

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

Masks Do No More Than Prevent Transmission: Theory and Data Undermine the Variolation Hypothesis

Katia Koelle^{a,b,*}, Jack Lin^a, Huisheng Zhu^a, Rustom Antia^{a,b}, Anice C. Lowen^{b,c}, Daniel Weissman^{a,d}

^a Department of Biology, Emory University, Atlanta, GA

^b Emory Center of Excellence for Influenza Research and Response [CEIRR], Atlanta, GA

^c Department of Microbiology and Immunology, Emory University, Atlanta, GA

^d Department of Physics, Emory University, Atlanta, GA

* corresponding author: katia.koelle@emory.edu

29 Abstract

30 *Background.* Masking serves an important role in reducing the transmission of respiratory
31 viruses, including SARS-CoV-2. During the COVID-19 pandemic, several perspective and review
32 articles have also argued that masking reduces the risk of developing severe disease by
33 reducing the inoculum dose received by the contact. This hypothesis – known as the
34 ‘variola hypothesis’ – has gained considerable traction since its development.

35 *Methods.* To assess the plausibility of this hypothesis, we develop a quantitative framework for
36 understanding the relationship between (i) inoculum dose and the risk of infection and (ii)
37 inoculum dose and the risk of developing severe disease. We parameterize the mathematical
38 models underlying this framework with parameters relevant for SARS-CoV-2 to quantify these
39 relationships empirically and to gauge the range of inoculum doses in natural infections. We
40 then identify and analyze relevant experimental studies of SARS-CoV-2 to ascertain the extent
41 of empirical support for the proposed framework.

42 *Results.* Mathematical models, when simulated under parameter values appropriate for SARS-
43 CoV-2, indicate that the risk of infection and the risk of developing severe disease both increase
44 with an increase in inoculum dose. However, the risk of infection increases from low to almost
45 certain infection at low inoculum doses (with <1000 initially infected cells). In contrast, the risk
46 of developing severe disease is only sensitive to dose at very high inoculum levels, above 10^6
47 initially infected cells. By drawing on studies that have estimated transmission bottleneck sizes
48 of SARS-CoV-2, we find that inoculum doses are low in natural SARS-CoV-2 infections. As such,
49 reductions in inoculum dose through masking or greater social distancing are expected to
50 reduce the risk of infection but not the risk of developing severe disease conditional on
51 infection. Our review of existing experimental studies support this finding.

52 *Conclusions.* We find that masking and other measures such as distancing that act to reduce
53 inoculum doses in natural infections are highly unlikely to impact the contact’s risk of
54 developing severe disease conditional on infection. However, in support of existing empirical
55 studies, we find that masking and other mitigation measures that reduce inoculum dose are
56 expected to reduce the risk of infection with SARS-CoV-2. Our findings therefore undermine the
57 plausibility of the variola hypothesis, underscoring the need to focus on other factors such
58 as comorbidities and host age for understanding the heterogeneity in disease outcomes for
59 SARS-CoV-2.

60

61

62

63

64

65 Introduction

66 The efficacy of masks in reducing infection risk has been shown in the context of SARS-CoV-2¹
67 and for other respiratory viruses². Masks reduce the amount of virus shed in exhaled breath of
68 infected individuals³, reducing viral transmission potential. Although less effective than ‘source
69 control’^{1,2}, masking on the part of a contact also reduces infection risk. During the COVID-19
70 pandemic, an additional benefit of masking has been hypothesized: that masks can reduce
71 disease severity in individuals who become infected despite masking⁴⁻⁶. The initial articles
72 arguing that ‘masks do more’ than reduce viral transmission have been heavily cited^{4,5,7}, with
73 several follow-up articles that either express support of this hypothesis^{6,8} or are critical of it
74 based on the extent of evidence presented⁹⁻¹¹ or on findings from subsequent studies¹².

75 The potential for masks to lower the risk of disease has been termed the ‘variola
76 hypothesis’⁴. The term variola derives from a practice that was first documented in Asia in
77 the 1500’s to reduce an individual’s risk of contracting smallpox. The practice involved
78 inoculation of previously uninfected individuals using pulverized smallpox scabs. These
79 challenged individuals only rarely developed severe disease in response to the inoculation but
80 gained immunity to smallpox infection. A possible reason why variola rarely led to severe
81 disease is that the inoculum dose may have been low compared to a natural smallpox infection.

