medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.01.10.21268254; this version posted February 15, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Title: SARS-CoV-2 risk taxation model and validation based on large scale Dutch test-events

Authors: Bas Kolen[1,2], Laurens Znidarsic[1], Andreas Voss[3,4], Simon Donders[5], Iris Kamphorst[5], Maarten van Rijn[5], Dimitri Bonthuis[6], Merit Cloquet[6], Maarten Schram[6], Rutger Scharloo[6], Tim Boersma[6], Tim Stobernack[3] and Pieter van Gelder[1]

Corresponding author: Bas Kolen

Address for correspondence: Bas Kolen, HKV Consultants, Botter 11-29, 8203 AC Lelystad, the Netherlands; email: b.kolen@hkv.nl

Affiliations:

[1] Delft University of Technology, Delft, The Netherlands

[2] HKV lijn in water, Lelystad, The Netherlands

[3] Radboudumc, Nijmegen, The Netherlands

[4] Canisius-Wilhelmina Hospital, Nijmegen, The Netherlands

[5] Breda University of Applied Sciences, Breda, The Netherlands

[6] Fieldlab Program Committee, Zaandam, The Netherlands

Abstract

In response to the outbreak of SARS-CoV-2 many governments decided in 2020 to impose lockdowns on societies. Although the package of measures which constitute such lockdowns differs between countries, it is a general rule that contacts between people, and especially in large groups of people, are avoided or prohibited. The main reasoning behind these measures is preventing that healthcare systems become overloaded. As of 2021 vaccines against SARS-CoV- are available, but these do not guarantee 100% risk reduction and it will take a

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.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/10.1101/2022.01.10.21268254; this version posted February 15, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

while for the world to reach a sufficient immune status. This raises the question whether and under which conditions events like theater shows, conferences, professional sports events, concerts and festivals can be organized. The current paper presents a COVID-19 Risk taxation method for (large scale) events. This method can be applied to events to define an alternative package of measures replacing generic social distancing.

1. Introduction

In response to the SARS-CoV-2 pandemic many governments implemented measures to reduce the risk for infections. Social distancing to reduce the number of contacts is the main measure to reduce the transmission of SARS-CoV-2 (*1*). To support social distancing, governments all over the world have taken measures, resulting in various types of (partial) lockdowns to reduce the number of contacts between people and limit gathering in groups. At the same time, Dutch event-organizers affirmed that organizing events on the basis of social distancing would be economically detrimental.

1.1 Research question

The aim of this research was to develop a model to determine the risk for infection at events during the pandemic, and the effectiveness of alternative measures instead of generic social distancing at these events. During test events we evaluated several measures and determined how the risk for infection at these events was compared to the average risk of infection during a lockdown or the risk at different locations. In this study we distinguish between four types of events:

- Type I: Indoor, passive (theater show or conference),

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.01.10.21268254; this version posted February 15, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

- Type II: Indoor, active (concert or dance events),
- Type III: Outdoor, active (public sports events),
- Type IV: Outdoor, active festival (festivals).

Regular contact matrices distinguish between different categories for locations and age. The most recent contact matrix for The Netherlands distinguishes between home, school, work and other as classes for locations, based on a pre pandemic situation (2). In these contact matrices also classes for age are used. Events are part of the class ‘other’. This class ‘other’ contains multiple locations which might contribute very differently to the risk for infections. Standard social contact data (2, 3) also do not apply because of governmental measures and personal behavior changes. We have therefore gathered actual data regarding contacts and settings representing peoples' whereabouts during the pandemic, as well as statistics regarding the epidemiologic situation during the pandemic; they have been used to develop a causal risk taxation model.

In this study we have developed a causal model to describe the risk for infections at these events. Causal modelling forms an alternative for physical or biological models, and (as such) can support the insight into the interdependencies between the constituent parts of complex systems as these events (2). A causal risk model is developed based on available data of infections and contacts among people during the pandemic. This risk-model determines the risk for infection per hour at events depending on the circumstances of the event and the contacts at these events given the epidemiologic situation at that moment.

