

A Coupled Experimental and Statistical Approach for an Assessment of the Airborne Infection Risk in Event Locations

Lukas Siebler M.Sc.^{1*}, Torben Rathje M.Sc.¹, Maurizio Calandri M.Sc.¹, Prof. Dr.-Ing. Konstantinos Stergiaropoulos¹, Prof. Dr. med. Bernhard Richter², PD Dr. rer. nat. Manfred Nusseck² and Prof. Dr. med. Dr. phil. Claudia Spahn²

^{1*}Institute for Building Energetics, Thermotechnology and Energy Storage (IGTE), University of Stuttgart, Pfaffenwaldring 35, Stuttgart, 70569, Baden-Württemberg, Germany.

^{2*}Freiburg Institute for Musicians' Medicine, University Medical Center Freiburg, University of Music Freiburg, Medical Faculty of the Albert-Ludwigs-University Freiburg, Freiburg Center for Research and Teaching in Music, Germany, Elsässer Straße 2m, Freiburg, 79110, Baden-Württemberg, Germany.

*Corresponding author(s). E-mail(s):

lukas.siebler@igte.uni-stuttgart.de;

Contributing authors: torben.rathje@igte.uni-stuttgart.de;

maurizio.calandri@igte.uni-stuttgart.de;

konstantinos.stergiaropoulos@igte.uni-stuttgart.de;

bernhard.richter@uniklinik-freiburg.de;

manfred.nusseck@uniklinik-freiburg.de;

claudia.spahn@uniklinik-freiburg.de;

Abstract

Operators of event locations are particularly affected by a pandemic. Resulting restrictions may cause uneconomical business. With previous models, only an incomplete quantitative risk assessments is possible, whereby no suitable restrictions can be derived. Hence, a mathematical and statistical model has been developed in order to link measurement data of substance dispersion in rooms with epidemiological data like incidences, reproduction numbers, vaccination rates and test qualities. This allows a first time overall assessment of airborne infection risks in large event locations. In these venues displacement ventilation concepts are often implemented. In this case simplified theoretical assumptions fail for the prediction of relevant airflows for infection processes. Thus, with locally resolving trace gas measurements and specific data of infection processes, individual risks can be computed more detailed. Via inclusion of many measurement positions, an assessment of entire event locations is possible. Embedding the overall model in a flexible application, daily updated epidemiological data allow latest calculations of expected new infections and individual risks of single visitors for a certain event. With this model, an instrument has been created that can help policymakers and operators to take appropriate measures and to check restrictions for their effect.

Keywords: aerosol infection risk, SARS-CoV-2 transmission, substance dispersion, trace gas, statistical model, epidemiological data

quantity	description	unit
Acronyms		
FFP2	filtering facepiece (class 2)	
SARS-CoV-2	Severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2	
mRNA	messenger ribonucleic acid	
NPI	non-pharmaceutical interventions (NPI)	
PCR	polymerase chain reaction	
PIRA	predicted infection risk via aerosols	
Roman Symbols		
c	concentration	mol mol ⁻¹
D	dose	–
I	incidence number	–
k	number of infectious persons	–
M	molar mass	kg mol ⁻¹
n	number of persons	–
\dot{m}	mass flow	kg h ⁻¹
P	overall probability for k infectious persons in the location	–
p	probability of one single person being infected	–
PIRA	predicted infection risk via aerosols	%
R	reproduction number	–
q	quanta rate	h ⁻¹
t	time	h
\dot{V}	volume flow	m ³ h ⁻¹
Greek Symbols		
η	efficiency	–
μ	expected value of new infections	–
ρ	density	kg m ⁻³
τ	infection transmission constant	d ⁻¹
Subscripts		
0	initial state	
air	air	
acc	access	
crit	critical	
exh	exhalation	
exp	exposition	
i	vaccination / recovery status class	
I	infection risk via aerosols	
in	in	
ind	individual	
inf	infection	
inh	inhalation	
j	age class	
out	out	
q	quanta	
r	neighbor ring	
tg	trace gas	
total	total	
fnt	false negative test	
~	number of classes	

Table 1 Nomenclature

1 Introduction

The pandemic of SARS-CoV-2 forced cultural institutions such as theatres and music halls to restrict or cancel their programs, without knowing the actual infection risk at their location. In order to identify this risk and take appropriate measures scientific evidences and risk estimation models for these venues are required.