82 Here, we use mathematical modeling to develop a framework for assessing the plausibility of
83 the variola hypothesis as it pertains to respiratory viruses. We parameterize the models
84 with estimated parameter values for SARS-CoV-2 and test the predictions of this framework
85 using findings from existing experimental studies. Application of our framework to SARS-CoV-2
86 indicates that masking and other measures to reduce natural inoculum doses are highly unlikely
87 to impact the risk of developing disease in those individuals who become infected. However,
88 our findings indicate that these measures are effective at reducing infection risk, consistent
89 with an existing body of empirical findings.

90 Methods

91 ***The relationship between inoculum dose and infection risk.*** The basic reproduction number R_0
92 in epidemiology quantifies the expected number of secondary cases resulting from a single
93 infected case in an otherwise susceptible host population¹³. Given a value of R_0 and a measure
94 of the extent of transmission heterogeneity between individuals, the probability of an emerging
95 infectious agent establishing, rather than going stochastically extinct, can be calculated¹⁴. These
96 epidemiological calculations have analogies at the within-host level, where the within-host
97 basic reproduction number ($R_{0, \text{within}}$) quantifies the expected number of cells that will become
98 infected by virus progeny produced from a single infected cell early on in infection when target
99 cells are readily available and host immune responses have not yet developed. We thus use
100 mathematical expressions from the epidemiological literature to project how inoculum dose

101 impacts the probability of an individual becoming infected (Supplemental Material). We
102 parameterize the infection risk model based on existing SARS-CoV-2 literature estimates for $R_{0, \text{within}}$ ¹⁵
103 and under a broad range of cell-to-cell heterogeneity levels. The range of heterogeneity
104 levels we consider span from no cell-to-cell heterogeneity to extreme levels of heterogeneity
105 with virus progeny from approximately 0.1% of infected cells being responsible for infecting
106 80% of the next generation of infected cells (Supplemental Material).

107 ***The relationship between inoculum dose and the risk of developing severe disease.*** Within-
108 host models are commonly used to understand viral load and immune response dynamics¹⁶. To
109 project the relationship between inoculum dose and the risk of developing severe disease, we
110 use an existing mathematical model for the viral and immune response dynamics during SARS-
111 CoV-2 infection¹⁵. This model incorporates uninfected target cells, infected target cells, free
112 virus, and the innate immune response. We extend this model to further incorporate an
113 adaptive immune response, given the documented importance of the cellular immune response
114 in clearing SARS-CoV-2 infection and in modulating disease severity¹⁷. We further add an
115 equation to model tissue damage, which we ultimately use to quantify the extent of disease
116 severity. Model equations and parameterizations are provided in the Supplemental Material.
117 For any given parameterization (reflecting a given individual), we simulate the within-host
118 model starting with different values for the initial number of infected cells.

119 ***The inoculum dose in natural infections.*** To estimate the inoculum dose in natural SARS-CoV-2
120 infections, we used empirical estimates of the transmission bottleneck size of SARS-CoV-2¹⁸⁻²¹.
121 The transmission bottleneck size N_b is defined as the number of viral particles that establish
122 genetic lineages in an infected host. By contrast, inoculum dose is defined herein as the number
123 of initially infected cells, which may be greater than N_b . Under each considered inoculum dose,
124 we analytically calculated the probability of N_b being 1, 2, 3, etc. viral particles, conditional on
125 host infection (Supplemental Material). We used these probabilities to calculate the mean
126 bottleneck size under any given inoculum dose. We compared these mean bottleneck sizes
127 against the empirical mean estimate¹⁸ of $N_b = 1.21$ to determine a plausible range of natural
128 inoculum doses.

129 Results

130 ***The expected relationship between inoculum dose and infection risk.*** To parameterize the
131 infection risk model, we consider three values of $R_{0, \text{within}}$: 7.4, 2.6, and 14.9, corresponding to
132 the mean, low, and high estimates derived from a within-host viral dynamic model that was fit
133 to viral load data from 17 infected individuals¹⁵. With $R_{0, \text{within}} = 7.4$ and in the absence of cell-to-
134 cell heterogeneity ($k = \infty$), the risk of infection was close to 100% in the case of the inoculum
135 dose being one or more initially infected cells (**Figure 1**). At any given inoculum dose, the risk of
136 infection was lower at higher levels of cell-to-cell heterogeneity. However, even at extreme
137 levels of cell-to-cell heterogeneity, infection risk saturated at 100% with inoculum doses of
138 approximately 100-1000 initially infected cells. The overall patterns of infection risk were

139 similar for a higher $R_{0, \text{within}}$ (of 14.9) and a lower $R_{0, \text{within}}$ (of 2.6). These results indicate that, for
140 viral infections with high within-host basic reproduction numbers ($R_{0, \text{within}} > 2$), infection risk
141 increases rapidly with increases in inoculum dose only over a range of low viral inoculum doses;
142 at high inoculum doses, infection is already ensured.