1.2 The infection risk per hour

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.01.10.21268254; this version posted February 15, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Most of the available literature estimates the reproduction number R_0 of Severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) is between 2-4 *(5, 6)*. For Western Europe the R_0 is estimated at 2.2 (*7*) and the Dutch National Institute for Public Health and the Environment (RIVM) estimated a range between 2 and 3 (*8*). The probability of an infected person infecting another person peaks during the first week of illness, after which this probability drops significantly (*9*). Based on data from Wuhan the incubation time was on average 5.2 days and at least 4 days (*10*). Later studies based on more data indicated that the average incubation time ranged between 5.2 and 6.65 days and could be up to 14 days (*12*). We decided to express the probability of infection during the period of exposure during an event as the probability per hour. This risk can be compared to the infection risk outside these events during the pandemic. When R_0 is 2.2, people are infectious for 7 days and a prevalence of 0,77% in the Netherlands this means that the probability that a person infects another person is $1.04\ 10^{-4}$ per hour

The number of positive SARS-CoV-2 tests in the Netherlands are reported by the RIVM on a weekly basis (13). These reports include the expected location where people had been infected. Examples of these locations are homes, work, home while having visitors (friends or family), leisure, schools, catering industry, elderly houses and events. The measures taken by the government strongly influence the number of contacts at these locations. Although of all location types most people were infected at home, the probability per hour for a person of being infected at this type of location was relatively small compared to other types.

We conducted a survey te estimate the time people spend a several location and number of contacts at these locations. The individual probability per hour of being infected for each location can be compared when the absolute numbers of infections are corrected for the duration

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.01.10.21268254; this version posted February 15, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

of the stay at a location and the number of people at these locations. These figures can be used as benchmarks when deciding whether to have events.

2. Methodology SARS-CoV-2 Risk taxation Model

2.1 Methodology

In this study a SARS-CoV-2 risk taxation model was developed based on data sets collected by the National Institute for Public Health and the Environment (RIVM) and Municipal health services (GGD) collected data sets during the SARS-CoV-2 pandemic. The method resulted in the average risk of infection R at the event i per hour:

$$R_i = \sum_{j=1}^{2}\left(1 - F_{T,j}\right)P\begin{pmatrix} V_1V_1(1-R_1^I)(1-R_1^S) & V_1V_2(1-R_1^I)(1-R_2^S) \\ V_2V_1(1-R_2^I)(1-R_1^S) & V_2V_2(1-R_2^I)(1-R_2^S) \end{pmatrix}\left(1 - F_{M,i}\right)(C_{1,i}A_1 + \left(C_{2,i}A_2\left(1 - F_{Y,x}\right)\right)Y$$

In which:

- The actual prevalence P describes the proportion of infectious people in the Netherlands.
- Contacts at the event i. The complete role of virus-laden droplets and aerosols transmission is poorly understood (*11*). We distinguish between two contact-classes which are most significant: C_1 is the number of contacts per hour within 1,5m (droplets) and C_2 the number of contacts per hour within 10m (aerosols). Smart logistics and crowd control at an event reduce contacts and avoid gathering of large groups of people. Therefore, specific data were collected at test events. Because the duration of events is limited the latency period is shorter than the duration of stay at each location.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.01.10.21268254; this version posted February 15, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

- We consider two types of individuals j who can attend an event and for which different test regimes can apply. $j = 1$ corresponds to unvaccinated individuals without a documented infection, $j = 2$ corresponds to vaccinated individuals, or people with a documented infection. V_j is the proportion of the people in each group. The combination always equals 100%. At each event we assume an homogeneous mixing of all people.
- Testing prior to an event, factor $F_{T,j}$ describes the proportion of people that cannot attend the event because of testing in a certain window prior to the event.
- Vaccination and earlier infections result in a level of immunity and reduces the infectiousness I and susceptibility S of an individual. R_j^I and R_j^S the relative infectiousness and susceptibility for a type j individual related to a naive person. For the test events used to validate the model all people were considered as naïve (which means that they do not have any immunity), during the test events nobody was vaccinated and a limited amount of people had had an infection.
- $F_{Y,x}$. x is the percentage of reduction of aerosols. When $x = 0$ locations are ventilated according to building codes, $x = 1$ means very well ventilated and $x = 2$ is outdoor.
- Personal protection measures such as mouth-nose masks. This reduces the risk with factor F_M.
- Y is a multiplier for variants which are more infectious than the Alfa-variant which was dominant during the data collection.

