); f_e is the penetration efficiency of virus-carrying particles through masks or
154 face coverings for exhalation (which takes into account the impact of whether the infector wears
155 a face covering); V is the volume of the space; λ_0 is the first-order rate of removal of quanta by
156 ventilation with outdoor air (h^{-1}); λ_{cle} is the removal of quanta by air cleaning devices (e.g.
157 recirculated air with filtering, germicidal UV, portable air cleaners, etc.); λ_{dec} is the infectivity
158 decay rate of the virus; λ_{dep} is the deposition rate of airborne virus-containing particles onto
159 surfaces. E_p is a critical parameter that depends strongly on the disease, and it can be
160 estimated with a forward model based on aerosol emission rates and pathogen concentration in
161 saliva and respiratory fluid^{31,35} or by fitting a model such as the one used here to real
162 transmission events.^{11,31}

163

164 This equation can be solved analytically or numerically for specific situations. Given the
165 enormous number of possible situations, and given the prevalence of outbreaks resulting from
166 longer events where air is shared for a substantial period of time, we consider a sufficiently long
167 event so that a steady state condition ($dc/dt \sim 0$) is a reasonable approximation. Writing $\lambda = \lambda_0 +$

168 $\lambda_{cle} + \lambda_{dec} + \lambda_{dep}$ for simplicity leads to a steady-state infectious quanta concentration of:

169

$$170 \quad c = E_p f_e / (V \lambda) \quad (2)$$

171

172 Under the assumption of no infectious quanta at the beginning of the event, a multiplicative
173 factor, r_{ss} , can be applied for events too short to approximately reach steady state (see Section
174 S1 for detail) to correct the deviation of the quanta concentration averaged over the event (c_{avg})
175 from that at steady state:

176

$$177 \quad c_{avg} = r_{ss} E_p f_e / (V \lambda) \quad (3)$$

178

179 Since the goal is to analyze outbreaks, we assume that only a single infectious person is
180 present in the space, which is thought to be applicable to the outbreaks analyzed below. This
181 allows calculation of the probability of infection, *conditional* to one infectious person being
182 present. The model can also be formulated to calculate the *absolute* probability of infection, if
183 we assume that the probability of an infectious person being present reflects the prevalence of a
184 disease at a given location and time (e.g. refs ^{30,36}).

185

186 The dose expressed in infectious quanta (n) inhaled by each of the susceptible persons present
187 in the space (N_{sus}) is then:

188

$$189 \quad n = f_i B c_{avg} D \quad (4)$$

190

191 where f_i is the penetration efficiency of virus-carrying particles through masks or face coverings
192 for inhalation (which takes into account the effect of the fraction of occupants wearing face
193 coverings); B is the breathing volumetric flow rate of susceptible persons; D is the duration of

194 exposure, assumed to be the same for all the susceptible persons. Substituting:

195

$$196 \quad n = r_{ss} E_p f_e f_i B D / (V \lambda) \quad (5)$$

197

198 The number of expected secondary infections increases monotonically with increasing n . For an

199 individual susceptible person, by definition of an infectious quantum, the probability of infection

200 is ²⁸:

201

$$202 \quad P = 1 - e^{-n} \quad (6)$$

203

204 For low values of n , the use of the Taylor expansion for an exponential allows approximating P

205 as:

206

$$207 \quad P \sim n \quad (7)$$

208

209 The total number of secondary infections expected, which may also be regarded as the effective

210 reproduction number (R_e) in a given situation, is then:

211

$$212 \quad N_{si} = P N_{sus} \sim n N_{sus} \quad (8)$$

213

214 where N_{sus} is the number of susceptible individuals present, which may be lower than the

215 number of occupants due to vaccination or immunity due to past infection. All the outbreaks

216 studied here occurred before COVID-19 vaccines became available. Thus, the number of

217 secondary infections increases linearly with n at lower values, and non-linearly at higher values.

218 We retain the simplified form to define and calculate the risk parameters, but use equation (6)

219 for fitting the outbreak results in Figure 1b below.

220

221 Risk parameters for airborne infection

222

223 We define the relative risk parameter, H_r , and the risk parameter, H , for airborne infection in a
224 shared space. The purpose of H_r and H is to capture the dependency of P and N_{si} , respectively,
225 on the parameters that define an event in a given space, in particular those parameters that can
226 be controlled to reduce risk of shared-room airborne transmission. To better capture the
227 controllable actions, E_p and B were split into factors that can and cannot be controlled. E_p can
228 be expressed as the product $E_{p0} \times r_E$ where E_{p0} and r_E are, respectively, the quanta shedding
229 rate of an infectious person resting and only orally breathing (no vocalization); and the shedding
230 rate enhancement factor relative to E_{p0} for an activity with a certain degree of vocalization and
231 physical intensity (see Table S2a for detail). B can be expressed as $B_0 \times r_B$, where B_0 and r_B are
232 the volumetric breathing rate of a sedentary susceptible person in the age group of 41-<51
233 years (numerically also the average for all age groups) and the relative breathing rate
234 enhancement factor (vs. B_0) for an activity with a certain physical intensity and for a certain age
235 group (see Table S2b for detail). E_{p0} is uncertain, likely highly variable across the population,
236 and variable over time during the period of infectiousness.^{31,35,37} It may also increase due to new
237 virus variants such as the SARS-CoV-2 Delta variant, that is more contagious, assuming that
238 the increased contagiousness is due to increased viral emission or reduced infectious dose
239 (both of which would increase the quanta emission rate).^{38,39} We note that some variants could
240 in principle also increase transmissibility by lengthening the period of infectiousness for a given
241 person, which by itself would not increase the quanta emission rate in a given situation. B_0 is
242 relatively well known, and varies with a susceptible person's age, sex, and body weight, in
243 addition to physical activity level. r_E and r_B are less uncertain than E_{p0} and are functions of the
244 specific physical and vocalization activities.^{31,35,40} Thus, they are useful in capturing the
245 quantitative impact of specific controllable factors. There could be factors beyond those

246 considered here that lead to variation of viral emissions, such as the respiratory effort of patients
247 with breathing disorders, such as emphysema or asthma.⁴¹ Such factors can be incorporated
248 into updated Tables in the future.

249

250 Then P can be expressed as a function of E_{p0} , B_0 and the product of the other controllable
251 factors as:

252

$$253 \quad P = 1 - \exp(-E_{p0} B_0 H_r) \sim E_{p0} B_0 H_r \quad (9)$$

254

255 Where H_r is the relative risk parameter:

256

$$257 \quad H_r = r_{ss} r_E r_B f_e f_i D / (V \lambda) \quad (10)$$

258

259

260 It has a unit of $h^2 m^{-3}$, which indicates the increase of risk with duration (h), the inverse of the
261 ventilation rate expressed as air changes per hour ($1/h^{-1} = h$), and the inverse of the volume of
262 the space ($1/m^3$). The other parameters such as the effect of masking are dimensionless. H_r
263 includes the relative increase of the emission with activity (r_E), but not the quanta emission rate
264 by a resting and orally breathing infector (E_{p0}). This allows using the same risk parameters for
265 different diseases, which will naturally separate in the graphs according to their transmissibility.
266 The four terms that make up λ may vary in relative importance for different diseases and
267 conditions. $\lambda_{dec} \sim 1.1 h^{-1}$ ⁴² has been reported for COVID-19. λ_{dec} depends on temperature and
268 relative humidity.^{43,44} λ_{dep} depends on particle size and the geometry and airflow in a given
269 space. Respiratory particle sizes in the range from 1-5 μm are thought to play a role in aerosol
270 transmission of COVID-19, due to a combination of high emission rates by activities such as
271 talking⁴⁵ and low deposition rates. λ_{dep} for a typical furnished indoor space span 0.2-2 h^{-1} over
272 this size range, with faster deposition for larger particles.⁴⁶ λ_0 varies from $\sim 12 h^{-1}$ for airborne
273 infection isolation rooms,⁴⁷ $\sim 6 h^{-1}$ for laboratories, $\sim 0.5 h^{-1}$ for residences,⁴⁸ and $\sim 1 h^{-1}$ for
274 offices.^{1,49} Very little ventilation data is available for many semi-public spaces such as shops,

275 restaurants and bars or transportation. λ_{cle} can vary from 0, if such systems are not in use, to
276 several h^{-1} for adequately sized systems. Ventilation with clean outdoor air will be important in
277 most situations, while virus decay and deposition likely contribute but are more uncertain for
278 COVID-19, based on current information. In particular, the size distribution of aerosols
279 containing infectious viruses is uncertain.

