Particle Based Model for Airborne Disease Transmission

Michael B Dillon
Charles F Dillon

April 2020

LLNL-TR-808973

Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory is operated by Lawrence Livermore National Security, LLC, for the U.S. Department of Energy, National Nuclear Security Administration under Contract DE-AC52-07NA27344.

LLNL-TR-808973

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

Auspices and Disclaimer

This work was performed under the auspices of the U.S. Department of Energy by Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory under Contract DE-AC52-07NA27344.

This document was prepared as an account of work sponsored by an agency of the United States government. Neither the United States government nor Lawrence Livermore National Security, LLC, nor any of their employees makes any warranty, expressed or implied, or assumes any legal liability or responsibility for the accuracy, completeness, or usefulness of any information, apparatus, product, or process disclosed, or represents that its use would not infringe privately owned rights. Reference herein to any specific commercial product, process, or service by trade name, trademark, manufacturer, or otherwise does not necessarily constitute or imply its endorsement, recommendation, or favoring by the United States government or Lawrence Livermore National Security, LLC. The views and opinions of authors expressed herein do not necessarily state or reflect those of the United States government or Lawrence Livermore National Security, LLC, and shall not be used for advertising or product endorsement purposes.

M Dillon and
C Dillon

Particle Model for
Airborne Disease Transmission

Particle Based Model for Airborne Disease Transmission

Authors

Michael B Dillon,^{a,*} dillon7@llnl.gov

Charles F Dillon

^a Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory

* Corresponding author

M Dillon and
C Dillon

Particle Model for
Airborne Disease Transmission

Executive Summary

Prior literature documents cases of airborne infectious disease transmission at distances ranging from ≥ 2 m to inter-continental in scale. Physics- and biology- based models describe the key aspects of these airborne disease transmission events, but important gaps remain. This report extends current approaches by developing a new, single-particle based theory that (a) assesses the likelihood of rare airborne infections (where individuals inhale either one or no infectious particles) and (b) explicitly accounts for the variability in airborne exposures and population susceptibilities within a geographic region of interest. For these hazards, airborne particle fate and transport is independent of particulate concentration, and so results for complex releases can be determined from the results of many single-particle releases.

This work is intended to provide context for both (a) the initial stages of a disease outbreak and (b) larger scale (≥ 2 m) disease spread, including distant disease “sparks” (low probability, unexpected disease transmission events that infect remote, susceptible populations). The physics of airborne particulate dispersion inherently constrains airborne disease transmission. As such, this work suggests results that, *a priori*, may be applicable to many airborne diseases.

Model Predictions:

- i. Modeling predictions of the single-particle transmission kernel suggest that outdoor airborne disease transmission events may occur episodically as the infection probabilities can vary over many orders of magnitude depending on the distance downwind; specific virus, prion, or microorganism; and meteorological conditions.
- ii. Model results suggest that, under the right conditions, an indoor infected person could spread disease to a similar, or greater, number of people downwind than in the building they occupy. However, the downwind, per-person infection probability is predicted to be lower than the within-building, per-person infection probability. This finding is limited to airborne transmission considerations.
- iii. This work suggests a new relative disease probability metric for airborne transmitted diseases. This metric, which is distinct from the traditional relative risk metric, is applicable when the rate at which the infectious agent losses infectivity in the atmosphere is $\lesssim 1 \text{ h}^{-1}$.

M Dillon and
C Dillon

Particle Model for
Airborne Disease Transmission

42Table of Contents

43	Executive Summary.....	2
44	Table of Contents.....	3
45	1. Introduction	5
46	2. Physics- and Biology- Based Airborne Transmission Modeling	7
47	2.1. Dilute Particle Considerations.....	9
48	2.2. Advantages of Spatial and Temporal Averaging.....	9
49	2.3. Discrete Nature of Airborne Infection	10
50	2.4. Building Protection.....	11
51	3. Theory.....	14
52	3.1. Absolute (Mean) Infection Probabilities for Geographic Regions	14
53	3.2. Relative Infection and Disease Probability.....	16
54	3.3. Indoor Airborne Particle Dynamics.....	18
55	4. Results	20
56	4.1. Upper Bound on Absolute Infection Probability vs. Distance.....	22
57	4.2. Relative Infection and Disease Probability vs. Distance	26
58	4.3. Model Prediction – Outbreak Data Comparison	29
59	4.4. Relative Magnitude of Within Building and Downwind Infections	33
60	5. Discussion	34
61	5.1. Characterizing Airborne Disease Spread.....	34
62	5.2. Background Disease Incidence	35
63	5.3. Key Infectious Agent/Disease Characteristics	36
64	5.3.1. Number of Infectious Particles Emitted: <i>Total Particles Released</i>	36
65	5.3.2. Single Particle Infectivity: [Single Particle Infection Probability]	37
66	5.3.4. Loss of Particle Infectivity While Airborne: Affects [Normalized TSIAC].....	38
67	5.4. Potential Future Efforts	40
68	6. Acknowledgements	42
69	7. Attestations.....	43
70	8. References.....	44
71		

M Dillon and
C Dillon

Particle Model for Airborne Disease Transmission

72	Supplemental Material A: Airborne Disease Transmission Literature Review.....	66
73	Near Range (< 5 m)	66
74	Short Range (5 m to 50 m).....	67
75	Medium Range (50 m to 500 m).....	68
76	Long Range (500 m to 500 km).....	69
77	Continental and Global Range (> 500 km)	71
78	Supplemental Material B: Key Atmospheric Transport and Dispersion Modeling Concepts	73
79	Mean Air Flow in the Atmosphere.....	73
80	Atmospheric Turbulence	74
81	Atmospheric Dispersion Physics	75
82	Atmospheric Dispersion Models	77
83	Supplemental Material C: General Theory.....	80
84	Section Variables Definitions	81
85	Conceptual Model	86
86	Rare Exposures	86
87	Subgroups	87
88	Groups.....	88
89	Absolute Infection Probability for Geographic Regions.....	90
90	Relative Infection Probability for Geographic Regions	91
91	Extrapolating Regional Infection Probabilities	91
92	Relationship to Disease and Other Metrics	94
93	Supplemental Material D: Indoor Particle Dynamics	95
94	Section Variables Definitions	96
95	Building Protection Against Outdoor-Origin Particles.....	98
96	Normalized Indoor Exposures	102
97	Fraction of Indoor Airborne Particles Released to the Outdoors	104
98	Supplemental Material E: Outdoor Normalized Time and Space Integrated Air Concentrations.....	106
99	Supplemental Material F: Outbreak Model-Measurement Comparison	130
100	Supplemental Material G: Infection Estimates.....	131
101	Section Variables Definitions	131
102	Key Equation.....	132
103	Downwind Infections	133
104	Within Building Assumptions	134
105	Supplemental Material H: U.S. Coxiella burnetti Infection and Disease Estimates	135
106	Background	135
107	Human Infection and Disease Characteristics	136
108	Human Infection and Disease Prevalence	137
109	Acute Q Fever	138
110	Comparison to Prior Work	140
111		

1. Introduction

Particles of all types are routinely transported in the atmosphere, including infectious disease particles. The physics of the local airborne person-to-person inhalation pathway of infectious disease transmission was investigated by early Public Health investigators who were focused on human Tuberculosis and Measles outbreaks [1]–[3]. As documented in the **Supplemental Material A: Airborne Disease Transmission Literature Review**, airborne human, veterinary, and plant disease transmission and other bioaerosol transmission events naturally occur across a wide range of distance scales, from two meters up to and including inter-continental transmission. These multiscale transmission events include bacteria, viruses, and fungi.

The population disease burden caused by infectious agents that are transmitted through the air remains substantial as lower respiratory infections and Tuberculosis are the fourth and tenth, respectively, leading causes of death world-wide [4], [5]. We adopt here the classic definition of the airborne disease transmission pathway as the inhalation of $\leq 5 \mu\text{m}$ aerodynamic diameter (AD) infectious particles that have traveled airborne a distance of two or more meters.¹ We note that the airborne pathway can be the primary means of disease transmission or a secondary pathway when more than one disease transmission pathway is active, including the droplet ($> 5 \mu\text{m}$ AD particles) or contact pathways, e.g., [6], [7].

