

Analysis of the Dynamics, Outcome, and Prerequisites of the first German SARS-CoV-2 Superspreading Event

Lukas Wessendorf¹, Enrico Richter¹, Bianca Schulte¹, Ricarda Maria Schmithausen²,
Martin Exner², Nils Lehmann³, Martin Coenen⁴, Christine Fuhrmann⁴, Angelika
Kellings⁴, Anika Hüsing³, Karl-Heinz Jöckel³, and Hendrik Streeck^{1,*}

¹ Institute of Virology, University Hospital, University of Bonn, Germany, and German Center for Infection Research (DZIF), partner site Bonn-Cologne

² Institute of Hygiene and Public Health, University Hospital, University of Bonn, Germany

³ Institute of Medical Informatics, Biometry und Epidemiology (IMIBE), University Hospital Essen, Germany

⁴ Clinical Study Core Unit, Study Center Bonn (SZB), Institute of Clinical Chemistry and Clinical Pharmacology, University Hospital Bonn, Germany

* Corresponding author: Hendrik Streeck, Institute of Virology, University Hospital Bonn, Venusberg-Campus 1, 53127 Bonn, Germany, Hendrik.Streeck@ukbonn.de

51 **Abstract**

52 **Background**

53 The beginning of the COVID-19 pandemic was shaped by superspreading events
54 including large-scale outbreaks. In Germany the first SARS-CoV-2 outbreak was a
55 superspreading event in a rural area during indoor carnival festivities in February
56 2020.

57 **Methods**

58 51 days after the event all known participants were asked to give blood samples,
59 pharyngeal swabs and answer a self-administered questionnaire. Metric room
60 coordinates for all tables, seats, and ventilation-points were assessed.

61 **Findings**

62 We analyzed infection rates among all 411 participants, and the risk of infection in
63 relation to various factors including age, alcohol consumption, and ventilation system.
64 Overall, 46% (n=186/404) of the participants had been infected. We demonstrate that
65 the spatial distribution of infected participants was associated with proximity to the
66 ventilation system (represented as inverse distance, with Odds Ratio OR 1.39, 95%
67 KI [0.86; 2.25]). Interestingly, the risk of infection was highly associated with age,
68 whereby children (OR: 0.33 [0.267; 0.414]) and young adults (age 18-25) had a lower
69 risk of infection than older participants resulting in an average infection risk increase
70 of 28% per 10 years age difference. Behavioral differences also impacted the risk of
71 infection including time spent outside (OR: 0.55 [0.33; 0.91]) or smoking (OR: 0.32
72 [0.124; 0.81]).

73 **Interpretation**

74 Our findings underline the importance of proper indoor ventilation for events in the
75 future. The lower susceptibility for children and young adults indicates their limited
76 involvement in superspreading events.

77 **Funding**

78 The government of North Rhine-Westphalia (Germany) supported the study with
79 65,000 Euro.

80

81 **Abstract: 250 words**

82

83

84

85 **Research in context**

86

87 **Evidence before this study**

88 The scientific literature was searched for the term "superspreading event AND Covid-
89 19 OR Sars Cov 2" and identified published papers from China, South Korea,
90 Europe, and North America. Most researchers analyzed superspreading events
91 within a health care setting e.g. in hospitals or nursing homes, or described the
92 general impact of superspreading events on the global pandemic. Only a few
93 metanalyses of transmission clusters analyzed party occasions (e.g. a nightclub in
94 Berlin, Germany) as superspreading events. These reports describe less than 100
95 infections and are very limited due to missing data or reporting biases. Therefore, the
96 ability to draw scientific conclusions is also limited. Additionally, to our knowledge,
97 there are no studies, which investigated individual behavior, the location, and role of
98 children during a superspreading event. The research for the study started April 2020
99 and was concluded in June 2021.

100 **Added value of this study**

101 Our report analyzes the first COVID-19 superspreading event in Germany in detail,
102 which was not only a unique setting but also included children and adults in the same
103 room. We demonstrate that nearly half of the participants were infected with SARS-
104 CoV-2 and that the proximity of the seating to the ventilation system was an
105 important risk factor for infection. The data showed that low physical distance
106 including singing and duration of attendance at this event increased the risk of
107 infection, while regular smoking and spending the break of the event outside lowered
108 the risk of infection. This underlines the benefit of airing to lower the amount of both
109 droplets and aerosols. Furthermore, we found lower infection in children than adults
110 despite being in the same room suggesting differences in infectability in children.
111 Indeed, we observed that an additional 10 years of age is on average associated with
112 28% increased risk of infection.

113 **Implications of all the available evidence**

114 Taken together, the results demonstrate the importance of the ventilation system
115 during superspreading events. In particular children and young adults had a lower
116 risk of infection during the event indicating that they have a limited role during this

117 pandemic. Overall, our data demonstrate in detail age-dependent infectability as well
118 as highlights to understand transmission dynamics in order to improve
119 comprehensive public health preparedness measures.

