

1 Development of a COVID-19 risk-assessment model for participants at an
2 outdoor music festival: Evaluation of the validity and control measure
3 effectiveness

4

5 Michio Murakami ^{a, b, *}, Tsukasa Fujita ^b, Pinqi Li ^b, Seiya Imoto ^c, Tetsuo Yasutaka ^b

6

7 ^a Center for Infectious Disease Education and Research (CiDER), Osaka University, 2-8 Yamadaoka,
8 Suita, Osaka 565-0871, Japan

9 ^b Institute for Geo-Resources and Environment, National Institute of Advanced Industrial Science and
10 Technology (AIST), 1-1-1, Higashi, Tsukuba, Ibaraki, 305-8567, Japan

11 ^c Division of Health Medical Intelligence, Human Genome Center, The Institute of Medical Science,
12 The University of Tokyo, 4-6-1 Shirokanedai, Minato-ku, Tokyo, 108-8639, Japan

13 * Corresponding author: michio@cider.osaka-u.ac.jp

14

15

16

17 **Abstract**

18 We developed an environmental exposure model to estimate the Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-
19 19) risk among participants at an outdoor music festival and validated the model using a real cluster
20 outbreak case. Furthermore, we evaluated the extent to which the risk could be reduced by additional
21 infection control measures such as negative proofs of antigen tests on the day of the event, wearing
22 masks, disinfection of environmental surfaces, and vaccination. The total number of already- and
23 newly-infected individuals who participated in the event according to the new model was 47.0 (95%
24 uncertainty interval: 12.5–185.5), which is in good agreement with the reported value (45). Among
25 the additional control measures, vaccination, mask-wearing, and disinfection of surfaces were
26 determined to be effective. Based on the combination of all measures, a 94% risk reduction could be
27 achieved. In addition to setting a benchmark for an acceptable number of newly-infected individuals
28 at the time of an event, the application of this model will enable us to determine whether it is necessary
29 to implement additional measures, limit the number of participants, or refrain from holding an event.

30

31 **Keywords**

32 COVID-19; Environmental exposure model; Infection control; Mass gatherings; Quantitative
33 microbial risk assessment

34

35

36 **Main text**

37

38 **INTRODUCTION**

39 During the global Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) outbreak, the assessment and management
40 of the infection risk during mass gatherings have become urgent issues ¹. One risk assessment method
41 is the epidemiological approach. To date, the COVID-19 infection risk related to events has been
42 assessed using randomized controlled trials ² or observational studies including both events with and
43 without the use of measures such as mask-wearing ³. However, in the absence of infection control
44 measures, participating in an event may result in a large number of infected individuals (i.e., clusters)
45 ⁴. From an ethical perspective, having studies that actively use events without adequate control
46 measures may not be suitable ⁵.

47 To overcome such limitations of existing studies, environmental exposure models may be applied and
48 their effectiveness should be assessed. We previously developed an environmental exposure model to
49 assess the COVID-19 risk among spectators at the opening ceremony of the Tokyo 2020 Olympic
50 Games and evaluated the effectiveness of the implementation of control measures, including mask-
51 wearing, physical distance, ventilation, disinfection, and handwashing ⁶. Additionally, we conducted
52 parametric studies to evaluate the effects of the number of spectators, capacity proportions, and
53 infection prevalence by extending the model to other sporting events ⁷. In another study, we evaluated
54 the effects of vaccine-testing packages ⁸. We confirmed the validity of the model based on the fact

55 that no newly-infected individuals were observed among the participants of professional baseball and
56 soccer events in the fiscal year 2020 ⁷; however, this validation has limitations due to the
57 unavailability of active testing after these events.

58 Therefore, in this study, we focused on a cluster outbreak case that occurred during an outdoor music
59 festival event with inadequate infection control measures that was held in Japan during the emergence
60 of the Delta variant. The objectives of this study were as follows: First, we extended the
61 environmental exposure model to assess the COVID-19 risk at a music festival and validate the model
62 by comparing the model estimates with the actual number of reported infected individuals. Second,
63 we evaluated the reduction in the infection risk by applying the developed model to a hypothetical
64 situation in which the event was held but additional or enhanced measures were implemented. This
65 is the first study in which an environmental exposure model for the estimation of the infection risk
66 was validated using a case study of an actual cluster outbreak among participants at a mass gathering
67 event.