Physics- and biology- based atmospheric transport and dispersion models have been developed to predict airborne infectious disease transmissions, exposures, and the subsequent infection or disease incidence to various degrees of accuracy, e.g., [8]. However, important scientific gaps remain (discussed below). The aim of physics- and biology- based models is to determine (a) the extent of airborne disease spread (including identification of disease sources) and (b) disease outbreak control strategies. These remain key areas of research and this report extends current, physics- and biology- based modeling approaches. Specifically, we develop a new theory that provides methods and metrics to assess rare, but finite airborne infection incidence (single particle airborne disease transmission: dilute atmospheric exposures where an individual inhales either one infectious particle² or none at all).

¹ For readability, much of the focus of this paper is on $\leq 5 \mu\text{m}$ AD infectious particles. However, we note that the research presented in this paper is also relevant to larger particles.

² The infectious particle can, in theory, carry one or more infectious pathogens and be physically larger than the pathogen itself, see the 5.3.2. *Single Particle Infectivity* section.

M Dillon and
C Dillon

Particle Model for
Airborne Disease Transmission

140 In this report, we highlight implications for two distinct categories of diseases. In the first case,
141 the disease does not have significant individual to individual transmission ($R_0 < 1$).³ One
142 example is Q Fever in humans in which the source of infectious particles is outdoors (i.e.,
143 infected livestock and/or contaminated soil) and infections are not typically passed from one
144 human to another. In the second case, the disease has notable individual to individual
145 transmission ($R_0 > 1$) and so there may be the potential for rapid disease spread. We note that
146 both disease cases may have multiple disease transmission pathways, including direct contact,
147 indirect contact, or ingestion.
148

³ R_0 is the basic reproduction number and is defined as the expected number of secondary cases produced by a single (typical) infection in a totally susceptible population (dimensionless). If $R_0 < 1$, then an exposed person can become ill but typically does not infect others. If $R_0 > 1$, then further person-to-person infection spread may occur.

M Dillon and
C Dillon

Particle Model for
Airborne Disease Transmission

2. Physics- and Biology- Based Airborne Transmission Modeling

Airborne transmission of infectious disease from an infected host to a susceptible individual occurs in three phases: (a) the release of infectious particles into the air; (b) particle transport to, and the exposure of, downwind individuals; and (c) the infection of susceptible exposed individuals (receptors), see **Figure 1**. Physics and biology based models mathematically describe each of these three phases. They estimate the number and/or distribution of subsequent infections using previously determined principles combined with key particle, environmental, infectious organism, and receptor properties, see **Table 1**. This paper focuses on improvements for modeling the second and third phases.

Figure 1. Conceptual model of the airborne transmission pathway

M Dillon and
C Dillon

Particle Model for
Airborne Disease Transmission

Table 1. Key properties affecting the airborne disease transmission pathway

Particle Physical Properties	Particle number
	Particle size (aerodynamic diameter) and infectivity* as a function of (a) time, (b) the infectious agent and (c) environmental conditions (e.g., temperature, humidity, solar radiation)
Environmental Properties	Wind speed, Turbulence, Precipitation, Temperature,
	Humidity, Solar radiation, Terrain/Land Use, and Built Environment (for indoor exposures)
Infectious Agent Properties	Infectivity* as a function of (a) time and (b) particle, environmental, and receptor properties
	Pathogenicity (ability to cause disease)
Receptor (Host) Properties	Breathing rate as a function of the receptor and environmental properties (e.g., activity, temperature)
	Number of receptors (population)
	Factors affecting infection probability* Age, Gender, Nutrition, Health Status, Immune status

* The probability that an inhaled particle causes infection for a given receptor is affected by parameters in several columns. Specifically, it depends on a combination of particle, infectious agent, and receptor properties - each of which depends, in part, upon environmental properties.

2.1. Dilute Particle Considerations

If airborne particles are added to a small mass of air, the resulting particle concentration is, in many cases, dilute and the material's presence will not significantly affect the local atmosphere.⁴ Therefore the downwind transport and dilution (dispersion) of such material can be determined from environmental (meteorological + surface) considerations alone. Also, as a practical matter, dilute particles can be assumed to behave *independently* in the atmosphere, i.e., there is essentially no particle-to-particle interaction. Therefore, the downwind exposure associated with any release of dilute material is mathematically identical to the sum of the exposures associated with many independent "point" releases that occur at specific points in time and space. Thus, insights and model results derived for single particles released at a specific location and time can be combined to characterize the more complex cases, such as complex particle aerodynamic diameter distributions and/or time varying locations and release quantities.

2.2. Advantages of Spatial and Temporal Averaging

Physics-based models of atmospheric transport and dispersion simulate the effects of the physical processes which determine the air concentrations of infectious particles downwind of a release. All practical dispersion models resolve only a portion of the atmospheric motions and physical processes, typically the regional winds that transport particles downwind. The effects of the unresolved processes, such as turbulent eddies that dilute the airborne particulate cloud, are parameterized, often using empirical data. An important consequence is that model predictions can be much more accurate with predicting metrics that are spatially and/or temporally integrated (or averaged), see **Supplemental Material B: Key Atmospheric Transport and Dispersion Modeling Concepts**. This study uses the exposure integrated over a (a) a disc (circular area) and (b) along a circle arc both centered at the release point, see **Figure 2**. These exposure metrics also eliminate sensitivity to wind direction uncertainty, although we note that other uncertainties, such as wind speed, remain.⁵

⁴ The number of particles required to change the behavior of the local atmosphere depends on the (a) atmospheric volume of interest, (b) particle size and density, (c) release duration, and (d) ambient wind speed [9]. For context, assuming a light wind (1 m s^{-1}) and monodisperse particles as dense as water (1000 kg m^{-3}); a 1 m^3 release volume can contain at least 10^{16} $0.1 \text{ }\mu\text{m}$ diameter particles, 10^{13} $1 \text{ }\mu\text{m}$ diameter particles, or 10^{10} $10 \text{ }\mu\text{m}$ diameter particles without violating this assumption.

⁵ Standard wind measurements are typically only accurate to within 5 degrees [10]–[14]. Thus plume predictions based on such a single measurement may be offset by as much as a 1 km by the time the plume is 10 km downwind.

M Dillon and
C Dillon

Particle Model for
Airborne Disease Transmission

Figure 2. Illustration of airborne exposure (plume) integrated over a (left) a disc and (right) along a circle arc, both centered at the release point.

2.3. Discrete Nature of Airborne Infection

The research community understands that airborne, infectious agents are carried as or within discrete particles, either as individual viruses, prions, or microorganisms or as part of a larger particle which could contain more than one infectious agent. However, there has been limited attention, within the context of risk assessment, as to how the discrete, quantal nature of airborne particulate exposures affect downwind infection probabilities. This scientific gap is particularly notable for rare exposures - defined for the purposes of this paper as exposures where a typical individual inhales either one infectious particle or none at all, see **Supplemental Material C: General Theory**.

Historically, rare exposure infection probabilities have been estimated by (a) extrapolating population-mean dose-response models to “less-than-one” infectious agent exposures⁶ or (b) using “single hit” models. Population-mean dose-response models are often based on data from toxicology experiments that use multiple infectious agent exposures to extrapolate to single particle exposures. Single hit models assume that (a) the number of infectious agents inhaled by a given individual is a random number whose expected value equals the predicted exposure and (b) the likelihood of an individual inhaling an infectious organism is independent of the total number of infectious agents inhaled. Effectively each infectious agent inhaled is assumed to cause infection independently, although the overall infection probability can

⁶ “Less than one” exposures occur when in a mathematical model the expectation value of the individual exposure is less than one infectious agent.

M Dillon and
C Dillon

Particle Model for
Airborne Disease Transmission

depend on other factors, including exposure to other viruses or microorganisms [3], [15]–[19]. Recent work has extended single hit models to consider infectious agents randomly aggregating while in the environment, see [20], [21] and refs therein. However with the exception of a single theoretical treatment of a complex exposure distribution [19], we did not identify a prior approach that explicitly addresses a real-world situation in which (a) a distribution of infectious particles types is aerosolized, (b) the number of infectious agents present in each particle may scale with particle volume (i.e., is not random), and (c) environmental fate (and hence downwind exposures) vary by particle type (again is not random).