120

121 **Introduction**

122 Severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) is a highly
123 transmissible and pathogenic RNA virus that emerged in late 2019 and has caused a
124 pandemic threatening human health and public safety worldwide.¹ While factors
125 shaping the dynamics of a pandemic are multifactorial, virulence and reproductive
126 number are important properties of a virus.² For SARS-CoV-2 there is a substantial
127 over-dispersion of the secondary infection distribution (individual R_0) for an individual
128 infected with SARS-CoV-2.² An over-dispersed R_0 means that most infected people
129 do not transmit (individual $R_0 = 0$) while a minority of infected people are super-
130 spreaders (individual $R_0 >5$). Superspreading has been observed for many infectious
131 pathogens, such as measles or SARS.³ During the SARS pandemic in 2003 a
132 superspreading event was defined as one infected person infecting eight others.⁴ For
133 SARS-CoV-2 it has been estimated that 80% of the infections are caused by 10% of
134 infected individuals highlighting the importance of the cluster factor (k).² In Germany
135 an indoor carnival event in the beginning of 2020 is considered as the first major
136 outbreak in a German city and was considered a hotspot during the beginning of the
137 pandemic in Germany.⁵ Other SARS-CoV-2 superspreading events worldwide have
138 been linked to indoor gatherings with close proximity of individuals.⁶ Nevertheless,
139 most of the reported superspreading events had less than 100 cases and the reports
140 are limited by missing data or a reporting bias.⁶

141

142 Here, we closely examined the prerequisite of a unique super-spreading event in
143 Germany during the SARS-CoV-2 pandemic, where nearly half of the participants
144 became infected including children. We systematically analyzed infection rate,
145 potential individual, and environmental risk factors for infection as well as the role of
146 the ventilation system.

147

148 **Materials and methods**

149 **Study design and sampling**

150 This cross-sectional epidemiological study was conducted 51 days after a carnival
151 celebration in the beginning 2020. Eleven days after the event authorities sent all
152 known participants into quarantine after testing 38 out of 99 individuals PCR-positive.
153 All adults known to have attended the event were invited to participate in the study.
154 About 450 persons attended the event of which 411 participated in the study (**figure**
155 **1**, participation rate 91.3%). All study participants provided written informed consent
156 before enrolment. The Ethics Committee of the Medical Faculty of the University of
157 Bonn approved the study (approval number 085/20).
158 Self-administered questionnaires included questions about demographic background,
159 symptoms of viral infection as well as detailed information about the behavior during
160 the event. Participants’ arrival and exit times were assessed in 1-hour categories.
161 Study participants were asked to provide blood specimens and pharyngeal swabs for
162 further analysis.

164 **Pharyngeal swab and blood preparation**

165 Pharyngeal swabs of participants were performed with FLOQSwabs (Copan) and
166 immediately stored in UTM RT-mini tubes containing UTM Viral Stabilization Media
167 (Copan) at 4 °C. Venous blood was drawn into EDTA tubes (Sarstedt) per volunteer
168 and was transported to the laboratory at the University Hospital Bonn.

170 **Anti-SARS-CoV-2 ELISA**

171 Anti-SARS-CoV-2 IgA and IgG were determined using enzyme-linked
172 immunosorbent assays (ELISA) on the EUROIMMUN Analyzer I platform.⁵ According
173 to the manufacturer’s instructions a result was considered positive when a ratio
174 (extinction of sample/extinction of calibrator) of 0.8 or higher was reached. The
175 guidelines of the German Medical Association (RiliBÄK) were abided by, including
176 internal and external quality controls.

178 **Reverse transcription polymerase chain reaction (RT-PCR)**

179 Viral RNA was extracted from each 300µl swab sample via the chemagic Viral 300
180 assay (according to manufacturer’s instructions) on the Perkin Elmer chemagic™
181 Prime™ instrument platform. The presence of two viral target genes (E and RdRP)

182 was assessed in each sample by real time RT-PCR (SuperScriptTMIII One-Step RT-
183 PCR System with PlatinumTM TaqDNA Polymerase, Thermo Fisher). The following
184 primers were used, for E gene: E_Sarbeco_F1 and R, and probe E_Sarbeco_P1, for
185 RdRP gene: RdRP_SARSr_F, and R, and probe RdRP_SARSr-P2.⁷ In addition, an
186 internal control for RNA extraction, reverse transcription, and amplification was
187 applied to each sample (innuDETECT Internal Control RNA Assay, Analytik Jena
188 #845-ID-0007100). If amplification occurred in both virus-specific reactions samples
189 were considered positive.