68

69 **METHODS**

70 **Event and participants**

71 The target event in this study was Namimonogatari2021, an outdoor Hip Hop festival held at the
72 Aichi Sky Expo (3.5 ha) in the Aichi Prefecture from 9:00 to 21:00 (JST) on August 29, 2021 ⁹. The
73 festival was held during the emergence of the Delta strain. In total, 7,392 people attended the festival

74 and 45 infected individuals were reported ⁹. Of the participants, 1,154 were tested using the free
75 polymerase chain reaction (PCR) tests that were conducted in the Aichi Prefecture and Nagoya City.
76 As of September 13, a total of 658 test results were known and included eight positive cases. The
77 reported number of infected cases (i.e., 45) included infected individuals identified in other areas ¹⁰.
78 The number of infected people in the Aichi Prefecture during the week before this event (August 22–
79 28) was 12,072 ¹¹. By dividing by the total population of the Aichi Prefecture ¹², the number of
80 infected persons per 10 million people was converted to 2,290 persons per day. Assuming that the
81 proportion of asymptomatic individuals was 0.46 ¹³, the number of days between infectivity onset
82 and recovery for asymptomatic individuals was 9.3 days and the number of days from infectivity
83 onset to symptom onset for symptomatic individuals was 2.3 days ¹⁴. The crude probability of a
84 participant being an infector (P_0) is 1.3×10^{-3} based on weighting the infectivity time and the
85 proportion of asymptomatic and symptomatic individuals ⁶. This number may be underestimated
86 because several asymptomatic infectors may have not been identified.

87

88 **Model development**

89 In this study, we extended a previously established model ⁶⁻⁸ to music festivals. In this model, the
90 virus emission by asymptomatic infectors through talking, coughing, and sneezing is divided into
91 four pathways: direct droplet spray, direct inhalation of inspirable particles, hand contact, and
92 inhalation of respirable particles via air. The viral concentration was calculated after considering the

93 inactivation in the environment and the risk of infection was estimated from several environmental
94 and human behavioral parameters, including the breath volume and the frequency of hand contact
95 with the surface, as well as the dose-response equation. The dose-response equation for the infection
96 risk used in this study was based on the severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus (SARS-CoV)
97 in mice ¹⁵ and the proportion of asymptomatic infected individuals in humans ¹³ because the equation
98 was established on the basis of a wide range of doses. This parameter was similar to that for SARS-
99 CoV-2 obtained from ferrets and the estimated human exposure ¹⁶. The estimated infection risk was
100 slightly lower than the infection risk observed in the SARS-CoV-2 human challenge ¹⁷; the risk of
101 infection at 55 focus forming unit was 53% in the human challenge, whereas it was 25% (95%
102 uncertainty interval [UI]: 15–48) in this study.

103 The activities of the music festival participants were categorized into five behavioral patterns, that is,
104 (A) attending live performances (60 min × 6 times); (B) entering, exiting, and resting (50 min × 6
105 times); (C) using restrooms (2 min × 3 times); (D) ordering at concession stands (1 min × 4 times);
106 and (E) eating (25 min × 2 times); representing a total of 720 min. For each behavioral pattern, the
107 amount of exposure was calculated according to the type of person exposed: (1) people accompanying
108 the infector, (2) people in front of the infector at live performance venues, (3) peoples exposed in
109 restrooms, (4) people exposed at concession stands, and (5) others. The types and numbers of people
110 exposed are shown in Table S1 and the exposure pathways and doses for each behavioral pattern are
111 shown in Tables S2 and S3.

112 By considering the actual size of the venue, number of spectators, and P_0 , we calculated the exposure
113 related to the above-mentioned behavioral patterns. Considering the possibility that the Delta-variant
114 strain has a 1,000-fold higher viral load than the wild-type strain ¹⁸, we carried out a sensitivity
115 analysis and analyzed the results under conditions in which the concentration of the virus in saliva
116 varied 10-, 100-, and 1,000-fold relative to the wild-type strain.

117 In the base scenario (without additional measures), mask-wearing and vaccination were considered.
118 The amount of virus emitted by the infector differs depending on whether the infector wears a mask
119 or not ⁸. Furthermore, exposed individuals wearing masks have a reduced frequency of contact with
120 facial mucosal membranes ⁶. The mask-wearing proportions of the participants were set as follows:
121 While the mask-wearing proportion among the Japanese public is extremely high (>85%) ¹⁹, the target
122 event has been criticized for not ensuring that masks were worn ⁹. Therefore, we conducted a
123 sensitivity analysis in which we assumed that 50% of the participants wore masks (base scenario) and
124 then varied the mask-wearing proportion from 0% to 100% in 10% increments under conditions in
125 which the Delta-variant concentration in saliva was 100-fold relative to the wild-type strain. The
126 participants were divided into mask-wearers and non-wearers according to the mask-wearing
127 proportion and the exposure dose was calculated for each category.

