medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.11.24.21266824; this version posted November 27, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Synergetic measures needed to prevent infection waves and contain SARS-CoV-2 transmission

Authors: Hang Su[1†], Yafang Cheng[1†], Ulrich Pöschl[1].

Affiliations:

[1] Max Planck Institute for Chemistry, Mainz 55128, Germany.

† Correspondence to: Y.C. (yafang.cheng@mpic.de) and H.S. (h.su@mpic.de)

Abstract:
We investigate the effectiveness and synergies of vaccination and non-pharmaceutical interventions like masking, distancing & ventilation, testing & isolation, and contact reduction as a function of compliance in the population. For realistic conditions, we find that it would be difficult to contain highly contagious SARS-CoV-2 variants by any individual measure. Instead, we show how multiple synergetic measures have to be combined to reduce the effective reproduction number (R_e) below unity. For R_0=5 and ~70% vaccination rate, the synergies of masking, distancing & ventilation, and testing & isolation with compliances around 30% appear suitable to keep R_e<1. With frequent testing, this would work also at lower vaccination rates, e.g., in schools. Higher compliance or additional measures like contact reductions are required to break intense waves of infection.

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.11.24.21266824; this version posted November 27, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Main Text:

The COVID-19 pandemic has severe health, economic, and societal effects (*1*). Immunization by vaccination is one of the most important and prominent measures to control and mitigate the transmission of SARS-CoV-2, which has the benefit of not just reducing the transmission but also reducing the average severity of disease (*2*). Recent developments, however, suggest that the progress and effectiveness of vaccination may not suffice for suppressing or breaking waves of infection and swiftly mitigating the spread of COVID-19 (*3*). Besides vaccination, common further measures to control and contain the transmission of SARS-CoV-2 are universal masking, distancing & ventilation, contact reduction, and testing & isolation (*4-9*). Here, we investigate and quantify the effectiveness and synergies of these measures in reducing the effective reproduction number, R_e. In the main text and figures we focus on a basic reproduction of $R_0 = 5$ that approximates the transmissibility of the delta variant of SARS-CoV-2 (*10*). In the supplement, we also refer to higher and lower values ($R_0 = 3$ or 8).

A detailed account of the scientific approach and methods applied in our study is given in the supplementary text (sect. S1). Based on recent observations, we assume that the probability of SARS-CoV-2 transmission is on average reduced by approx. 70% for vaccinated persons (*11-14*). Universal masking reduces both the exhalation and the inhalation of respiratory viruses like SARS-CoV-2 (source control and wearer protection) and can thus reduce the probability of transmission by approx. 80% in case of surgical masks and approx. 99% in case of N95/FFP2 masks (sect. S1; Cheng et al., 2021). Physical distancing by at least 1-2 meters and proper ventilation of indoor environments can decrease the risk of droplet (>100 µm) and aerosol transmission (<100 µm) in indoor environments by approx. 90% (supplementary text, sect. S1), whereby distancing primarily reduces droplet transmission and ventilation primarily reduces aerosol transmission (*4-7, 15*). Reducing the number of contacts leads to a directly proportional decrease of R_e (*16*), and the effects of testing & isolation of infected persons on R_e can be described as detailed in the supplement (sect. S1) (*17*).

For each of the investigated protective measures, Figure 1 shows how R_e decreases with increasing compliance in the population. Vaccination alone (black line) can reduce the reproduction number from $R_0 = 5$ to $R_e = 2.5$ at 70% compliance, which corresponds approximately to the current rate of vaccination in Germany (https://impfdashboard.de/). Even at 100% compliance, however, vaccination alone would not reduce R_e below 1 as required to contain the transmission. Without other protective measures, R_e would remain as high as 1.5, leading to continued exponential growth. In other words, the currently available vaccines are highly protective against the disease and severe outcomes of COVID-19 (*11-14*), but they are not sufficient to contain and end the transmission of SARS-CoV-2 without synergetic measures. For $R_0 = 5$ or higher basic reproduction rates, even a vaccine that reduces the probability of infection and transmission by 95% (*2*) would require vaccination rates higher than 85% to decrease R_e below 1 (Fig. S1). In theory, distancing & ventilation alone (yellow line) could decrease R_e to 0.5 at 100% compliance, but at more realistic compliance rates around 50% as discussed below, R_e would also remain above 1. Similarly, universal masking (red line) with 100% compliance could bring R_e close to 1 in case of surgical masks (Fig. 1A) and well below 1 in case of N95/FFP2 masks (Fig. 1B), but at more realistic compliance rates around 50%, R_e would again remain above 1.