143 ***The expected relationship between inoculum dose and risk of developing severe disease.***

144 Simulation of the within-host viral dynamic model, parameterized with baseline values and
145 starting with an inoculum dose of 10 initially infected cells, recapitulated key features of SARS-
146 CoV-2 within-host dynamics. Viral load increased over a period of approximately 6 days, peaked
147 at approximately 10^7 genome equivalents per ml, and then declined to undetectable levels
148 within the following ~ 8 days (**Figure 2A**). Tissue damage, driven by proinflammatory cytokines
149 and T-cell-induced pathology, increased as viral load increased, peaked at around the same
150 time as viral load, and then declined (**Figure 2B**). Only approximately 10% of target cells were
151 killed over the course of the infection, with viral regulation resulting primarily from the innate
152 immune response initially, followed by the cellular immune response (Supplemental Material).

153 Increasing the inoculum dose by three orders of magnitude (10^4 initially infected cells),
154 decreased the time between infection and peak viral load (**Figure 2A**), and similarly sped up the
155 dynamics of the other variables (**Figure 2B**; Supplemental Material). Despite these kinetic
156 differences, the dynamics are quantitatively similar to those with a low inoculum dose of 10
157 initially infected cells such that the risk of developing severe disease was similar at these two
158 doses. However, at an even higher inoculum dose of 1.6×10^7 initially infected cells
159 (corresponding to $\sim 20\%$ of the total number of target cells), the within-host dynamics are
160 substantially different from those at the two lower doses: viral titers peak at higher levels
161 (**Figure 2A**), fewer target cells remain (Supplemental Material), and tissue damage is more
162 substantial (**Figure 2B**), resulting in a higher risk of developing severe disease (**Figure 2C**).

163 To gauge the point at which the risk of developing severe disease increases, we simulated the
164 within-host model across a wide range of inoculum doses, calculating the risk at each inoculum
165 dose (**Figure 2C**). In **Figure 2D**, we plot this risk in terms of fold change relative to an infection
166 starting from 10 initially infected cells. This figure shows that across >6 orders of magnitude
167 difference in inoculum dose, from a single initially infected cell to $\sim 10^6$ initially infected cells,
168 the risk of developing severe disease is insensitive to dose; only at extremely high doses does
169 the risk of developing severe disease increase with an increase in dose.

170 To examine interindividual variation in the risk of developing severe disease, we simulated the
171 within-host model 10 times, with parameter values drawn from distributions with mean values
172 given by the baseline parameterized model (Supplemental Material). Simulated viral dynamics
173 and tissue damage dynamics were variable between these 10 simulations (Supplemental
174 Material), resulting in highly variable risks of developing severe disease across individuals at a
175 given inoculum dose (**Figure 2C**). However, plotting the risk for each of these 10 individuals
176 relative to the risk under the assumption of 10 initially infected cells again indicates that the
177 risk of developing severe disease is insensitive to the inoculum dose until doses approach very
178 high levels (**Figure 2D**).

179 Our finding that the risk of developing severe disease is insensitive to dose across a broad range
180 of inoculum doses, ranging from a single initially infected cell to $\sim 10^6$ initially infected cells ($\sim 1\%$
181 of initially available target cells), can be generally understood in the context of how host
182 immunity responds to viral infection. At any inoculum dose, host immunity develops in
183 response to viral infection. When inoculum doses are not extremely large, this immune
184 response can effectively regulate viral dynamics. At extremely large inoculum doses, however,
185 the host immune response does not have the ability to quickly regulate within-host viral
186 dynamics, and as such, the number of infected cells is significantly higher. A higher number of
187 infected cells results in higher interferon levels, which act to control the viral infection but also
188 lead to higher levels of interferon-induced pathology. Simplifications of the within-host model
189 we use here demonstrate this point (Supplemental Material).