128 The percentage of people who received two doses of the vaccine was set to 45% based on the Japanese
129 average ²⁰. Considering that for many vaccinated individuals the elapsed time since the second
130 vaccination was less than three months at the time of the event (two-dose vaccination coverage on

131 May 29, 2021: 3% based on the Japanese average ²⁰), the vaccine was assumed to be 80% effective
132 in preventing infection with the Delta strain, which was emerging at the time of the event ²¹. The risk
133 of infection in consideration of vaccination was assessed following a previous study ⁸.

134 Furthermore, in comparison to Supersonic (September 18–19, 2021) ²², which is known as an outdoor
135 music festival with thorough infection control measures, we evaluated the risk of infection based on
136 the addition of further hypothetical control measures under conditions in which the Delta-variant
137 concentration was 100-fold relative to the wild-type strain:

138 (a) Antigen testing: By conducting qualitative antigen testing for all participants on the day of the
139 event, we reduced P_0 by assuming that asymptomatic infectors who tested positive would be excluded
140 from the event ⁸.

141 (b) Distance: The distance from people during the entry, exit, and rest was set to 1.5 m and the distance
142 from people during the attendance of live performances was set to 1 m. The number of people in front
143 of the infector during the attendance of one live performance changed from three to one.

144 (c) Mask-wearing: The mask-wearing proportion of the participants was set to 100%.

145 (d) Restriction of talking during the attendance of live performances and meals: The frequency of
146 talking during the attendance of live performances and meals was set to 0.03.

147 (e) Disinfection: Disinfection after ordering at concession stands reduces the viral concentration on
148 the surfaces to 1/1,000 ⁶.

149 (f) Handwashing: Washing hands after using the restroom reduces the viral concentration on fingers

150 to $1/100^6$.

151 (g) Vaccination: The vaccination coverage of the participants was set to 100%. In this case, P_0 did not
152 change. This risk reduction may be underestimated because vaccinated individuals are considered to
153 have a lower probability of being infected than unvaccinated individuals.

154 (h) All measures (a–f) are implemented.

155 (i) All measures (a–g) are implemented.

156 In addition, with measure (h) in place, analyses were conducted under conditions in which the number
157 of participants or P_0 was reduced from the base scenario to 75%, 50%, 25%, and 10%.

158 The model was run 10,000 times for each scenario.

159

160 **RESULTS**

161 The total number of already- and newly-infected individuals, who participated in the event, was 24.8
162 (95% UI: 9.2–48.1), 47.0 (95% UI: 12.5–185.5), and 172.7 (95% UI: 25.1–610.0) for those with a
163 10-, 100-, and 1,000-fold increase in the Delta-variant viral concentrations relative to the wild-type
164 strain, respectively (Figure 1). These results concur with the reported number of infected cases (45).

165 Under a 100-fold viral concentration and mask-wearing proportion ranging from 0% to 100%, the
166 total number of infected individuals varied from 73.0 (95%UI: 14.7–348.1) to 25.5 (95%UI: 9.6–
167 48.9; Figure S1).

168 When additional measures were implemented individually, the number of newly-infected individuals

169 significantly decreased by vaccination (69%), mask-wearing (57%), and disinfection (54%), and the
170 risk of infection was greatly reduced by implementing all the control measures (all measures except
171 for vaccination: 81%; all measures including vaccination: 94%). When all measures, except for
172 vaccination, were implemented and the number of participants or P_0 was reduced, the number of
173 newly-infected individuals was linearly related to the reduction ratio of the number of participants or
174 P_0 (Figure S2). If the event organizer considered keeping the number of newly-infected individuals
175 below five as the arithmetic mean and below 10 as the 97.5 percentile, the number of participants or
176 P_0 had to be less than or equal to 50% of the base scenario.

177

178 **DISCUSSION**

179 In this study, the number of infected individuals was estimated using an environmental exposure
180 model for an outdoor music festival during which the cluster outbreak occurred. The risk reduction
181 by the implementation of additional control measures was evaluated. The reported value was in the
182 range of 95% UI of the total estimated number of infected individuals at any condition (10-, 100-,
183 and 1,000-fold increase of the Delta-variant concentrations relative to the wild-type strain). It agreed
184 well with the arithmetic mean of the values obtained for the condition with the 100-fold increase in
185 the viral concentration. The results of the sensitivity analysis with varying mask-wearing proportions
186 also showed that the reported value was within the range of the estimates. The reported number of
187 infected individuals might have been underestimated because not all the participants were tested.