280

281 We consider a worst-case scenario where rates of deposition and infectivity decay are small
282 compared with ventilation and air cleaning and can therefore be neglected. This also allows
283 using the same relative risk parameter to compare different airborne diseases. This yields:

284

$$285 \quad H_r = r_{ss} r_E r_B f_e f_i D / (V (\lambda_0 + \lambda_{cle})) \quad (11)$$

286

287 H_r can be recast as:

288

$$289 \quad H_r = r_{ss} r_E r_B f_e f_i D / (L N_{sus}) \quad (12)$$

290

291

292 where:

293

$$294 \quad L = V (\lambda_0 + \lambda_{cle}) / N_{sus} \quad (13)$$

295

296 Assuming that all of the people present in a space are susceptible to infection, L is equivalent to
297 the ventilation plus air cleaning rate per person present in the space, (typically expressed in
298 liters s^{-1} person $^{-1}$ in standards and guidelines such as from refs ⁵⁰⁻⁵². If some fraction of the
299 people present are immune to the disease, then L is larger than the corresponding personal
300 ventilation rate in the guidance. While this recasting will be useful to persons familiar with
301 ventilation guidelines, we keep the form in equation (11) for most further analyses, since the

302 number of people allowed in a space is one of the critical variables that can be examined with
303 this relative risk parameter.

304

305 We insert equation (9) into equation (8) and obtain

306

$$307 \quad N_{si} = N_{sus} [1 - \exp(-E_{p0} B_0 H_r)] \sim N_{sus} E_{p0} B_0 H_r = E_{p0} B_0 H \quad (14)$$

308

309 where we define the risk parameter

310

$$311 \quad H = N_{sus} H_r = r_{ss} r_E r_B f_e f_i D N_{sus} / (V (\lambda_0 + \lambda_{cle})) = r_{ss} r_E r_B f_e f_i D / L \quad (15)$$

312

313 When there is only one infector present and n is small, H is proportional to N_{si} , i.e., the outbreak
314 size. When it is unknown whether an infector is present, H is an approximate indicator of the
315 absolute probability of infection (P_a), since the expected value of number of infectors (N_i) is the
316 product of number of occupants (N) and probability of an occupant being infectious, a measure
317 of prevalence of infectious people in local population (η_i), as shown below:

318

$$319 \quad P_a \sim N_i r_{ss} E_p f_e f_i B D / (V \lambda) = \eta_i N r_{ss} E_{p0} B_0 r_E r_B f_e f_i D / (V \lambda)$$

$$320 \quad \sim \eta_i N_{sus} H_r E_{p0} B_0 = \eta_i E_{p0} B_0 H \quad (16)$$

321

322 The precise estimation of η_i is complex for several reasons. Most transmission may be
323 associated with those infected with high viral loads,^{53,54} as many infected people may not shed
324 virus into the air.³⁷ Also much spread is by people with few or no symptoms who may not know
325 that they are infected,⁵⁵ however a fraction of symptomatic infectious people are typically in
326 isolation. There is also significant variation in viral load and infectivity during the course of the

327 disease.⁵⁶ For these reasons, it is very difficult to determine η_i precisely based on test data. For
328 a situation with multiple potential infectors present (e.g., a COVID ward in a hospital), the risk
329 parameters should be multiplied by the number of infectors.

330

331 For the analysis later in the paper that does not involve activity type or face covering choice
332 (and thus does not involve r_E , r_B , f_e , or f_i), we define another parameter (H'), which is closely
333 related to H :

334

$$335 \quad H' = D N_{\text{sus}} / (V (\lambda_0 + \lambda_{\text{cle}})) = r_{\text{ss}} D / L \quad (17)$$

336

337 This parameter only captures the characteristics of susceptible people's presence in the indoor
338 space, not of their behavior.

339

340 **Value of the risk parameters for documented outbreaks of COVID-19**

341

342 An important advantage of the simple risk parameters is that their values can be calculated for
343 outbreaks that are documented in the scientific literature. Values for documented COVID-19
344 outbreaks are shown in Table 1 (r_E and r_B are estimated based on the likely types of activities in
345 each case,^{31,35,40} see Table S2 for typical values). Also included are values for outbreaks
346 documented in the literature for tuberculosis and measles, which are widely accepted to
347 transmit through the air, and an influenza outbreak that was clearly due to airborne
348 transmission. We have included all the outbreaks known to us for which sufficient information
349 was available to estimate airborne infection risk. Most public health investigations so far in this
350 pandemic have neglected to report ventilation rates, the volume of the space, filter and air
351 cleaner efficiencies, and other building science details, and thus their airborne risk cannot be
352 estimated. It is important that future outbreak reports include this information, to allow

353 expanding our knowledge of the circumstances conducive to airborne transmission of different
 354 diseases.
 355

Disease	Outbreak (reference)	r_E Relative shedding rate factor	r_B Relative breathing rate factor	D (h)	N_{sus}	V (m ³)	λ_0 (h ⁻¹)	L (liter s ⁻¹ person ⁻¹)	r_{ss}	H (persons h ² m ⁻³)	H' (persons h ² m ⁻³)	H_r (h ² m ⁻³)	Attack rate (%)	Number of secondary cases
COVID-19	Guangzhou restaurant ⁴	9.3 ^a	1	1.2	20	97	0.67	0.9	0.31	1.1	0.11	0.054	45	9
	Big bus outbreak ¹⁹ (ventilation from pers. comm. Y. Li)	1	1	3.3	46	60	4.7	1.7	0.94	0.50	0.50	0.011	17	8
	Small bus outbreak ¹⁹ (ventilation from pers. comm. Y. Li)	1	1	1	17	22	8.9	3.2	0.89	0.077	0.077	0.0045	12	2
	Skagit Choir ¹¹	85 ^b	2.5 ^c	2.5	60	810	0.7	2.6	0.53	30	0.14	0.5	87	53
	Call center ⁵⁷	30 ^d	1	8	216	630	6	4.9	0.98	13	0.45	0.062	44	94
	Aircraft ⁵⁸	50 ^e	1	11	19 ^f	60	21	18	1	8.4	0.17	0.44	63	12
	Slaughterhouse ⁵⁹	4.3 ^g	5 ^h	8		3000	0.53		0.77			0.083	26	
	Berlin Choir ⁶⁰	85 ^b	2.5 ^c	2.5		1200	0.17		0.19			0.49	91	

	Berlin School ¹⁶⁰	1	1	4.5		180	8.3		0.97			0.0029	10	
	Berlin School ²⁶⁰	1	1	1.5		150	10		0.93			0.00093	6	
	Israel School ⁶¹	5.7 ⁱ	1.1 ^j	4.5		150	2.7		0.92			0.1	43	
	Germany Meeting ⁶⁰	1.7 ^k	1	2		170	1.2		0.62			0.012	17	
Tuberculosis	Office ⁶²	1.7 ^k	1	160	67			7.1	1 ^l	11	6.3	0.16	40	27
	Hospital ⁶³	1.9 ^m	1.7 ⁿ	1800	25	200	6	13	1 ^l	120	37.5	4.8	28	7
Influenza	Aircraft ^{e 64}	50	1	4.3	29	168	0.5	0.45	0.59	44	0.88	1.5	86	25
Measles	School ²⁸	1	1	10	48			150 ^o (7.6)	1 ^l	0.019	0.019	0.0004	52	25
	School ^{p 28}	1	1	30	31			170 ^o (5.5)	1 ^l	0.05	0.05	0.0016	23	7
	Physician's Office ⁶⁵	1	1	1	12	250	1.2	6.9	0.42	0.017	0.017	0.0014	33	4

356

357 Footnotes: choice of parameters for specific cases. ^a Talking during half of the time and half normal / half loud talking

358 assumed; ^b Light exercise - loudly speaking; ^c Light intensity for 61-<71 years; ^d Resting - loudly speaking; ^e Estimate

359 for coughing. The value is the product of r_E for resting - speaking and the ratio of the average expired aerosol counts

360 for coughing and talking;⁶⁶ ^f only the business class cabin is considered; ^g Moderate exercise - oral breathing; ^h

361 Moderate intensity for all age groups; ⁱ Standing - speaking for the infectious teacher; ^j Sedentary/passive for students

362 aged 12-18; ^k Resting - speaking during $\frac{1}{3}$ of the time assumed; ^l Event long enough for the assumption of unity for

363 r_{ss} ; ^m Half resting - oral breathing / half light exercise -oral breathing assumed; ⁿ Half sedentary/passive / half light

364 intensity assumed; ^o Ventilation rate per susceptible person. The number in parentheses is for the ventilation rate per

365 occupant, estimated based on a teacher-to-student ratio of 11.3% for Monroe County, NY (according to National
366 Center for Education Statistics Common Core of Data (<https://nces.ed.gov/ccd/>));^p Scaled to the single-infectior
367 condition.