When all these measures are combined (solid blue line), compliance rates around 50% are sufficient to bring R_e close to 1 in case of surgical masks (Fig. 1A) and well below 1 in case of N95/FFP2 masks (Fig. 1B). The steep non-linear decay of the "all measures" curve and the

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.11.24.21266824; this version posted November 27, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

very low R_e values obtained at high compliance highlight the strong synergetic effect that results from combining multiple protective measures and multiplying their individual effects. Even if only universal masking were combined with distancing & ventilation ("physical measures", dashed blue line), R_e would fall below 1 at 50% compliance with N95/FFP2 masking (Fig. 1B). Note, however, that 50% compliance with masking are not easy to achieve as discussed below and in Cheng et al. (2021). We are not suggesting to promote these physical measures without vaccination, which would also be missing the benefit of reducing both the transmission of the virus and the severity of the disease by immunization (*2, 11-14*). Nevertheless, the "physical measures" curve shows, that the synergetic effects of combining and properly applying these simple measures are strong enough to reduce the reproduction number substantially, e.g., for breaking or suppressing waves of infection. The actual rates of vaccination vary widely due to different supplies, age limits, and willingness. For example, the percentages of fully vaccinated people are around 28% in India, 58% in the U.S.A., 68% in Germany, 88% in Portugal, and 42% worldwide at this time (November 2021) (*18*). In our study, we are not explicitly accounting for persons immunized by recovery from the disease. Depending on the level of immunization, they can be implicitly included in the vaccination rate (compliance). Given an approximate efficacy of 70% and an approximate upper limit of 90% for compliance, vaccination can only reduce R_e from 5 to approx. 1.9.

For universal masking, 100% compliance would be difficult to achieve because masking is not always possible and practical, for example at home, during eating or drinking in restaurants and bars, in schools and kindergartens, etc. (*6*). The potential importance of such situations is demonstrated by a recent modeling study attributing around 10% to 40% of daily infections to restaurants and cafés/bars (*19*). Moreover, a lack of willingness to follow recommendations or mandates for mask use may also lead to low compliance with mask wearing. For example, inpatient respiratory protection studies show that adherence rates vary from 10% to 84% for health care personnel (*20-22*). Similar effects can be expected when wearing masks with low efficiency or poor fit and high penetration or leakage rates (*6, 23*). Combining these effects, we may estimate ~50% as an effective upper limit for the compliance with universal masking. For physical distancing, we may expect a similar effective upper limit of compliance because distancing may be difficult under the same or similar conditions that are unfavorable for masking. With regard to ventilation, earlier investigations indicate that the ventilation of indoor environments is often much lower than recommended, and the values recommended for common indoor environments are also lower than the ventilation rates used for effective infection control in health care units (*7, 24*). We found no data specifically suited for estimating population-average ventilation effects (*7*), but based on the available literature we assume that the effective upper limit of compliance with distancing & ventilation is similar to the value estimated for distancing (approx. 50%).

Thus, it would be difficult to contain SARS-CoV-2 transmission and end the pandemic by any individual measure as currently available under realistic conditions. On the other hand, Fig. 1 shows that the synergetic effects of combining the investigated protective measures at realistic levels of compliance can decrease R_e from $R_0 = 5$ to well below 1. In case of new virus variants, the efficacy of vaccines may be reduced, but the effectiveness of simple physical measures should not change much. In case of higher reproduction numbers (e.g., $R_0 = 8$, Fig. S5), higher compliances or additional measures would be required as discussed below. In the following, we explore the synergies of combining vaccination with universal masking, distancing & ventilation, contact reduction, and testing & isolation.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.11.24.21266824; this version posted November 27, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Figures 2A and 2B show how R_e decreases as a function of compliance with universal masking for different vaccination rates in the population, assuming that vaccine efficacy against virus transmission is 70% and that no other protective measures are applied. The basic reproduction number R_0 is 5, and the reduced starting values of R_e at zero compliance with masking correspond to different vaccination rates. At a vaccination rate around 70% (black line), decreasing R_e below 1 would require compliances higher than 70% for surgical masking (Fig. 2A) and higher than 50% for N95/FFP2 masking (Fig. 2B). In practice, such compliance values appear unrealistically high as discussed above, indicating that controlling the transmission of SARS-CoV-2 in a population with moderate vaccination rate (e.g., in Germany) requires additional measures beyond vaccination and masking. At a vaccination rate around 90% (yellow line), decreasing R_e below 1 would require compliances around 50% for surgical masking (Fig. 2A) and 30% for N95/FFP2 masking (Fig. 2B). Thus, high compliance with universal masking may suffice to prevent or suppress potential waves of infection in populations with high vaccination rates (e.g., in Portugal).

In Figures 2C and 2D, we include the effect of distancing & ventilation. They show how R_e decreases as a function of compliance with distancing & ventilation for different compliances with universal masking at a fixed vaccination rate of 70%. Different starting values of R_e at zero compliance reflect the effects of vaccination and different levels of masking. Without masking (black line), decreasing R_e below 1 would require compliances higher than 70%, which appear unrealistically high as discussed above. With universal masking at a level of 30% (red line), decreasing R_e below 1 would require distancing & ventilation compliances around 50% in case of surgical masks (Fig. 2C) and around 30% for N95/FFP2 masks (Fig. 2D). As discussed above, compliance levels around 30% are not unrealistic. Thus, high compliance with universal masking in combination with distancing & ventilation may suffice to prevent or suppress waves of infection in populations with moderate vaccination rates (e.g., in Germany).