188 Based on the information from the free PCR testing that was conducted in the Aichi Prefecture and
189 Nagoya City (eight positive cases among 658 people ¹⁰), the number of infected individuals was
190 determined to be 90. This value was within the 95% UI of the number of infected individuals under
191 conditions in which the viral concentration was 100 or 1,000 times higher. Considering that the viral
192 loads of the Delta strain are approximately 1,000 times higher than those of the wild-type strain ¹⁸,
193 these results support the validity of the infection risk assessment using the environmental exposure
194 model.

195 Subsequently, we evaluated the extent to which the risk could be reduced by strengthening the
196 infection control measures. Among the additional individual measures, vaccination, mask-wearing,
197 and disinfection of surfaces were effective. The combination of all measures resulted in a higher risk
198 reduction (all measures excluding vaccination: 81%; all measures including vaccination: 94%). Thus,
199 the infection risk can be reduced by blocking all pathways of virus transmission including direct
200 exposure, direct inhalation, contact, and air inhalation.

201 During mass gathering events, the extent to which any measures are implemented depends on the
202 organizers' decisions or society's consensus on how many newly-infected individuals are acceptable.
203 For example, in this study, the number of newly-infected individuals was estimated to be 7.2 (95%
204 UI: 0.9–16.4) even if all measures, except for vaccination, were implemented. If the benchmark of
205 acceptable newly-infected individuals was set to less than five and 10 as the arithmetic mean and 97.5
206 percentile, respectively, additional measures would be necessary such as allowing only vaccinated

207 people to participate or limiting the number of participants to less than or equal to 50%. In addition,
208 although the infection status fluctuates from time to time, there is a linear relationship between P_0
209 and the number of newly-infected individuals, which makes it possible to determine whether
210 additional measures are necessary for holding mass gathering events or whether to refrain from
211 holding such events.

212 This study has several limitations. First, the risk of infection outside the event was not assessed in
213 this study; however, confirmed infected individuals may have been infected during activities outside
214 the event. In particular, those who accompany infectors might also act together, even outside the event.
215 Second, we validated the model based on the total number of infected individuals but did not validate
216 the detailed calculations within the model such as the exposure rates related to each infection pathway
217 and the risk of infection for each type of exposed person. Case-control studies with behavioral records
218 of event participants and environmental measurements of viral concentrations in the air and surface
219 would fill these knowledge gaps.

220 Despite these limitations, a model for outdoor music festivals was successfully developed in this
221 study and its validity was evaluated. The results of this study guide decision-making related to event
222 organization such as the need to implement additional measures.

223

224 **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

225 We would like to thank Editage (www.editage.com) for English language editing and Dr. Kotoe

226 Katayama and Dr. Masaaki Kitajima for their advice.

227

228 **FUNDING**

229 No external financial support is used for this article.

230

231 **DECLARATION OF INTERESTS**

232 Support for the reported work:

233 This research received no external financial or non-financial support.

234

235 Relevant support outside this work:

236 T.Y. reports a relationship with Kao Corporation, Nippon Professional Baseball Organization,

237 Yomiuri Giants, Tokyo Yakult Swallows, the Japan Professional Football League, and the Japan

238 Professional Basketball League: funding grants.

239

240 Intellectual property:

241 There are no patents to disclose.

242

243 Other activities:

244 This study was conducted as part of a comprehensive research project, comprising members from

245 two private companies, Kao Corporation and NVIDIA Corporation, Japan. No authors in this study
246 belong to these companies. M.M., S.I., and T.Y. have attended the new coronavirus countermeasures
247 liaison council jointly established by the Nippon Professional Baseball Organization and Japan
248 Professional Football League as experts without any rewards. T.Y. is an advisor to the Japan
249 National Stadium and Japan Professional Football League. Other authors declare no competing
250 interests. The findings and conclusions of this article are solely the responsibility of the authors and
251 do not represent the official views of any institution.