Airborne transmission of viruses is a complex process involving emission, dispersion in the room, and inhaling [1]. There are many calculation models for an aerosol transmission and infection risk of SARS-CoV-2 in indoor environments [2–7]. However, these calculators often require idealised assumptions (e.g. ideal mixed ventilation), which lose accuracy with the size of the room. Therefore, they mainly consider small to medium room sizes.

In larger event locations, displacement ventilation concepts are often implemented, whose virus transmission towards neighbors is challenging to predict. Unobjectionable vertical buoyancy flows are superimposed by critical horizontal flows due to disturbance effects (e.g. cold walls and leaky doors). The estimation becomes even more critical in large and complex rooms, when relevant boundary conditions are unknown. [8] Moreover, these models neglect the access probabilities of infectious persons, which can be derived from specific epidemiological data. In summary, it has to be stated, that the required overall risk assessment model for large locations is still missing.

Within the framework of a project at the Stuttgart State Theatre, locally resolved trace gas measurements were carried out to calculate the airborne infection risk. Based on these investigations, a coupled experimental and statistical model is essential.

Depending on the epidemiological data (incidence and reproduction number, vaccination rate and test quality) the access probability of an infectious

person to an event location varies. Furthermore vaccinations prevent infections when sitting near an infectious person. All the data are highly relevant for an overall risk assessment, especially for locations with several hundred people. Hence, the research objective is to develop a coupled experimental and statistical model that accounts for these data. The results will provide scientifically based recommendations for actions non-pharmaceutical interventions (NPI) to maintain the operation of cultural institutions under pandemic conditions.

2 Model for an overall assessment of infection risks

The approach of the model can be separated in several sections, which are interacting with each other. This calculation procedure is shown in figure 1 and assists to comprehend the structure of the paper by means of a section assignment.




Fig. 1 structure of the combined model for an overall assessment of infection risks

Using measured data of substance dispersion in combination with certain boundary conditions allows a transfer to an estimated airborne infection risk (see section 2.1.1). Due to the combination of many individual results an averaged local infection risk (see section 2.1.2) can be calculated. The access probability of an infectious person is calculated based on the age distribution in location and epidemiological data (see section 2.2). In section 2.3.1 the expected value of new infections as a final result is calculated. In order to compute an individual infection risk as a second result the individual vaccination/recovery status is required (see section 2.3.2). In the following, each model section is presented separately.

2.1 Measurements

The focus of previous indoor air investigations using trace gas, also conducted at the University of Stuttgart, has mostly been on evaluating the ventilation effectiveness rather than infection risks [9]. For this new purpose, however, such measurements are also well suited, whereby a transfer to viral loads has to be performed. The method even provides reliable results for unknown air flows resulting from partly uncertain boundary conditions.

2.1.1 Substance dispersion measurements at individual positions

For transferring measurement data into airborne infection risks a mathematical approach is required. The model of *Wells et al.* and *Riley et al.* [10, 11] allows an estimation of the predicted infection risk via aerosols (PIRA). They introduced quanta as a fictitious unit for an amount of inhaled viruses which lead to an infection with a certain probability. As a result the following correlation is announced:

$$P_1 = 1 - e^{-D_q}. \quad (1)$$

with P_1 and D_q as PIRA and dose of inhaled quanta, respectively.