190

191 [SARS-CoV-2 Neutralization Assay](#)

192 A plaque reduction neutralization test was used to determine SARS-CoV-2
193 neutralization capacity as previously described.⁵ Briefly, plasma samples were heat-
194 inactivated and supernatant transferred to a new tube and serially two-fold diluted in
195 OptiPROTMSFM (Gibco) performed. 120 mL of each plasma dilution was mixed with
196 80 plaque-forming units (PFU) of SARS-CoV-2 in 120 mL OptiPRO SFM (GIBCO)
197 cell culture medium and seeded with 1.25×10^5 Vero E6 cells/well. Subsequently, the
198 inoculum was removed and cells were overlaid with a mixture of
199 carboxymethylcellulose (Sigma) and 2xMEM (Biochrom). Following 3-day incubation,
200 the overlay was removed and the 24 well plates were fixed using a 6% formaldehyde
201 solution and stained with 1% crystal violet in 20% ethanol revealing the formation of
202 plaques. Finally, the neutralizing titers were calculated as the reciprocal of serum
203 dilutions resulting in neutralization of 50% input virus (NT50), read out as reduction in
204 the number of plaques.

205

206 [Data management and quality control](#)

207 The Clinical Study Core Unit of the Study Center Bonn (SZB) supported the study by
208 outlining the study protocol and developing the informed consent form as well as
209 participants information sheets with respect to data management and quality control.
210 The data were gathered on paper-based Case Report Forms (pCRF). Data was
211 entered as double-data-entry into the REDCap study database programmed and
212 hosted by SZB. Study personnel was trained by experienced members of the SZB. A
213 quality manager was on site to support the study team. Monitoring of trial data and
214 informed consent forms was performed according to the monitoring plan by qualified

215 SZB staff. The ethics committee of the Medical Faculty of the University of Bonn was
216 involved and approved the study (reference no. 085/20)

217

218 **Spatial information**

219 Metric room coordinates (length and width [m]) for areas, tables, seats and ventilation
220 shafts were assessed via measurements, seating plan and photos from the event.

221 Persons providing multiple positions were considered as spending an equal amount
222 of time on different positions. When exact seating was unclear and information was
223 available on table or greater area localisation (bar, stage), average coordinate values
224 were used.

225 On the grounds of these coordinates, we calculated pairwise metric distances
226 between all persons and distances to closest inletting and purging airshafts. For all
227 persons their pairwise inverse distances were summarized as mean inverse
228 distance. Inverse metric distances to persons or airshafts were regarded as
229 representing infectious potential through local proximity, and inverse distances were
230 capped at 2.5 (the inverse of the width of a seat of 0.4 m). Alternatively, we counted
231 all, and all infected persons within adjacent rings of 1.5 m width around each
232 participant as a measure of crowdedness and infectious potential.

233

234 **Statistical analysis**

235 Associations between positive infection status and exposure variables were analysed
236 via logistic regression models. Exposure variables were included crudely, and
237 adjusted for potential confounding factors age, sex, and duration of attendance as
238 fixed effects. To correct for common household effects a random effects model was
239 used. We present odds ratios with 95% confidence intervals. Because we present
240 data on a single specific event among a limited number of participants, we
241 completely refrain from presenting p-values. All analyses were done with SAS 9.4.

242

243 **Results**

244 411 out of estimated 450 participants of the event responded to our study invitation,
245 resulting in a response rate of 91.3%. 404 individuals provided plasma samples and
246 316 pharyngeal swabs (**figure 1**). Genders were represented equally among all 404
247 participants (48% were male) with a broad range in age ((range 6-79) median age 36

248 years) and level of education (**table 1**). 297 individuals were residents of the
249 community the event took place in, 103 lived in other parts of the county, and 11
250 were external visitors.

251
252 Overall, 186 out of 404 individuals tested seropositive for IgG- and 161 for IgA-
253 antibodies (**suppl. figure 1**). To confirm seropositivity we performed a plaque
254 reduction neutralization assay (**suppl. figure 2**) demonstrating neutralizing activity
255 against SARS-CoV-2 of their respective antibody responses. Given the low specificity
256 of the IgA assay, IgA seropositivity was not further considered.**Error! Bookmark not
257 defined..** As we tested for seropositivity 51 days after the superspreading event, we
258 additionally performed SARS-CoV-2 RT PCR analysis from pharyngeal swabs to
259 exclude potential recent infections. Indeed, 19 participants tested positive in RT-
260 PCR, and were therefore not considered in the study as there was no likelihood of
261 infection during the superspreading event. Overall, we found that 46.0% (95% CI:
262 [41.2%; 51.0%]) tested seropositive who attended the event, which was significantly
263 higher than the overall estimated infection rate in the same community at large at that
264 time. Indeed, officially 3.1% of the community were reported as positive cases at that
265 time and we estimated the infection rate as 15.5% (95% CI:[12.3%; 19.00%]).**Error!
266 Bookmark not defined.** for the community. Taken together, an estimated 46% of
267 participants became infected during a single superspreading event.