252

253 **AUTHORSHIP CONTRIBUTION**

254 **Michio Murakami:** Conceptualization; Data curation; Methodology; Visualization; Project
255 administration; Writing –original draft

256 **Tsukasa Fujita:** Formal analysis; Methodology; Writing –review & editing

257 **Pinqi Li:** Formal analysis; Methodology; Writing –review & editing

258 **Seiya Imoto:** Project administration; Supervision; Writing –review & editing

259 **Tetsuo Yasutaka:** Methodology; Project administration; Writing –review & editing

260

261 **REFERENCES**

262 (1) McCloskey, B.; Zumla, A.; Lim, P. L.; Endericks, T.; Arbon, P.; Cicero, A.; Borodina, M. A

263 risk-based approach is best for decision making on holding mass gathering events. *Lancet*

- 264 **2020**, 395(10232), 1256-1257.
- 265 (2) Revollo, B.; Blanco, I.; Soler, P.; Toro, J.; Izquierdo-Useros, N.; Puig, J.; Puig, X.; Navarro-
266 Pérez, V.; Casañ, C.; Ruiz, L.; Perez-Zsolt, D.; Videla, S.; Clotet, B.; Llibre, J. M. Same-day
267 SARS-CoV-2 antigen test screening in an indoor mass-gathering live music event: a
268 randomised controlled trial. *Lancet Infect. Dis.* **2021**, 21(10), 1365-1372.
- 269 (3) The United Kingdom Government. Information on the Events Research Programme.
270 [https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/guidance-about-the-events-research-programme-](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/guidance-about-the-events-research-programme-erp-paving-the-way-for-larger-audiences-to-attend-sport-theatre-and-gigs-safely-this-summer/guidance-on-the-events-research-programme)
271 [erp-paving-the-way-for-larger-audiences-to-attend-sport-theatre-and-gigs-safely-this-](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/guidance-about-the-events-research-programme-erp-paving-the-way-for-larger-audiences-to-attend-sport-theatre-and-gigs-safely-this-summer/guidance-on-the-events-research-programme)
272 [summer/guidance-on-the-events-research-programme](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/guidance-about-the-events-research-programme-erp-paving-the-way-for-larger-audiences-to-attend-sport-theatre-and-gigs-safely-this-summer/guidance-on-the-events-research-programme) (accessed on May 31, 2021)
- 273 (4) Smith, J. A. E.; Hopkins, S.; Turner, C.; Dack, K.; Trelfa, A.; Peh, J.; Monks, P. S. Public health
274 impact of mass sporting and cultural events in a rising COVID-19 prevalence in England
275 (preprint).
276 [https://khub.net/documents/135939561/338928724/Public+health+impact+of+mass+sporting+a](https://khub.net/documents/135939561/338928724/Public+health+impact+of+mass+sporting+and+cultural+events+in+a+rising+COVID-19+prevalence+in+England.pdf/05204895-1576-1ee7-b41e-880d5d6b4f17)
277 [nd+cultural+events+in+a+rising+COVID-19+prevalence+in+England.pdf/05204895-1576-](https://khub.net/documents/135939561/338928724/Public+health+impact+of+mass+sporting+and+cultural+events+in+a+rising+COVID-19+prevalence+in+England.pdf/05204895-1576-1ee7-b41e-880d5d6b4f17)
278 [1ee7-b41e-880d5d6b4f17](https://khub.net/documents/135939561/338928724/Public+health+impact+of+mass+sporting+and+cultural+events+in+a+rising+COVID-19+prevalence+in+England.pdf/05204895-1576-1ee7-b41e-880d5d6b4f17) (accessed on 9 December, 2021)
- 279 (5) de Vrieze, J. Dutch studies bring back the fun—but are they good science? *Science* **2021**,
280 372(6541), 447.
- 281 (6) Murakami, M.; Miura, F.; Kitajima, M.; Fujii, K.; Yasutaka, T.; Iwasaki, Y.; Ono, K.; Shimazu,
282 Y.; Sorano, S.; Okuda, T.; Ozaki, A.; Katayama, K.; Nishikawa, Y.; Kobashi, Y.; Sawano, T.;