Siebler et al. [8] suggests an experimental approach with trace gas for ventilation with outdoor air exchange. It is based on releasing a certain rate of gas with a mass flow controller. Measuring the neighboring concentrations with a gas analyser enables users the quantification of substance dispersion in general. Assuming that trace gases are dispersed in the same way as relevant virus-bearing aerosols [12], a transfer to infection risk is possible. In order to link trace gas to quanta and to account for mask filtration effects the following approach is introduced:

$$\begin{aligned} D_q &= \int_0^{t_{\text{exp}}} \dot{q}_{\text{in}}(t) dt \\ &= (1 - \eta_{\text{inh}})(1 - \eta_{\text{exh}}) \frac{\dot{q}_{\text{out}} M_{\text{tg}}}{\dot{m}_{\text{out tg}}} \frac{\rho_{\text{air}} \dot{V}_{\text{inh}}}{M_{\text{air}}} \int_0^{t_{\text{exp}}} c_{\text{tg}}(t) dt \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

with \dot{q}_{in} , t , η_{inh} , η_{exh} , \dot{q}_{out} , M_{tg} , $\dot{m}_{\text{out tg}}$, ρ_{air} , \dot{V}_{inh} , M_{air} , c_{tg} as inhaled quanta rate, time, mask filtration efficiency for inhaling/exhaling, exhaled quanta rate, molar mass of trace gas, mass flow of trace gas (output), density of air, inhalation volume flow, molar mass of air and measured trace gas concentration respectively. In order to calculate the dose a numerical integration of trace gas concentration is needed. Filling in equation (1) results in the predicted infection risk via aerosols for a certain position. [8]

2.1.2 Transfer of individual measurement positions on entire location

Quanta concentrations of neighbours sitting near an infectious person vary depending on disturbance influences of the ventilation concept. Particularly displacement ventilation systems are sensitive for disturbance effects. If measurement positions are limited due to the equipment these can be quantified by random sampling. For more conservative consideration critical assumed areas (e.g. dead water areas and low ceiling heights) shall predominate. Therefore, transfer methods are needed, of which one potential method is presented.

First the measurement positions in the neighborhood of an infectious person should be well distributed. A 360° circumferential arrangement of measurement positions is recommended because critical horizontal air flows are not known and might predominate over the momentum of exhalation. In figure 2 each neighbourhood is divided into rings – in that case one for close (black line) and one for far neighbours (dark blue line). Besides this division concept there are a few alternatives. Representative measurement results included in these rings are averaged. Finally all neighbourhoods are averaged again to have an overall assessment for a statistically prediction of an arbitrary place. This procedure is outlined in figure 2 for an exemplary occupancy density of 50%. For any other density an alternative positioning might be more suitable.




Fig. 2 procedure of averaging measurement data for an overall PIRA

The expected value of new infections in several neighbour-rings of one available infected person can be calculated generally as:

$$\mu = \sum_{r=1}^{\tilde{r}} n_r P_{1r} \quad (3)$$

with μ , P_{1r} , \tilde{r} , n_r as expected value of new infections, infection risk in the certain neighbor ring r , number of considered neighbor rings and number of persons in the certain neighbor ring r respectively.

2.2 Access probability of one infectious person

The probability P_{acc} of infectious persons in an event location can be calculated with the binomial distribution of Gauss [13], if the probability p_{acc} of an individual infectious person gaining access is known. Equation 4 shows the calculation in detail:

$$P_{\text{acc}}(n, p_{\text{acc}}, k) = \binom{n}{k} p_{\text{acc}}^k (1 - p_{\text{acc}})^{n-k}$$

$$= \frac{n!}{k!(n-k)!} p_{\text{acc}}^k (1-p_{\text{acc}})^{n-k} \quad (4)$$

with n and k as number of persons in the location and number of infectious persons respectively.

In order to keep the complexity and the effort of the statistical model in acceptable range it is only practical for maximum one infectious person in the location. For small p (for high vaccination rates and a high quality test procedure) the following assumption and resulting equation is appropriate and above all conservative [13]:

$$P_{\text{acc}}(k=1) \approx \sum_{k=1}^{k=n} P_{\text{acc}}(k) = 1 - (1-p_{\text{acc}})^n. \quad (5)$$

For an accurate the identification of p_{acc} , different types and dimensions of classifications are possible in principle, depending on the accessibility of the data. In this case, the status of vaccination is significant. A subdivision in not vaccinated, recovered and vaccinated allows higher accuracy for predicting p_{acc} . An additional subdivision in several different vaccine types due to different effectiveness is specifying the results further.