2.2 Transmission coefficients $A1$ and $A2$

The parameters A_1 *and* A_2 are transmission-coefficients for exposure to droplets and aerosols. We distinguished between two periods: 15 September – 13 October 2020 and 14

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.01.10.21268254; this version posted February 15, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

October - 15 December 2020. On 13 October additional measures were implemented by the Dutch Government, on the 15th of December 2020 a new lockdown was implemented. For these two periods we collected contact data of persons by a questionnaire and combined with statistical data (14). We applied linear regression via Least-squares Minimization (as most common and proven approach for linear models) on a dataset of infections per location, duration and contact per location. We used data for the locations home, work, visitors at home and leisure. For the other locations the amount of available data was not sufficient. In the questionnaire we asked people after:

- The time spent at a certain location.
- The number of persons in a range of 10m.
- The number of contacts within a distance of < 0,5 m, between 0,5 and 1,5 and between 1,5 and 2,0 m for less than a minute, between 1 and 15 minutes and more than 15 minutes.
- The proportion of the time which was spend indoor, indoor and well-ventilated or outdoor given a type of location.

For each category of location, we assumed an average duration (30 seconds for the class < 1 minute, 8 minutes for contacts within 1 and 15 minutes and 30 minutes for contacts more than 15 minutes. For all indoor locations we assumed standard ventilated locations $F_{y,0} = 0$, for well ventilated indoor $F_{y,1} = 0.5$, for outdoor events $F_{y,2} = 1$. All people were considered to be naïve, and testing was not available in this period.

This resulted in a probability per hour that a person will be infected given a contagious person in a distance of 1.5m ($A_1 = 6.376\ 10^{-3}$ per hour) or 10m ($A_2 = 0.986\ 10^{-3}$ per hour).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.01.10.21268254; this version posted February 15, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Table 3 shows sensitivity analyses that the impact of other choices in the distances of 1,5m and 10m or for F_y is limited (given a prevalence of 0.5%). For the reference situation C_1 is 5 contacts per hour for the low contact event and 12.5 for the high contact event. C_2 is 10 contacts for the low contact event and 30 for the high contact event. The sensitivity analysis shows that the impact on the results sits within a bandwidth of a factor 0.5.

2.2 Total number of infections at an event

The expected number of infections at an event S are the combination the product of R_i and the duration (in hours) of the event t and the number of people at the event N:

$$S_i = R_i t_i N_i \qquad (2)$$

3 Validation of the model

The model determines an average risk for infection. The data concerning SARS-CoV-2 infections gathered at the test events can be used to validate the model. During these test vaccinations were not yet available, and only a small amount of people had earlier infections. Therefore all people were considered to be naïve, and all people who attended an event had to be tested ($V_1 = 100\%$). The model outcome, an average number of infections, is based on a skewed probability distribution. For example, consider a large-scale event where 1.000 people will join the event given a prevalence of 0.75%. Without pre-testing 7.5 infectious persons would have attended the event, when $F_{T,j} = 0.95$ on average 0.38 person would have been infectious at the event and could infect others. In the model we use the average number of contacts, there will be a probability distribution about these contacts some people will have many close contacts and others will see only a few people. Because of these uncertainties it is expected that many events

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.01.10.21268254; this version posted February 15, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

will be organized that will result in no or limited number of infections, and a few events will result in many infections.

A model validation would need a large dataset during the SARS-CoV-2 pandemic. This large dataset is expected to cover the skewed probability distribution including events. Such a database, however, is not available. Data from media and literature of superspreader events are biased as these always attract more attention. For loss of life modelling for natural hazards the limited availability of data also leads to difficulties for conducting model validation. For example, the loss of life models for river and storm surge flooding as used in the Netherlands are based on the 1953 flood in Sealand and the flood caused by hurricane Katrina in 2005 in the US (*15, 16*). However, despite the limited validation, the model is still used to define the safety standards for Dutch levees which implies an investment program of multiple billions of euros (*17*). Although a perfect validation is not attainable, the available data can be used for a first validation of the model.