268
269 No association between sex and risk of infection was found ((OR: 1.01 [0.65; 1.58])
270 for women). On average infected individuals had a higher body mass index
271 (26.2kg/m² compared to 24.3kg/m² for uninfected individuals). Infected participants
272 were more likely to be clustered living in the same household (**table 1**). Having at
273 least one comorbidity, including lung disease (42.3%), cardiovascular disease
274 (53.3%), neurological disease (16.7%), cancer (58.3%) or diabetes (80%), did not
275 increase the risk of infection (OR: 0.64 [0.33; 1.26]). In conclusion, sex and
276 comorbidities did not seem to affect the risk of infection. We next assessed whether
277 age influenced the risk of infection at the event, considering sex, duration of
278 attendance and common household as covariates. Comparison across age-
279 categories showed a lower risk for children (OR: 0.31 [0.14; 0.69]), and also for
280 young adults (18-25 years, OR: 0.53 [0.26; 1.09]) as well as adults between 25 and
281 40 years (OR: 0.48 [0.28; 0.85]) in comparison to older adults (40 to 65 years) (OR:
282 1, reference), while seniors had a slightly higher risk (older than 65 years, OR: 1.1

283 [0.31; 3.97]) (**figure 3**). Our data suggest that an additional 10 years of age are on
284 average associated with 28% increased risk of infection (OR: 1.28 [1.10; 1.48]).

285

286 To understand the spreading dynamics of SARS-CoV-2 during the event, we first
287 performed a detailed analysis of potential risk factors and social behavior. The event
288 consisted of speeches, dance, and music performances for a total of five hours, with
289 one large intermission and was hosted at a small community center (320 square
290 meters) with a stage up front and a bar in the back close to the entrance. Alcoholic
291 and nonalcoholic drinks were served in glasses and a food truck was located outside
292 in front of the venue. While most participants were sitting in the hall, a committee of
293 eleven individuals hosting the event were sitting on stage. The eleven people on
294 stage switched after a break. With approximately 450 participants there were about
295 1-4 individuals per square meter and the tables, each with two benches, were
296 arranged in two blocks with an alley to the stage (**figure 2**). Infected participants had
297 been seated mostly at tables close to the bar, at the bar, or on stage. One table with
298 8 out of 11 infected people, was located far away from the bar at the other side of the
299 hall and close to an air inlet. The group sitting on stage showed high numbers of
300 infection (18 infected out of 24, **table 1**). We first analyzed whether the ventilation
301 system influenced the distribution of SARS-CoV-2 infected individuals. It is important
302 to state that the system's air flow consisted of 75% used and 25% fresh air. The air
303 flow can be described as clockwise. The air system uses vents along one side of the
304 venue and on stage to take in air (**figure 2**, air inlets purple). After 25% of fresh air
305 has been added and the air has been filtered, vents along the other side of the venue
306 return the air into the room (**figure 2**, air outlets blue). All ventilation points received
307 the same amount of air due to throttle valves. For noise protection reasons windows
308 remained closed. The air-system used F7-Filters (ISO ePM $\geq 2,5$) and had an air
309 volume flow of 7500 m³/h.

310

311 Most tables located close to the air-inlets and showed no or only few infections
312 (**figure 2**, green) also most surrounding tables showed low numbers of infection
313 (**figure 2**, yellow). Tables close to the air-outlets (**figure 2**) show high (4 or 5 infected
314 per table) and very high (6 or 7 infected per table) numbers of infected individuals. It
315 is important to mention that the overall number of participants per table was not equal
316 for all tables. Greater proximity to air outlets was associated with increased risk of

317 infection with a crude OR=1.39 [0.86; 2.25]. This association remained stable and
318 was hardly attenuated from adjustment for proximity to air inlet, age, gender, duration
319 of attendance, proximity to other infected persons, stage-activity and going outside
320 during the intermission (**figure 4**, multiple adjusted OR=1.26 [0.63; 2.50]). A similar
321 apparent effect for proximity to air inlets (crude OR=1.17 [0.72; 1.89]) disappeared
322 when duration of attendance was added to the model (**figure 4**, multiple adjusted
323 OR=1.01 [0.53; 1.94]). Overall, however, we found the increased risk for individuals
324 located closer to the air outlet remarkably persistent (**figure 4**).

325

326 We further studied the sum of the inverse distance to all infected participants as a
327 measure of proximity to either one common virus source or mutual infection.
328 However, there was no evidence for increased risk of infection from greater proximity
329 to other infected persons (**suppl. table 1**). Furthermore, we found no evidence for a
330 single person being the source of the infection using 401 quantile-plot analysis
331 conducted for each participant as potential source of infection separately (**suppl.**
332 **figure 3**).

333

334 To understand the association of risk with behavior patterns we next investigated the
335 influence of several factors on SARS-CoV-2 infection including time spent outside,
336 smoking, performing on stage and participation during the final act (“Finale”) for 30
337 minutes. Results were all adjusted for age, sex, common household, and duration of
338 attendance. Participation in multiple performances did not increase the risk of
339 infection (OR per performance: 1.08 [0.91; 1.27]) while participation in the last
340 “Finale” indicated a trend towards increased risk of infection (OR: 1.41 [0.65; 3.02])
341 (**figure 4**). Duration of attendance was persistently and strongly associated with an
342 increased infection risk of 32% with each additional hour spent at the party (OR per
343 hour: 1.32 [1.16; 1.49]). All further analyses were adjusted for this variable as
344 potential confounding factor.