190 *Inference of inoculum dose in natural infections.* **Figure 3A** shows the expected transmission
191 bottleneck size under a range of inoculum doses, under the same set of values of $R_{0, \text{within}}$ and
192 cell-to-cell heterogeneity levels considered in Figure 1. Even at an extreme level of cell-to-cell
193 heterogeneity ($k = 0.001$), the inoculum dose that yields an expected transmission bottleneck
194 size of 1.21 does not exceed 124 initially infected cells. Even if transmission bottleneck sizes
195 were an order of magnitude higher (~ 10 viral particles), the inoculum dose would not exceed
196 ~ 3000 initially infected cells. These results indicate that the inoculum dose in natural SARS-CoV-
197 2 infections is very low. In this range of inoculum doses, reductions in dose would be expected
198 to decrease the risk of infection but not have an effect on the risk of developing severe disease.
199 In **Figure 3B**, we show the distribution of transmission bottleneck sizes that has been previously
200 inferred from empirical studies¹⁸. **Figures 3C-G** show that expected distributions of transmission
201 bottleneck sizes under different cell-to-cell heterogeneity levels, parameterized with inoculum
202 doses that yield mean N_b estimates that are closest to the value of 1.21, quantitatively
203 reproduce the inferred empirical distribution.

204 *Analysis of experimental challenge studies.* Our modeling provides two predictions relevant to
205 the variolation hypothesis: (i) in the range of low inoculum doses, infection risk decreases with
206 a decrease in inoculum dose, but the risk of developing severe disease (conditional on
207 infection) is not substantially impacted; and (ii) in the range of very high inoculum doses, the
208 risk of developing severe disease decreases with a decrease in inoculum dose, but infection risk
209 is not impacted (individuals will become infected despite decreases in dose).

210 To test these predictions, we turn to experimental SARS-CoV-2 challenge studies. The most
211 relevant of these studies are ones that measure disease outcomes in contact (sentinel) animals,
212 across experimental designs that have the potential to modulate infection dose. In these
213 experiments, we expect that inoculum doses of sentinel animals are of similar orders of
214 magnitude to those of humans experiencing natural infection. We found two relevant
215 studies^{22,23}. The first study²² assessed the efficacy of masks for reducing transmission risk using
216 a Syrian hamster model. They found that masking significantly reduced the risk of infection of
217 sentinel hamsters from 10/15 (66.7%) to 6/24 (25.0%) ($p = 0.018$; Fisher exact test). The study

218 also reported that the sentinel hamsters in the masked arms of the experiments had lower
219 clinical severity scores and milder histopathological changes, consistent with the variolation
220 hypothesis. However, the authors did not condition on infection and uninfected sentinel
221 hamsters exhibited no clinical symptoms. Inclusion of uninfected sentinel hamsters therefore
222 would bias clinical severity scores to be lower in the masked arms of the experiment relative to
223 the unmasked arm of the experiment. We reanalyzed their data (Supplemental Material) and
224 did not find a statistically significant difference in the clinical severity scores of infected sentinel
225 hamsters between the masked and unmasked treatment groups ($p = 0.07$ for 5 dpi; $p = 0.27$ for
226 7 dpi; Mann-Whitney U test; Supplemental Material). The data from this study therefore
227 indicate that masking reduces infection risk but do not demonstrate significant impact of
228 masking on disease outcome during transmission from an index to a contact individual.

229 A second study²³ examined SARS-CoV-2 transmission efficiency from inoculated to contact
230 animals, also using the Syrian hamster model. The study found that transmission efficiency was
231 high in exposures that lasted one or more hours when the index animals were inoculated with
232 1×10^4 PFU of virus. In a follow-up experiment that examined transmission efficiency at different
233 points in time following index inoculation, the authors allowed contact between sentinel and
234 index cases for one to two hours, at different time periods post-inoculation. Transmission was
235 found to be most efficient when viral load in the inoculated animal was high (17 h to 2 d post-
236 inoculation), consistent with the risk of infection of a contact animal depending on dose when
237 doses are low. However, infected contact animals across the different exposure time blocks did
238 not exhibit statistically significant differences in infection severity as measured by weight loss
239 (all p -values > 0.05 ; two-sample t-test; Supplemental Material), even though one would expect
240 exposure during high viral load of the index case to increase inoculum dose. However, infected
241 contact animals did exhibit a statistically significant ($p = 0.004$; two-sample t-test), yet small,
242 amount of weight loss relative to their uninfected counterparts. These results are consistent
243 with other experimental transmission studies on Syrian hamsters that found either small or
244 insignificant amounts of weight loss in infected contact animals^{24,25}.