Separately, we note that the current physics-based airborne exposure models have been validated against measurements of high concentrations of airborne particulates (and gases). As such they do not explicitly consider the quantal nature of exposures inherent to rare exposures to particulate matter, i.e., the downwind individuals are exposed to either one or no particles. The theory developed later in the paper addresses this historical gap, see the **3. Theory** section.

2.4. Building Protection

Ideally, airborne infectious particle risks would be assessed at the location where the exposure takes place. It is generally acknowledged that buildings afford protection from outdoor airborne infection. However most current assessments of downwind exposures to airborne infectious particles only consider outdoor exposures and typically do not consider the degree to which buildings protect their occupants from such hazards. For example, in a recent review of existing pathogenic, bio-aerosol dispersion modeling literature; only two studies were included that consider the degree to which indoor exposures may differ from outdoor exposures and no general theory was discussed [8]. This gap is notable as (a) individuals spend about 85% of a typical day indoors [22]; (b) outdoor airborne biological particles have been proven to infiltrate indoors and be inhaled by building occupants, e.g., [23], [24]; and (c) the scientific and public health communities have long recognized the importance of the contribution of indoor exposures during disease outbreaks involving outdoor, airborne plumes of infectious particles. For example, outdoor-origin fungal pathogens such as *Aspergillus*, including *fumigatus* and *flavus*, and *Histoplasma capsulatum* are known pose a particularly severe hazard to indoor, immune compromised individuals and hospital facilities are engineered to minimize such concerns [25]–[29].

The degree to which building occupants are protected from outdoor, airborne, infectious particles is determined by (a) the building air change rate (the rate at which outdoor air passes through air handling systems, open windows and doors, and/or cracks in the building envelope) and (b) indoor particle dynamics (e.g., deposition, resuspension and rate at which infectious

M Dillon and
C Dillon

Particle Model for
Airborne Disease Transmission

257 agents lose infectivity), see **Supplemental Material D: Indoor Particle Dynamics**. We, and
258 collaborators, have recently developed a proof-of-concept method, Regional Shelter Analysis
259 (RSA), to (a) estimate the degree of protection US buildings provide against outdoor airborne
260 particulate hazards and (b) estimate total population exposures [30], [31]. **Figure 3** illustrates
261 the RSA method for calculating building protection-adjusted population impacts resulting from
262 an estimate of the outdoor hazard. The example shown is for an external gamma radiation
263 hazard. The process for inhalation exposures is similar. US building protection against
264 particulate hazards varies strongly, i.e., by orders of magnitude, with particle size and building
265 use (occupancy). For context, being inside a typical US residence is expected to reduce outdoor
266 exposures by a factor of 5 for 1 μm AD particles, a size typical of many individual bacteria [30].
267

M Dillon and
C Dillon

Particle Model for
Airborne Disease Transmission

Figure 3. Regional Shelter Analysis illustrative calculation (top panel) and summary (bottom panel). This schematic illustration uses an outdoor (external) radiation exposure and shelter quality (building protection) estimates. Potential applications and uses are listed.

Regional Shelter Analysis summary

- Incorporates shelter quality into existing assessment methods
- Applicable to
 - Nuclear, radiological, chemical, and biological acute and chronic hazards (e.g., outdoor particle air pollution, wildfire smoke)
 - External radiation and inhalation exposure (rad and non-rad) pathways
 - Spatial scales ranging from individual buildings to census tracts to entire countries
 - Capable of using multiple data sources
- Elements being integrated into operational models
 - US Department of Energy, NARAC
 - US Department of Defense, HPAC

Illustrative fallout protection

https://figshare.com/authors/Michael_Dillon/4116202

3. Theory

Theoretically, the total number of infections in a disease outbreak could be calculated by considering every exposed person. Computationally this approach is challenging to implement, due in part to the need to acquire high resolution input data such as individual exposures and responses to each exposure. To provide an alternative approach, we develop here infection probability prediction equations for (a) the number of airborne infections (and the absolute airborne infection probability) expected in a specific geographic region for both the general and the rare exposure cases (**Equations 1 and 2**) and (b) an equation that relates the relative probability of airborne infection across two regions (**Equation 3**). Note that these, and subsequent, equations can also be used directly without modification to estimate disease probability and other probabilities of interest. These equations are based on the atmospheric physics assumptions and considerations presented in the *2. Physics-and Biology- Based Airborne Transmission Modeling* section. **Supplemental Material C: General Theory** formally derives these equations and provides more detail, including theory that considers multiple particle types that have varying infectivity and environmental fates. **Supplemental Material D: Indoor Particle Dynamics** provides more detail on **Equations 5 to 7** which predict the degree to which buildings protect their occupants from outdoor airborne hazards; expected numbers of infections in the indoor environment from an indoor release; and the fraction of indoor, airborne, infectious particles that may exit a given building into the outdoor atmosphere.

3.1. Absolute (Mean) Infection Probabilities for Geographic Regions

Geographic regions, e.g., zip codes and census tracts, are often used when reporting epidemiological data and defining outbreak response zones, e.g., for quarantine and/or vaccination. In general, people within these geographic regions may have varying exposures and/or responses to a given exposure, e.g., individuals inside a building may receive a smaller exposure than those outside; immune compromised individuals may be more sensitive than a healthy person. To account for these considerations, we extend the previously developed Regional Shelter Analysis methodology [30], [31]. Specifically, we assign each group of people within a geographic region a linear scaling factor, termed *adjustment factor*, to account for both exposure and response variability.

For a given release, the total number of airborne infections in a region can be determined by **Equation 1**. **Equation 2** can be used when the (a) population density and adjustment factor are constant within a region, e.g., the geographic entity is a residential area, and (b) exposures are rare.

M Dillon and
C Dillon

Particle Model for
Airborne Disease Transmission

308 (Equation 1)

$$\begin{aligned} 309 \quad & [Airborne\ Infections](r_{source}, r) \\ 310 \quad & = [Absolute\ Airborne\ Infection\ Probability](r_{source}, r) \\ 311 \quad & \cdot [Population\ Density](r) \cdot [Area](r) \end{aligned}$$

312 (Equation 2)

$$\begin{aligned} 313 \quad & [Absolute\ Airborne\ Infection\ Probability](r_{source}, r) \approx \\ 314 \quad & \frac{\left([Total\ Particles\ Released] \cdot [Normalized\ TSIAC](r_{source}, r) \right)}{[Area](r)} \end{aligned}$$

315

316 where

317 r = a specific geographic region (dimensionless),

318 $[Absolute\ Airborne\ Infection\ Probability](r_{source}, r)$ = mean probability that a random individual in
319 region r becomes infected by inhaling an airborne particle emitted from region r_{source} .
320 (dimensionless),

321 $[Airborne\ Infections](r_{source}, r)$ = total number of people who become infected in region r by inhaling
322 infectious airborne particles emitted from region r_{source} . (people),

323 $[Area](r)$ = area of region r (m^2),

324 $[Infection\ Adjustment\ Factor](r)$ = linear scaling factor for region r that accounts for the deviation of
325 exposure and infection response from the reference exposure and infection response
326 (dimensionless),

327 $[Normalized\ TSIAC](r_{source}, r)$ = particle air concentration integrated over region r and the passage of the
328 airborne infectious plume assuming that a single particle has been released to the air from source
329 region r_{source} . TSIAC = time and space integrated air concentration. ($s\ m^{-1}$),

330 $[Population\ Density](r)$ = population density in region r (people m^{-2}),

331 $[Single\ Particle\ Infection\ Probability]_{ref}$ = reference probability that an individual will become infected
332 after being exposed to a single particle. This term includes the individual's breathing rate. ($m^3\ s^{-1}$
333 $particle^{-1}$), and

334 $[Total\ Particles\ Released]$ = total number of particles released into the atmosphere (particles).