In Figure 3, we include the effect of contact reduction. It shows how R_e decreases as a function of contact reduction for different compliances with universal masking at a fixed vaccination rate of 70%. With universal masking at 30% compliance (Figs. 3A and 3B, red line), decreasing R_e below 1 would require contact reductions by approx. 50% in case of surgical masks and approx. 30% for N95/FFP2 masks. According to recent studies (*9, 25-27*) , 30% contact reduction would correspond to a partial confinement and 50% would correspond to a hard lockdown. When universal masking is combined with distancing & ventilation at 30% compliance (Figs. 3C and 3D, red line), contact reductions by approx. 30% would decrease R_e slightly below 1 for surgical masks and as low as 0.7 for N95/FFP2 masks. Thus, moderate contact reductions (around 30%, partial confinement) combined with distancing & ventilation and N95/FFP2 masking at moderate levels of compliance (around 30%) may suffice to effectively break waves of infection. The synergetic effects of contact reduction with other protective measures are further illustrated in Figs. S5 and S6.

Testing & isolation of infected persons is a protective measure particularly common and relevant for mitigating the transmission of SARS-CoV-2 in schools (*17*). Figure 4 shows a pronounced non-linear dependence of R_e on the frequency of testing (number of tests per week) for different vaccination rates and compliances with universal masking and distancing & ventilation. The latter are key measures and essential tools to contain the transmission in schools and keep them operational during the pandemic. Even for largely unvaccinated groups such as primary school children, R_e can be kept as low as 0.5-0.9 by 2-3 tests per week combined with distancing & ventilation and surgical or N95/FFP2 masking at moderate

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.11.24.21266824; this version posted November 27, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

compliance levels around 30% (red lines, Figs. 4A and 4B). At a vaccination rate of 70%, similar results can be achieved just by testing and masking (red lines, Figs. 4C and 4D). At 70% vaccination rate, 30% masking, and 30% distancing & ventilation, even one test per week may suffice to keep R_e below 1 and contain the spread of SARS-CoV-2 (red lines, Figs. 4E and 4F). Figure S7 shows the results obtained for various further combinations of protective measures at different levels of compliance. In practice, the frequency of testing has to be adjusted according to the rates of false negative results (*28*)(sect S1), and the effects of incomplete isolation have to be considered, which may reduce the effectiveness of this measure. Nevertheless, testing & isolation may be highly effective not only in educational but also in workplace and private environments, especially with increasing vaccination rates (see Fig. S7).

We suggest to further extend and validate the above results by target-oriented collection and analysis of observational data. The modeling tools developed and applied in this study will be made freely available on the internet. In this context, it will be important and challenging to clarify and resolve the actual contributions of viruses in respiratory particles of different sizes, e.g., the contribution of aerosol versus droplet transmission. This will be worthwhile for both the traditional medical cut-off at 5 µm, distinguishing between fine and coarse droplets, as well as for the physical cut-off at 100 µm, distinguishing between suspended and ballistic droplets and particles, respectively(*5, 29-32*) (*6, 33-35*). Among the simple physical protective measures, distancing works primarily against droplet transmission and ventilation against aerosol transmission (sect. S1)(*4, 7*) (*6, 15*). Surgical and N95/FFP2 masks are highly effective against aerosol transmissions, and are even more effective against droplet transmissions because of the higher filtering efficiency of masks against large droplets (*36, 37*).

We suggest that the presented scientific approach, results, and tools can be used to design and communicate efficient strategies to contain the transmission of SARS-CoV-2 in different environments and to mitigate the COVID-19 pandemic. Our quantitative results are consistent with earlier recommendations (*3, 38, 39*), and the modeling tools can be used to explore and refine the synergetic effects of combining multiple protective measures as a function of R_0, compliance, and efficacy of each measure. For example, universal masking should be promoted and the efficacy and suitability of different masks against aerosol and droplet transmission under different conditions should be further clarified and communicated – in particular, why any decent mask is better than none, why tightly fitting FFP2 masks are particularly effective, and why masks are also useful in outdoor gatherings (*6, 23*). Efficient ventilation of classrooms and other indoor environments could be fostered, optimized and assessed by readily available techniques like exhaust fans, air ducts for displacement ventilation, and CO_2 sensors etc. (*7, 15, 40*). For schools, we find that the transmission of SARS-CoV-2 can be contained by 2-3 tests per week combined with masking, distancing & ventilation, even at moderate compliance and low vaccination rates at $R_0 = 5$. Thus, testing appears worthwhile in schools and other densely occupied environments (*17*), and the frequency of testing may be adjusted according to the non-linear relation to R_e as well as the rates of false negative results (*28*), and the effects of incomplete isolation.

The strong dependence of R_e on compliance highlights the importance of situations where masking, distancing & ventilation or isolation are not possible, impractical, or ineffective – in particular during eating/drinking in restaurants/bars, schools/kindergartens, trains/planes, and at home. In such situations, it may, for example, help to wear masks alternatingly. Obviously, infectious fluids can also be transferred via surface contacts, and standard hygiene procedures

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.11.24.21266824; this version posted November 27, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

against fomite transmission should also be followed (https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/more/science-and-research/surface-transmission.html).