- 283 Abe, T.; Saito, M. M.; Tsubokura, M.; Naito, W.; Imoto, S. COVID-19 risk assessment at the
284 opening ceremony of the Tokyo 2020 Olympic Games. *Microb. Risk Anal.* **2021**, 100162.
- 285 (7) Yasutaka, T.; Murakami, M.; Iwasaki, Y.; Naito, W.; Onishi, M.; Fujita, T.; Imoto, S.
286 Assessment of COVID-19 risk and prevention effectiveness among spectators of mass
287 gathering events (preprint). *medRxiv* **2021**, 2021.07.05.21259882.
- 288 (8) Murakami, M.; Fujita, T.; Iwasaki, Y.; Onishi, M.; Naito, W.; Imoto, S.; Yasutaka, T.
289 Quantitative risk assessment of COVID-19 and serious illness among spectators at mass
290 gathering events with vaccine-testing package implementation (preprint). *medRxiv* **2022**,
291 2022.01.30.22269980.
- 292 (9) Aichi Prefecture. Report of the Investigation Committee for NAMIMONOGATARI2021
293 (translated by the authors). https://www.pref.aichi.jp/uploaded/life/363341_1540347_misc.pdf
294 (accessed on 8 February, 2022) (in Japanese)
- 295 (10) Asahi Shimbun. <https://www.asahi.com/articles/ASP9F7562P9FOIPE00W.html> (accessed on 8
296 February, 2022) (in Japanese)
- 297 (11) Aichi Prefecture. Aichi Prefecture: COVID-19 measure site (translated by the authors).
298 <https://www.pref.aichi.jp/site/covid19-aichi/> (accessed on 8 February, 2022) (in Japanese)
- 299 (12) Aichi Prefecture. Monthly report of the Aichi prefectural population census (translated by the
300 authors). <https://www.pref.aichi.jp/soshiki/toukei/jinko1new.html> (accessed on 8 February,
301 2022) (in Japanese)


- 302 (13)He, W.; Yi, G. Y.; Zhu, Y. Estimation of the basic reproduction number, average incubation
303 time, asymptomatic infection rate, and case fatality rate for COVID-19: Meta-analysis and
304 sensitivity analysis. *J. Med. Virol.* **2020**, *92*(11), 2543-2550.
- 305 (14)He, X.; Lau, E. H. Y.; Wu, P.; Deng, X.; Wang, J.; Hao, X.; Lau, Y. C.; Wong, J. Y.; Guan, Y.;
306 Tan, X.; Mo, X.; Chen, Y.; Liao, B.; Chen, W.; Hu, F.; Zhang, Q.; Zhong, M.; Wu, Y.; Zhao, L.;
307 Zhang, F.; Cowling, B. J.; Li, F.; Leung, G. M. Temporal dynamics in viral shedding and
308 transmissibility of COVID-19. *Nat. Med.* **2020**, *26*(5), 672-675.
- 309 (15)Watanabe, T.; Bartrand, T. A.; Weir, M. H.; Omura, T.; Haas, C. N. Development of a dose-
310 response model for SARS coronavirus. *Risk Anal.* **2010**, *30*(7), 1129-38.
- 311 (16)Zhang, X.; Wang, J. Dose-response relation deduced for coronaviruses from coronavirus
312 disease 2019, severe acute respiratory syndrome, and Middle East respiratory syndrome: Meta-
313 analysis results and its application for infection risk assessment of aerosol transmission. *Clin.*
314 *Infect. Dis.* **2021**, *73*(1), e241-e245.
- 315 (17)Killingley, B.; Mann, A.; Kalinova, M.; Boyers, A.; Goonawardane, N.; Zhou, J.; Lindsell, K.;
316 Hare, S. S.; Brown, J.; Frise, R.; Smith, E.; Hopkins, C.; Noulin, N.; Londt, B.; Wilkinson, T.;
317 Harden, S.; McShane, H.; Baillet, M.; Gilbert, A.; Jacobs, M.; Charman, C.; Mande, P.;
318 Nguyen-Van-Tam, J. S.; Semple, M. G.; Read, R. C.; Ferguson, N. M.; Openshaw, P. J.;
319 Rapeport, G.; Barclay, W. S.; Catchpole, A. P.; Chiu, C. Safety, tolerability and viral kinetics
320 during SARS-CoV-2 human challenge (preprint). *Research Square* **2022**, 10.21203/rs.3.rs-

