medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.01.10.21268254; this version posted January 10, 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 The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.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. 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-2 are available, but these do not guarantee 100% risk reduction and it will take a while for the

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.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 January 10, 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 The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.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.

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.

Text

1. Introduction

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 *(1, 2)*. For Western Europe the R_0 is estimated on 2.2 (*3*) and the Dutch National Institute for Public Health and the Environment (RIVM) estimated a range between 2 and 3 (*4*). The probability of an infected person infecting another person peaks during the first week of illness, after which this probability drops significantly (*5*). Based on data from Wuhan the incubation time was estimated on average 5.2 days and minimal 4 days (*6*). Later studies based on more data indicated that the average incubation time was between 5.2 and 6.65 days and can be up to 14 days (*7*). The probability that an individual gets infected can be estimated based on the R_0, the duration that contagious people can infect others and the prevalence. When R_0 is 2.2, the duration is 7 days and the prevalence is 0,77% (this is the highest prevalence during the test events) then the probability that a person infects another person is $1.04\ 10^{-4}$ per hour (based on a population of the Netherlands of 17 million people) .

Social distancing, to reduce the number of contacts, is the main measure to reduce the transmission of SARS-CoV-2 (*8*). To support social distancing, governments all over the world

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.01.10.21268254; this version posted January 10, 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.

took measures, resulting in various lockdowns to reduce the number of contacts between people and the amount of people that can gather in a group.

As a consequence, large scale events were generally prohibited. At the same time, Dutch event-organizers affirmed that organizing events on the basis of social distancing would be economically detrimental. The question there is if an alternative package of measures can be defined instead of generic social distancing at these events, while requiring that the average individual risk of becoming infected at an event is equal to the infection risk for staying at home. In this study we distinguish between four types of events which can be representative for almost all events:

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

An alternative for physical or biological models is a data driven analysis. Based on available data of infections and contacts among people in this period a model can be developed which relates the risk of infection to the number of contacts and other measures which can be implemented. Because governments directly implemented numerous measures to support social distancing and avoid large groups, the normal social contact data (9) do not apply because the behavior of people had been forced to change.

2. Methodology SARS-CoV-2 Risk taxation Model (SCRTM)

2.1 Methodology

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.01.10.21268254; this version posted January 10, 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.

In this study a SARS-CoV-2 risk taxation method was developed based on 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_i) per hour, whereby R_i is a function of the prevalence (P) and the number of contacts per hour at a given location. We distinguish two contact-classes: up to 1,5m for droplets (C_1) and up to 10m for aerosols (C_2). The risk can further be reduced by:

- Testing prior to an event which results in a reduction of P with factor F_T.
- Additional measures can be taken to improve ventilation for indoor events and reduce the exposure to aerosols by $F_{Y,x}$. x is the level of ventilation for C_2. For $x = 0$ locations are ventilated as standard, for $x = 1$ indoor locations are very well ventilated and when $x = 2$ locations are outdoor.
- Smart logistics at an event to reduce contacts and gathering of large groups of people. Therefore, specific data were collected at test events.
- Personal protection measures such as mouth-nose masks. This reduces the risk with factor F_M.
- The impact of vaccination, which reduces the risk of transmission with a factor F_V.

These measures resulted in an average individual risk of infection per hour, given by:

$$R_i = P(1 - F_T)(1 - F_M)(1 - F_V)(C_1 A_1 + (C_2 A_2 \left(1 - F_{Y,x}\right)) \quad (1)$$

The parameters A_1 and A_2 are transmission-coefficients for exposure to droplets and aerosols. These transmission-coefficients were based on data-analyses. The expected number of infections at an event can be defined by S and is given by the product of R_i, the duration of the event t in hours and the number of people at the event (N):

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.01.10.21268254; this version posted January 10, 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.

$$S = R_I t N \tag{2}$$

2.2 Transmission coefficients $A1$ and $A2$

The number of positive SARS-CoV-2 tests in the Netherlands are reported by the RIVM on a weekly base, and include the probable locations where people got infected. Examples of these locations are at home, at work, at home while having visitors (friends or family), leisure, but also schools, catering industry and elderly houses and events or parties. The measures taken by the government strongly influence the locations people frequently visit and their number of contacts.