The simple and robust methods and the easy-to-understand plots of R_e vs. compliance provided in this study may help to communicate these strategies and to demonstrate the importance of cooperation to the wider public. Moreover, they may help to convince both the public and decision makers that each of the currently available measures by itself is insufficient to contain the transmissions of SARS-CoV-2 and that the synergetic effects of multiple protective measures can and have to exploited for efficient mitigation of the pandemic. Even with high and increasing rates of vaccination, other protective measures and synergetic effects should be maintained to prevent, suppress, or break potential and ongoing waves of infection. These aspects and their quantitative description might become even more important, if more transmissible variants and escape mutations of SARS-CoV-2 were to emerge. The challenge we are facing now is not just how to end the pandemic, but also how fast we can do it to save more lives and reduce the probability of further dangerous mutations of SARS-CoV-2.

References and Notes:

1. J. C. Castillo *et al.*, Market design to accelerate COVID-19 vaccine supply. *Science* **371**, 1107-1109 (2021).
2. F. P. Polack *et al.*, Safety and Efficacy of the BNT162b2 mRNA Covid-19 Vaccine. *New England Journal of Medicine* **383**, 2603-2615 (2020).
3. S. Moore, E. M. Hill, M. J. Tildesley, L. Dyson, M. J. Keeling, Vaccination and non-pharmaceutical interventions for COVID-19: a mathematical modelling study. *The Lancet Infectious Diseases* **21**, 793-802 (2021).
4. C. C. Wang *et al.*, Airborne transmission of respiratory viruses. *Science* **373**, eabd9149 (2021).
5. J. Lelieveld *et al.*, Model Calculations of Aerosol Transmission and Infection Risk of COVID-19 in Indoor Environments. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health* **17**, 8114 (2020).
6. Y. Cheng *et al.*, Face masks effectively limit the probability of SARS-CoV-2 transmission. *Science*, eabg6296 (2021).
7. L. Morawska *et al.*, A paradigm shift to combat indoor respiratory infection. *Science* **372**, 689-691 (2021).
8. N. R. Jones *et al.*, Two metres or one: what is the evidence for physical distancing in covid-19? *BMJ* **370**, m3223 (2020).
9. N. Islam *et al.*, Physical distancing interventions and incidence of coronavirus disease 2019: natural experiment in 149 countries. *BMJ* **370**, m2743 (2020).
10. Y. Liu, J. Rocklöv, The reproductive number of the Delta variant of SARS-CoV-2 is far higher compared to the ancestral SARS-CoV-2 virus. *Journal of Travel Medicine* **28**, (2021).
11. S. Y. Tartof *et al.*, Effectiveness of mRNA BNT162b2 COVID-19 vaccine up to 6 months in a large integrated health system in the USA: a retrospective cohort study. *The Lancet* **398**, 1407-1416 (2021).
12. P. Tang *et al.*, BNT162b2 and mRNA-1273 COVID-19 vaccine effectiveness against the SARS-CoV-2 Delta variant in Qatar. *Nature Medicine*, (2021).
13. A. Fowlkes *et al.*, Effectiveness of COVID-19 Vaccines in Preventing SARS-CoV-2 Infection Among Frontline Workers Before and During B.1.617.2 (Delta) Variant Predominance - Eight U.S. Locations, December 2020-August 2021. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep* **70**, 1167-1169 (2021).
14. B. A. Cohn, P. M. Cirillo, C. C. Murphy, N. Y. Krigbaum, A. W. Wallace, SARS-CoV-2 vaccine protection and deaths among US veterans during 2021. *Science* **0**, eabm0620.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.11.24.21266824; this version posted November 27, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