2.3.1 Internal validation: reproduction of infections at different settings.

First, the performance of the model can be checked by the reproduction of infections for the settings at work, visitors and leisure time. Given the value for A_1 and A_2, the prevalence as published by the RIVM and using data from the questionnaire for the type of locations 'visitors at home', 'work' and 'leisure' to define C_1, C_2, $F_{Y,x}$ we estimated the number of infections by the model for these locations. These model results are compared with the measured number of infection at these location by RIVM and regional health services (see figure 1). The infections 'at work' are overestimated in the model, while infections in the setting of 'at home with visitors' are underestimated. An explanation can be that people received more visitors than they admitted

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.01.10.21268254; this version posted February 15, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

to in the survey or than allowed within the prevailing COVID-19-rules (two visitors per day until mid-October, and one per day afterwards). Overall, we concluded that the outcomes support the results of the model. Room for improvement is available if more contact data is available.

2.3.2 External validation: test-events.

The Fieldlab test-events are for an external validation. The test events occurred during the pandemic in the middle of a wave of infections. A lockdown was still in place and vaccination was not available yet. The input for the model is defined as:

During these test-events C_1 en C_2 are measured for different variants of measures at these events and different types of events.

All Fieldlab participants and crew were asked to get tested on day five after the event, a request that was followed by more than 80% of the participants. In addition, all positive cases related to a Fieldlab event, identified by the regional Health Care Services, were included in the data set. Infections identified after an event included persons infected just before or after the pre-test or persons who had taken a PCR test around the cut-off of the PCR, thereby varying in outcome. This means that people who were at the event and tested positive also could have been infected at other locations before of after the test-event.

Very short, “passing” contacts of less than 10 seconds were not taken into account because these “passing contacts” are assumed not to be significant with regard to transmission. At the test events, the generic measures for social distancing were not in place. The risk of infection was reduced by several packages comprising variations in occupation rate, catering, crowd management, the use of masks, ventilation protocols.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.01.10.21268254; this version posted February 15, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

- P is based on the prevalence of the date of the events as published by RIVM (13)
- $V_1 = 100\%$. Because vaccination was not available yet and earlier infections were very limited, so no immunity is taken into account, $F_{T,1} = 0{,}95$. Persons with COVID-19 (like) symptoms were banned from participation. All visitors and crew needed a negative PCR test taken within 48 hours before the event in order to attend. As the PCR test may pick up low viral loads such as in cases of persons who recently recovered from COVID-19, the ratio of positive tests is higher than the ratio of asymptomatic people only (*18*).
- $F_{y,0} = 0$ if the ventilation meets the requirements of building codes and $F_{y,1} = 0.90$. This value is based on expert judgment. $F_{y,1}$ is applied when ventilation is significantly improved (with a CO2 value below 800 ppm). Venues have been checked prior to the event and during the event the CO2 value was measured. All outdoor events were not completely open (the festival was in a tent, football stadiums had a large roof), therefore we assumed $F_{y,2} = F_{y,1}$.
- The effectivity of masks was estimated by medical experts. While the effectivity under *in-vitro* conditions can be high (*19*), a low estimate is realistic for their effectiveness during *in-vivo* events because masks are not used correctly and they may be ill-fitting . During all test events different rules applied. $F_M = 0{,}05$ when the mask was used only when people were seated, and $F_M = 0.1$ when the mask was used while people move (but not while they are drinking and eating). During type 2 and 4 events, F_M was set at 0, as masks compliance was extremely low to non-existent.

The number (and risk of) infections at the event are estimated with the model based on the prevalence and measures at the test-events. While in the post-event test results, the crew is also taken into account, the calculated risk for infections applies to visitors only. The model

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.01.10.21268254; this version posted February 15, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

results can be compared with the confirmed infections after the events. In Table 4 the results of the test events have been summarized per type of event and compared to the model results. The detailed results of all events and measures are described elsewhere (*20*).

In the post-event tests, 14 cases have been identified where persons were possibly infected at the events. Other positive tests were excluded during interviews, for example because participants had known close contacts with SARS-CoV-2 positive cases at their home or events around the same time. But even in the 14 cases where participants were possibly infected, infections could have occurred in other places and situations at any time from around the pre-test, the day of the event, or even a few days after the event. If we use the Dutch average infection risk during the event as a control group we can estimate the number of infections which could be expected outside the event. The time spent at the event represents about 4-10% of the total time where people could be infected. If we also consider the risk at other locations, one or two of the possible infections could be (on average) related to the events.