For event locations, the age distribution of visitors might be a relevant parameter. The vaccination rate and the vaccine types are often age dependent. In table 2, one exemplary classification is shown.

		$j = 1$			$j = 2$			$j = 3$		
vaccination/recovery		0...29 years			30...59 years			60... years		
$i = 1$	not vaccinated	p_{11}	η_{11}	I_{11}	p_{12}	η_{12}	I_{12}	p_{13}	η_{13}	I_{13}
$i = 2$	recovered	p_{21}	η_{21}	I_{21}	p_{22}	η_{22}	I_{22}	p_{23}	η_{23}	I_{23}
$i = 3$	vaccinated-mRNA	p_{31}	η_{31}	I_{31}	p_{32}	η_{32}	I_{32}	p_{33}	η_{33}	I_{33}
$i = 4$	vaccinated-Vector	p_{41}	η_{41}	I_{41}	p_{42}	η_{42}	I_{42}	p_{43}	η_{43}	I_{43}

Table 2 classification of visitors and associated data

For each class combination there is a probability of p_{ij} for a person belonging to it. For instance, an arbitrary person of possible visitors, has the probability p_{31} to be mRNA-vaccinated and between 0...29 years old with a related vaccine effectiveness η_{31} and incidence number I_{31} .

Incidence numbers in general describe the rate of (new) infections per time and inhabitants. It is assumed that once someone knows that they are infectious they generally stay at quarantine or at least they do not try to get access to an event location. Therefore, predicting incidence rates is relevant to the probability of gaining access being infectious p_{accij} because presymptomatic, asymptomatic, and unwittingly infectious persons are critical.

This forecast can be estimated by the reproduction number R (R-value), the mean duration between being infected and infecting the next person Δt_{inf} and the mean critical duration between one becomes infectious and the knowledge about it Δt_{crit} . R describes how many persons one infectious person infects in average. For even higher accuracies, reproduction numbers could optionally be further classified by age groups and vaccination/recovery status. The following equation shows the correlation between the aforementioned values assuming an exponential course:

$$I_0 e^{\tau \Delta t_{inf}} = I_0 R \tag{6}$$

with I_0 , τ , Δt_{inf} , R as initial overall incidence (no age and vaccination/recovery status related separation), infection transmission constant in $1/d$, mean duration between being infected and infecting the next person and reproduction number (R-value) respectively.

The course of the incidence value correlates with the constant τ , which can be derived from equation 6:

$$\tau = \frac{\ln R}{\Delta t_{\text{inf}}}. \quad (7)$$

To estimate the critical ratio of infectious persons, who do not know about their infectiousness at a certain day, it is useful to predict the incidence course up to the duration Δt_{crit} later. The integral of that course over duration describe persons, who could be infectious over that period (Δt_{crit}) without knowing it. It is calculated as:

$$I(t) = I_0 e^{\frac{\ln R}{\Delta t_{\text{inf}}} t}. \quad (8)$$

The access probability of an infectious person of a certain class combination (e.g. 23) is depending on its certain incidence (e.g. I_{23}). In addition, the test quality with regard to false negative results of different principles (antigen, polymerase chain reaction (PCR)) is considered [14] [15].

$$p_{\text{acc } ij} = p_{\text{fnt}} \int_0^{\Delta t_{\text{crit}}} I_{ij} e^{\frac{\ln R}{\Delta t_{\text{inf}}} t} dt = p_{\text{fnt}} I_{ij} \frac{\Delta t_{\text{inf}}}{\ln R} \left(e^{\frac{\ln R}{\Delta t_{\text{inf}}} \Delta t_{\text{crit}}} - 1 \right) \quad (9)$$

with $p_{\text{acc } ij}$, I_{ij} , p_{fnt} as access probability of an infectious person of a certain class combination ij , incidence of a certain class combination ij and probability of a false negative test result (if no test is done $p_{\text{fnt}} = 1$) respectively.