15. F. Helleis, T. Klimach, U. Pöschl, Vergleich von Fensterlüftungssystemen und anderen Lüftungs- bzw. Luftreinigungsansätzen gegen die Aerosolübertragung von COVID-19 und für erhöhte Luftqualität in Klassenräumen. (2021).
16. P. van den Driessche, J. Watmough, in *Mathematical Epidemiology*, F. Brauer, P. van den Driessche, J. Wu, Eds. (Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2008), pp. 159-178.
17. P. Willeit *et al.*, Prevalence of RT-qPCR-detected SARS-CoV-2 infection at schools: First results from the Austrian School-SARS-CoV-2 prospective cohort study. *The Lancet Regional Health - Europe* **5**, 100086 (2021).
18. M. Roser, Coronavirus Pandemic (COVID-19). *Our World in Data*, (2020).
19. S. Chang *et al.*, Mobility network models of COVID-19 explain inequities and inform reopening. *Nature* **589**, 82-87 (2021).
20. L. J. Radonovich, Jr *et al.*, N95 Respirators vs Medical Masks for Preventing Influenza Among Health Care Personnel: A Randomized Clinical Trial. *Jama* **322**, 824-833 (2019).
21. C. R. MacIntyre *et al.*, A cluster randomized clinical trial comparing fit-tested and non-fit-tested N95 respirators to medical masks to prevent respiratory virus infection in health care workers. *Influenza and Other Respiratory Viruses* **5**, 170-179 (2011).
22. C. R. MacIntyre *et al.*, A Randomized Clinical Trial of Three Options for N95 Respirators and Medical Masks in Health Workers. *American journal of respiratory and critical care medicine* **187**, 960-966 (2013).
23. J. Howard *et al.*, An evidence review of face masks against COVID-19. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* **118**, e2014564118 (2021).
24. P. Aguilera Benito, C. Piña Ramírez, G. Viccione, E. Lepore, Ventilation for Residential Buildings: Critical Assessment of Standard Requirements in the COVID-19 Pandemic Context. *Frontiers in Built Environment* **7**, (2021).
25. S. Flaxman *et al.*, Estimating the effects of non-pharmaceutical interventions on COVID-19 in Europe. *Nature* **584**, 257-261 (2020).
26. G. Pullano, E. Valdano, N. Scarpa, S. Rubrichi, V. Colizza, Evaluating the effect of demographic factors, socioeconomic factors, and risk aversion on mobility during the COVID-19 epidemic in France under lockdown: a population-based study. *The Lancet Digital Health* **2**, e638-e649 (2020).
27. F. Schlosser *et al.*, COVID-19 lockdown induces disease-mitigating structural changes in mobility networks. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* **117**, 32883-32890 (2020).
28. E. Albert *et al.*, Field evaluation of a rapid antigen test (Panbio™ COVID-19 Ag Rapid Test Device) for COVID-19 diagnosis in primary healthcare centres. *Clinical Microbiology and Infection* **27**, 472.e477-472.e410 (2021).
29. W. C. Hinds, W. C. Hinds, *Aerosol Technology: Properties, Behavior, and Measurement of Airborne Particles*. (Wiley, 1999).
30. U. Pöschl, Atmospheric Aerosols: Composition, Transformation, Climate and Health Effects. *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed.* **44**, 7520-7540 (2005).
31. P. A. Baron, K. Willeke, *Aerosol Measurement: Principles, Techniques, and Applications*. (Wiley, 2005).
32. J. H. Seinfeld, S. N. Pandis, *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics, from Air Pollution to Climate Change*. (John Wiley, New York, 2006).
33. M. L. Pöhlker *et al.*, Respiratory aerosols and droplets in the transmission of infectious diseases. *arXiv [physics.med-ph]*, (2021).
34. K. A. Prather *et al.*, Airborne transmission of SARS-CoV-2. *Science* **370**, 303-304 (2020).
35. K. A. Prather, C. C. Wang, R. T. Schooley, Reducing transmission of SARS-CoV-2. *Science* **368**, 1422-1424 (2020).
36. S. A. Grinshpun *et al.*, Performance of an N95 Filtering Facepiece Particulate Respirator and a Surgical Mask During Human Breathing: Two Pathways for Particle Penetration. *Journal of Occupational and Environmental Hygiene* **6**, 593-603 (2009).
37. A. Weber *et al.*, Aerosol penetration and leakage characteristics of masks used in the health care industry. *Am J Infect Control* **21**, 167-173 (1993).
38. J. Dehning *et al.*, Inferring change points in the spread of COVID-19 reveals the effectiveness of interventions. *Science* **369**, eabb9789 (2020).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.11.24.21266824; this version posted November 27, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

39. V. Priesemann *et al.*, "Nachhaltige Strategien gegen die COVID-19-Pandemie in Deutschland im Winter 2021/2022," (Technische Universität Berlin, 2021).
40. Z. Peng *et al.*, Practical Indicators for Risk of Airborne Transmission in Shared Indoor Environments and their application to COVID-19 Outbreaks. *medRxiv*, 2021.2004.2021.21255898 (2021).

Acknowledgments: This study is supported by the Max Planck Society (MPG), We acknowledge and emphasize the importance of Open Access to the studies and materials referenced and used in our investigations. Our research profits from Open Access policies for COVID-19-related publications, and our experience confirms that Open Access indeed accelerates scientific progress and should be extended as widely as possible; **Funding:** Y.C. thanks the Minerva Program of MPG; **Author contributions:** H.S. and Y.C. designed and led the study. Y.C., H.S. and U.P. performed the research. H.S., Y.C., and U.P. wrote the manuscript with input from all coauthors; **Competing interests:** Authors declare no competing interests; and **Data and materials availability:** All data is available in the main text or the supplementary materials.

Supplementary Materials:

Supplementary Text S1

Figs. S1 to S7



Fig. 1 Effectiveness of individual and combined measures. Reduction of effective reproduction number, R_e, as a function of compliance with different protective measures for a basic reproduction number $R_0 = 5$ approximately reflecting the transmissibility of the delta variant of SARS-CoV-2. Panels **A** and **B** refer to universal masking with surgical masks and N95/FFP2 masks, respectively. The curve labeled "physical measures" refers to the combination and synergy of universal masking plus distancing and ventilation; the curve labeled "all measures" refers to the combination and synergy of the physical measures with vaccination.