- 321 1121993/v1.
- 322 (18) Li, B.; Deng, A.; Li, K.; Hu, Y.; Li, Z.; Shi, Y.; Xiong, Q.; Liu, Z.; Guo, Q.; Zou, L.; Zhang, H.;
- 323 Zhang, M.; Ouyang, F.; Su, J.; Su, W.; Xu, J.; Lin, H.; Sun, J.; Peng, J.; Jiang, H.; Zhou, P.; Hu,
- 324 T.; Luo, M.; Zhang, Y.; Zheng, H.; Xiao, J.; Liu, T.; Tan, M.; Che, R.; Zeng, H.; Zheng, Z.;
- 325 Huang, Y.; Yu, J.; Yi, L.; Wu, J.; Chen, J.; Zhong, H.; Deng, X.; Kang, M.; Pybus, O. G.; Hall,
- 326 M.; Lythgoe, K. A.; Li, Y.; Yuan, J.; He, J.; Lu, J. Viral infection and transmission in a large,
- 327 well-traced outbreak caused by the SARS-CoV-2 Delta variant. *Nat. Commun.* **2022**, *13*(1),
- 328 460.
- 329 (19) YouGov PLC. Personal measures taken to avoid COVID-19.
- 330 [https://yougov.co.uk/topics/international/articles-reports/2020/03/17/personal-measures-taken-](https://yougov.co.uk/topics/international/articles-reports/2020/03/17/personal-measures-taken-avoid-covid-19)
- 331 [avoid-covid-19](https://yougov.co.uk/topics/international/articles-reports/2020/03/17/personal-measures-taken-avoid-covid-19) (accessed on 8 February, 2022)
- 332 (20) Our World in Data. Coronavirus (COVID-19) vaccinations. [https://ourworldindata.org/covid-](https://ourworldindata.org/covid-vaccinations)
- 333 [vaccinations](https://ourworldindata.org/covid-vaccinations) (accessed on 8 February, 2022)
- 334 (21) Chemaitelly, H.; Tang, P.; Hasan, M. R.; AlMukdad, S.; Yassine, H. M.; Benslimane, F. M.; Al
- 335 Khatib, H. A.; Coyle, P.; Ayoub, H. H.; Al Kanaani, Z.; Al Kuwari, E.; Jeremijenko, A.;
- 336 Kaleeckal, A. H.; Latif, A. N.; Shaik, R. M.; Abdul Rahim, H. F.; Nasrallah, G. K.; Al Kuwari,
- 337 M. G.; Al Romaihi, H. E.; Butt, A. A.; Al-Thani, M. H.; Al Khal, A.; Bertollini, R.; Abu-
- 338 Raddad, L. J. Waning of BNT162b2 vaccine protection against SARS-CoV-2 infection in Qatar.
- 339 *N. Eng. J. Med.* **2021**, *385*(24), e83.

340 (22)Supersonic. Stop the spread of COVID-19.

341 <https://supersonic2020.com/feature/guideline?lang=en> (accessed on 8 February 2022)

342




343

344 Figure 1. Comparison of the estimated and reported numbers of already- and newly-infected

345 individuals (base scenario). Already-infected individuals represent those who were infectors at the

346 time they participated in the event.

347



348

349 Figure 2. Number of newly-infected individuals and risk reduction when additional measures were

350 applied to the base scenario. Viral concentration in the saliva: 100-fold increase relative to the wild-

351 type strain.

352

353 **Supporting Information**

354

355 Table S1. Type and number of people exposed. P_0 : crude probability of a participant being an
 356 infector.

Type of people exposed	Number of people
(0) Infectors	This value (X) was estimated from the binomial distribution based on the number of participants (base scenario: 7,392) and P_0 (base scenario: 1.3×10^{-3}).
(1) People accompanying the infector	$X \times 2^6$
(2) People in front of the infector at live performance venues	$X \times 18$ (base scenario: one infector produces three people during one attendance of a live performance; six live performances) $X \times 6$ (distance measure scenario: one infector exposes one person during one attendance of a live performance; six live performances)
(3) People exposed in restrooms	$X \times 45$ (one infector exposes 15 people per one restroom use ⁶ ; four restroom visits)
(4) People exposed at concession stands	$X \times 120$ (one infector produces 30 exposed people per one order at a concession stand ⁶ ; four orders at concession stands)
(5) Others	Total number of participants minus the sum of (0)–(4)