245 Another set of studies that has the potential to give insight into the effect of dose on disease
246 outcomes are those that modulate inoculum dose across a wide range of values in
247 experimentally challenged donor animals. One such study²⁶ assessed the effect of SARS-CoV-2
248 inoculum dose on seroconversion and fever development in a non-human primate model.
249 Positive relationships were observed between deposited dose and seroconversion (an indicator
250 of infection, albeit an imperfect one; **Figure 4A**) and also between deposited dose and fever
251 development (**Figure 4B**). A similar effect was maintained when we reanalyzed the data by
252 estimating the relationship between deposited dose and fever development, conditional on
253 seroconversion (**Figure 4B**; Supplemental Material). As already remarked on in the original data
254 analysis²⁶, the median infectious dose that resulted in fever development was significantly
255 higher than the median infectious dose that resulted in seroconversion (256 TCID50 vs. 52
256 TCID50), a result that was maintained when fever development was conditioned on
257 seroconversion (**Figure 4**). We further fit an alternative model to these data to allow for a non-

258 zero probability of developing fever at low inoculum doses, conditional on infection. The
259 extended model, which was statistically preferred over the original logistic model, predicted an
260 even higher inoculum dose for the median infectious dose that resulted in fever development
261 (460 TCID₅₀; **Figure 4B**). This analysis therefore provides empirical support for the modeling
262 results presented above: at low inoculum doses, an increase in dose increases the risk of
263 infection but not the risk of developing disease.

264 Another SARS-CoV-2 experimental challenge study examined disease outcomes at more than
265 one dose²⁷. However, this study considered dose ranges that ranged from high to very high
266 (referred to as “low” and “high” dose, respectively, in their study) with all challenged animals
267 becoming infected. At these dose levels, we expect that there might be a positive relationship
268 between dose and disease severity. The findings from this study meet this expectation²⁷ but do
269 not provide support in favor of the variolation hypothesis because the inoculum doses used in
270 this study lie outside the range of natural ones.

271 Discussion

272 Here, we have used mathematical models to study the relationships between inoculum dose
273 and the risks of infection and of developing severe disease. Based on parameterizations of
274 these models for SARS-CoV-2, we argue that decreases in the inoculum dose, for example
275 through masking, will only result in lower probabilities of infection when the natural inoculum
276 dose is low. We further argue that decreases in the inoculum dose will only result in less severe
277 disease when the natural inoculum dose is high. Our comparison of expected and empirical
278 estimates of transmission bottleneck size indicates that natural inoculum doses are very low,
279 such that masking (as documented¹) is expected to reduce transmission potential. However,
280 this means that masking is highly unlikely to reduce the risk of developing severe disease,
281 conditional on infection. Our results thereby undermine the plausibility of the variolation
282 hypothesis. Our results are consistent with experimental challenge studies, which have not
283 found a significant difference in disease outcomes in contact animals infected with different but
284 small inoculum doses; however, disease outcomes in index animals that are inoculated with
285 high doses have been shown to differ, with higher doses resulting in more severe disease²⁷.

286 We restricted our analyses to ones involving experimental challenge studies. While there are
287 observational studies that have argued against the variolation hypothesis¹², we feel that these
288 studies offer an absence of evidence rather than evidence of absence, owing to uncertainty in
289 the data. Other studies have been invoked to instead support the variolation hypothesis. For
290 example, it has been argued that the higher asymptomatic rate on board of the Greg Mortimer
291 ship destined for Antarctica (81%)²⁸ relative to the asymptomatic rate on board of the Diamond
292 Princess (17.9%)²⁹ was due to masking on the Greg Mortimer⁵. However, alternative
293 explanations, such as differences in the age distribution of the passengers or differences in the
294 SARS-CoV-2 tests used, were not considered.

295 An alternative hypothesis to consider is that masks may modulate disease severity not by
296 decreasing inoculum dose but by modulating the mode of transmission³⁰. A viral inoculum
297 delivered in larger droplets, such as those that comprise a spray, would become trapped in the
298 nasal passages and upper airways. Conversely, small aerosolized particles can penetrate the
299 lower lungs, where infection is more likely to result in severe symptoms. While masks that
300 create a seal around the nose and mouth can limit inhalation of aerosols, most are more
301 effective at limiting transfer of a droplet spray. Thus, while masking is expected to lower the
302 overall number of infections, it could increase the proportion of cases resulting from inhalation
303 directly to the lower respiratory tract. For this reason, we suggest that an effect of masking on
304 modes of transmission is not consistent with the variolation hypothesis.