Fig. 2 Effectiveness of masking and distancing & ventilation for different vaccination rates and compliances. Reduction of effective reproduction number, R_e, as a function of compliance with universal masking for different vaccination rates (**A, B**) and as a function of compliance with distancing & ventilation for different levels of masking at a fixed vaccination rate of 70% (**C, D**). Basic reproduction number $R_0 = 5$; reduced starting values of R_e at zero compliance with masking correspond to different vaccination rates. Left column corresponds to universal masking with surgical masks, right column corresponds to N95/FFP2 masks.



Fig. 3 Effectiveness of contact reduction for different compliances with masking and distancing & ventilation. Reduction of effective reproduction number, R_e, as a function of contact reduction for different compliances with universal masking at a fixed vaccination rate of 70%. Basic reproduction number $R_0 = 5$; reduced starting values of R_e at zero contact reduction reflect the vaccination rate and different levels of masking and distancing & ventilation (30% compliance, panels **C** and **D**). Left column corresponds to universal masking with surgical masks, right column corresponds to N95/FFP2 masks.



Fig. 4 Effectiveness of testing & isolation for different compliances with masking, vaccination, and distancing & ventilation. Reduction of effective reproduction number, R_e, as a function of testing frequency (number tests per week per person) for different compliances with universal masking and distancing & ventilation, as well as different vaccination rates. Basic reproduction number $R_0 = 5$; reduced starting values of R_e reflect different vaccination rates and compliances with masking and with distancing & ventilation, respectively. Left column corresponds to universal masking with surgical masks, right column corresponds to N95/FFP2 masks.

Supplementary Materials for

Synergetic measures needed to prevent infection waves and contain SARS-CoV-2 transmission

Hang Su, Yafang Cheng, Ulrich Pöschl.

This PDF file includes:

Supplementary Text S1

Figs. S1 to S7

Supplementary Text

S1. Vaccination, non-pharmaceutical interventions and effective reproduction number

By definition [1], the basic reproduction number R_0 can be linked to P_0, the basic population average infection probability by

$$R_0 = P_0 \cdot c \cdot d \quad \text{(S1)}$$

where d represents the average duration of infectiousness, and c represent average daily numbers of human contacts.

Vaccination, non-pharmaceutical interventions such as universal masking (surgical, N95/FFP2), distancing & ventilation, contact reduction, and testing & isolation can reduce R_e by reducing the infection probability (P), duration of infectiousness or daily contacts.

$$R_e = P \cdot c \cdot d \quad \text{(S2)}$$

The effectiveness of individual measure, E_i, can be defined as

$$E_i = 1 - R_{e,i}/R_0 \quad \text{(S3)}$$

where $R_{e,i}$ represents the effective reproduction number after implementing the measure i.

The effectiveness of multiple independent measures, E_{tot}, can be calculated by

$$E_{tot} = 1 - \sum(1-E_i)$$

In the following, we introduced how the effects of protective measures on R_e were calculated in this study.

E_{vac}, the effectiveness of vaccination on R_e depends on the vaccination rate and the corresponding effectiveness of vaccines,

$$E_{vac} = \text{vaccine effectiveness} * \text{vaccination rate} \quad \text{(S4)}$$

Among different effectiveness parameters (e.g., against infections, or severe, critical or fatal disease), we considered the effectiveness against infections as most relevant for R_e and transmission. Based on recent observations, we assume that the probability of SARS-CoV-2 transmission is on average reduced by approx. 70% for vaccinated persons [11-14]. Here, we are not explicitly accounting for persons immunized by recovery from the disease. Depending on the level of immunization, they can be implicitly included in the vaccination rate.

E_{mask}, the effectiveness of universal masking on R_e is calculated for both aerosol transmission (via respiratory particle with diameters < 100 µm) and droplet transmission (via respiratory particle with diameters < 100 µm). The effects of universal masking on aerosol transmission of SARS-CoV-2 were calculated the same way as in Cheng et al. (2021)[2]. Because the effectiveness of masking depends on the infection probability (or R_e) and the variability of infection probability [2], we adopted a σ of 2 (the

standard deviation of virus concentration's common logarithm) in this study. The effect of compliance (m) on $P_{\mathrm{mask,a}}$, the infection probability via aerosol transmission with masking can be determined by Eq. S5 [2],

$$P_{\mathrm{mask,a}} = P_{0,\mathrm{a}}(1-m)^2 + P_{\mathrm{sc,a}}m(1-m) + P_{\mathrm{wp,a}}m(1-m) + P_{\mathrm{um,a}}m^2 \quad \text{(S5)}$$

where $P_{0,a}$ represents the population average infection probability via aerosol transmission when no one wears masks; $P_{sc,a}$ represents the average infection probability in the case of source control; $P_{wp,a}$ represent the average infection probability in the case of wearer protection; and $P_{uc,a}$ represent the average infection probability in the case of universal masking. Once we have $P_{mask,a}$, we then calculate the corresponding effectiveness from Eqs. S2 and S3.