During the eight test-events, four persons were confirmed to be infected during the event. Confirmed infections are those infections which can be related to each other for example by sequencing or because of proven contacts with other positive tested people during the event. Two infections occurred while travelling home with a contagious person, which caused two infections at the type IV event. These are not infected at the event (and part of the model) but these are related to the event.

As the number of events was limited related to the expected probability distribution, the data analysis would have profited from a higher number of events. Still, the data can be used to check if the model is plausible. We believe that we included nearly all infected people at the

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.01.10.21268254; this version posted February 15, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

event because we combined the information of regular testing procedures and the after-event tests. Overall, we concluded that the outcomes of the test-events support the results of the model.

4. Discussion and concluding remarks

4.1 Reflection to the validation of the model .

In the model, we assumed an average of infectious people in the Netherlands. Our assumptions were actually corroborated by the pre-event test results, which were in the range of the nationally reported prevalence of SARS-CoV-2. However, it might be that the prevalence among the visitors was higher than the assumed average. A first argument is that more young people attended the test events, and these age groups contribute relatively more than elderly (as > 60 years old) to the positive PCR tests (*21*). A second argument is that the test events were held during the lockdown, and the non-risk-averse people who attend these events might also have attended more other activities. On the other hand the susceptibility of younger naïve individuals is less than for elder people (22). Because of these other activities it can be expected that the source of infections for some of the cases identified after the event may be unrelated to the event.

At day 5 after the event, visitors and crew were tested, but our model exclusively calculates the risk for visitors, as contact data of the crew were not measured. During the events, the crew attempted to keep their distance from the participants and wore masks continuously.

In general, we found more PCR-positive people in the pre-event than in the post-event testing. As the PCR test may pick-up low viral loads, some of the people testing positive, especially in the pre-tests group, may have been recovered from COVID-19, consequently resulting in a higher positive test ratio. This in part explains the positivity rate in the pre- and post-event testing. However, in the after test, also people with COVID-19 symptoms were

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.01.10.21268254; this version posted February 15, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

included. Only for (one of) the type 4 events, the ratio of positive tests in the after test was higher than in the pre-test. This corresponds to higher numbers of infections at the event.

A final remark about the model can be made with regard to the data which is used to estimate A_1 and A_2. The contacts used to train the model were gathered during a period of a (partial) lockdown. Large scale events were already prohibited or regulated. This could cause an underestimation of the risk in dynamic settings.

Based on the available but scarce information, the current risk taxation model results in plausible results, instead the model cannot be rejected as being invalid. The test events show that the Fieldlab measures at the events, which replace generic social distancing, reduce the risk to a level below the threshold level (which was the risk at home). The model can be extended with the risk for loss of life and hospitalization using the relation with the age of people. However, once more data is available, this larger training set can help improve the model. Once more data of especially type IV and maybe type II events becomes available, the need for a additional factor for increased transmission at dynamic events can be identified and incorporated. We therefore recommend to collect more data about infections and events while the COVID-19 pandemic continues.

4.2 Added value for decision makers and event planners.

Depending on the package of measures (such as testing, maximum occupation rate, ventilation) and the proportion of infectious people in the society the risk of infection at an event can be reduced. These measures can be an alternative for social distancing at these events which in general will lead to an increase in risk because of the increase in contacts per hour. The test events in the Netherlands showed that the risk at many of these events can be reduced to a level

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.01.10.21268254; this version posted February 15, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

that is equal to the average risk people are exposed to outside these events. This means that events, with supporting measures, can be organized in such a way that they do no contribute more to the risk of infection per hour as other activities which are considered to be more safe. When the total risk for infection in the society however is to high choices can be made which activities have to be stopped. These decisions are outside the scope of our research.