The calculation process of an overall probability for one arbitrary person being infectious and getting access is shown in figure (3). It is worth mentioning that the classifications can be extended as desired.




Fig. 3 calculation process for an access probability of at least one infectious person

The process of the shown scheme can be calculated as sums (number of sums equal to the dimension of the classification) of the proportion of each class combination p_{ij} and its certain probability of an infectious person inside $p_{acc\ ij}$:

$$p_{acc} = \sum_{j=1}^{\tilde{j}} \sum_{i=1}^{\tilde{i}} p_{ij} p_{acc\ ij} \quad (10)$$

Equations (9) and (10) filled in (5) result for the access probability of an infectious person in:

$$P_{\text{acc}}(k=1) \approx 1 - \left(1 - \sum_{j=1}^{\tilde{j}} \sum_{i=1}^{\tilde{i}} p_{ij} p_{\text{fint}} \int_0^{\Delta t_{\text{crit}}} I_{ij} e^{\frac{\ln R}{\Delta t_{\text{inf}}} t} dt \right)^n. \quad (11)$$

2.3 Model output

In this section the two outputs of the model are derived. Besides the expected value of new infections, which is relevant for operators and policy makers, an infection risk for an individual person is determined.

2.3.1 Expected value of new infections

Once an infectious person is in the location, the vaccination status of their neighbors is relevant. Taking the vaccination impact twice into account (access probability and neighbor vaccination status) is noteworthy for this model. Due to the classification, see table 2, equation (3) becomes more complex. Thereby the probability of neighbors belonging to a certain class combination is taken into account. In the following equation the union between measurement and statistical data occurs.

$$\mu_{\text{vac}} = \sum_{r=1}^{\tilde{r}} n_r P_{\Gamma r} \sum_{j=1}^{\tilde{j}} \sum_{i=1}^{\tilde{i}} p_{ij} (1 - \eta_{ij}) \quad (12)$$

with μ_{vac} , η_{ij} as expected value of new infections regarding the vaccination status and their efficiency respectively.

Combining equation (12) with the probability of access (equation (11)) results in the overall expected value of new infections:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mu_{\text{total}} &= \sum_{r=1}^{\tilde{r}} n_r P_{\text{acc}}(k=1) P_{1r} \sum_{j=1}^{\tilde{j}} \sum_{i=1}^{\tilde{i}} p_{ij} (1 - \eta_{ij}) \\
&= \sum_{r=1}^{\tilde{r}} n_r \left[1 - \left(1 - \sum_{j=1}^{\tilde{j}} \sum_{i=1}^{\tilde{i}} p_{ij} p_{\text{fnt}} \int_0^{\Delta t_{\text{crit}}} I_{ij} e^{\frac{\ln R}{\Delta t_{\text{inf}}} t} dt \right)^n \right] \\
&\quad P_{1r} \sum_{j=1}^{\tilde{j}} \sum_{i=1}^{\tilde{i}} p_{ij} (1 - \eta_{ij})
\end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

with μ_{total} as expected value of new infections regarding entrance probability and vaccination status. This calculation provides a valuable instrument for operators of event locations and politicians for a total risk assessment of infections.

2.3.2 Infection risk for an individual person

With regard to an individual person the probability of being exposed in a certain neighbor ring of an infectious person has to be taken into account as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
P_{\text{ind}} &= \sum_{r=1}^{\tilde{r}} \frac{n_r}{n} P_{1r} \eta_{\text{ind}} P_{\text{acc}}(k=1) \\
&= \sum_{r=1}^{\tilde{r}} \frac{n_r}{n} P_{1r} \eta_{\text{ind}} \left[1 - \left(1 - \sum_{j=1}^{\tilde{j}} \sum_{i=1}^{\tilde{i}} p_{ij} p_{\text{fnt}} \int_0^{\Delta t_{\text{crit}}} I_{ij} e^{\frac{\ln R}{\Delta t_{\text{inf}}} t} dt \right)^n \right]
\end{aligned} \tag{14}$$

with P_{ind} , η_{ind} as individual infection risk of one certain person and event date and efficiency of the individual vaccination status respectively. This calculation enables visitors to estimate their individual infection risk regarding the decision of participating an event.