M Dillon and
C Dillon

Particle Model for
Airborne Disease Transmission

3.2. Relative Infection and Disease Probability

Although disease outbreak assessments are often based on absolute risks, key outbreak response parameters may not be known. In this setting, relative infection probability metrics can be useful. **Equation 3** can also be used to model either relative probabilities of infection or disease. When the source of airborne particles and, separately, the impacted regions are similar (e.g., r and r_{ref} are both residential areas and $r_{new\ source}$ and $r_{ref\ source}$ are both office areas), **Equation 3** provides the theoretically expected ratio of regional infection probabilities. *Note that Equation 3 does not require any information on the release amount per person, the infectivity of individual particles, or the adjustment factor (variation of exposure and population sensitivity).* When there is a single source region (i.e., $r_{new\ source} = r_{ref\ source}$), **Equation 3** allows the infection probability of different downwind regions to be compared. When a clear case of region-to-region airborne disease transmission has been identified, **Equation 3** could be used to estimate the infection (or disease) rates for new sources and receptor regions. *We note that this relative infection/disease probability metric is distinct in form from the traditional “relative risk” metric which is defined as the ratio of infection (or disease) incidence between exposed and baseline (ideally non-exposed) populations.*

(Equation 3)

$$\begin{aligned} [Relative\ Infection\ Probability](r) &= [Relative\ Disease\ Probability](r) \\ &= \frac{[Absolute\ Airborne\ Infection\ Probability](r_{new\ source}, r)}{[Absolute\ Airborne\ Infection\ Probability](r_{ref\ source}, r_{ref})} \\ &= \left(\frac{[Normalized\ TSIAC](r_{new\ source}, r)}{[Normalized\ TSIAC](r_{ref\ source}, r_{ref})} \right) \cdot \left(\frac{[Area](r_{ref})}{[Area](r)} \right) \\ &\quad \cdot \left(\frac{[Infectious\ People](r_{new\ source})}{[Infectious\ People](r_{ref\ source})} \right) \end{aligned}$$

where

$[Infectious\ People](r_{source})$ = number of people emitting infectious particles in source region r_{source} .
(people),

$[Relative\ Disease\ Probability](r)$ = ratio of the region r disease probability to reference region r_{ref} disease probability. (dimensionless), and

$[Relative\ Infection\ Probability](r)$ = ratio of the region r infection probability to reference region r_{ref} infection probability. (dimensionless).

M Dillon and
C Dillon

Particle Model for
Airborne Disease Transmission

The equations presented in the prior sections and derived in **Supplemental Material C: General Theory** focus on infection probability. However, not all infections result in disease. In addition, other metrics, such as the probability of needing medical resources or economic impact, may also be of interest. It is straightforward to adapt the prior equations to any metric in which the probability of an individual's response to a single particle exposure can be calculated by multiplying (a) a reference response probability by (b) a linear scaling factor (i.e., a metric specific adjustment factor). While the scaling factor may take any value and may vary by individual, the value for a specific individual cannot change. The adjustment factors can vary by metric. When these conditions are met, the relative incidence, i.e., **Equation 3**, of multiple metrics of interest, such as infection and disease, are the same. The **Equation 3** disease spread estimates could also be used to assess importance of other disease transmission pathways for the new receptor region, see **Equations 1** and **4**.

(Equation 4)

$$[NonAirborne\ Infections](r) = [Total\ Infections](r) - [Airborne\ Infections](r)$$

where

$[NonAirborne\ Infections](r)$ = number of infected individuals in region r that were infected by the transmission pathways OTHER than airborne. (people), and

$[Total\ Infections](r)$ = number of infected individuals in region r . (people).

M Dillon and
C Dillon

Particle Model for
Airborne Disease Transmission

3.3. Indoor Airborne Particle Dynamics

Infectious airborne particles can be emitted within a building. Once airborne, these particles have the potential, among other fates, to (a) be inhaled and infect people within the building or (b) exit the building, enter the outdoor atmosphere, and be transported downwind. To provide context for later discussion, we have extended prior work [30] and derived **Equations 5 to 7**, which estimate key parameters.⁷ **Supplemental Material D: Indoor Particle Dynamics** derives these, and other, equations. These equations do not assume, but are compatible with, rare (single particle) exposures.

$$[Building Protection Factor] = \frac{(\lambda_{out} + \lambda_{internal})}{\lambda_{in}} \quad \text{(Equation 5)}$$

$$[Normalized TSIAC]_{indoor} = \frac{1}{[Room Height] \cdot (\lambda_{out} + \lambda_{internal})} \quad \text{(Equation 6)}$$

$$[Building Exit Fraction] = \frac{\lambda_{out} \cdot L_{out}}{(\lambda_{out} + \lambda_{internal})} \quad \text{(Equation 7)}$$

⁷ These equations assume that the air within the building is well mixed. As the mixing process takes time and depends on the room/building/population details, exposures (and infection probability) may be higher in the room occupied by an infected individual. We note that within room spread is an area of active research, e.g., [32], but the well-mixed assumption has also been often, but not always, been employed by prior modeling studies that examined indoor bioaerosol dynamics and disease transmission, e.g., [6], [7], [33], [34], and references therein. For context, the mixing time constants for both buoyant and mechanical flow conditions in laboratory studies of room mixing are of order 10 min to < 1 h [35], [36].

M Dillon and
C Dillon

Particle Model for
Airborne Disease Transmission

399 where

400

401 λ_{in} = the rate at which outdoor airborne particles enter the building – typically via infiltration or ventilation.

402 Includes losses that occur during transport from outdoor to indoor. (h^{-1}),

403 $\lambda_{internal}$ = the rate at which indoor particles are lost within the building. This term includes both physical

404 losses, such as deposition to indoor surfaces, and infectivity losses while the particle is airborne (h^{-1}),

405 λ_{out} = the rate at which indoor particles exit the building. (h^{-1}),

406 [*Building Exit Fraction*] = fraction of material released within a building that exits the building and enters

407 the outdoor atmosphere. (no units),

408 [*Building Protection Factor*] = ratio of the outdoor to indoor exposure. Similar to sunscreen and personal

409 protective respirator rating systems, higher protection factor values indicate lower exposures and

410 thus increased protection. (protection factor),

411 $L_{out}(\text{particle size})$ = the fraction of indoor particles lost while exiting the building. (dimensionless),

412 [*Normalized TSIAC*]_{indoor} = indoor time and space integrated air concentration assuming a single particle

413 is released. (s m^{-1}), and

414 [*Room Height*] = height of building living space. (m).

415

4. Results

This section applies the previously derived theory to estimate regional-level metric values. First, upper bound estimates are provided for both individual person level and regional level infection probabilities for locations downwind. These results assume that infectious particles are emitted from a single, non-moving source.⁸ Second, the relative infection and disease probabilities as a function of downwind distances are provided. The modeling examples provided here (a) assume 1 μm AD particles and no airborne loss of infectivity and (b) consider a wide range of common weather conditions.⁹ Other scenarios, including those with varying particle and environmental parameters, are briefly discussed for context. Third, the relative importance of within building and downwind (both indoors and outdoors) infections is illustrated.

In this section we also compare the modeled predictions for relative infection probabilities (**Equation 3**), with existing observational data from disease outbreaks which have a major airborne transmission pathway. This is not a formal theory validation but is a useful initial assessment of theory predictions compared to data from real-world events. As the primary data collected by the investigators were not available, existing data were abstracted from journal article tables and figures, see **Supplemental Material F: Outbreak Model-Measurement Comparison**. The scope and detail of the published observational data varied between studies which limited the comparisons. In general, the outbreak disease case ascertainment method was notified clinical cases (passive surveillance) and so a fraction of diagnosed cases and any undiagnosed cases were missed. Detailed sub-regional population demographics were not presented, and so adjusted age-specific disease incidence rates could not be estimated. Disease-specific disease incidence rates were not available in some studies. Also, true background disease incidence rates were not reported. Multiple transmission pathways are common in infectious diseases. Most of these studies evaluated that possibility, but one study did not [37].

All studies showed a clear pattern of high disease incidence rates close to an exposure source with a rapid decrease in disease incidence with increasing distance thereafter. **Figure 4** demonstrates this behavior using the Q Fever data. This attack rates shown in **Figure 4** likely underestimate the actual values, see the 5.2. *Background Disease Incidence* section below.