305 Our finding that masking and measures of social distancing that reduce inoculum dose are
306 unlikely to do more than protect against infection has relevance to other respiratory viruses
307 such as influenza, which is also characterized by a small transmission bottleneck size³¹. Masking
308 would be expected to reduce incidence of infection, helping to limit the impact of influenza at a
309 population level. To reduce disease in those infected, whether it be with influenza, SARS-CoV-2,
310 or another respiratory virus characterized by a small inoculum dose, vaccination likely remains
311 the most effective countermeasure^{32,33}.

312

313 Acknowledgments

314 We thank Dr. Jasper Chan and Dr. Kwok-Yung Yuen for providing their study's individual-level clinical
315 severity score data upon request. We further thank Ketaki Ganti and Lucas Ferreri for providing
316 individual-level weight data from the Ganti et. al. study, and Narendra Dixit for helpful conversations
317 about their SARS-CoV-2 within-host model. This work was funded by NIH/NIAID Centers of Excellence in
318 Influenza Research and Response (CEIRR), contract number 75N93021C00017 to KK, RA and ACL. DW
319 was supported by the Simons Foundation via a Mathematical Modeling of Living Systems Investigator
320 award, the Sloan Foundation via a Research Fellowship, the NSF via CAREER award PHY-2146260, the
321 Gordon and Betty Moore Foundation grant 2919.02, and the Kavli Institute for Theoretical Physics by
322 NSF grant PHY-1748958.

323

324 References

- 325 1 Howard J, Huang A, Li Z, *et al.* An evidence review of face masks against COVID-19. *Proc Natl Acad Sci*
326 *USA* 2021; **118**: e2014564118.
- 327 2 Cowling BJ, Zhou Y, Ip DKM, Leung GM, Aiello AE. Face masks to prevent transmission of influenza
328 virus: a systematic review. *Epidemiol Infect* 2010; **138**: 449–56.
- 329 3 Leung NHL, Chu DKW, Shiu EYC, *et al.* Respiratory virus shedding in exhaled breath and efficacy of
330 face masks. *Nat Med* 2020; **26**: 676–80.

- 331 4 Gandhi M, Rutherford GW. Facial Masking for Covid-19 — Potential for “Variolation” as We Await a
332 Vaccine. *N Engl J Med* 2020; **383**: e101.
- 333 5 Gandhi M, Beyrer C, Goosby E. Masks Do More Than Protect Others During COVID-19: Reducing the
334 Inoculum of SARS-CoV-2 to Protect the Wearer. *J GEN INTERN MED* 2020; published online July 31.
335 DOI:10.1007/s11606-020-06067-8.
- 336 6 Sehrawat S, Rouse BT. COVID-19: disease, or no disease? - that is the question. It’s the dose stupid!
337 *Microbes and Infection* 2021; **23**: 104779.
- 338 7 Spinelli MA, Glidden DV, Gennatas ED, *et al.* Importance of non-pharmaceutical interventions in
339 lowering the viral inoculum to reduce susceptibility to infection by SARS-CoV-2 and potentially
340 disease severity. *The Lancet Infectious Diseases* 2021; **21**: e296–301.
- 341 8 Van Damme W, Dahake R, van de Pas R, Vanham G, Assefa Y. COVID-19: Does the infectious inoculum
342 dose-response relationship contribute to understanding heterogeneity in disease severity and
343 transmission dynamics? *Medical Hypotheses* 2021; **146**: 110431.
- 344 9 Trunfio M, Calcagno A, Bonora S, Di Perri G. Lowering SARS-CoV-2 viral load might affect transmission
345 but not disease severity in secondary cases. *The Lancet Infectious Diseases* 2021; **21**: 914–5.
- 346 10 Escandón K, Rasmussen AL, Bogoch II, *et al.* COVID-19 false dichotomies and a comprehensive review
347 of the evidence regarding public health, COVID-19 symptomatology, SARS-CoV-2 transmission, mask
348 wearing, and reinfection. *BMC Infect Dis* 2021; **21**: 710.
- 349 11 Facial Masking for Covid-19. *N Engl J Med* 2020; **383**: 2092–4.
- 350 12 Trunfio M, Longo BM, Alladio F, *et al.* On the SARS-CoV-2 “Variolation Hypothesis”: No Association
351 Between Viral Load of Index Cases and COVID-19 Severity of Secondary Cases. *Front Microbiol* 2021;
352 **12**: 646679.
- 353 13 Anderson RM, May RM. Infectious diseases of humans: dynamics and control, Reprinted. Oxford:
354 Oxford Univ. Press, 2010.
- 355 14 Lloyd-Smith JO, Schreiber SJ, Kopp PE, Getz WM. Superspreading and the effect of individual variation
356 on disease emergence. *Nature* 2005; **438**: 355–9.
- 357 15 Ke R, Zitzmann C, Ho DD, Ribeiro RM, Perelson AS. In vivo kinetics of SARS-CoV-2 infection and its
358 relationship with a person’s infectiousness. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* 2021; **118**: e2111477118.
- 359 16 Perelson AS. Modelling viral and immune system dynamics. *Nat Rev Immunol* 2002; **2**: 28–36.
- 360 17 Moss P. The T cell immune response against SARS-CoV-2. *Nat Immunol* 2022; **23**: 186–93.
- 361 18 Martin MA, Koelle K. Comment on “Genomic epidemiology of superspreading events in Austria
362 reveals mutational dynamics and transmission properties of SARS-CoV-2”. *Sci Transl Med* 2021; **13**:
363 eabh1803.