To decide whether an event is acceptable or te decide for the need of additional measures a threshold can be used. In figure 2, such an example is given. The figure shows the expected the risk of infections (per 100.000 people per hour) as a function of the prevalence. Figure 2 holds the same event but with different packages of measures. The horizontal bar is the threshold, now set at 1 or 2 infections per 100.000 people per hour. During the test-events the risk for infection for people at home was about 1 per 100.000 per hour, the average risk of all types locations in the Dutch society was between 1 and 2 per 100.000 per hour. When the risk for an event is above the threshold additional measures are needed as testing, smart design of the catering and crowd control and occupation rates. These measures result in a reduction of the risk, when the risk is below the threshold the risk because of the event is acceptable. The developed COVID-19 Risk taxation method for (large scale) events can be applied to events to define an alternative package of measures replacing generic social distancing. The value for the thresholds is also a political choice. We therefore recommend a debate to discuss them in perspective to an acceptable risk for infection or load to the health care system.

References

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.01.10.21268254; this version posted February 15, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

1. Vos Eric R A, Boven Michiel van, Hartog Gerco den, Backer Jantien A, Klinkenberg Don, Hagen Cheyenne C E van, Boshuizen Hendriek, Binnendijk Robert S van, Mollema Liesbeth, Klis Fiona R M van der, Melker Hester E de. (2021). Associations between measures of social distancing and SARS-CoV-2 seropositivity: a nationwide population-based study in the Netherlands, Clinical Infectious Diseases, 2021; ciab264, https://doi.org/10.1093/cid/ciab264.
2. Ale, BJM, Bellamy, LJ, Roelen, ALC, Cooke, RM, Goossens, LHJ, Hale, AR, Kurowicka, D, & Smith, E. (2005) Development of a Causal Model for Air Transport Safety. Proceedings of the ASME 2005 International Mechanical Engineering Congress and Exposition. Engineering/Technology Management. Orlando, Florida, USA. November 5–11, 2005. pp. 107-116. ASME. https://doi.org/10.1115/IMECE2005-79374
3. Prem K, Cook AR, Jit M (2017) Projecting social contact matrices in 152 countries using contact surveys and demographic data. PLOS Computational Biology 13(9): e1005697. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pcbi.1005697
4. Hoang Thang, Coletti, Pietro, Melegaro Alessia, Wallinga Jacco D, Grijalva Carlos G, Edmunds John W, Beutels Philippe, Hens Neil A. (2019). Systematic Review of Social Contact Surveys to Inform Transmission Models of Close-contact Infections, Epidemiology: September 2019 - Volume 30 - Issue 5 - p 723-736 doi: 10.1097/EDE.0000000000001047.
5. Alimohamadi Y, Taghdir M, Sepandi M. (2020) Estimate of the Basic Reproduction Number for COVID-19: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. J. Prev. Med. Public Health. 2020;53(3):151-157. doi:10.3961/jpmph.20.076.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.01.10.21268254; this version posted February 15, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

6. Wenqing He, Grace Y. Yi, Yayuan Zhu. (2020) Estimation of the basic reproduction number, average incubation time, asymptomatic infection rate, and case fatality rate for COVID-19: Meta-analysis and sensitivity analysis. 29 May 2020 https://doi.org/10.1002/jmv.26041.
7. Locatelli I, Trächsel B, Rousson V. (2021) Estimating the basic reproduction number for COVID-19 in Western Europe. PLoS ONE 16(3): e0248731. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0248731.
8. RIVM 2021. De ziekte COVID-19. https://www.rivm.nl/coronavirus-covid-19/ziekte (visited 04-06-2021).
9. Cevik, Tate, Lloyd, Maraolo, Schafers, Ho (2021) SARS-CoV-2, SARS-CoV, and MERS-CoV viral load dynamics, duration of viral shedding, and infectiousness: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Articles| Volume 2, Issue 1, E13-E22, January 01, 2021.
10. Backer Jantien A, Klinkenberg Don, Wallinga Jacco. (2020). Incubation period of 2019 novel coronavirus (2019-nCoV) infections among travellers from Wuhan, China, 20–28 January 2020. Euro Surveill. 2020;25(5):pii=2000062. https://doi.org/10.2807/1560-7917.ES.2020.25.5.2000062.
11. Dhouib W, Maatoug J, Ayouni I. et al. (2021). The incubation period during the pandemic of COVID-19: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Syst. Rev. 10, 101 (2021). https://doi.org/10.1186/s13643-021-01648-y.
12. Mahesh Jayaweera, Hasini Perera, Buddhika Gunawardana, and Jagath Manatunge (2020). Transmission of COVID-19 virus by droplets and aerosols: A critical review