2.3.3 Limitations and boundaries of the model

The coupled experimental and statistical model assumes that maximum one infectious person is present. Due to superposition of trace gas results risk assessments for more than one infectious person could be calculated. However, the effort for this statistical model adjustment would become laborious.

Figure 4 shows the deviation between $P_{\text{acc}}(k=1)$ and $\sum_{k=1}^{k=n} P_{\text{acc}}(k)$ (which are assumed to be approximately equal (equation (5)) in this study) for $n = 100$ and $n = 500$ visitors. For $n = 500$ up to $p_{\text{acc}} \approx 1 \times 10^4$ and $n = 100$ up to $p_{\text{acc}} \approx 1 \times 10^3$ the deviations are assumed low. Hence even for large locations the model stays conservative and also acceptable for small p_{acc} . With this approach users could estimate whether this model is still accurate enough. Otherwise, operation with such boundary conditions is questionable anyway.




Fig. 4 error estimation between $P_{\text{acc}}(k=1)$ and $\sum_{k=1}^{k=n} P_{\text{acc}}(k)$, left $n = 100$, right $n = 500$

3 Discussion

In order to develop a robust mathematical and statistical model, there are several assumptions needed. One of these relates to the transfer of individual measurement positions to entire locations. It is supposed that the number of seats each ring contains is constant. However, it varies at edge positions of an infectious person. This assumption reduces the accuracy of the model marginally, but it is still conservative.

Besides, the structure of the coupled model is adapted to visitors instead of artists and staff. To analyse the air flow interactions between audience and stage further trace gas measurements should be carried out.

It should be noted that included statistical data must be robust and detailed. Given the fact, that infection processes are dynamic, possible virus mutations should be considered when calculating the infection risk. It is assumed that responsible action will be taken and that quarantine measures will be followed in the case of known infection (no attendance at events). Otherwise, the accuracy of the model will be affected. Furthermore, in order to validate the model appearing infections can be taken into account (e.g. p_{fnt} or the classification in general).

4 Conclusion

This paper presents a coupled experimental and statistical approach for an assessment of the airborne infection risk in event locations. Combining data of trace gas measurements and statistical data in one model provides two valuable results: For operators and policy makers it delivers an expected value of new infections for a certain event. For society an individual infection risk for this event is given, which might help in deciding whether to participate in certain events. Both results are valuable tools that can make it possible to maintain

social life despite an ongoing pandemic. Hence, the objective of improving the validity of the existing models described in section 1 was achieved by developing this coupled experimental and statistical model.

Acknowledgments. We would like to thank Dr. Tjibbe Donker who supported us with his expertise regarding the infection process. Another special thanks goes to Mr. Donagh Hennessy for his scientific editing services.

Declarations

- Data availability statement: Datasets generated/analysed during the current study are available from the corresponding author on reasonable request.
- Funding statement: The authors received a funding from the Stuttgart State Theatre for the development of a simplified infection risk model compared to the presented one.
- Conflict of interest disclosure: The authors declare no competing interests.
- Ethics approval statement: Not applicable.
- Patient consent statement: Not applicable.
- Permission to reproduce material from other sources: Not applicable.
- Authors' contributions: LS: Conceptualization, methodology and writing original draft. TR: Participation in the conception and writing— review & editing. MC: Writing— review & editing and visualization. KS: Writing— review & editing. MN: Conceptualization, writing— review & editing. BR: Writing— review & editing. and CS: Supervision writing— review & editing

References

- [1] Ai, Z., Hashimoto, K., Melikov, A.K.: Airborne transmission between room occupants during short-term events: Measurement and evaluation. *Indoor air* **29**(4), 563–576 (2019). <https://doi.org/10.1111/ina.12557>
- [2] Lelieveld, J., Helleis, F., Borrmann, S., Cheng, Y., Drewnick, F., Haug, G., Klimach, T., Sciare, J., Su, H., Pöschl, U.: Model calculations of aerosol transmission and infection risk of covid-19 in indoor environments. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health* **17**(21) (2020). <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph17218114>
- [3] Hussein, T., Löndahl, J., Thuresson, S., Alsvéd, M., Al-Hunaiti, A.,