345

346 We next determined the level of alcohol consumption as number of drinks (high-proof
347 liquor or beer) and did not observe any influence for the amount of alcohol
348 consumption on the risk of becoming infected (OR per drink: 1.00 [0.96; 1.05]).
349 Furthermore, participants who spent the break outside were less likely to be infected
350 (OR: 0.55 [0.33; 0.91]) compared to individuals who spent the break inside the venue

351 hall (**figure 4**). Interestingly, however, when we determined the impact of being
352 regular smoker (defined as smoking of at least 10 cigarettes a day) on the risk of
353 SARS-CoV-2 infection we observed a reduced risk of infection (OR: 0.32 [0.12; 0.81])
354 even after adjustment for “time spent outside”. In conclusion, duration of attendance
355 at the carnival party increased the risk of infection, the number of alcoholic drinks
356 was not associated with infection risk, while regular smoking and spending the break
357 of the event outside lowers the risk of infection.

358

359 We next stratified seropositive individuals by their reported symptoms. Odds-ratios
360 for each symptom were calculated for the timespan of 14 days following the event
361 (**figure 5**). Similar to previous reports⁸ loss of smell (OR: 8.78 [4.81; 16.02]) and taste
362 (OR: 10.09 [5.13; 19.88]) were strongest associated with SARS-CoV-2 infection.
363 Other symptoms which were strongly associated with COVID-19 were: sweats and
364 chills (OR: 5.28 [3.08; 9.07]), muscle and joint ache (OR: 5.19 [3.19; 8.44]), fatigue
365 (OR: 4.22 [2.76; 6.45]) and fever (OR: 3.73 [2.10; 6.63]) (**figure 5**). Importantly,
366 15.1% of the infected individuals reported no symptoms at all in a period of 14 days
367 after the event. The rate of asymptomatic infections of participants of the event was
368 lower than generally observed in the community the event took place in (36%).⁵
369 Overall, there was a lower proportion of asymptomatic cases among individuals
370 infected after the event compared to members of the community, while loss of smell
371 and taste showed the strongest association with an infection.

372

373 Discussion

374 The high overdispersion characteristics of SARS-CoV2 and its ability to be
375 transmitted via aerosols under certain conditions are one of the main reasons that
376 the beginning of the SARS-CoV2 pandemic was shaped by superspreading
377 events.^{9,10} Germany`s first superspreading event was an indoor carnival event in the
378 beginning of 2020 in a rural the community. In this naturally occurring experiment, we
379 demonstrate that nearly half of the participants became infected and demonstrate
380 multiple prerequisites of such an event and risk factors for becoming infected. While
381 our study population is not a representative sample of the general population the
382 event may be regarded as exemplary for similar party occasions and may help
383 reduce the number of infected in the future.

384

385 An important factor associated with infection risk was the ventilation system and the
386 individual proximity to the ventilation outlets. Individuals close to the air-outlets that
387 contained air with low amount of fresh air had the highest infection risk compared to
388 those close to the air-inlets. This is in line with previous studies that demonstrated
389 SARS-CoV-2 to be able to become air-borne under certain conditions and that the
390 ventilation system can have an influence on virus spread.^{11,12,13} The air filters in the
391 venue were not capable of intercepting virus particles supporting the notion on the
392 importance of proper indoor ventilation systems.^{14,15} Indeed, spending the break of
393 the event outside decreased the possibility of infection underscoring the benefit of
394 proper ventilation to lower the amount of aerosols. Due to the nature of the event, the
395 spatial distribution of the participants was not fixed throughout the evening, and not
396 perfectly recapitulated, so this information carries some error. However, allowing for
397 multiple positions per person we used all available information. Assuming further
398 error in the spatial data to be random, this might lead to a dilution of effects, i.e. true
399 associations may remain undetected. Complementary analyses including e.g. the
400 persons' functions during the event show consistent results, so we see no evidence
401 suggesting bias in our findings.

402

403 The consumption of alcoholic drinks did not increase the risk of infection. While it has
404 been assumed that the alcoholic effect of decreased social inhibition may increase
405 likelihood of infection, we did not find any evidence for this association questioning
406 measures of a ban on alcohol to reduce numbers of infected. It is known that current
407 and former smokers disproportionately suffer from severe COVID-19 and their
408 numbers are relatively increased among those patients that need intensive care
409 treatment compared to non-smokers.^{16,17} However, it has been previously speculated
410 that the risk of infection is lower for smokers.¹⁸ Furthermore, a meta-analysis of
411 seven studies suggests that smokers have a reduced risk of testing positive for
412 SARS-CoV-2.¹⁹ Interestingly, we also observed a protective effect for an infection
413 with SARS-CoV-2, thus our findings support those statements and show an even
414 greater protective effect. The association might for example be explained by a role of
415 the nicotinic acetylcholine receptor.²⁰ While we strongly advise that smoking should
416 not be considered as a protective habit to prevent risk of infection, this knowledge