- 364 19 Lythgoe KA, Hall M, Ferretti L, *et al.* SARS-CoV-2 within-host diversity and transmission. *Science* 2021;
365 **372**: eabg0821.
- 366 20 Braun KM, Moreno GK, Halfmann PJ, *et al.* Transmission of SARS-CoV-2 in domestic cats imposes a
367 narrow bottleneck. *PLoS Pathog* 2021; **17**: e1009373.
- 368 21 Braun K, Moreno G, Wagner C, *et al.* Limited within-host diversity and tight transmission bottlenecks
369 limit SARS-CoV-2 evolution in acutely infected individuals. *Evolutionary Biology*, 2021
370 DOI:10.1101/2021.04.30.440988.
- 371 22 Chan JF-W, Yuan S, Zhang AJ, *et al.* Surgical Mask Partition Reduces the Risk of Noncontact
372 Transmission in a Golden Syrian Hamster Model for Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19). *Clinical*
373 *Infectious Diseases* 2020; **71**: 2139–49.
- 374 23 Ganti K, Ferreri LM, Lee C-Y, *et al.* Timing of exposure is critical in a highly sensitive model of SARS-
375 CoV-2 transmission. *PLoS Pathog* 2022; **18**: e1010181.
- 376 24 Port JR, Yinda CK, Avanzato VA, *et al.* Increased small particle aerosol transmission of B.1.1.7
377 compared with SARS-CoV-2 lineage A in vivo. *Nat Microbiol* 2022; **7**: 213–23.
- 378 25 Port JR, Yinda CK, Owusu IO, *et al.* SARS-CoV-2 disease severity and transmission efficiency is
379 increased for airborne compared to fomite exposure in Syrian hamsters. *Nat Commun* 2021; **12**:
380 4985.
- 381 26 Dabisch PA, Biryukov J, Beck K, *et al.* Seroconversion and fever are dose-dependent in a nonhuman
382 primate model of inhalational COVID-19. *PLoS Pathog* 2021; **17**: e1009865.
- 383 27 Imai M, Iwatsuki-Horimoto K, Hatta M, *et al.* Syrian hamsters as a small animal model for SARS-CoV-2
384 infection and countermeasure development. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* 2020; : 202009799.
- 385 28 Ing AJ, Cocks C, Green JP. COVID-19: in the footsteps of Ernest Shackleton. *Thorax* 2020; **75**: 693–4.
- 386 29 Mizumoto K, Kagaya K, Zarebski A, Chowell G. Estimating the asymptomatic proportion of
387 coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) cases on board the Diamond Princess cruise ship, Yokohama,
388 Japan, 2020. *Eurosurveillance* 2020; **25**. DOI:10.2807/1560-7917.ES.2020.25.10.2000180.
- 389 30 Prather KA, Wang CC, Schooley RT. Reducing transmission of SARS-CoV-2. *Science* 2020; **368**: 1422–4.
- 390 31 McCrone JT, Woods RJ, Martin ET, Malosh RE, Monto AS, Lauring AS. Stochastic processes constrain
391 the within and between host evolution of influenza virus. *eLife* 2018; **7**. DOI:10.7554/eLife.35962.
- 392 32 Gross PA. The Efficacy of Influenza Vaccine in Elderly Persons: A Meta-Analysis and Review of the
393 Literature. *Ann Intern Med* 1995; **123**: 518.
- 394 33 Feikin DR, Higdon MM, Abu-Raddad LJ, *et al.* Duration of effectiveness of vaccines against SARS-CoV-
395 2 infection and COVID-19 disease: results of a systematic review and meta-regression. *The Lancet*
396 2022; **399**: 924–44.
- 397