The transmission coefficients A_1 and A_2 have been estimated based on national (RIVM) and regional (GGD-Amsterdam) data over the period 15 September – 13 October 2020 and between 14 October and 15 December 2020 using linear regression via Least-squares Minimization. On 13 October additional measures were implemented by the Dutch Government, leading to the final lockdown on 15 December 2020.

One of the first estimates was the risk per location (see table 1). As a consequence of the stay-at-home advice, most people, in absolute numbers, became infected at home. When corrected for the number of people present and duration of contact, the risk of getting infected at these locations can be standardized and the risk estimates be compared with other locations. The hours while sleeping (8 hours) are excluded.

In the second step, we estimated the number of contacts between people at a location. To do so, we combined data from a specifically developed questionnaire with statistical data (*10*). We focused on the locations at home, at work, visitors at home and leisure, for the other

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.01.10.21268254; this version posted January 10, 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.

locations the amount of available data was not sufficient. In the questionnaire we asked people to estimate:

- The time spent at a certain location.
- The number of people in a range of 10m.
- The number of contacts in a distance < 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 indoor, indoor and well-ventilated or outdoor at the location.

In the third step, we performed the data-analyses using linear regression via Least-squares Minimization on function (1) to determine transmission factor A_1 and A_2. The data gathered from step 1 and 2 was used as a training set (see table 2). F_T and F_V are assumed to be 0 because pre-testing and vaccines were not available. For each class of contacts, 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 $F_{y,2} = 1$. This resulted in a probability per hour that a person is 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).

The complete role of virus-laden droplet and aerosol transmission is poorly understood (*11*). Table 3 shows sensitivity analyses showing 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 (for a radius of 1.5m) is 5 contacts per hour for the low contact event and 12.5 for the high contact event. C_2 (with a radius of 10m) is 10 contacts for the low contact event and 30 for the

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.01.10.21268254; this version posted January 10, 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.

high contact event. The sensitivity analysis shows that the impact on the results is within a bandwidth of a factor 0.5.

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. The model outcome 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 contagious persons would have attended the event, when $F_T = 0.95$ on average 0.38 person would have been contagious at the event and would thus be a source. Also the number of contacts per individual person will vary or some will have many close contacts and others will see only a few people. Therefore, it is expected that many events will be organized with no or limited number of infections, and a few with 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 with no infections and events with many infections. 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 in The Netherlands is based on the 1953 flood and Katrina in the US (*12*, *13*). 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 (*14*).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.01.10.21268254; this version posted January 10, 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.

Although a perfect validation is not possible, 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 and contacts C_1 and C_2 (data for at home is not gathered in the survey) and ventilation, the number of infections is estimated (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 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.

2.3.2 External validation: test-events.

The test-events organized by Fieldlab phase 1 can be used for a second validation. The test events occurred while the prevalence was high and a lockdown was still in place. These test events have been organized to measure C_1 en C_2 given the implemented measures. 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. Instead, so called "Fieldlab measures" were taken, such as the separation of groups of people in bubbles. During the test events, several packages consisting of variation in occupation rate, catering, routing, instructions on when to wear masks and indoor/outdoor situations have been tested.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.01.10.21268254; this version posted January 10, 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.

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.

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%. In addition, all positive cases related to a Fieldlab event, identified by the regional Health Care Services (GGD) were included in the data set. Infections identified after an event, included cases infected just before or after the pre-test or had a PCR test around the cut-off of the PCR, thereby varying in outcome. People can be infected at the event, but also at other locations.

The input for the model is defined as:

- While in the post-event test results, the crew is also taken into account, the calculated risk for infections applies to visitors only.
- $F_T = 0{,}95$, was set based on expert judgment and the sensitivity of a PCR test (*15*), combined with the restriction of testing within 48 hours before the event.
- Ventilation of all indoor places is according to the building codes, $F_{y,0} = 0$, all locations have been checked in advance. For all outdoor events we took into consideration that festival tents, and roofs at a stadium are not completely outdoor, we assumed $F_{y,2} = 0.9$.
- The effectivity of masks was estimated by medical experts. While the effectivity under *in-vitro* conditions can be high (*16*), a low estimate was used for their effectiveness during *in-vivo* events, in order to consider the impact of how masks are used. During events, masks were not used while eating or drinking, not while being stationary, were

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.01.10.21268254; this version posted January 10, 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.

inadequately used, ill-fitting or not used at all. Therefore, we set $F_M = 0{,}05$ when the mask is only used when people are seated, and $F_M = 0.1$ when the mask is also used while people move. During type 2 and 4 events, F_M was set at 0, as masks compliance was extremely low to non-existent.