417 may lead to the investigation of a therapeutic or prophylactic treatment on the basis
418 of this molecular target.²¹

419

420 Our results indicate a trend that younger people are less likely to be infected
421 compared to older age groups. This trend is strongest for people under 18 but levels
422 out over 40 years of age. The risk of infection for children in superspreading events
423 has not been investigated but the overall risk for infection in children seems to be
424 lower than for adults as a systematic review and its recent update reported, which is
425 further supported by our findings.^{22,23} As all individuals were exposed at the same
426 event and time our study is a perfect model for the previously described notion, that
427 children are less likely to become infected. Indeed, a recently published meta-
428 analysis by Viner et al. showed a low susceptibility for children and adolescents (OR
429 of 0.56 (95% CI, 0.37-0.85)) which strongly supports our findings of a lower risk of
430 infection in that age group, which is even lower in our study.²⁴ Our finding supports
431 the previously shown subordinate influence on the spreading of the virus by children.
432 The finding that each 10 years of age increase the risk of infection during an event
433 indicates that younger people and their limited role should be considered when
434 measures to contain the pandemic are implemented. Taken together, we could
435 demonstrate important risk factors for infection during a superspreading event, which
436 helps to understand transmission dynamics in order to improve comprehensive public
437 health preparedness measures.

438

439

440 **Acknowledgments**

441 We would like to thank the inhabitants of the town in question for their participation.
442 We would also like to thank the local government of the town where the outbreak
443 took place for their support to conduct the study. Furthermore, we would like to thank
444 the following people who helped with the study: Rudi Kirschen, Gero Wilbring, Janett
445 Wieseler, Marek Korencak, Ryan Natrass, Jernej Pusnik, Maximilian Becker, Ann-
446 Sophie Boucher, Marc Alexander de Boer, Rebekka Dix, Sara Dohmen, Kim Friele,
447 Benedikt Gansen, Jannik Geier, Marie Gronemeyer, Sarah Hundertmark, Nora
448 Jansen, Michael Jost, Louisa Khorsandian, Simon Krzycki, Ekaterina Kuskova, Judith
449 Langen, Silvia Letmathe, Ann-Kathrin Lippe, Jonathan Meinke, Freya Merker, Annika
450 Modemann, Janine Petras, Sophie Marie Porath, Anna Quast, Laurine Reese, Isabel

451 Maria Rehbach, Jonas Richter, Thea Rödig, Eva Schmitz, Tobias Schremmer,
452 Louisa Sommer, Jennifer Speda, Yuhe Tang, Oliver Thanscheidt, Franz Thiele,
453 Johanna Thiele, Julia Tholen, Moritz Transier, Maïke van der Hoek, Tillmann
454 Verbeek, Sophia Verspohl, Kira Vordermark, Julian Wirtz, Marina Wirtz, Lisa Zimmer,
455 Philip Koenemann, Adi Yaser, Lisa Anna, Katharina Bartenschlager, Lisa Baum,
456 Roxana Böhmer Romero, Diana de Braganca, Isabelle Engels, Moritz Färber, Carina
457 Fernandez Gonzalez, Lucia Maria Goßner, Victoria Handschuch, Franziska Georgia
458 Liermann, Steffan Meißner, Laura Racenski, Patrick, Denis Raguse, Larissa Reiß,
459 Maximilian Rölle, Franziska Scheele, Chiara Schwippert, Arlene Christin Schwippert,
460 Antonia Seifert, Joshua David Stockhausen, Sofia Waldorf, Leonie Weinhold, Nicolai
461 Trimpop, Julia Reinhardt, Vera Gast, Michelle Yong, Eva Engels, Jonathan Meinke,
462 Susanne Schmidt, Janine Schulte, Saskia Schmitz, Kübra Bayrak, Regina Frizler,
463 Katarzyna Andryka, Sofía Soler, Bastian Putschli, Thomas Zillinger, Marcel Renn,
464 Patrick Müller, Dillon Corvino, Zeinab Abdullah, Katrin Paeschke, Hiroki Kato, Florian
465 Schmidt, Maximilian Baum, Celina Schüter, Daniel Hinze, Martina Schmidt,
466 Arcangelo Ricchiuto, Sonja Gross, Uta Wolber, Tobias Höller, Marion Zerlett, Esther
467 Sib, Benjamin Marx, Souhaib Aldabbagh. We thank the Medizinischer Dienst der
468 Krankenkasse (MDK) Nordrhein for their generous help in conducting this study. In
469 particular we would like to thank: Tanja Bell, Ina de Hesselle-Taddey, Susanne Goll,
470 Katja Hoffmann-Pruss, Niko Kalamakidis, Verena Kayser, Hildegard Kessler, Norbert
471 Körfer, Daniela Kroll, Florian Messerschmidt, Svenja Peters, Sebastian Schröder,
472 Linda Schroers, Michael Zimmermann, Klaus-Peter Thiele. We thank Stefan
473 Holdenrieder, Alexander Semaan, Bernd Pöttsch, and Georg Nickenig for providing
474 control samples. The idea, the plan, the concept, protocol, the conduct, the data
475 analysis, and the writing of the manuscript of this study were independent of any third
476 parties, including the government of North Rhine-Westphalia, Germany.