368

369 *Table 1: Parameters for outbreaks documented in the literature. Missing parameters could not*
370 *be calculated from the information given in the literature references.*

371

372 We see that the COVID-19 outbreaks that have been documented span ~2.5 orders of
373 magnitude range of the risk parameter $H \sim 0.09\text{-}30$ persons $\text{h}^2 \text{m}^{-3}$. Numbers of secondary
374 cases of these outbreaks generally increase with H (Figure 1a). Aiming to maintain values far
375 below the threshold of 0.05 persons $\text{h}^2 \text{m}^{-3}$ should help reduce outbreaks.

376

377 H_r correlates well with the attack rates for the outbreaks reported in Table 1 (Figure 1b, H_r can
378 be calculated for more literature outbreaks than H). COVID-19 outbreaks are observed for $H_r >$
379 0.001 $\text{h}^2 \text{m}^{-3}$, and thus indoor activities should be limited to conditions below this value during
380 the pandemic whenever possible.

381

382 A trend line can be fitted to the attack rate vs. H_r dataset with the Box/Wells-Riley model (Figure
383 1b), with the fitting parameter being E_{p0} , i.e. the basic quanta shedding rate (when breathing
384 only, no vocalization). A best-fit E_{p0} of 18.6 quanta h^{-1} was obtained (with $B_0 = 0.288 \text{ m}^3 \text{ h}^{-1}$
385 assumed for all occupants for simplicity). When the uncertainties of H_r and attack rates are
386 considered, the uncertainty of E_{p0} can also be estimated through Monte Carlo uncertainty
387 propagation, described in detail in Section S2. The 5th and 95th percentiles of the E_{p0} values are
388 8.7 and 45.4 quanta h^{-1} , respectively. This range is higher than that suggested by Buonanno et
389 al. (2 quanta h^{-1}),^{31,35} but overlapping with the uncertainty range provided by those authors. Note
390 that outbreaks are typically only observed for individuals with higher quanta emission rates;


391 many infected individuals have low emission rates and the risk in those situations will be lower
392 than estimated here.^{31,35} The attack rates estimated according to this trend line have a high
393 correlation with the actual attack rates ($r^2 = 0.90$; Figure S1). Given the small size of the dataset
394 of H_r and attack rates, we cross-validate this fitting by the leave-one-out method.⁶⁷ The 12
395 values of E_{p0} obtained in the cross validation have maximum and mean relative absolute
396 deviations of 20% and 6%, respectively, from the best-fit value, showing the robustness of the
397 fitting.

398


399 Close alignment supports the dominant shared-room airborne character of these COVID-19
400 outbreaks. If the outbreaks had major components of other transmission modes (e.g., fomite or
401 close-range transmission), we would expect a dependence on other parameters not considered
402 here and overall much lower correlation with the risk parameters. Nevertheless, it can be
403 observed that the attack rates of the outbreaks at low H_r ($\sim 0.01 \text{ h}^2 \text{ m}^{-3}$ or lower) are higher than
404 the fitted curve. This can be due to several factors, including i) other transmission routes (e.g.,
405 short-range airborne transmission, for which the risk cannot be well captured by the model in
406 this study and can still be significant at low H_r) or ii) the detection of only outlier cases of long-
407 range airborne transmission resulting from the variability of E_{p0} (e.g., cases where the infector's
408 actual quanta emission rate was extremely high), as the other cases may have too few
409 secondary infections to be documented in the literature.

410

411 (a)



412
413 (b)



414
415 *Figure 1: (a) Number of secondary cases vs. the risk parameter H and (b) attack rate vs. the*
416 *relative risk parameter H_r for outbreaks of COVID-19, tuberculosis, influenza, and measles*
417 *reported in the literature. The fitted trend line of attack rate as a function of H_r and its estimated*
418 *uncertainty range (5th and 95th percentiles) are also shown in (b). All of the outbreaks*
419 *investigated here involve the original variants of the virus. A variant twice as contagious should*
420 *result in moving the results to the left by a factor of two or so.*

421
422 **Effect of building parameters vs. human activities**

423
424 The type of activity performed in each case (captured by the product of r_E and r_B) contributes
425 substantially to the difference in H between these cases. When human activities are not taken

426 into account, the parameter H' only spans a narrow range of 0.09-0.56 person $\text{h}^2 \text{m}^{-3}$. This is
427 probably due to similar per-person ventilation rates in many public indoor spaces (on the order
428 of a few liter $\text{s}^{-1} \text{person}^{-1}$)⁵⁰ and similar lengths of common events (in hours).

429
430 Similar to H , the variation in the values of H_r for the outbreaks in Table 1 is also largely
431 determined by r_E and r_B . If they are not taken into account, H_r for all outbreaks would vary in the
432 narrow range 0.001 to $\sim 0.01 \text{h}^2 \text{m}^{-3}$, as V and λ_0 are building characteristics and D , as discussed
433 above, is usually in hours. This implies that, in the presence of a single infector, reducing
434 vocalization and/or physical intensity levels of the indoor activity is a very effective way to lower
435 the infection risk of susceptible individuals. Reducing event length can also help, while reducing
436 occupancy cannot in this case, as shown by equation (10).

437
438 It is possible that some of the most visible outbreaks are associated with super-emitter
439 individuals, who shed virus particles at higher rates than others.^{41,68-70} If that is the case, the
440 actual H_r values at which significant transmission starts to appear in the presence of individuals
441 that are not super emitters may be higher than those determined here. However, if super-
442 emitters are important, so will be their contribution to total spread, and thus one should try to
443 reduce the risk to reduce the probability of such events occurring.

444

445 **Values of the risk parameters for outbreaks of other airborne diseases**

446

447 In Table 1 and Figure 1 we also include a few reported indoor outbreaks of three other diseases
448 with significant airborne transmission, i.e., tuberculosis, influenza, and measles. For outbreaks
449 to have a similar number of secondary cases or attack rate, H or H_r needs to be higher for
450 tuberculosis and influenza and lower for measles than that for COVID-19 (Figure 1). Note that
451 many of the children present in the measles outbreak were vaccinated, but the risk parameter

452 framework can still be applied by considering the number of susceptible children present. This
453 difference is mainly due to differences in E_{p0} (lower for tuberculosis and influenza and higher for
454 measles; Figure 1b). A higher E_{p0} for measles may indicate a larger amount of airborne measles
455 virus in breath or a steeper dose-response curve for the measles virus than SARS-CoV-2, or
456 both. A novel disease as contagious as measles would make almost any indoor situation prone
457 to superspreading. On the other hand, tuberculosis and influenza are less contagious.
458 Tuberculosis transmission is propagated because untreated infected people remain contagious
459 for years.⁷¹ The influenza outbreak occurred in an airplane without ventilation with the index
460 case constantly coughing, and represents an extreme for this disease.⁶⁴ Most influenza patients
461 emit significantly less virus.⁷² More discussions about quanta emission rates of different
462 diseases can be found in refs ^{35,73}.

463
464 Given that both the measles and tuberculosis pathogens are widely accepted as airborne, the
465 intermediate risk profile for COVID-19 in Figure 1b is not inconsistent with airborne
466 transmission, contrary to frequently made arguments.^{74,75} Contagiousness of a disease does not
467 necessarily indicate the transmission route.⁷⁶ Airborne diseases can vary in their
468 contagiousness depending on parameters such as the amount of virus shed, the survival of the
469 virus in the air, the dose-response relationship for infection, and other parameters. The only
470 fundamental requirement is that transmission needs to be sufficient for the disease to survive as
471 such, something COVID-19 has had no trouble with so far.