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 (*17*).

The risk at these locations or settings can, given the actual or expected prevalence be used to define a threshold to decide about the permission for events and the required measures. In figure 2, such an example is given. The figure shows the expected number of infections per 100.000 people per hour as a function of the prevalence and possible measures. Given a threshold of, for example 1 or 2 acceptable infections per hour per 100.000, the model can be used to design the events in such a way that the risk is acceptable.

Depending on the package of measures (as testing, maximum occupation rate, ventilation) the risk at an event without social distancing can be reduced to a risk which is equal or less while staying at home during the lockdown in the Netherlands. A second comparison can be made between the risk at an event and having visitors at home. The risk of visitors at home is about four times higher than the risk at home.

4. Discussion

The number (and risk of) infections at the event are estimated with the model based on the prevalence and measures at the test-events. The model results can be compared with the confirmed infections after the events.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.01.10.21268254; this version posted January 10, 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.

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 event because we combined the information of regular testing procedures and the after-event tests.

In the model, we assumed an average prevalence for 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 (*18*). A second argument is that the test events were during the lockdown, and the non risk-averse people which attend these events also might have more other activities. 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 January 10, 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) thetype 4 events, the ratio of positive tests in the after test was higher than in the pre-test. This corresponds with higher numbers of infections at the event.

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 as participants had known contacts with SARS-CoV-2 positive cases at their home or unrelated events around the same time. Even the 14 cases are only "possible" cases, as infections could have occurred in other places and situations at any time from around the pre-test, the day of the event, or even the 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 is about 4-10% of the time a period of, for example, three days where people were at different locations exposed to the risk of infection. 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.

A last 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.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.01.10.21268254; this version posted January 10, 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.

Based on the available but scarce information, the current risk taxation model results in plausible results, 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, if more data is available, the model can be improved because of the larger training set. If more data of especially type IV and maybe type II events are available, research can be done on an additional factor for increased transmission at dynamic events. Therefore, it is recommended to collect more data about infections and events while the COVID-19 pandemic continues.

References

1. 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.
2. 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.
3. 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.
4. RIVM 2021. De ziekte COVID-19. https://www.rivm.nl/coronavirus-covid-19/ziekte (visited 04-06-2021).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.01.10.21268254; this version posted January 10, 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.

5. 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.
6. 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.
7. 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.
8. 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.
9. 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.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.01.10.21268254; this version posted January 10, 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.

10. Statline 2021. The Netherlands in figures. https://opendata.cbs.nl/#/CBS/en/. Statistics Netherlands (CBS). Visited at January 2021.
11. Mahesh Jayaweera, Hasini Perera, Buddhika Gunawardana, and Jagath Manatunge (2020). Transmission of COVID-19 virus by droplets and aerosols: A critical review on the unresolved dichotomy. Environ Res. 2020 Sep; 188: 109819. 13. doi: 10.1016/j.envres.2020.109819
12. Jonkman S.N. (2007) . Loss of life estimation in flood risk assessment – theory and applications. PhD Thesis, Delft University, 2007.
13. Maaskant B, Jonkman SN, Kok M. (2009), Analyse slachtofferaantallen VNK-2 en voorstellen voor aanpassingen van slachtofferfuncties. HKV lijn in water Rapport PR1669.10.
14. CRA (2020). Hoogwaterbeschermings programma: van 'sober en doelmatig' naar 'slim en doelmatig'Board of Government Advisors. The Hague. July 2020.
15. 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.
16. 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.
17. Stobernack et al. 2021. unpub. data.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.01.10.21268254; this version posted January 10, 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.

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

Table 1: 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: 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 $F\ \ y,2$=100 and $F\ \ y,1$=50	R absolute $F\ \ y,2$=95 and $F\ \ y,1$=90	difference
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%

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.01.10.21268254; this version posted January 10, 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.

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
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	$8.5\ 10^{-6}$	$4.3\ 10^{-5}$	$1.6\ 10^{-5}$	$3.6\ 10^{-5}$

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.01.10.21268254; this version posted January 10, 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.

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 January 10, 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 January 10, 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.