- Saksela, K., Aqel, H., Junninen, H., Mahura, A., Kulmala, M.: Indoor model simulation for covid-19 transport and exposure. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health* **18**(6) (2021). <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph18062927>
- [4] Xu, C., Liu, W., Luo, X., Huang, X., Nielsen, P.V.: Prediction and control of aerosol transmission of sars-cov-2 in ventilated context: from source to receptor. *Sustainable cities and society* **76**, 103416 (2022). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scs.2021.103416>
- [5] Kennedy, M., Lee, S.J., Epstein, M.: Modeling aerosol transmission of sars-cov-2 in multi-room facility. *Journal of loss prevention in the process industries* **69**, 104336 (2021). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jlp.2020.104336>
- [6] Moreno, T., Pintó, R.M., Bosch, A., Moreno, N., Alastuey, A., Minguillón, M.C., Anfruns-Estrada, E., Guix, S., Fuentes, C., Buonanno, G., Stabile, L., Morawska, L., Querol, X.: Tracing surface and airborne sars-cov-2 rna inside public buses and subway trains. *Environment international* **147**, 106326 (2021). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envint.2020.106326>
- [7] Redder, C., Fieberg, C.: Sensitivity analysis of sars-cov-2 aerosol exposure. *GMS hygiene and infection control* **16**, 28 (2021). <https://doi.org/10.3205/dgkh000399>
- [8] Siebler, L., Calandri, M., Rathje, T., Stergiaropoulos, K.: Experimental methods of investigating airborne indoor virus-transmissions adapted to several ventilation measures. *medRxiv* **2022** (2022). preprint submitted
- [9] Adili, M.R., Schmidt, M.: Ventilation effectiveness of residential ventilation systems and its energy-saving potential. In: Sayigh, A. (ed.)

- Sustainable Building for a Cleaner Environment: Selected Papers from the World Renewable Energy Network's Med Green Forum 2017, pp. 451–462. Springer International Publishing, Cham (2019). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-94595-8_38
- [10] Keene, C.H.: Airborne contagion and air hygiene. *william firth wells. Journal of School Health* **25**(9), 249 (1955). <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1746-1561.1955.tb08015.x>
- [11] Riley, E.C., Murphy, G., Riley, R.L.: Airborne spread of measles in a suburban elementary school. *American journal of epidemiology* **107**(5), 421–432 (1978). <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordjournals.aje.a112560>
- [12] Ai, Z., Mak, C.M., Gao, N., Niu, J.: Tracer gas is a suitable surrogate of exhaled droplet nuclei for studying airborne transmission in the built environment. *Building simulation* **13**, 489–496 (2020). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12273-020-0614-5>
- [13] Wypij, D.: *Binomial Distribution*. Wiley StatsRef: Statistics Reference Online. John Wiley & Sons, Ltd, New York City (2014). <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118445112.stat04852>
- [14] Scheiblaue, H., Filomena, A., Nitsche, A., Puyskens, A., Corman, V.M., Drosten, C., Zwirgmaier, K., Lange, C., Emmerich, P., Müller, M., Knauer, O., Nübling, C.M.: Comparative sensitivity evaluation for 122 ce-marked rapid diagnostic tests for sars-cov-2 antigen, germany, september 2020 to april 2021. *Euro surveillance : bulletin Europeen sur les maladies transmissibles = European communicable disease bulletin* **26**(44) (2021). <https://doi.org/10.2807/1560-7917.ES.2021.26.44.2100441>

- [15] Horvath, K., Semlitsch, T., Jeitler, K., Krause, R., Siebenhofer, A.: Antikörpertests bei COVID-19 - Was uns die Ergebnisse sagen. *Zeitschrift für Evidenz, Fortbildung und Qualität im Gesundheitswesen* **153**, 54–59 (2020). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.zefq.2020.05.005>