472

473 **Graphical representation of relative risks of different situations**

474

475 When it is not known whether infectors are present at an indoor event, all occupants must be
476 considered possible infectors. We assume that the probability of an occupant being infectious is
477 the same as the fraction of infectious people in the local population (η_i). H indicates the risk of

478 an outbreak. Consequently, the risk also depends on the number of occupants in addition to
479 vocalization level, event duration, ventilation, and mask wearing. Jones et al.²⁵ estimated the
480 dependency of the infection risk on these factors and tabulated it in a manner similar to Table 2.
481 However, they only did so qualitatively. Having defined H as a risk parameter, we can assess
482 the risk more quantitatively based on H values (as well as contact times allowed until outbreak
483 risk is significant ($H = 0.05$ persons $h^2 m^{-3}$) and attack rates) under different conditions (Table 2).
484 Although the actual risk also depends on η_1 and the choice of the threshold for high risk (red
485 cells in Table 2) is subjective, the risk parameter (H value) in Table 2 seems to vary in a smaller
486 range than the corresponding table in Jones et al..²⁵ We also show that being outdoors (with
487 much better ventilation than indoors) has a greater expected benefit than they estimated.
488
489 (a) Risk parameter H (persons $h^2 m^{-3}$)

Type and level of group activity	Low occupancy			High occupancy		
	Outdoor and well ventilated	Indoor and well ventilated	Poorly ventilated	Outdoor and well ventilated	Indoor and well ventilated	Poorly ventilated
Wear face coverings, contact for short time						
Silent	2.33E-05	1.17E-03	1.17E-02	2.33E-04	1.17E-02	1.17E-01
Speaking	1.17E-04	5.83E-03	5.83E-02	1.17E-03	5.83E-02	5.83E-01
Shouting, singing	7.00E-04	3.50E-02	3.50E-01	7.00E-03	3.50E-01	3.50E+00
Heavy exercise	1.63E-03	8.17E-02	8.17E-01	1.63E-02	8.17E-01	8.17E+00
Wear face coverings, contact for prolonged time						
Silent	2.33E-04	1.17E-02	1.17E-01	2.33E-03	1.17E-01	1.17E+00
Speaking	1.17E-03	5.83E-02	5.83E-01	1.17E-02	5.83E-01	5.83E+00
Shouting, singing	7.00E-03	3.50E-01	3.50E+00	7.00E-02	3.50E+00	3.50E+01
Heavy exercise	1.63E-02	8.17E-01	8.17E+00	1.63E-01	8.17E+00	8.17E+01
No face coverings, contact for short time						
Silent	6.67E-05	3.33E-03	3.33E-02	6.67E-04	3.33E-02	3.33E-01
Speaking	3.33E-04	1.67E-02	1.67E-01	3.33E-03	1.67E-01	1.67E+00
Shouting, singing	2.00E-03	1.00E-01	1.00E+00	2.00E-02	1.00E+00	1.00E+01
Heavy exercise	4.67E-03	2.33E-01	2.33E+00	4.67E-02	2.33E+00	2.33E+01
No face coverings, contact for prolonged time						
Silent	6.67E-04	3.33E-02	3.33E-01	6.67E-03	3.33E-01	3.33E+00
Speaking	3.33E-03	1.67E-01	1.67E+00	3.33E-02	1.67E+00	1.67E+01
Shouting, singing	2.00E-02	1.00E+00	1.00E+01	2.00E-01	1.00E+01	1.00E+02
Heavy exercise	4.67E-02	2.33E+00	2.33E+01	4.67E-01	2.33E+01	2.33E+02

490

491

492

493

494 (b) Exposure time (in h) corresponding to an infection risk parameter (H) value of 0.05 person h²

495 m⁻³

Type and level of group activity	Low occupancy			High occupancy		
	Outdoor and well ventilated	Indoor and well ventilated	Poorly ventilated	Outdoor and well ventilated	Indoor and well ventilated	Poorly ventilated
Wear face coverings						
Silent	2142.86	42.86	4.29	214.29	4.29	0.43
Speaking	428.57	8.57	0.86	42.86	0.86	0.09
Shouting, singing	71.43	1.43	0.14	7.14	0.14	0.01
Heavy exercise	30.61	0.61	0.06	3.06	0.06	0.01
No face coverings						
Silent	750.00	15.00	1.50	75.00	1.50	0.15
Speaking	150.00	3.00	0.30	15.00	0.30	0.03
Shouting, singing	25.00	0.50	0.05	2.50	0.05	0.01
Heavy exercise	10.71	0.21	0.02	1.07	0.02	0.00

496

497 (c) Estimated attack rate when 0.1% of the local population are infectious

Type and level of group activity	Low occupancy			High occupancy		
	Outdoor and well ventilated	Indoor and well ventilated	Poorly ventilated	Outdoor and well ventilated	Indoor and well ventilated	Poorly ventilated
Wear face coverings, contact for short time						
Silent	0.00%	0.01%	0.06%	0.00%	0.06%	0.62%
Speaking	0.00%	0.03%	0.31%	0.01%	0.31%	3.08%
Shouting, singing	0.00%	0.19%	1.86%	0.04%	1.86%	17.10%
Heavy exercise	0.01%	0.44%	4.28%	0.09%	4.28%	35.43%
Wear face coverings, contact for prolonged time						
Silent	0.00%	0.06%	0.62%	0.01%	0.62%	6.06%
Speaking	0.01%	0.31%	3.08%	0.06%	3.08%	26.84%
Shouting, singing	0.04%	1.86%	17.10%	0.37%	17.10%	84.66%
Heavy exercise	0.09%	4.28%	35.43%	0.87%	35.43%	98.74%
No face coverings, contact for short time						
Silent	0.00%	0.02%	0.18%	0.00%	0.18%	1.77%
Speaking	0.00%	0.09%	0.89%	0.02%	0.89%	8.54%
Shouting, singing	0.01%	0.53%	5.22%	0.11%	5.22%	41.47%
Heavy exercise	0.02%	1.24%	11.75%	0.25%	11.75%	71.35%
No face coverings, contact for prolonged time						
Silent	0.00%	0.18%	1.77%	0.04%	1.77%	16.35%
Speaking	0.02%	0.89%	8.54%	0.18%	8.54%	59.05%
Shouting, singing	0.11%	5.22%	41.47%	1.07%	41.47%	99.53%
Heavy exercise	0.25%	11.75%	71.35%	2.47%	71.35%	100.00%

498

499

500 *Table 2: (a) Values of the airborne infection risk parameter (H , in persons $h^2 m^{-3}$), (b) exposure*
501 *times corresponding to $H = 0.05$ persons $h^2 m^{-3}$, and (c) predicted attack rates with 0.1%*
502 *infectious people in local population in shared spaces under different conditions in the similar*
503 *format of Fig. 3 of ref 25. An additional type of activity (“heavy exercise”) is included. Table S3*
504 *details the specific choices of the conditions in Table 2. Note that these specifications can be*
505 *changed as needed, which is easy to implement in the COVID-19 Aerosol Transmission*
506 *Estimator (Figure S2). Color of a cell varies (a) with H value from green (0 persons $h^2 m^{-3}$) via*
507 *yellow (0.05 persons $h^2 m^{-3}$) to red (≥ 0.5 persons $h^2 m^{-3}$), (b) with exposure time from red (0.1 h)*
508 *via yellow (1 h) to green (10 h), and (c) with predicted attack rate from green (0) via yellow*
509 *(0.01%) to red (0.1%). The selection of the colors in Table 2a was based on the following*
510 *considerations: i) no risk ($H=0$ persons $h^2 m^{-3}$) for green; ii) no documented outbreaks when*
511 *$H < 0.05$ persons $h^2 m^{-3}$ (Figure 1a) (thus 0.05 persons $h^2 m^{-3}$ for yellow); iii) outbreaks with*
512 *significant numbers of secondary infections when $H \geq 0.5$ persons $h^2 m^{-3}$ (Figure 1a) (thus red).*
513 *For that in Table 2b, relatively simple numbers are chosen for the thresholds that correspond to*
514 *the thresholds for H in Table 2a. As probability of infection is given in Table 2c, its colors are*
515 *chosen based on the personal risk tolerance of the authors. These tables are available in the*
516 *online transmission risk estimator, and all of their aspects can be modified depending on*
517 *specific situations and preferences.*

518

519 Note that, although occupancy has no impact on attack rate if an infector is present, occupancy
520 affects the risk in two ways when the presence of infector(s) is unknown, i.e., i) the probability of
521 the presence of an infector in a certain locality and ii) the size (number of secondary cases) of
522 the outbreak if it occurs. Therefore, lowering occupancy has double benefits.

523

524

525 **Risk evaluation for indoor spaces with pre-pandemic and mitigation scenarios**

526

527 Values of the risk parameter H for some typical public spaces under pre-pandemic conditions
528 are tabulated in Table S4 and shown in Figure 2. H in all pre-pandemic settings is on the order
529 of 0.05 persons $\text{h}^2 \text{m}^{-3}$ or higher, implying significant risk of outbreak during the pandemic.

530 Often, ventilation rates may be lower than official guidance due to e.g. malfunction, lack of
531 maintenance, or attempts to save energy. Substandard ventilation, coupled with poor air
532 distribution, substantially increases the risk of an outbreak and its size. This is consistent with
533 observations that indicate that COVID-19 outbreaks are disproportionately observed in poorly-
534 ventilated environments, which are specifically spaces with little to no added outdoor air or
535 adequately filtered air.⁷⁷ However, H and H_r of all of the pre-pandemic spaces are in a regime
536 highly sensitive to mitigation efforts. Therefore mitigation measures such as increasing
537 ventilation or air cleaning, reducing voice volume when speaking, reducing occupancy,
538 shortening duration of occupancy and mask wearing are required to reduce the risk of
539 transmission in similar settings. With mitigation measures implemented, H in these settings can
540 be lowered to the order of 0.01 persons $\text{h}^2 \text{m}^{-3}$, low enough to avoid major outbreaks.