⁸ This is an assumption used to simplify the analysis presented in this report. Methodology exists for modeling mobile populations that is compatible with RSA analysis, see the 5.4 *Potential Future Efforts* section and reference [31].

⁹ 1 μm AD particles are chosen here for theoretical modeling purposes. However, this particle size is characteristic of many infectious bacterial cells. Furthermore, infectious agents, including viruses, may be carried on, or in, larger particles comprised of other material such as respiratory fluids, see the 5.3.2. *Single Particle Infectivity* section.

M Dillon and
C Dillon

Particle Model for
Airborne Disease Transmission

Figure 4. Observed Q Fever attack rate as a function of distance as published in airborne infectious disease outbreak studies. The distance downwind corresponds to the radial distance from the source to the center of a circular band (torus) centered on the source. The band width varies with each point and ranges from 50 m to 5 km. The legend shows the study location, outbreak year, and infectious agent (Q = Q Fever (*Coxiella burnetii*)).

4.1. Upper Bound on Absolute Infection Probability vs. Distance

The top panels in **Figure 5(a-b)** show the predicted upper bound on the absolute airborne infection probability for each particle released to the outdoor atmosphere as integrated (a) over a series of discs and (b) along a series of circle arcs (see **Figure 2**) at distances between 50 m and 20 km from the release point. The bottom panels show the corresponding number of infections in an urban area (assuming 0.01 people m⁻²) for each airborne particle released. For context, about 30% of the New York State, US 2000 Census Tracts have population densities $\geq$ 0.01 people m⁻².

The results shown in **Figure 5** were derived from **Equations 1 and 2** and **Table E2** from **Supplemental Material E: Outdoor Normalized Time and Space Integrated Air Concentrations**. We present here the results for one important class of possible weather scenarios, where constant light, moderate, and strong winds (1, 4.5, and 10 m s⁻¹, respectively) would transport an airborne particle 1 km downwind in about 17, 4, and 2 min, respectively.¹⁰ Thus these results are reasonable when losses are not significant on the timescale of minutes to hours.¹¹

The absolute infection probability varies over several orders of magnitude and decreases rapidly with distance. Broadly speaking, the infection probability increases with (i) decreasing wind speed and (ii) increasing atmospheric stability (increasing stability corresponds to decreasing rates at which material dilutes within the broader atmosphere). The actual infection probability will be smaller if not all inhaled particles cause infections and/or the individual is indoors or otherwise protected. In the latter case, downwind infection probability estimates can be determined by dividing the values shown in **Figure 5** by a building protection factor, e.g., [30]. We note that the expected number of infections linearly scales with both the total number of particles released and the population density.

When the airborne loss rate is significant on the timescale of minutes, e.g., 10 h⁻¹, the modeled relative infection incidence increases with wind speed at distances greater than 1 km, see **Figure 6**.

¹⁰ This transport timescale calculation is intended for illustrative purposes as it does not consider the effects of atmospheric turbulence (e.g., plume dispersion) nor the known increase of wind speed with height above the earth's surface.

¹¹ For context, respirable size (1 to 5 μ m AD) particle deposition losses are often limited (approximately 0.1 h⁻¹ or less) on these scales. Deposition rates depends on particle size, atmospheric conditions, and surface characteristics. For this illustrative calculation, we have assumed (a) a 1 cm s⁻¹ deposition velocity (the speed at which the particle travels to a surface and is lost) [38], (b) a 300 m boundary layer height (the height of the air near the surface that is well mixed – this value corresponds to stable, nighttime conditions), and (c) that the atmospheric boundary layer is a well-mixed system and so the deposition loss rate = deposition velocity / boundary layer height [39].

M Dillon and
C Dillon

Particle Model for
Airborne Disease Transmission

Figure 5. Predicted infection probabilities and infections by distance, wind speed and atmospheric stability for a single airborne particle with no airborne loss of infectivity. Legend box indicates Pasquill-Gifford-Turner atmospheric stability class (A to F) and the 10 m agl wind speed. Individual person infection probability (top panels) is dimensionless. Urban area infections (bottom panels) assume a uniform population density of 0.01 people m^{-2} and has dimensions of people (disc) or people m^{-1} (arc).

Figure 5a. Infection Probabilities and Urban Infections Within a Disc Centered on the Release

M Dillon and
C Dillon

Particle Model for
Airborne Disease Transmission

**Figure 5b. Infection Probabilities and Urban Infections
Along an Arc Centered on the Release**

486

487

M Dillon and
C Dillon

Particle Model for
Airborne Disease Transmission

Figure 6. Predicted infection probabilities and infections by distance, wind speed and atmospheric stability for a single airborne particle with a 10 h^{-1} airborne loss of infectivity. Legend box indicates Pasquill-Gifford-Turner atmospheric stability class (A to F) and the 10 m agl wind speed. Individual person infection probability (top panels) is dimensionless. Urban area infections (bottom panels) assume a uniform population density of $0.01 \text{ people m}^{-2}$ and has dimensions of people (disc) or people m^{-1} (arc).

Figure 6. Infection Probabilities and Urban Infections Along an Arc Centered on the Release

4.2. Relative Infection and Disease Probability vs. Distance

Figure 7a shows the corresponding relative infection (and disease) probabilities as calculated by **Equation 3** and the upper bound absolute infection probability curves shown in **Figure 5** as integrated over (top panel) a disc and (bottom panel) along a circle arc, both being centered at the common release point ($r_{new\ source} = r_{ref\ source}$). While the relative infection (and disease) probabilities again decrease rapidly with distance, there is minimal variation with wind speed or atmospheric stability over the range of atmospheric conditions considered.¹² Hence the relative infection probability metric may be particularly valuable when there is incomplete or entirely lacking information on meteorological conditions, but (a) atmospheric conditions are known to not be materially changing during the time it takes for the infectious particles to travel from the source to the receptor and (b) the particle infectivity is not lost rapidly in the atmosphere. *This relationship is expected to hold even when the exposed population has varying sensitivity to the infecting particle and/or are located inside buildings affording different degrees of protection as long as the distributions of both the infection sensitivity and building protection are similar in both exposure regions.*

When the airborne loss rate is significant on the timescale of minutes, e.g., $10\ h^{-1}$, the modeled relative infection incidence for circle arcs increases with wind speed, see **Figure 7b**. Notably, the slope of $\log_{10}(\text{distance from source})$ vs. $\log_{10}(\text{relative infection rate})$ is smaller than the no ($0\ h^{-1}$) airborne loss rate case. Due to the rapid decrease in airborne infection probability with distance, the corresponding plots for relative infection incidence for a disc are nearly identical to that shown in **Figure 7a**.

¹² The equations shown in **Figure 7** are based on the mean of the individual slope and intercept for each weather case ($r^2 > 0.99$ for all cases). The individual values varied less than 15% from the mean values provided.

M Dillon and
C Dillon

Particle Model for
Airborne Disease Transmission

Figure 7. Predicted relative infection probabilities by distance, wind speed and atmospheric stability for a single airborne particle with (a) 0 h^{-1} and (b) 10 h^{-1} airborne infectivity loss rates. Legend box indicates Pasquill-Gifford-Turner atmospheric stability class (A to F) and the 10 m agl wind speed. Relative infection probability is dimensionless.

Figure 7a. Relative Infection Probabilities as a Function of Distance from Release

M Dillon and
C Dillon

Particle Model for
Airborne Disease Transmission

**Figure 7b. Relative Infection Probabilities
as a Function of Distance from Release**

523

524

4.3. Model Prediction – Outbreak Data Comparison

In this section, we compare previously published, major airborne outbreak data against relative probability values calculated using **Equation 3**. First we use data from Q Fever (*Coxiella burnetti*) [37], [40]–[42], Legionnaire’s disease (*Legionella pneumophila*) [43], [44], and Valley Fever (*Coccidioides immitis*) [45], [46] outbreaks. We note that these human pathogens have reproductive number (R_0) values less than 1 (Case 1 diseases) and so they have little or no potential for person-to-person transmission, simplifying the airborne disease modeling.¹³ Subsequently we use results derived from veterinary disease outbreak studies of Highly Pathogenic Avian influenza (HPAI) [47]–[49], Foot and Mouth Disease (FMD) [50], [51], and Classical Swine Fever (CSF) [52]. These diseases have reproductive numbers (R_0) greater than 1 (Case 2 diseases) and so have the potential for secondary epidemic spread (they also are known to have multiple disease transmission pathways). The modeled values were determined using **Equation 3** and the neutral (D) stability, moderate wind (4.5 m s^{-1} at 10 m agl) modeling results presented in **Supplemental Material E: Outdoor Normalized Time and Space Integrated Air Concentrations**. Other than the source location, definition of the base and reference areas, and the assumption of a single source ($r_{\text{new source}} = r_{\text{ref source}}$), no disease or outbreak specific information was used in the modelling.