477
478
479
480
481
482
483

484

485

486 References

487

488

- 489 1. Chakraborty I, Maity P. COVID-19 outbreak: Migration, effects on society, global
490 environment and prevention. *Sci Total Environ* 2020; **728**: 138882.
- 491 2. Lloyd-Smith JO, Schreiber SJ, Kopp PE, Getz WM. Superspreading and the effect of
492 individual variation on disease emergence. *Nature* 2005; **438**(7066): 355-9.
- 493 3. De Serres G, Markowski F, Toth E, et al. Largest measles epidemic in North America
494 in a decade--Quebec, Canada, 2011: contribution of susceptibility, serendipity, and
495 superspreading events. *J Infect Dis* 2013; **207**(6): 990-8.
- 496 4. Shen Z, Ning F, Zhou W, et al. Superspreading SARS events, Beijing, 2003. *Emerg*
497 *Infect Dis* 2004; **10**(2): 256-60.
- 498 5. Streeck H, Schulte B, Kümmerer BM, et al. Infection fatality rate of SARS-CoV2 in a
499 super-spreading event in Germany. *Nat Commun* 2020; **11**(1): 5829.
- 500 6. Leclerc QJ, Fuller NM, Knight LE, Funk S, Knight GM. What settings have been
501 linked to SARS-CoV-2 transmission clusters? *Wellcome Open Res* 2020; **5**: 83.
- 502 7. Corman VM, Landt O, Kaiser M, et al. Detection of 2019 novel coronavirus (2019-
503 nCoV) by real-time RT-PCR. *Euro Surveill* 2020; **25**(3).
- 504 8. Schmithausen RM, Döhla M, Schöbler H, et al. Characteristic Temporary Loss of
505 Taste and Olfactory Senses in SARS-CoV-2-positive-Individuals with Mild Symptoms.
506 *Pathog Immun* 2020; **5**(1): 117-20.
- 507 9. Kyriakopoulos AM, Papaefthymiou A, Georgilas N, Doulberis M, Kountouras J. The
508 Potential Role of Super Spread Events in SARS-COV-2 Pandemic; a Narrative Review. *Arch*
509 *Acad Emerg Med* 2020; **8**(1): e74.
- 510 10. Patel KP, Vunnam SR, Patel PA, et al. Transmission of SARS-CoV-2: an update of
511 current literature. *Eur J Clin Microbiol Infect Dis* 2020; **39**(11): 2005-11.
- 512 11. Lednicky JA, Lauzardo M, Fan ZH, et al. Viable SARS-CoV-2 in the air of a hospital
513 room with COVID-19 patients. *Int J Infect Dis* 2020; **100**: 476-82.
- 514 12. Santarpia JL, Rivera DN, Herrera VL, et al. Aerosol and surface contamination of
515 SARS-CoV-2 observed in quarantine and isolation care. *Sci Rep* 2020; **10**(1): 12732.
- 516 13. Günther T, Czech-Sioli M, Indenbirken D, et al. SARS-CoV-2 outbreak investigation
517 in a German meat processing plant. *EMBO Mol Med* 2020; **12**(12): e13296.
- 518 14. Pokora R, Kutschbach S, Weigl M, et al. Investigation of superspreading COVID-19
519 outbreak events in meat and poultry processing plants in Germany: A cross-sectional study.
520 *PLoS One* 2021; **16**(6): e0242456.
- 521 15. Nazarenko Y. Air filtration and SARS-CoV-2. *Epidemiol Health* 2020; **42**: e2020049.
- 522 16. Vardavas CI, Nikitara K. COVID-19 and smoking: A systematic review of the
523 evidence. *Tob Induc Dis* 2020; **18**: 20.
- 524 17. Engin AB, Engin ED, Engin A. Two important controversial risk factors in SARS-
525 CoV-2 infection: Obesity and smoking. *Environ Toxicol Pharmacol* 2020; **78**: 103411.
- 526 18. Israel A, Feldhamer E, Lahad A, Levin-Zamir D, Lavie G. Smoking and the risk of
527 COVID-19 in a large observational population study. *medRxiv* 2020: 2020.06.01.20118877.
- 528 19. Grundy EJ, Suddek T, Filippidis FT, Majeed A, Coronini-Cronberg S. Smoking,
529 SARS-CoV-2 and COVID-19: A review of reviews considering implications for public health
530 policy and practice. *Tob Induc Dis* 2020; **18**: 58.
- 531 20. Changeux JP, Amoura Z, Rey FA, Miyara M. A nicotinic hypothesis for Covid-19
532 with preventive and therapeutic implications. *C R Biol* 2020; **343**(1): 33-9.