541 Particularly, for hospital general examination room, a high-risk setting where there can be
542 coughing infectors emitting quanta at a high rate, a combination of an improvement of
543 ventilation rate to 6 h^{-1} , application of higher efficiency air filters, a halved duration, and a
544 requirement of fit-tested N95 respirators can lower the attack rate from ~90% to negligible
545 (Figure 2c). Use of high-quality masks (e.g., N95/FFP3) is highly effective among the mitigation
546 measures.


547

548

549


550 (a)

It is made available under a [CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/).




551

552 (b)



553

554 (c)



555

556

557 *Figure 2: (a, b) same format as Figure 1, but for COVID-19 only. Also shown are the H and H_r*
558 *values for several common indoor situations listed in Table S4. The H values for the cases with*
559 *pre-pandemic settings except for a lower occupancy and the H and H_r values for the ASHRAE*
560 *standard cases⁵⁰ with pre-pandemic settings except for a lower ventilation rate are shown for*
561 *comparison. The standalone legend box is for (a) and (b) only. (c) The approximately*
562 *multiplicative effects of various mitigation measures for the hospital general examination room*
563 *case are also shown as an example.*

564

565 **Calculation of risk parameters for specific situations**

566

567 The calculation of H , H' , and H_r for specific situations of interest has been implemented in the
568 COVID-19 aerosol transmission estimator, which is freely available online.³⁰ The estimator is a
569 series of spreadsheets that implement the same aerosol transmission model described by Miller
570 et al.¹¹ It allows the user to make a copy into an online Google spreadsheet or download it as a
571 Microsoft Excel file for adaptation to the situations of interest to each user. The model can be
572 used to estimate the risk of specific situations, to explore the reduction in transmission due to
573 different control measures (e.g. increased ventilation, masking etc.), and to understand aerosol
574 transmission modeling for incorporation into more complex models. The model also allows the
575 estimation of the average CO_2 concentration during an activity, as an additional indicator of
576 indoor risk, and to facilitate the investigation of the relationship between infection risk and CO_2
577 concentrations.^{36,78} A screenshot of the estimator is shown in Figure S2.

578

579 In addition a sheet allows recalculating Table 2 in this paper for sets of parameters different
580 from those used here (and shown in Table S2).

581

582 Discussion

583

584 We have explored the relationship between airborne infection transmission when sharing indoor
585 spaces and the parameters of the space using a box / Wells-Riley model. We have derived an
586 expression for the number of secondary infections, and isolated the controllable terms in this
587 expression in two airborne transmission risk parameters, H and H_r .

588

589 We find a consistent relationship, with increasing attack rate in the known COVID-19 outbreaks,
590 as the value of H_r increases. This provides some confidence that airborne transmission is
591 important in these outbreaks, and that the models used here capture the key processes
592 important for airborne transmission.

593

594 Outbreaks have been observed when H_r is on the order of $0.001 \text{ h}^2 \text{ m}^{-3}$ and higher. A criterion
595 based on H_r (e.g. $H_r > 0.01$ or $0.1 \text{ h}^2 \text{ m}^3$, depending on available contact tracing resources) can
596 also be used to determine if an occupant of an indoor space is a “close contact” of an identified
597 infector in the same space through the shared-room air airborne transmission (note that this
598 criterion does not apply to close contacts at risk of infection through short-range (<2 m) airborne
599 transmission). The lowest H for the major COVID-19 outbreaks in indoor settings reported in the
600 literature is $\sim 0.1 \text{ person h}^2 \text{ m}^{-3}$. Note that all the outbreaks investigated here concern the early to
601 mid-2020 variants of SARS-CoV-2, and a variant twice as contagious as those should reduce
602 the tolerable values of the parameters by about a factor of 2. H can be orders of magnitude
603 higher for the superspreading events where most attendees were infected (e.g. the Skagit
604 Valley choir rehearsal).¹¹ However, if human activity-dependent factors are not taken into
605 account, H' for all the outbreaks discussed in this paper is $\sim 0.1\text{-}0.5 \text{ person h}^2 \text{ m}^{-3}$. H' values for
606 public indoor spaces usually fall in or near this range primarily due to similar per-person
607 ventilation rates and public event durations. Substandard ventilation, coupled with poor air

608 distribution, is associated with substantial increases in the risk of outbreak. However, all of the
609 pre-pandemic example spaces analyzed are in a regime in which they are highly sensitive to
610 mitigation efforts.

611
612 The relative risk of COVID-19 infection falls between that of two well-known airborne diseases:
613 the more transmissible measles and the less transmissible tuberculosis. This shows that the fact
614 that COVID-19 is less transmissible than measles does not rule out airborne transmission.

615 These risk parameters can be applied to other airborne diseases, if outbreaks are characterized
616 in this framework. This approach may be useful in the design and renovation of building
617 systems. For a novel disease that was as transmissible as measles, it would be very difficult to
618 make any indoor activities safe aside from vaccination.

619
620 Our analysis shows that mitigation measures to limit aerosol transmission are needed in most
621 indoor spaces whenever COVID-19 is spreading in a community. Among effective measures are
622 reducing vocalization, avoiding intense physical activities, shortening duration of occupancy,
623 reducing number of occupants, wearing high-quality well-fitting masks, increasing ventilation,
624 improving ventilation effectiveness and applying additional virus removal measures (such as
625 HEPA filtration and UVGI disinfection). The use of multiple “layers of protection” is needed in
626 many situations, while a single measure (e.g. masking) may not be able to reduce risk to low
627 levels. We have shown that combinations of some or all of these measures are able to lower H
628 close to $0.01 \text{ person h}^2 \text{ m}^{-3}$, so that the expected number of secondary cases is substantially
629 lower than 1 even in the presence of an infectious person, hence would be likely to avoid major
630 outbreaks.

631

632

633 **Acknowledgements**

634 ZP and JLJ were partially supported by NSF AGS-1822664. TG was supported by ESRC

635 ES/V010069/1.

636

637 **Competing interests**

638 The authors declare no competing interests.

639

640 **References**

- 641 (1) Nazaroff, W. W. Indoor Bioaerosol Dynamics. *Indoor Air* **2016**, *26* (1), 61–78.
- 642 (2) Morawska, L.; Cao, J. Airborne Transmission of SARS-CoV-2: The World Should Face the
643 Reality. *Environ. Int.* **2020**, *139*, 105730.
- 644 (3) Tellier, R. Review of Aerosol Transmission of Influenza A Virus. *Emerg. Infect. Dis.* **2006**,
645 *12* (11), 1657–1662.
- 646 (4) Li, Y.; Qian, H.; Hang, J.; Chen, X.; Cheng, P.; Ling, H.; Wang, S.; Liang, P.; Li, J.; Xiao, S.;
647 Wei, J.; Liu, L.; Cowling, B. J.; Kang, M. Probable Airborne Transmission of SARS-CoV-2 in
648 a Poorly Ventilated Restaurant. *Build. Environ.* **2021**, *196*, 107788.
- 649 (5) Public Health England. Varicella: The Green Book, Chapter 34. *Immunisation against*
650 *infectious disease: London, UK* **2015**.
- 651 (6) Tellier, R.; Li, Y.; Cowling, B. J.; Tang, J. W. Recognition of Aerosol Transmission of
652 Infectious Agents: A Commentary. *BMC Infect. Dis.* **2019**, *19* (1), 101.
- 653 (7) Morawska, L.; Milton, D. K. It Is Time to Address Airborne Transmission of Coronavirus
654 Disease 2019 (COVID-19). *Clin. Infect. Dis.* **2020**, *71* (9), 2311–2313.
- 655 (8) Lednicky, J. A.; Lauzardo, M.; Fan, Z. H.; Jutla, A.; Tilly, T. B.; Gangwar, M.; Usmani, M.;
656 Shankar, S. N.; Mohamed, K.; Eiguren-Fernandez, A.; Stephenson, C. J.; Alam, M. M.;
657 Elbadry, M. A.; Loeb, J. C.; Subramaniam, K.; Waltzek, T. B.; Cherabuddi, K.; Morris, J. G.,
658 Jr; Wu, C.-Y. Viable SARS-CoV-2 in the Air of a Hospital Room with COVID-19 Patients.
659 *Int. J. Infect. Dis.* **2020**, *100*, 476–482.
- 660 (9) National Academies of Sciences, Engineering; Medicine; Others. Airborne Transmission of
661 SARS-CoV-2: Proceedings of a Workshop in Brief. The National Academies Press,
662 Washington, DC 2020.
- 663 (10) Prather, K. A.; Marr, L. C.; Schooley, R. T.; McDiarmid, M. A.; Wilson, M. E.; Milton, D.
664 K. Airborne Transmission of SARS-CoV-2. *Science* **2020**, *370* (6514), 303–304.
- 665 (11) Miller, S. L.; Nazaroff, W. W.; Jimenez, J. L.; Boerstra, A.; Buonanno, G.; Dancer, S. J.;
666 Kurnitski, J.; Marr, L. C.; Morawska, L.; Noakes, C. Transmission of SARS-CoV-2 by
667 Inhalation of Respiratory Aerosol in the Skagit Valley Chorale Superspreading Event.
668 *Indoor Air* **2021**, *31* (2), 314–323.
- 669 (12) Greenhalgh, T.; Jimenez, J. L.; Prather, K. A.; Tufekci, Z.; Fisman, D.; Schooley, R. Ten
670 Scientific Reasons in Support of Airborne Transmission of SARS-CoV-2. *Lancet* **2021**.
671 [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(21\)00869-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(21)00869-2).
- 672 (13) Tang, J. W.; Marr, L. C.; Li, Y.; Dancer, S. J. Covid-19 Has Redefined Airborne
673 Transmission. *BMJ* **2021**, *373*, n913.
- 674 (14) Gelfand, H. M.; Posch, J. The Recent Outbreak of Smallpox in Meschede, West
675 Germany. *Am. J. Epidemiol.* **1971**, *93* (4), 234–237.