Figure 8 compares the predicted model relative disease probabilities to the observed relative incidence of clinical disease reported for Q Fever, Legionnaire’s disease, and Valley Fever outbreaks. The modeled and measured values are reasonably well correlated, $r^2 = 0.86$, and close to the 1:1 line.¹⁴ The base and reference areas vary by comparison point and are specified in **Supplemental Material F: Outbreak Model-Measurement Comparison**. Some data points from these studies were not used either due to (a) the low number of observed disease cases¹⁵ or (b) because they were adjacent to the source and did not exhibit the expected decrease in disease rate with distance. The specific data points used and omitted are indicated in the **Supplemental Material F: Outbreak Model-Measurement Comparison**.

¹³ This case is also applicable to initial stage of epidemic that is later propagated by secondary transmission.

¹⁴ A linear regression (not shown) of the data presented in **Figure 8** yields $\log_{10}(\text{Modeled Relative Disease Probability}) = 1.05 (\pm 0.08) * \log_{10}(\text{Observed Relative Disease Incidence}) - 0.10 (\pm 0.05)$. A linear regression with all available data reduces the correlation, $r^2 = 0.53$, but yields a similar line, $\log_{10}(\text{Modeled Relative Disease Probability}) = 0.85 (\pm 0.13) * \log_{10}(\text{Observed Relative Disease Incidence}) - 0.02 (\pm 0.09)$. The provided parameter uncertainties are $\pm 1\sigma$.

¹⁵ As a practical matter, the population within the region of interest may be low and so the corresponding disease incidence rates may be unreliable.

M Dillon and
C Dillon

Particle Model for
Airborne Disease Transmission

Figure 8. Modeled Relative Disease Probability Compared to Observed Relative Disease Incidence as published in airborne infectious disease outbreak studies. The dashed line is the 1:1 line which indicates perfect agreement. The legend box shows the study location, outbreak year, and infectious agent (Q = Q Fever (*Coxiella burnetii*); L = Legionnaire's Disease (*Legionella*); C = Valley Fever (*Coccidioidomycosis*)).

M Dillon and
C Dillon

Particle Model for
Airborne Disease Transmission

Table 2 demonstrates that our prediction¹⁶ of the slope of $\log_{10}(\text{distance from source})$ vs. $\log_{10}(\text{relative infection rate}) \leq -2$ is consistent with both (a) the previously discussed studies and (b) as previously reported for Highly Pathogenic Avian influenza and Foot and Mouth Disease outbreaks. We note that Classical Swine Fever and Valley Fever do not have sufficient data to formally assess this statement, but the reported values are $\pm 25\%$ of the predicted values.

For the HPAI, FMD, and CSF cases, the infection rate as a function of distance was determined by the original authors from a set of base equations whose parameter values were determined from the timing of the discovery of each specific disease case, the locations of known infected farms, assumptions about disease incubation periods, the time from infection until detection, certain farm attributes, and (for some studies) varying sensitivity to a given infectious exposure. In contrast to the current analysis, the analyses presented in those studies did not model the physics of disease transmission mechanisms, nor do they assume airborne transmission. In these outbreaks, the infection probability (transmission kernel) was demonstrated to be relatively constant over an initial, short-range geographic extent and then decrease with distance. The latter decrease in infection probability (disease incidence rate) with distance is equivalent to the slope in equation shown in lower panels of both **Figure 7(a-b)**.¹⁷

The observed FMD disease rate decreases notably faster than that demonstrated in our baseline results, which assume no atmospheric loss of infectivity. The FMD results are, however, more consistent with modeling that includes infectivity losses that are significant on the timescale of the plume transport and we note that FMD virus is in fact known to lose infectivity in the atmosphere [53].

¹⁶ We speculate, but have not proven, that this result is related to the well-known fact that away from the source, airborne plume dispersion is proportional to $(\text{distance})^{1/2}$, see **Supplemental Material B: Key Atmospheric Transport and Dispersion Modeling Concepts**. If true, then we would expect that the slope of $\log_{10}(\text{distance from source})$ vs. $\log_{10}(\text{relative infection rate})$ would be closer to -1 for impacts that take place close to the source, where dispersion eddies are well-correlated and the airborne plume dispersion is proportional to distance.

¹⁷ (a) This statement is true in the mathematical limit that the “base” and “reference” distance in the prior study equations are large relative to the constant infectivity distance, (b) The modeling presented in this study is limited to less than 20 km from the source.

M Dillon and
C Dillon

Particle Model for
Airborne Disease Transmission

Table 2. Summary of decrease in relative infectivity (or disease) with distance for selected studies.

Outbreak	Decrease in Relative Infectivity (or Disease) Incidence with Distance	Uncertainty / Variability	Reference
model prediction for 1 μm aerodynamic diameter particles and no atmospheric losses			
n/a	-1.9	-1.7 to -1.9 ^a	(this study)
analysis of prior studies shown in Figure 8^b			
<i>Q Fever (Coxiella burnetii)</i>			
Netherlands 2008	-2.2	-1.8 to -2.5 ^c	[40]
W. Midlands 1989	-1.5	-0.9 to -2.0 ^c	[42]
Germany 2005	-1.4	-0.17 to -2.7 ^c	[37]
<i>Legionnaire's Disease (Legionella)</i>			
Norway 2005	-1.5	-1.3 to -1.8 ^c	[43]
France 2003	-0.7	n/a	[44]
<i>Valley Fever (Coccidioidomycosis)</i>			
Simi Valley 1994	-1.4	n/a	[45], [46]
other prior studies^d			
<i>Highly Pathogenic Avian Influenza (HPAI)</i>			
Netherlands 2003	-2.1	-1.8 to -2.4 ^c	[47]
Minnesota 2015 (first wave)	-2.4	-1.7 to -3.7 ^c	[48]
Italy 2000	-2.1	-1.9 to -2.3 ^c	[49] (reported in [48])
<i>Foot and Mouth Disease (FMD)</i>			
Japan 2010	-2.5	n/a	[50]
Great Britain 2001 (conditioned on Feb 23 data)	-2.7	-2.6 to -2.8 ^c	[51]
<i>Classical Swine Fever (CSF)</i>			
Netherlands 1997/1998	-2.2	n/a	[52]

^a range modeled

^b slope of $\log_{10}(\text{distance in m})$ vs. $\log_{10}(\text{relative disease rate})$ calculated for this study

^c 95% Confidence Interval

^d as reported in referenced study

4.4. Relative Magnitude of Within Building and Downwind Infections

Physical science considerations suggest that some fraction of airborne indoor particles will exit buildings. For example, we predict that, on average, about 35% of the airborne, 0 hr⁻¹ infectivity loss rate, 1 µm particles in US single family homes will be released to the outdoor atmosphere, see **Supplemental Material D: Indoor Particle Dynamics** and [30].¹⁸ Indeed under some conditions, infections due to airborne transmission could result in similar numbers of people being infected downwind than in the same house as an infected individual – see the example provided in **Supplemental Material G: Infection Estimates**. When the regional population density is notably greater than 0.01 people m⁻², more people may be infected downwind than within the source building. We note that (a) not all diseases are capable of longer-distance downwind transmission, see 5.3. *Key Infectious Agent/Disease Characteristics* section, (b) other disease transmission pathways may substantially increase the probability of being infected while sharing the same house as an infected individual, (c) downwind individuals may be indoors, and (d) even for the airborne transmission pathway, the “per-person” infection probability is higher within a given building than it is downwind.