- 533 21. Paleiron N, Mayet A, Marbac V, et al. Impact of Tobacco Smoking on the Risk of
534 COVID-19: A Large Scale Retrospective Cohort Study. *Nicotine Tob Res* 2021; **23**(8): 1398-
535 404.
- 536 22. Li X, Xu W, Dozier M, He Y, Kirolos A, Theodoratou E. The role of children in
537 transmission of SARS-CoV-2: A rapid review. *J Glob Health* 2020; **10**(1): 011101.
- 538 23. Li X, Xu W, Dozier M, et al. The role of children in the transmission of SARS-CoV2:
539 updated rapid review. *J Glob Health* 2020; **10**(2): 021101.
- 540 24. Viner RM, Mytton OT, Bonell C, et al. Susceptibility to SARS-CoV-2 Infection
541 Among Children and Adolescents Compared With Adults: A Systematic Review and Meta-
542 analysis. *JAMA Pediatr* 2021; **175**(2): 143-56.
543

	Not infected N%	Infected N%
Total number	218	186
Female	114 (52%)	89 (48%)
Age		
<18 years	31 (14%)	15 (8%)
18-24 years	30 (14%)	20 (11%)
25-39 years	81 (37%)	43 (23%)
40-64 years	71 (33%)	100 (54%)
65+ years	5 (2%)	8 (4%)
BMI (kg/m²) (Std Dev)	24.3 (5.12)	26.2 (5.16)
Participating house hold member (Std Dev)	2.1 (1.12)	2.4 (1.16)
Highest level of formal education		
None	27 (13%)	13 (7%)
lower secondary school	27 (13%)	23 (13%)
secondary school	55 (26%)	71 (39%)
higher education entrance qualification	54 (25%)	34 (18%)
(technical) university degree	52 (24%)	43 (23%)
duration of attendance [h] (Std Dev)	4.7 (2.06)	5.8 (1.85)
Service Team	4 (2%)	22 (12%)
on stage during event	80 (37%)	62 (34%)
member of "Council of 11"	6 (3%)	18 (10%)
on stage during "Finale"	26 (12%)	48 (26%)
Behavior during break		
remaining seated	73 (36%)	85 (48%)
going outside	114 (55%)	72 (39%)
alcohol consumption [drink] (Std Dev)	11.3 (7.76)	12.2 (7.40)
former smoker	34 (16%)	45 (24%)
active smoker ?10 ciarettes a day)	54 (25%)	23 (12%)
at least one comorbidity	29 (13%)	28 (15%)
avg. distance to other participants [m] (Std Dev)	9.2 (1.68)	9.1 (1.70)
distance to air inlet [m] (Std Dev)	6.1 (3.22)	6.0 (3.30)
distance to air outlet [m] (Std Dev)	4.8 (2.94)	5.1 (2.87)

Table 1: Distribution of demographic factors and exposure information of interest among study participants who tested positive or negative in serology test of SARS-Cov2-infection.




Fig. 1: Study participants. Of the 400 people contacted originally (left) 362 adults and 49 children agreed to enroll in the study. An overview of the number of samples collected is given on the right. Downstream sample processing included centrifugation of blood samples for plasma collection (SARS-CoV-2 ELISAs), and viral RNA extraction from swab samples (SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR).




Fig. 2: Reconstructed 3D-Model of the venue hall. Self-administered questionnaires included questions about main seating-position of the participants during the evening event as specifying table and seat with the help of a schematic seating plan. Metric room coordinates for all tables, seats, and ventilation-points were assessed and the seating was reconstructed from pictures taken during the event. Therefore, the location of the stage, the bar, the exit as well as the tables and the air-inlets/outlets were reconstructed in a 3D-Model. The original external dimensions of the building were 27m x 13.20m x 4.20m. Tables, where more than 7 infected individuals have stayed are colored in red, this includes the stage and bar as well. Air-inlets are colored in blue and the air-outlets in violet. Infected participants had been seated mostly at tables close to the bar, the bar itself and on stage. One table with 8 out of 11 infected people, was located far away from the bar at the other side of the hall and close to an air inlet. The group sitting on stage showed as well high numbers of infection (18 infected out of 24). Greater proximity to air outlets seems to be associated with increased risk of infection with a crude OR=1.39 [0.86; 2.25].




Fig. 3 Odds-Ratio for the likelihood of SARS-CoV-2 infection by age groups. Participants were divided into age groups of 8, 15, or 25 years, participants younger than 18 or older than 65 years. Participants were considered to have been infected during the event if they were SARS-CoV-2 antibody positive (ELISA).




Fig. 4: Odds ratios for the association of SARS-CoV-2 infection with specific activities of the participants and their location in the venue relative to ventilation shafts. The model was additionally adjusted for age, sex, duration of attendance, participation in multiple activities, and cumulative proximity to other infected persons, and common household.




Fig. 5: Odds ratios for symptoms of SARS-CoV-2 antibody-positive participants in the 14 days following the super spreading event. The information on symptoms was derived from the self-administered questionnaire, which was filled out on the day of sample collection. Odds ratio estimates (OR) are shown with confidence intervals