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.01.10.21268254; this version posted February 15, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

on the unresolved dichotomy. Environ Res. 2020 Sep; 188: 109819. 13. doi: 10.1016/j.envres.2020.109819

13. RIVM (2021). https://www.rivm.nl/coronavirus-covid-19/actueel
14. Statline (2021). The Netherlands in figures. https://opendata.cbs.nl/#/CBS/en/. Statistics Netherlands (CBS). Visited at January 2021.
15. Jonkman S.N. (2007) . Loss of life estimation in flood risk assessment – theory and applications. PhD Thesis, Delft University, 2007.
16. Maaskant B, Jonkman SN, Kok M. (2009), Analyse slachtofferaantallen VNK-2 en voorstellen voor aanpassingen van slachtofferfuncties. HKV lijn in water Rapport PR1669.10.
17. CRA (2020). Hoogwaterbeschermings programma: van 'sober en doelmatig' naar 'slim en doelmatig'Board of Government Advisors. The Hague. July 2020.
18. Zhen Zhang, Qifang Bi, Shisong Fang, Lan Wei, Xin Wang, Jianfan He, Yongsheng Wu, Xiaojian Liu, Wei Gao, Renli Zhang, Wenfeng Gong, Qiru Su, Andrew S Azman, Justin Lessler, Xuan Zou. (2021). Insight into the practical performance of RT-PCR testing for SARS-CoV-2 using serological data: a cohort study. Open AccessPublished:January 19, 2021DOI:https://doi.org/10.1016/S2666-5247(20)30200-7 Volume 2, Issue 2, E79-E87, February 01, 2021.
19. Ueki H, Furusawa Y, Iwatsuki-Horimoto K, Imai M, Kabata H, Nishimura H, Kawaoka Y. (2020). Effectiveness of Face Masks in Preventing Airborne Transmission of SARS-CoV-2. mSphere. 2020 Oct 21;5(5):e00637-20. doi: 10.1128/mSphere.00637-20.
20. Stobernack et al. (2021). unpub. data.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.01.10.21268254; this version posted February 15, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

21. RIVM (2021). Epidemiologische situatie van SARS-CoV-2 in Nederland Rijksinstituut voor Volksgezondheid en Milieu – RIVM 6 april 2021.

22. Edward Goldstein, Marc Lipsitch, Muge Cevik (2021), On the Effect of Age on the Transmission of SARS-CoV-2 in Households, Schools, and the Community, The Journal of Infectious Diseases, Volume 223, Issue 3, 1 February 2021, Pages 362–369, https://doi.org/10.1093/infdis/jiaa691

Table 1: Location and infection data used for the least-squares regression of A1 and A2 based on RIVM and the Survey.

Setting	No. positive PCR tests (source RIVM).	Hours at location	Average infections per hour
At home	186772	$1.74\ 10^{10}$	$1.08\ 10^{-5}$
Visitor	59882	$1.09\ 10^{9}$	$5.49\ 10^{-5}$
Leisure	8530	$1.49\ 10^{8}$	$5.72\ 10^{-5}$
At work	46881	$1.00\ 10^{9}$	$4.69\ 10^{-5}$

Table 2: Contact data used for the least-squares regression of A1 and A2 based on RIVM and survey data on the number of contacts/hour within a certain contact category, per setting.

	between 2 and 1.5m			between 1.5 and 0.5m			less than 0.5m					
	< 1min	1<min<15	>15min	< 1min	1<min<15	>15min	< 1min	1<min<15	>15min	$C1$	$C2$	$F_{Y,x}$.
Visitor	0.31	0.92	2.42	0.31	0.10	0.14	0.35	0.41	0.89	0.58	2.47	0.71
Leisure	1.28	0.49	3.18	1.11	0.06	0.00	1.13	0.06	1.72	0.89	8.88	0.53
At work	0.36	0.38	1.68	0.24	0.09	0.02	0.24	0.17	0.11	0.10	7.47	0.90

Table 3: Sensitivity analyses for ventilation and distance for contact classes. F_V, F_T and F_M are all 0