Building operation changes could alter the absolute and relative probability of source building and downwind infections. For example, actions that increase the indoor/outdoor air change rates ($\lambda_{out}, \lambda_{in}$), such as increasing the ventilation, would (a) decrease indoor exposures within the source building, (b) increase the number of infectious particles emitted to the greater atmosphere, and (c) decrease the protection downwind buildings provide their occupants. In contrast, actions that increase the within building loss rates ($\lambda_{internal}$), potentially including replacement of existing furnace filters with higher efficiency filters, have the potential to reduce exposures in both the source and downwind buildings.

¹⁸ This fraction is expected to vary with particle size, airborne infectivity loss rate, and building type.

5. Discussion

5.1. Characterizing Airborne Disease Spread

In a disease outbreak situation, it may be necessary to establish whether airborne disease transmission is occurring. Laboratory studies to identify the suspect pathogen and the known pathogen characteristics (see the 5.3. *Key Infectious Agent/Disease Characteristics* section above) are valuable in this regard. Epidemiological factors may indicate a spatio-temporal signal consistent with airborne transmission, specifically (a) new infections that have no contact with a known infectious individual, (b) correlation between new infections and key weather conditions, and (c) the presence of disease “sparks” outside the regions of known infection. This work suggests an additional method, where the geographic distribution of observed disease cases agrees with that predicted by **Equation 3**, i.e., $\log_{10}(\text{distance from source})$ vs. $\log_{10}(\text{disease rate})$ is linear with a slope ≤ -2 . Comparison to prior outbreak data suggests that this airborne transmission signal may be readily apparent, especially in cases where there is a single emission source. However, we note that it could be (a) mimicked by other infection transmission pathways if they are also correlated with distance from the source, (b) obscured by other disease transmission pathways, and (c) challenging to identify when there are multiple, geographically separate emission source regions. However, other disease transmission pathway(s) should be considered when the **Equation 3** predicted signal is absent.

The theory and modeling presented in this paper define the single particle airborne disease transmission kernel. This kernel corresponds to the set of lower probability, longer-distance airborne transmission events. These could contribute to large scale disease spread by “sparking” unexpected disease outbreaks distant from an emission source. The impacts of these longer-distance transmissions can be high for diseases that can cause many secondary infections (i.e., Case 2 diseases). In the plant biology and biosafety literature, it is well understood that these low probability, long distance (100’s of km) spread events do occur and are a primary mechanism of long-term species colonization of new environments and plant pathogen spread [54]–[57]. Indeed, unexpected long-distance disease sparks are a particularly well-documented problem in Foot and Mouth Disease of ruminants, where prior investigators have noted “Airborne spread is the most important mechanism of uncontrollable [disease] spread and although this is not a common event, when it occurs the speed and extent of spread can be spectacular” [58].

5.2. Background Disease Incidence

Due to the predicted finite, but characteristically low, individual-person infection probability rates in the general population, airborne diseases that present similarly to other common, non-airborne diseases may be prone to being under diagnosed and under reported. While an individual event may not affect many people, the cumulative impact of routine, small-scale events could pose a significant health burden. More accurately defining the airborne disease burden may be important since with appropriately targeted programs, there is a potential to reduce the currently existing US population airborne disease burden.

As an illustration, Q Fever is a disease with a well-established airborne transmission pathway and disease control measures exist [59]. Q Fever is often considered a rare disease; however, it is known that Q Fever cases are significantly underreported even though it is a US nationally notifiable disease with mandatory reporting in most states [60], [61]. US nationally representative data from 2003 to 2004 suggest that the overall adult population prevalence of acute, recent, and chronic *Coxiella* infections is 6 million people, 3% of the general US population [62]. Further analysis of this data indicates the prevalence of Acute Q Fever (*Coxiella burnetii*) infections may be approximately 2 million people, see **Supplemental Material H: U.S. *Coxiella burnetii* Infection and Disease Estimates**.¹⁹ For comparison, during this time period there were 70 Q Fever cases in the national reporting system [64], [65] and in 2017 there were 153 acute and 40 chronic Q Fever cases reported in the US [66]. Disease underreporting rates are similar for other major airborne disease mentioned here. For example, among US hospitalized persons with pneumonia, Legionnaire's Disease is ten times more common than currently being diagnosed [67].

Accurately estimating background disease rates is also an important step in investigating epidemic outbreaks as these are needed to produce accurate absolute outbreak incidence estimates and relative risks. We note that true population-based background incidence and prevalence rates are unavailable for most diseases.²⁰ This literature gap is a practical matter as analysts often arbitrarily choose the lowest observed incidence rates at a location adjacent to the main body of outbreak cases as a background reference rate. However, as seen above, infections at these distances might be due to long-distance airborne transmission as this work suggests that once an infectious particle is airborne, there is a non-zero probability of infections downwind. Misclassification of background disease rates could result in inaccurate (a)

¹⁹ Direct contact and vectors (ticks) are also known to transmit *Coxiella* infections and so these estimates may not be solely due to airborne transmission [61], [63].

²⁰ A notable exception is focused vaccine safety studies which perform population-based assessments of background prevalence of rare diseases as a baseline to compare against rare adverse vaccine events, e.g., [68].

M Dillon and
C Dillon

Particle Model for
Airborne Disease Transmission

estimation of the true spatial extent of an outbreak and (b) dose-response modeling [69]. There is also risk of undiagnosed cases and secondary disease spread.

5.3. Key Infectious Agent/Disease Characteristics

Only select infectious agents can transmit disease via inhalation of a single particle, particularly over longer (>5 m) distances. Based on **Equation 2**, the key infectious agent/disease characteristics that determine the likelihood of airborne transmission are (a) the number of infectious particles emitted, (b) the degree of infectivity of individual particles, and (c) the loss of particle infectivity while airborne. **Table 3** summarizes these characteristics.

Table 3. Summary of Factors Relevant to Single Particle Airborne Disease Transmission

The number of infectious airborne particles emitted must be comparable to, or larger than, the number required to expose a downwind individual.

A single particle must carry sufficient infectious material to cause disease when inhaled.

Airborne transport must occur rapidly enough so that enough infectious particles are present downwind. This can happen in one of two ways.

- (1) Airborne infectivity losses could be negligible.
- (2) Infectious particles are transported fast enough so that airborne losses are limited.

5.3.1. Number of Infectious Particles Emitted: [*Total Particles Released*]

With respect to Case 2 ($R_0 > 1$) human diseases, human-origin particles can comprise a significant fraction of indoor airborne particles, e.g., [70], [71], and ill individuals are known to emit infectious particles through coughing, sneezing, breathing, and/or shedding of infected skin or mucosal cells [71]–[74]. While it is challenging to develop reliable estimates of the number of infectious particles emitted by an ill individual, working estimates of total human respirable (1 to 5 μm AD) particle emissions are available from published studies. For context, up to 10^6 airborne particles can be emitted per sneeze (although there is some debate on the fraction of these particles that are respirable) [75], [76]; 10^3 to 10^5 respirable diameter particles are emitted both in a cough and for short (15 to 30 minute) periods of breathing and talking [33], [73], [77]–[80]; and 10^7 skin cells are shed per day (of which a fraction become airborne respirable particles) [53], [81]. We note that sick individuals may emit more particles than healthy individuals and some individuals can emit an order of magnitude or more particles than

M Dillon and
C Dillon

Particle Model for
Airborne Disease Transmission

the average person, e.g., super-spreaders [77], [82]. For context, we estimate 10^4 to 10^6 environmentally stable infectious particles emitted indoors are required to infect one downwind person in an urban area ($0.01 \text{ people m}^{-2}$).²¹

5.3.2. Single Particle Infectivity: [Single Particle Infection Probability]

Individual particles need to carry enough infectious material to cause disease. For some disease-causing infectious agents, this is a given as they possess a very low infectious inhalation dose. One example is *Coxiella burnetii*, which causes Q Fever, where a single bacterium can potentially cause infection in humans [15], [83].²² For other infectious agents, multiple individual agents are required for infection. Theoretically, the required number of infectious agents may be transported on the surface of, or within, larger carrier particles.²³ From physical considerations alone, approximately 100 $1 \mu\text{m}$ AD infectious agents (a common bacteria size) could fit within a single $5 \mu\text{m}$ AD particle.²⁴ For smaller agents, such as viruses, the number of agents in a carrier particle could be much larger.