- 676 (15) Yu, I. T. S.; Li, Y.; Wong, T. W.; Tam, W.; Chan, A. T.; Lee, J. H. W.; Leung, D. Y. C.;
677 Ho, T. Evidence of Airborne Transmission of the Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome
678 Virus. *N. Engl. J. Med.* **2004**, *350* (17), 1731–1739.
- 679 (16) Dick, E. C.; Jennings, L. C.; Mink, K. A.; Wartgow, C. D.; Inhorn, S. L. Aerosol
680 Transmission of Rhinovirus Colds. *J. Infect. Dis.* **1987**, *156* (3), 442–448.
- 681 (17) Chen, W.; Zhang, N.; Wei, J.; Yen, H.-L.; Li, Y. Short-Range Airborne Route Dominates
682 Exposure of Respiratory Infection during Close Contact. *Build. Environ.* **2020**, *176*
683 (January), 106859.
- 684 (18) Katelaris, A. L.; Wells, J.; Clark, P.; Norton, S.; Rockett, R.; Arnott, A.; Sintchenko, V.;
685 Corbett, S.; Bag, S. K. Epidemiologic Evidence for Airborne Transmission of SARS-CoV-2
686 during Church Singing, Australia, 2020. *Emerg. Infect. Dis.* **2021**, *27* (6).
687 <https://doi.org/10.3201/eid2706.210465>.
- 688 (19) Shen, Y.; Li, C.; Dong, H.; Wang, Z.; Martinez, L.; Sun, Z.; Handel, A.; Chen, Z.; Chen,
689 E.; Ebell, M. H.; Wang, F.; Yi, B.; Wang, H.; Wang, X.; Wang, A.; Chen, B.; Qi, Y.; Liang, L.;
690 Li, Y.; Ling, F.; Chen, J.; Xu, G. Community Outbreak Investigation of SARS-CoV-2
691 Transmission Among Bus Riders in Eastern China. *JAMA Intern. Med.* **2020**, *180* (12),
692 1665–1671.
- 693 (20) Kwon, K. S.; Park, J. I.; Park, Y. J.; Jung, D. M.; Ryu, K. W.; Lee, J. H. Evidence of
694 Long-Distance Droplet Transmission of SARS-CoV-2 by Direct Air Flow in a Restaurant in
695 Korea. *J. Korean Med. Sci.* **2020**, *35* (46), e415.
- 696 (21) Jang, S.; Han, S. H.; Rhee, J. Y. Cluster of Coronavirus Disease Associated with Fitness
697 Dance Classes, South Korea. *Emerg. Infect. Dis.* **2020**, *26* (8), 1917–1920.
- 698 (22) Eichler, N.; Thornley, C.; Swadi, T.; Devine, T.; McElnay, C.; Sherwood, J.; Brunton, C.;
699 Williamson, F.; Freeman, J.; Berger, S.; Ren, X.; Storey, M.; de Ligt, J.; Geoghegan, J. L.
700 Transmission of Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 during Border
701 Quarantine and Air Travel, New Zealand (Aotearoa). *Emerg. Infect. Dis.* **2021**, *27* (5).
702 <https://doi.org/10.3201/eid2705.210514>.
- 703 (23) Nissen, K.; Krambrich, J.; Akaberi, D.; Hoffman, T.; Ling, J.; Lundkvist, Å.; Svensson, L.;
704 Salaneck, E. Long-Distance Airborne Dispersal of SARS-CoV-2 in COVID-19 Wards. *Sci.*
705 *Rep.* **2020**, *10* (1), 19589.
- 706 (24) Hwang, S. E.; Chang, J. H.; Oh, B.; Heo, J. Possible Aerosol Transmission of COVID-19
707 Associated with an Outbreak in an Apartment in Seoul, South Korea, 2020. *Int. J. Infect.*
708 *Dis.* **2021**, *104*, 73–76.
- 709 (25) Jones, N. R.; Qureshi, Z. U.; Temple, R. J.; Larwood, J. P. J.; Greenhalgh, T.;
710 Bourouiba, L. Two Metres or One: What Is the Evidence for Physical Distancing in Covid-
711 19? *BMJ* **2020**, *370*, m3223.
- 712 (26) Morawska, L.; Tang, J. W.; Bahnfleth, W.; Bluyssen, P. M.; Boerstra, A.; Buonanno, G.;
713 Cao, J.; Dancer, S.; Floto, A.; Franchimon, F.; Haworth, C.; Hogeling, J.; Isaxon, C.;
714 Jimenez, J. L.; Kurnitski, J.; Li, Y.; Loomans, M.; Marks, G.; Marr, L. C.; Mazzearella, L.;
715 Melikov, A. K.; Miller, S.; Milton, D. K.; Nazaroff, W.; Nielsen, P. V.; Noakes, C.; Peccia, J.;
716 Querol, X.; Sekhar, C.; Seppänen, O.; Tanabe, S.-I.; Tellier, R.; Tham, K. W.; Wargocki, P.;
717 Wierzbicka, A.; Yao, M. How Can Airborne Transmission of COVID-19 Indoors Be
718 Minimised? *Environ. Int.* **2020**, *142*, 105832.
- 719 (27) Bond, T. C.; Bosco-Lauth, A.; Farmer, D. K.; Francisco, P. W.; Pierce, J. R.; Fedak, K.
720 M.; Ham, J. M.; Jathar, S. H.; VandeWoude, S. Quantifying Proximity, Confinement, and
721 Interventions in Disease Outbreaks: A Decision Support Framework for Air-Transported
722 Pathogens. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* **2021**, *55* (5), 2890–2898.
- 723 (28) Riley, E. C.; Murphy, G.; Riley, R. L. Airborne Spread of Measles in a Suburban
724 Elementary School. *Am. J. Epidemiol.* **1978**, *107* (5), 421–432.
- 725 (29) Noakes, C. J.; Sleigh, P. A. Mathematical Models for Assessing the Role of Airflow on
726 the Risk of Airborne Infection in Hospital Wards. *Journal of The Royal Society Interface.*