357

358

359 Table S2. Pathways of infection by behavioral pattern.

Behavioral pattern	Type of people exposed	Pathway	Note
(A) Attending live performances	People accompanying the infector	Direct droplet spray, direct inhalation of inspirable particles, and inhalation of respirable particles via air	The distance between the infector and the accompanying people or people in front of the infector was as follows: 0.5 m (base scenario), 1 m (distance measure scenario) Frequency of talking of the infector: 0.2 per minute (base scenario), 0.03 per minute (talk measure scenario)
	People in front of the infector at live performance venues	Direct inhalation of inspirable particles and inhalation of respirable particles via air	The probability that an infector faces each accompanying person and the people in front was 15% and 70%, respectively.
	People exposed in restrooms, people exposed at concession stands, and others	Inhalation of respirable particles via air	The probability that the accompanying person faces the infector was 50%.
(B) Entering, exiting, and resting	People accompanying the infector	Direct droplet spray, direct inhalation of inspirable particles, and inhalation of respirable particles via air	The distance between the infector and the companions was as follows: 0.5 m (base scenario), 1.5 m (distance measure scenario) Frequency of talking of the infector: 0.2 per minute
	People in front of the infector at live performance venues, people exposed in restrooms, people exposed at concession stands, and others	Inhalation of respirable particles via air	The probability that an infector faces each accompanying person was 50%. The probability that the accompanying person faces the infector was 50%.
(C) Using restrooms	People exposed in restrooms	Hand contact	The person touches the contaminated surface two minutes after the virus was deposited on the surface. The exposure from fingers-to-face contact was considered to be 6 h. Frequency of talking of the infector: 0 per minute. Handwashing measures inactivate the virus on fingers. Wearing a mask reduces the frequency of touching the facial mucosal membranes.
(D) Ordering at concession stands	People exposed at concession stands	Hand contact	The person touches the contaminated surface 1 min after the virus was deposited on the surface. The exposure from fingers-to-face contact was considered to be 6 h. Frequency of talking of the infector: 1 per minute. By considering the talk time to be 10 s, the amount of virus emitted by talking was assumed to be 1/6 th of that per minute. Disinfection measures inactivate the virus on surfaces. Wearing a mask reduces the frequency of touching the facial mucosal membranes.
(E) Eating	People accompanying the infector	Direct droplet spray, direct inhalation of inspirable particles, and inhalation of respirable particles via air	The distance between the infector and the accompanying people was as follows: 0.5 m (base scenario), 1.5 m (distance measure scenario) Frequency of talking of the infector: 0.2 per

	People in front of the infector at live performance venues, people exposed in restrooms, people exposed at concession stands, and others	Inhalation of respirable particles via air	minute (base scenario), 0.03 per minute (talk measure scenario) The probability that an infector faces each companioner was 50%. The probability that the accompanying person faces the infector was 50%. People do not wear masks during meals.
--	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

360


361

362 Table S3. Dose by type of person exposed.

Types of people exposed	Dose
(1) People accompanying the infector	(A) Attending live performances: (direct droplet spray + direct inhalation of inspirable particles + inhalation of respirable particles via air) $\times 6$ (B) Entering, exiting, and resting: (direct droplet spray + direct inhalation of inspirable particles + inhalation of respirable particles via air) $\times 6$ (E) Eating: (direct droplet spray + direct inhalation of inspirable particles + inhalation of respirable particles via air) $\times 2$
(2) People in front of the infector at live performance venues	(A) Attending live performances: (direct inhalation of inspirable particles) $\times 1$ + (inhalation of respirable particles via air) $\times 6$ (B) Entering, exiting, and resting: (inhalation of respirable particles via air) $\times 6$ (E) Eating: (inhalation of respirable particles via air) $\times 2$
(3) People exposed in restrooms	(A) Attending live performances: (inhalation of respirable particles via air) $\times 6$ (B) Entering, exiting, and resting: (inhalation of respirable particles via air) $\times 6$ (C) Using restrooms: (hand contact) $\times 1$ (E) Eating: (inhalation of respirable particles via air) $\times 2$
(4) People exposed at concession stands	(A) Attending live performances: (inhalation of respirable particles via air) $\times 6$ (B) Entering, exiting, and resting: (inhalation of respirable particles via air) $\times 6$ (D) Ordering at concession stands: (hand contact) $\times 1$ (E) Eating: (inhalation of respirable particles via air) $\times 2$
(5) Others	(A) Attending live performances: (inhalation of respirable particles via air) $\times 6$ (B) Entering, exiting, and resting: (inhalation of respirable particles via air) $\times 6$ (E) Eating: (inhalation of respirable particles via air) $\times 2$

363

364




365

366 Figure S1. Comparison of the estimated and reported numbers of already- and newly-infected

367 individuals under conditions with varying mask-wearing proportions. Viral concentration in the

368 saliva: 100-fold increase relative to the wild-type strain. No additional measures (base scenario).

369



370

371 Figure S2. Number of newly-infected individuals for varying ratios of the number of participants (a)

372 and P_0 (b) to the base scenario. P_0 : crude probability of a participant being an infector. Viral

373 concentration in the saliva: 100-fold increase relative to the wild-type strain. Additional measures

374 (a–f) were implemented. When the number of participants was 10% (739), the sum of infectors,

375 people accompanying the infector, people in front of the infector at live performance venues, people

376 exposed in restrooms, and people exposed at concession stands exceeded the number of participants

377 in seven of 10,000 simulations. The number of newly-infected individuals in these runs was

378 calculated by summing the number of newly-infected individuals calculated for each group and

379 dividing it by the total number of participants (739).