398

399

400 Figures

401

402 **Figure 1. The relationship between inoculum dose and the risk of infection for SARS-CoV-2.** Inoculum
403 dose is defined here as the initial number of infected cells. Relationships are shown for $R_{0, \text{within}} = 7.4$
404 (solid lines), $R_{0, \text{within}} = 2.6$ (dashed lines), and $R_{0, \text{within}} = 14.9$ (dotted lines). Line colors denote the extent
405 of cell-to-cell heterogeneity: overdispersion parameter $k = \infty$ (blue; no cell-to-cell heterogeneity), $k = 1$
406 (brown), $k = 0.1$ (yellow), $k = 0.01$ (purple), and $k = 0.001$ (green; extreme level of cell-to-cell
407 heterogeneity). These k values correspond to approximately 65%, 40%, 10%, 1%, and 0.1% of the most
408 infectious cells giving rise to 80% of secondary infected cells, respectively.

409 **Figure 2. The relationship between inoculum dose and the risk of developing severe disease for SARS-**
410 **CoV-2.** (A) Viral dynamics, and (B) corresponding tissue damage dynamics, simulated using the within-
411 host model parameterized with baseline values, for three inoculum doses: 10 (yellow), 10^4 (orange), and
412 1.6×10^7 (red) initially infected cells. (C) Disease severity of infection over a broad range of inoculum
413 doses. Solid black line shows results for the within-host model parameterized at baseline values. Dashed
414 gray lines show results for 10 individuals, with parameters sampled from the provided distributions
415 detailed in the Supplemental Material. (D) Disease severity, for the baseline model parameterization
416 (black) and 10 individuals (dashed gray), as in (C), in terms of fold change. Fold change is relative to the
417 disease severity level resulting from infection starting with 10 infected cells. Vertical yellow, orange, and
418 red lines in panels (C) and (D) show the inoculum doses used in the simulations shown in (A) and (B).

419 **Figure 3. Inference of the natural inoculum dose.** (A) The relationship between inoculum dose and
420 mean bottleneck size. Lines show the expected relationship under a given within-host basic
421 reproduction number and a given level of cell-to-cell heterogeneity. As in Figure 1, dashed, solid, and
422 dotted lines correspond to $R_{0, \text{within}}$ values of 2.6, 7.4, and 14.9, respectively, and line colors denote the
423 extent of cell-to-cell heterogeneity. Gray line shows the mean transmission bottleneck size of 1.21. (B)
424 Inferred distribution of transmission bottleneck sizes, reproduced from ¹⁸, showing the number of viral
425 particles that establish genetic lineages in an infected individual and their corresponding probabilities.
426 (C-G) Expected distribution of transmission bottleneck sizes for models parameterized with an $R_{0, \text{within}}$ of
427 7.4 and inoculum doses that yield a mean bottleneck size that is closest to the previously inferred value
428 of 1.21. Panels differ in their cell-to-cell heterogeneity levels. These doses correspond to 1 (C; $k = \text{Inf}$), 1
429 (D; $k = 1$), 2 (E; $k = 0.1$), 13 (F; $k = 0.01$), and 124 (G; $k = 0.001$) initially infected cells.

430 **Figure 4. The relationship between inoculum dose, seroconversion, and fever development.** Data
431 derive from a non-human primate SARS-CoV-2 challenge study²⁶, with inoculum doses ranging from low
432 to high. Deposited doses are calculated from inoculum doses, incorporating deposition fraction
433 estimates and accounting for variation in respiratory geometry. (A) The relationship between deposited
434 dose and infection risk. Individual-level data points are shown as open black circles. Solid black line
435 shows the fit of a logistic regression model. The median dose that results in seroconversion is 52 TCID₅₀,
436 as previously reported²⁶. (B) The relationship between deposited dose and the probability of developing
437 fever. Individual-level data points are shown as open black circles. Red asterisks within a subset of these

438 data points indicate the subset of individuals that seroconverted. Solid black line shows the fit of a
439 logistic regression model to all individual-level data points. Red solid line shows the fit of a logistic
440 regression model to the subset of individuals that seroconverted. The median dose that results in fever
441 development is approximately 256 TCID₅₀ for both models. The red dashed line shows the fit of the
442 alternative logistic model to the subset of animals that seroconverted.

443