2009. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rsif.2009.0305.focus>.
- 728 (30) Jimenez, J. L.; Peng, Z. COVID-19 Aerosol Transmission Estimator
729 <https://tinyurl.com/covid-estimator> (accessed Mar 26, 2021).
- 730 (31) Buonanno, G.; Morawska, L.; Stabile, L. Quantitative Assessment of the Risk of Airborne
731 Transmission of SARS-CoV-2 Infection: Prospective and Retrospective Applications.
732 *Environ. Int.* **2020**, *145*, 106112.
- 733 (32) Lelieveld, J.; Helleis, F.; Borrmann, S.; Cheng, Y.; Drewnick, F.; Haug, G.; Klimach, T.;
734 Sciare, J.; Su, H.; Pöschl, U. Model Calculations of Aerosol Transmission and Infection
735 Risk of COVID-19 in Indoor Environments. *Int. J. Environ. Res. Public Health* **2020**, *17* (21),
736 8114.
- 737 (33) Jones, B.; Sharpe, P.; Iddon, C.; Hathway, E. A.; Noakes, C. J.; Fitzgerald, S. Modelling
738 Uncertainty in the Relative Risk of Exposure to the SARS-CoV-2 Virus by Airborne Aerosol
739 Transmission in Well Mixed Indoor Air. *Buuld. Environ.* **2021**, *191*, 107617.
- 740 (34) Han, E.; Tan, M. M. J.; Turk, E.; Sridhar, D.; Leung, G. M.; Shibuya, K.; Asgari, N.; Oh,
741 J.; García-Basteiro, A. L.; Hanefeld, J.; Cook, A. R.; Hsu, L. Y.; Teo, Y. Y.; Heymann, D.;
742 Clark, H.; McKee, M.; Legido-Quigley, H. Lessons Learnt from Easing COVID-19
743 Restrictions: An Analysis of Countries and Regions in Asia Pacific and Europe. *Lancet*
744 **2020**, *396* (10261), 1525–1534.
- 745 (35) Buonanno, G.; Stabile, L.; Morawska, L. Estimation of Airborne Viral Emission: Quanta
746 Emission Rate of SARS-CoV-2 for Infection Risk Assessment. *Environ. Int.* **2020**, *141*
747 (April), 105794.
- 748 (36) Peng, Z.; Jimenez, J. L. Exhaled CO₂ as a COVID-19 Infection Risk Proxy for Different
749 Indoor Environments and Activities. *Environmental Science & Technology Letters* **2021**.
750 <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.estlett.1c00183>.
- 751 (37) Ma, J.; Qi, X.; Chen, H.; Li, X.; Zhang, Z.; Wang, H.; Sun, L.; Zhang, L.; Guo, J.;
752 Morawska, L.; Grinshpun, S. A.; Biswas, P.; Flagan, R. C.; Yao, M. COVID-19 Patients in
753 Earlier Stages Exhaled Millions of SARS-CoV-2 per Hour. *Clin. Infect. Dis.* **2020**.
754 <https://doi.org/10.1093/cid/ciaa1283>.
- 755 (38) Volz, E.; Mishra, S.; Chand, M.; Barrett, J. C.; Johnson, R.; Geidelberg, L.; Hinsley, W.
756 R.; Laydon, D. J.; Dabrera, G.; O’Toole, Á.; Amato, R.; Ragonnet-Cronin, M.; Harrison, I.;
757 Jackson, B.; Ariani, C. V.; Boyd, O.; Loman, N. J.; McCrone, J. T.; Gonçalves, S.;
758 Jorgensen, D.; Myers, R.; Hill, V.; Jackson, D. K.; Gaythorpe, K.; Groves, N.; Sillitoe, J.;
759 Kwiatkowski, D. P.; COVID-19 Genomics UK (COG-UK) consortium; Flaxman, S.;
760 Ratmann, O.; Bhatt, S.; Hopkins, S.; Gandy, A.; Rambaut, A.; Ferguson, N. M. Assessing
761 Transmissibility of SARS-CoV-2 Lineage B.1.1.7 in England. *Nature* **2021**, 1–17.
- 762 (39) Kidd, M.; Richter, A.; Best, A.; Cumley, N.; Mirza, J.; Percival, B.; Mayhew, M.; Megram,
763 O.; Ashford, F.; White, T.; Moles-Garcia, E.; Crawford, L.; Bosworth, A.; Atabani, S. F.;
764 Plant, T.; McNally, A. S-Variant SARS-CoV-2 Lineage B1.1.7 Is Associated with
765 Significantly Higher Viral Loads in Samples Tested by ThermoFisher TaqPath RT-qPCR. *J.*
766 *Infect. Dis.* **2021**. <https://doi.org/10.1093/infdis/jiab082>.
- 767 (40) EPA. Chapter 6—Inhalation Rates. In *Exposure Factors Handbook*; U.S. Environmental
768 Protection Agency, 2011.
- 769 (41) Edwards, D. A.; Ausiello, D.; Salzman, J.; Devlin, T.; Langer, R.; Beddingfield, B. J.;
770 Fears, A. C.; Doyle-Meyers, L. A.; Redmann, R. K.; Killeen, S. Z.; Maness, N. J.; Roy, C. J.
771 Exhaled Aerosol Increases with COVID-19 Infection, Age, and Obesity. *Proceedings of the*
772 *National Academy of Sciences* **2021**, *118* (8), e2021830118.
- 773 (42) van Doremalen, N.; Bushmaker, T.; Morris, D. H.; Holbrook, M. G.; Gamble, A.;
774 Williamson, B. N.; Tamin, A.; Harcourt, J. L.; Thornburg, N. J.; Gerber, S. I.; Lloyd-Smith, J.
775 O.; de Wit, E.; Munster, V. J. Aerosol and Surface Stability of SARS-CoV-2 as Compared
776 with SARS-CoV-1. *N. Engl. J. Med.* **2020**, *382* (16), 1564–1567.
- 777 (43) Chan, K. H.; Peiris, J. S. M.; Lam, S. Y.; Poon, L. L. M.; Yuen, K. Y.; Seto, W. H. The

- 778 Effects of Temperature and Relative Humidity on the Viability of the SARS Coronavirus.
779 *Adv. Virol.* **2011**, 2011, 734690.
- 780 (44) Dabisch, P.; Schuit, M.; Herzog, A.; Beck, K.; Wood, S.; Krause, M.; Miller, D.; Weaver,
781 W.; Freeburger, D.; Hooper, I.; Green, B.; Williams, G.; Holland, B.; Bohannon, J.; Wahl, V.;
782 Yolitz, J.; Hevey, M.; Ratnesar-Shumate, S. The Influence of Temperature, Humidity, and
783 Simulated Sunlight on the Infectivity of SARS-CoV-2 in Aerosols. *Aerosol Sci. Technol.*
784 **2021**, 55 (2), 142–153.
- 785 (45) Johnson, G. R.; Morawska, L.; Ristovski, Z. D.; Hargreaves, M.; Mengersen, K.; Chao,
786 C. Y. H.; Wan, M. P.; Li, Y.; Xie, X.; Katoshevski, D.; Corbett, S. Modality of Human Expired
787 Aerosol Size Distributions. *J. Aerosol Sci.* **2011**, 42 (12), 839–851.
- 788 (46) Thatcher, T. L.; Lai, A. C. K.; Moreno-Jackson, R.; Sextro, R. G.; Nazaroff, W. W. Effects
789 of Room Furnishings and Air Speed on Particle Deposition Rates Indoors. *Atmos. Environ.*
790 **2002**, 36 (11), 1811–1819.
- 791 (47) Ninomura, P.; Bartley, J. New Ventilation Guidelines for Health-Care Facilities. *ASHRAE*
792 *J.* **2001**, 43 (6), 29–33.
- 793 (48) Nazaroff, W. W. Residential Air-Change Rates: A Critical Review. *Indoor Air* **2021**, 31
794 (2), 282–313.
- 795 (49) Persily, A. K.; Gorfain, J.; Brunner, G. Survey of Ventilation Rates in Office Buildings.
796 *Build. Res. Inf.* **2006**, 34 (5), 459–466.
- 797 (50) ASHRAE. *Ventilation for Acceptable Indoor Air Quality: ANSI/ASHRAE Standard 62.1-*
798 *2019*; ANSI/ASHRAE, 2019.
- 799 (51) ASHRAE. *ASHRAE Position Document on Infectious Aerosols*; American Society of
800 Heating, Refrigerating and Air-Conditioning Engineers, 2020.
- 801 (52) REHVA. *How to Operate HVAC and Other Building Service Systems to Prevent the*
802 *Spread of the Coronavirus (SARS-CoV-2) Disease (COVID-19) in Workplaces*; Federation
803 of European Heating, Ventilation and Air Conditioning Associations, 2020.
- 804 (53) Chen, P. Z.; Bobrovitz, N.; Premji, Z.; Koopmans, M.; Fisman, D. N.; Gu, F. X.
805 Heterogeneity in Transmissibility and Shedding SARS-CoV-2 via Droplets and Aerosols.
806 *Elife* **2021**, 10, e65774.
- 807 (54) Yang, Q.; Saldi, T. K.; Gonzales, P. K.; Lasda, E.; Decker, C. J.; Tat, K. L.; Fattor, W. T.;
808 Meyerson, N. R.; Paige, C. L.; Gilchrist, A. R.; Barbachano-guerrero, A. Just 2% of SARS-
809 CoV-2–positive Individuals Carry 90% of the Virus Circulating in Communities. *Proceedings*
810 *of the National Academy of Sciences* **2021**, 118 (21), e2104547118.
- 811 (55) Wu, S. L.; Mertens, A. N.; Crider, Y. S.; Nguyen, A.; Pokpongkiat, N. N.; Djajadi, S.;
812 Seth, A.; Hsiang, M. S.; Colford, J. M.; Reingold, A.; Arnold, B. F.; Hubbard, A.; Benjamin-
813 Chung, J. Substantial Underestimation of SARS-CoV-2 Infection in the United States.
814 *Nature Communications*. 2020. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-020-18272-4>.
- 815 (56) Jones, T. C.; Biele, G.; Mühlemann, B.; Veith, T.; Schneider, J.; Beheim-Schwarzbach,
816 J.; Bleicker, T.; Tesch, J.; Schmidt, M. L.; Sander, L. E.; Kurth, F.; Menzel, P.; Schwarzer,
817 R.; Zuchowski, M.; Hofmann, J.; Krumbholz, A.; Stein, A.; Edelmann, A.; Corman, V. M.;
818 Drosten, C. Estimating Infectiousness throughout SARS-CoV-2 Infection Course. *Science*
819 **2021**, 373 (6551). <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.abi5273>.
- 820 (57) Park, S. Y.; Kim, Y. M.; Yi, S.; Lee, S.; Na, B. J.; Kim, C. B.; Kim, J. I.; Kim, H. S.; Kim,
821 Y. B.; Park, Y.; Huh, I. S.; Kim, H. K.; Yoon, H. J.; Jang, H.; Kim, K.; Chang, Y.; Kim, I.; Lee,
822 H.; Gwack, J.; Kim, S. S.; Kim, M.; Kweon, S.; Choe, Y. J.; Park, O.; Park, Y. J.; Jeong, E.
823 K. Coronavirus Disease Outbreak in Call Center, South Korea. *Emerg. Infect. Dis.* **2020**, 26
824 (8), 1666–1670.
- 825 (58) Khanh, N. C.; Thai, P. Q.; Quach, H.-L.; Thi, N.-A. H.; Dinh, P. C.; Duong, T. N.; Mai, L.
826 T. Q.; Nghia, N. D.; Tu, T. A.; Quang, L. N.; Quang, T. D.; Nguyen, T.-T.; Vogt, F.; Anh, D.
827 D. Transmission of SARS-CoV 2 During Long-Haul Flight. *Emerg. Infect. Dis.* **2020**, 26
828 (11), 2617–2624.