Similarly, we can calculate the effects of universal masking on aerosol transmission by $P_{\mathrm{mask,d}} = P_{0,\mathrm{d}}(1-m)^2 + P_{\mathrm{sc,d}}m(1-m) + (1-x)P_{\mathrm{wp,d}}m(1-m) + xP_{0,\mathrm{d}}m(1-m) + P_{\mathrm{um,d}}m^2$ (S5)

For the droplet transmission, the infection probability can be calculated in the same way as in Eq. S4 except for the wear protection. This is because droplet infections may also occur through eyes of the wearer. Assuming in wear protection, eye infections and mouth/nose infections contribute x and (1-x), respectively, we can then use them by the third and the fourth term on the right-hand side of Eq. S5. Here, we assume a contribution 30% droplet transmission is through eyes.

Because the relative contribution of aerosol transmission (respiratory particles <100 um) versus droplet transmission (respiratory particles >100 um) is not known yet. We used the minimum effectiveness as a conservative estimate for the overall effectiveness of masking.

Physical distancing can inhibit the transport of very large droplets, but has little/much smaller impact on reducing exposure to equilibrated aerosols in indoor environment. By assuming a standard distancing without recommendation is ~ 0.25 meter, our calculation shows that the mass of large respiratory droplets may drop by ~88% at a distance of 1 meter and by 95% at a distance of 2 meter (Fig. S2). Thus, we assumed ~90% effectiveness E_{dis} of proper physical distancing for droplet transmission. This value of E (90%) for physical distancing is also close to E_{dis} ~ 80% as reported by the review of Chu et al [3], which, however, relied heavily on data from the SARS-CoV-1 and MERS [4].

In contrast to physical distancing, standard ventilation mainly influences the aerosol transmission in indoor environment and hardly influences the transmission of large droplets > 100 µm. According to Cheng et al. (2021), changing from a passive ventilation to a high standard ventilation rate of 12 h^{-1} may reduce the virus concentration by 90%, roughly corresponding to E_{ven} ~ 90% for aerosol transmission.

Note that these values are calculated for the averaged indoor concentrations and the practical E_{ven} can be lower around a source that is away from the ventilation air flow [5].

In this study, we limited our discussion to the combined effects of physical distancing and ventilation whenever mentioned, $E_{dis\&ven}$ = ~90%. The reasons are (1) these two measures are very effective only on part of the transmission mode, either aerosol transmission or droplet transmission; and (2) relative contributions of aerosol and droplet transmission in SARS-CoV-2 transmission are not known yet. As we limited our discussions to conditions when they are applied together, they also share the same compliance rate (the fraction of contacts with preventive measures applied). Compared to masking and vaccination, our first estimate of $E_{dis\&ven}$ for physical distancing & ventilation may be subject to potentially large uncertainties. It needs to be tested and validated, e.g., by randomized control trials, in the future.

For testing & isolation, their effects are calculated through the reducing d, the average duration of infectiousness. According to US. CDC, "patients with mild-to-moderate COVID-19 remain infectious no longer than 10 days after symptom onset; Most patients with more severe-to-critical illness or those who are severely immunocompromised likely remain infectious no longer than 20 days after symptom onset; however, there have been several reports of severely immunocompromised people shedding replication-competent virus beyond 20 days" [6-10]. Here, we assumed that d is ~ 10 days without any intervention [11]. When applied n tests per week, the intervened $d = 7/n$ assuming 100% precision of tests and immediate application isolation to avoid further transmission. Then $E_{tes\&iso} = (1 - 0.7/n)$ for accurate testing and complete isolation. In practice, the frequency of testing has to be adjusted according to the rates of false negative results [28](sect S1), and the effects of incomplete isolation have to be considered, which may reduce the effectiveness of this measure.



Fig. S1 Effectiveness of vaccination for different vaccination rates and vaccination efficiency. Reduction of effective reproduction number, R_e, as a function of vaccination efficiency ("vacc. eff.") for different vaccination rates ("compliance" in %). Panel **A** is for a basic reproduction number $R_0 = 5$ approximately reflecting the transmissibility of the delta variant of SARS-CoV-2. Panel B is for $R_0 = 8$ approximating a variant with higher transmissibility than the delta variant of SARS-CoV-2. Panel **C** is for $R_0 = 3$ approximately reflecting the transmissibility of the ancestral strain of SARS-CoV-2.



Fig. S2 Fraction of remaining respiratory particle volume (aerosols and droplets with diameter up to 1 mm). Assumption: after ejection from the mouth, all respiratory particles move forward at a horizontal speed of 5 m s^{-1} with the airflow and the horizontal velocity remains constant; the deposition velocity is caused by the gravitational settling and is size dependent. When the vertical settling distance of the particles is < 1.2 m, we considered them as the remaining particles that may infect others.



Fig. S3 Effectiveness of masks in preventing aerosol or droplet transmission. The blue and green lines represent the effectiveness of surgical masks and N95/FFP2 masks in preventing aerosol transmission, respectively. The rest lines represent the effectiveness of masks in preventing droplet transmission with different contributions of eye infections (See sect. S1).