Setting	model	C1	C2	R absolute	R absolute	difference
				$F\ \ y,2$=100 and		

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.01.10.21268254; this version posted February 15, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

				$F\ \ y,1$=50	$F\ \ y,2$=95 and $F\ \ y,1$=90	
Low contact	Normal ventilated (reference)	5.0	30.0	3.07 10-4	3.07 10-4	0%
Low contact	Well ventilated	5.0	30.0	2.33 10-4	1.74 10-4	-25%
Low contact	Outdoor	5.0	30.0	1.59 10-4	1.67 10-4	5%
High contact	Normal ventilated (reference)	12.5	50.0	6.45 10-4	6.45 10-4	0%
High contact	Well ventilated	12.5	50.0	5.22 10-4	4.23 10-4	-19%
High contact	Outdoor	12.5	50.0	3.99 10-4	4.11 10-4	3%
Setting	model	C1	C2	R absolute	A1, A2 (x1000)	difference
Low contact (reference)	1.5m for C1, 10m for C2	5.0	30.0	3.07 10-4	6.38, 0.98	0.0%
Low contact	2.0m for C1, 10m for C2	8.9	30.0	2.21 10-4	2.71, 0.67	-28.1%
Low contact	1.5m for C1, 8m for C2	5.0	19.2	3.07 10-4	6.38, 1.54	0.0%
High contact (reference)	1.5m for C1, 10m for C2	12.5	50.0	6.45 10-4	6.38, 0.98	0.0%
High contact	2.0m for C1, 10m for C2	22.2	50.0	4.69 10-4	2.71, 0.67	-27.3%
High contact	1.5m for C1, 8m for C2	12.5	32.0	6.45 10-4	6.38, 1.54	0.0%

Table 4: Comparison model results with realization at test events

	Type I	**Type II**	**Type III**	**Type IV**
People at event (N) (without crew) [persons]	815	2341	1692	2960
Average duration (t) of event [hours]	4.4	4.3	3	7
Average prevalence (P) at events	0.0056	0.0061	0.0056	0.0077
Number of Pretests (incl crew) [persons]	1198	3078	2033	3890
Positive pretest [persons]	11 (0.9%)	18 (0.6%)	12 (0.6%)	26 (0.7%)
After (5d) tests (incl crew) [persons]	926	2603	1689	3168
Positive after test[persons]	1 (0.1%)	14 (0.5%)	4 (0.2%)	26 (0.8%)
Possible infections at event (realization) [persons]	0	4	0	12
Confirmed infections at event (realization) [persons]	0	0	0	4
Expected Infections (S) at event (model) [persons]	0.04	0.28	0.05	0.54

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.01.10.21268254; this version posted February 15, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Expected Infections (S) at event without measures (model) [persons]	0.86	5.56	1.14	10.81
Individual risk ($R\ event$) per hour at event	$1.12\ 10^{-5}$	$2.62\ 10^{-5}$	$1.00\ 10^{-5}$	$2.61\ 10^{-5}$
Maximum individual risk per hour at event	$1.4\ 10^{-5}$	$1.5\ 10^{-5}$	$8.04\ 10^{-6}$	$1.6\ 10^{-5}$
Minimal individual risk per hour at event	$8.5\ 10^{-6}$	$4.3\ 10^{-5}$	$1.6\ 10^{-5}$	$3.6\ 10^{-5}$
Average individual Risk ($R\ home$) per hour at home	$1.06\ 10^{-5}$	$1.14\ 10^{-5}$	$1.06\ 10^{-5}$	$1.45\ 10^{-5}$
Average individual Risk ($R\ visitor$)per hour having a visitor	$4.50\ 10^{-5}$	$4.82\ 10^{-5}$	$4.48\ 10^{-5}$	$6.13\ 10^{-5}$
Individual risk per hour ($R\ event$) at event without measures	1.25 10-4	5.10 10-4	2.24 10-4	5.22 10-4

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.01.10.21268254; this version posted February 15, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Figure 1: Number of infections based on internal validation by reproduction of infections at work, visitor at home and leisure.



medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.01.10.21268254; this version posted February 15, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Figure 2: Risk of infections as a function of the prevalence for different packages of measures, related to a possible reference.