- 829 (59) Günther, T.; Czech-Sioli, M.; Indenbirken, D.; Robitaille, A.; Tenhaken, P.; Exner, M.;
830 Ottinger, M.; Fischer, N.; Grundhoff, A.; Brinkmann, M. M. SARS-CoV-2 Outbreak
831 Investigation in a German Meat Processing Plant. *EMBO Mol. Med.* **2020**, *12* (12), e13296.
- 832 (60) Kriegel, M.; Buchholz, U.; Gastmeier, P.; Bischoff, P.; Abdelgawad, I.; Hartmann, A.
833 Predicted Infection Risk for Aerosol Transmission of SARS-CoV-2. *medRxiv* **2020**,
834 2020.10.08.20209106.
- 835 (61) Stein-Zamir, C.; Abramson, N.; Shoob, H.; Libal, E.; Bitan, M.; Cardash, T.; Cayam, R.;
836 Miskin, I. A Large COVID-19 Outbreak in a High School 10 Days after Schools' Reopening,
837 Israel, May 2020. *Eurosurveillance* **2020**, *25* (29), 1–5.
- 838 (62) Nardell, E. A.; Keegan, J.; Cheney, S. A.; Etkind, S. C. Airborne Infection: Theoretical
839 Limits of Protection Achievable by Building Ventilation. *Am. Rev. Respir. Dis.* **1991**, *144* (2),
840 302–306.
- 841 (63) Gammaitoni, L.; Nucci, M. C. Using a Mathematical Model to Evaluate the Efficacy of TB
842 Control Measures. *Emerg. Infect. Dis.* **1997**, *3* (3), 335–342.
- 843 (64) Moser, M. R.; Bender, T. R.; Margolis, H. S.; Noble, G. R.; Kendal, A. P.; Ritter, D. G. An
844 Outbreak of Influenza Aboard a Commercial Airliner. *Am. J. Epidemiol.* **1979**, *110* (1), 1–6.
- 845 (65) Remington, P. L. Airborne Transmission of Measles in a Physician's Office. *JAMA* **1985**,
846 *253* (11), 1574.
- 847 (66) Wilson, N. M.; Marks, G. B.; Eckhardt, A.; Clarke, A. M.; Young, F. P.; Garden, F. L.;
848 Stewart, W.; Cook, T. M.; Tovey, E. R. The Effect of Respiratory Activity, Non-Invasive
849 Respiratory Support and Facemasks on Aerosol Generation and Its Relevance to COVID-
850 19. *Anaesthesia* **2021**. <https://doi.org/10.1111/anae.15475>.
- 851 (67) James, G.; Witten, D.; Hastie, T.; Tibshirani, R. *An Introduction to Statistical Learning:*
852 *With Applications in R*, 1st ed.; Springer texts in statistics; Springer: New York, NY, 2013.
- 853 (68) Milton, D. K.; Fabian, M. P.; Cowling, B. J.; Grantham, M. L.; McDevitt, J. J. Influenza
854 Virus Aerosols in Human Exhaled Breath: Particle Size, Culturability, and Effect of Surgical
855 Masks. *PLoS Pathog.* **2013**, *9* (3), e1003205.
- 856 (69) Lindsley, W. G.; Noti, J. D.; Blachere, F. M.; Thewlis, R. E.; Martin, S. B.; Othumpangat,
857 S.; Noorbakhsh, B.; Goldsmith, W. T.; Vishnu, A.; Palmer, J. E.; Clark, K. E.; Beezhold, D.
858 H. Viable Influenza A Virus in Airborne Particles from Human Coughs. *J. Occup. Environ.*
859 *Hyg.* **2015**, *12* (2), 107–113.
- 860 (70) Yan, J.; Grantham, M.; Pantelic, J.; Bueno de Mesquita, P. J.; Albert, B.; Liu, F.;
861 Ehrman, S.; Milton, D. K. Infectious Virus in Exhaled Breath of Symptomatic Seasonal
862 Influenza Cases from a College Community. *Proceedings of the National Academy of*
863 *Sciences* **2018**, *115* (5), 1081–1086.
- 864 (71) Tiemersma, E. W.; van der Werf, M. J.; Borgdorff, M. W.; Williams, B. G.; Nagelkerke, N.
865 J. D. Natural History of Tuberculosis: Duration and Fatality of Untreated Pulmonary
866 Tuberculosis in HIV Negative Patients: A Systematic Review. *PLoS One* **2011**, *6* (4),
867 e17601.
- 868 (72) Bueno de Mesquita, P. J.; Noakes, C. J.; Milton, D. K. Quantitative Aerobiologic Analysis
869 of an Influenza Human Challenge-transmission Trial. *Indoor Air* **2020**, *30* (6), 1189–1198.
- 870 (73) Mikszewski, A.; Stabile, L.; Buonanno, G.; Morawska, L. THE AIRBORNE
871 CONTAGIOUSNESS OF RESPIRATORY VIRUSES: A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS AND
872 IMPLICATIONS FOR MITIGATION. *medRxiv* **2021**.
873 <https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.01.26.21250580>.
- 874 (74) Conly, J.; on behalf of the WHO Infection Prevention and Control Research and
875 Development Expert Group for COVID-; Seto, W. H.; Pittet, D.; Holmes, A.; Chu, M.;
876 Hunter, P. R. Use of Medical Face Masks versus Particulate Respirators as a Component
877 of Personal Protective Equipment for Health Care Workers in the Context of the COVID-19
878 Pandemic. *Antimicrob. Resist. Infect. Control* **2020**, *9* (1), 126.
- 879 (75) Klompas, M.; Baker, M. A.; Rhee, C. Airborne Transmission of SARS-CoV-2: Theoretical

- 880 Considerations and Available Evidence. *JAMA* **2020**, 324 (5), 441–442.
- 881 (76) Tang, J. W.; Bahnfleth, W. P.; Bluysen, P. M.; Buonanno, G.; Jimenez, J. L.; Kurnitski,
882 J.; Li, Y.; Miller, S.; Sekhar, C.; Morawska, L.; Marr, L. C.; Melikov, A. K.; Nazaroff, W. W.;
883 Nielsen, P. V.; Tellier, R.; Wargocki, P.; Dancer, S. J. Dismantling Myths on the Airborne
884 Transmission of Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus-2 (SARS-CoV-2). *J.*
885 *Hosp. Infect.* **2021**, 110, 89–96.
- 886 (77) WHO. *Roadmap to Improve and Ensure Good Indoor Ventilation in the Context of*
887 *COVID-19*; World Health Organization, 2021.
- 888 (78) Rudnick, S. N.; Milton, D. K. Risk of Indoor Airborne Infection Transmission Estimated
889 from Carbon Dioxide Concentration. *Indoor Air* **2003**, 13 (3), 237–245.

890