Fig. S4 Effectiveness of individual and combined measures. The same as in Fig. 1, reduction of effective reproduction number, R_e, as a function of compliance with different protective measures for a basic reproduction number $R_0 = 8$ (**A** and **B**) approximating a variant with higher transmissibility than the delta variant of SARS-CoV-2 and for $R_0 = 3$ (**C** and **D**) approximately reflecting the transmissibility of the ancestral strain of SARS-CoV-2. Panels **A**/**C** and **B**/**D** refer to universal masking with surgical masks and N95/FFP2 masks, respectively. The curve labeled "physical measures" refers to the combination and synergy of universal masking plus distancing and ventilation; the curve labeled "all measures" refers to the combination and synergy of the physical measures with vaccination.



Fig. S5 Effectiveness of individual and combined measures. Similar to Fig. 1, but with one additional measure of contact reduction. Reduction of effective reproduction number, R_e, as a function of compliance with different protective measures and contact reduction for a basic reproduction number $R_0 = 5$ approximately reflecting the transmissibility of the delta variant of SARS-CoV-2. Panels **A** and **B** refer to universal masking with surgical masks and N95/FFP2 masks, respectively. The curve labeled "non-pharmaceutical" refers to the combination and synergy of universal masking, distancing and ventilation and contact reduction; the curve labeled "all measures" refers to the combination and synergy of the non-pharmaceutical measures with vaccination.



Fig. S6 Effectiveness of non-pharmaceutical measures for different vaccination rates. Reduction of effective reproduction number, R_e, as a function of compliance with non-pharmaceutical measures for different vaccination rates in the population. Non-pharmaceutical measures are the combination and synergy of universal masking, distancing and ventilation and contact reduction. Basic reproduction number $R_0 = 5$; reduced starting values of R_e at zero compliance with non-pharmaceutical measures correspond to different vaccination rates. Panels **A** and **B** refer to universal masking with surgical masks and N95/FFP2 masks, respectively.



Fig. S7 Effectiveness of testing & isolation for different compliances with masking, vaccination, and distancing & ventilation. The same as Fig. 5, but with varies of combination of vaccination rates ("vacc."), compliance of universal masking ("masking") and distancing & ventilation ("dist. & vent."). Reduction of effective reproduction number, R_e, as a function of testing frequency (number tests per week per person) for different compliances with universal masking and distancing & ventilation, as well as different vaccination rates. Basic reproduction number $R_0 = 5$; reduced starting values of R_e reflect different vaccination rates and compliances with masking and with distancing & ventilation, respectively. Left column corresponds to universal masking with surgical masks, right column corresponds to N95/FFP2 masks.



Fig. S7 (Continued)



Fig. S7 (Continued)



Fig. S7 (Continued)

References:

1. van den Driessche, P. and J. Watmough, *Further Notes on the Basic Reproduction Number*, in *Mathematical Epidemiology*, F. Brauer, P. van den Driessche, and J. Wu, Editors. 2008, Springer Berlin Heidelberg: Berlin, Heidelberg. p. 159-178.
2. Cheng, Y., et al., *Face masks effectively limit the probability of SARS-CoV-2 transmission.* Science, 2021. **372**(6549): p. 1439-1443.
3. Chu, D.K., et al., *Physical distancing, face masks, and eye protection to prevent person-to-person transmission of SARS-CoV-2 and COVID-19: a systematic review and meta-analysis.* The Lancet, 2020. **395**(10242): p. 1973-1987.
4. Jones, N.R., et al., *Two metres or one: what is the evidence for physical distancing in covid-19?* BMJ, 2020. **370**: p. m3223.
5. Morawska, L., et al., *A paradigm shift to combat indoor respiratory infection.* Science, 2021. **372**(6543): p. 689-691.
6. Aydillo, T., et al., *Shedding of Viable SARS-CoV-2 after Immunosuppressive Therapy for Cancer.* New England Journal of Medicine, 2020. **383**(26): p. 2586-2588.
7. Avanzato, V.A., et al., *Case Study: Prolonged Infectious SARS-CoV-2 Shedding from an Asymptomatic Immunocompromised Individual with Cancer.* Cell, 2020. **183**(7): p. 1901-1912.e9.
8. Baang, J.H., et al., *Prolonged Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 Replication in an Immunocompromised Patient.* The Journal of Infectious Diseases, 2020. **223**(1): p. 23-27.
9. Tarhini, H., et al., *Long-Term Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) Infectiousness Among Three Immunocompromised Patients: From Prolonged Viral Shedding to SARS-CoV-2 Superinfection.* The Journal of Infectious Diseases, 2021. **223**(9): p. 1522-1527.
10. Choi, B., et al., *Persistence and Evolution of SARS-CoV-2 in an Immunocompromised Host.* New England Journal of Medicine, 2020. **383**(23): p. 2291-2293.
11. Johansson, M.A., et al., *SARS-CoV-2 Transmission From People Without COVID-19 Symptoms.* JAMA Network Open, 2021. **4**(1): p. e2035057-e2035057.