²¹ **Figure 5a** suggests that the outdoor release of 10^3 to 10^5 particles would infect a downwind outdoor individual. A factor of 10x reduction is added to account for both (a) the fraction of particles released indoors that exit the building and enter the outdoor atmosphere and (b) protection that downwind buildings protect their occupancy, see **Supplemental Material G: Infection Estimates**.

²² The dose required to infect 50% of the human subjects is 1.18 bacteria (95% CI: 0.76 to 40.2).

²³ Bacteria have the capacity to bind to a wide variety of surfaces and particles and depending on the vehicle, multiple bacteria can become airborne, including on the surface of human skin cells, e.g., [84]. Furthermore, viruses and bacteria such as Tuberculosis, *Coxiella burnetii*, *Legionella Pneumophila*, *Chlamydia pneumoniae* and others are intracellular pathogens, i.e., they infect host hosts by penetrating within cells where they reside and multiply [85]. Thus, there is the potential for multiple pathogens to be present in a single particle when the infected cells are exhaled (or exfoliated) as airborne particles [86]. We are unaware of a field experiment demonstrating multiple infectious agents present on a single airborne particle, no doubt due to the technical challenges involved [87]. However, this characteristic has been demonstrated in the laboratory, e.g., [88].

²⁴ (1) This 0th order estimate is based on volume considerations and assumes a spherical geometry. (2) the number of agents actually present in a particle will also depend on other factors and can be much smaller.

5.3.4. Loss of Particle Infectivity While Airborne: Affects [Normalized TSIAC]

Some infectious agents – including important human pathogens and economically important plant disease pathogens – are environmentally hardy and are known to readily transmit disease over long distances - causing significant disease outbreaks [57], [89]–[95]. However, other agents, including many human and veterinary pathogens, are more fragile and their potential for long-distance airborne disease transmission is more controversial. For some of these pathogens, the rate at which infectivity is lost in the atmosphere can be high and depends, in part, on the specific virus or microorganism and strain, microbial state (e.g., vegetative cell vs. spore), environmental conditions (e.g., temperature, humidity, insolation), and particle composition [96]–[98]. For context, reported airborne loss rates for a collection of pathogens (Category A select agents) range from undetectable to up to about 5 h^{-1} when expressed as a first order (base e) loss rate [98]. Observed loss rates are not always first order, as it is common to observe an initial “die-off” followed by a slower loss rate for a relatively hardy subpopulation, and so an alternate metric is also informative. These same studies reported that time required for 90% of the original material to be lost is at least 15 min [98].

The mere existence of notable atmospheric infectivity loss rates may not, in and of itself, prevent agents from transmitting disease via the atmosphere. Indeed, many of the examples provided in the medium and long range subsections of the **Supplemental Material A: Airborne Disease Transmission Literature Review** are known to have significant airborne loss rates. However, our modeling results indicate that even when infectivity is lost rapidly, 10 h^{-1} , infection probabilities are minimally impacted several hundred meters downwind, see **Figure 7b**. Longer distance airborne transmission of infectious agents with notable atmospheric loss rates is also facilitated by the following:

First, environmental conditions (e.g., insolation, temperature and humidity) are not fixed and so airborne disease transmission may simply be limited to when conditions are favorable for agent atmospheric survival. As one example, viruses or microorganisms that are sensitive to solar (UV) radiation would not be affected at night.²⁵ Similarly, UV exposure varies significantly by latitude, season, time of day, cloud cover, air pollution, airborne dust, indoors vs. outdoors, etc. . Similar considerations hold true for other common environmental variables including humidity and temperature.

²⁵ Also, bacteria have the ability to repair injuries induced by environmental damage. With regard to UV radiation, [99] reviews the effects of UV on viruses and makes the point that much of the existing published literature relates to the more potent UV (UV-C) radiation spectrum used in commercial UV germicidal irradiation devices. As UV-C does not reach the earth’s surface; natural ground-level solar UV wavelengths fall in the less viricidal UV-A and B spectrum above 290 nm.

M Dillon and
C Dillon

Particle Model for
Airborne Disease Transmission

745 Second, even if there is a significant airborne infectivity loss rate, disease transmission
746 might occur if the outdoor atmospheric transport is rapid relative to the loss rate. For
747 many common weather conditions, downwind transport of airborne particles may
748 indeed be rapid - with kilometer scale transport occurring in 15 minutes or less.²⁶
749 When airborne infectivity loss rates are significant, infection rates are predicted to be
750 higher at higher wind speeds, see **Figure 6**. For context when airborne infectivity loss
751 rates are negligible, infection rates are predicted to be higher during the night (stable
752 atmospheric conditions) and at lower wind speeds, see **Figure 5**.

²⁶ As an illustrative example, moderate winds, 4.5 m s^{-1} , would transport an outdoor airborne particle 1 km downwind in about 4 min. This example is intended for illustrative purposes as it does not consider the effects of atmospheric turbulence (e.g., plume dispersion) nor the known increase of wind speed with height above the earth's surface. Furthermore, this calculation focuses on outdoor emissions and exposures. Particles emitted indoors will take time to move outdoors and, similarly, outdoor particles will take additional time to travel indoors to expose indoor people.

M Dillon and
C Dillon

Particle Model for
Airborne Disease Transmission

5.4. Potential Future Efforts

This paper develops new theory for airborne disease transmission; models potential physical exposures; provides a selective literature review of airborne disease transmission; and provides an initial model comparison to published epidemiological data of the predicted relative infection/disease prevalence as a function of downwind distance for a single source region. However, the key variables and modeling parameters presented here are necessarily general and/or limited to archetypical cases.

More detailed analyses could provide more accurate predictions for specific scenarios and – coupled with laboratory, epidemiological, and/or field measurements – could also be used to validate the work presented in this paper. These detailed analyses could consider:

- (a) specific agents, particle properties, environmental conditions, and population demographics;²⁷
- (b) mobile populations;
- (c) particle distributions (including sizes greater than 5 μm AD);
- (d) improved exposure modeling particularly for (i) outdoor exposures < 50 m and > 20 km from the source and (ii) indoor exposures where which the indoor air is not well mixed, e.g., < few meters from the source; and
- (e) other disease transmission pathways, such as droplets, fomites, and direct/indirect contact including the case in which outdoor airborne particles travel indoors, deposit on indoor surfaces, and pose an on-going contact or resuspension hazard.

We note that special, at-risk, populations, such as (a) children < 5 years of age, (b) the elderly, or (c) immune compromised persons, may have higher infection disease risks relative to the general population, e.g., the examples of influenza risks or Aspergillus infections in immune compromised people.

After appropriate scientific peer review and validation, applications of this research may help enhance airborne disease outbreak management and chronically occurring airborne exposure management. Potential future research areas are briefly highlighted here, although we note that such work should be conducted with due consideration of (a) the potential impact on, or interaction with, other disease transmission pathways²⁸ and (b) other factors, such as food,

²⁷ We note that the effects of known variations in the building stock, population demographic distributions, and daily population mobility patterns could be assessed prior to the outbreak event and used to in real time to provide higher fidelity quantitative results [30], [31].

²⁸ Many viruses and microorganisms are opportunistic and so may have multiple, simultaneous disease transmission pathways.

M Dillon and
C Dillon

Particle Model for
Airborne Disease Transmission

water, medical needs, resource limitations, communication capabilities, expected population compliance, and impending hazards (e.g. fire).

The theory developed here could inform future updates to remediation clearance and biosafety criteria, i.e., how clean is clean enough. As one example, the interim B. anthracis clearance strategy suggests a best-practice clearance goal of no detectable viable spores on any environmental sample [100]. This goal was selected, in part, because the dose (exposure) response (infectivity or disease) relationship for B. anthracis is not sufficiently understood to adequately assess disease risk. The theory presented in this paper, coupled with estimates of how much surface contamination could become airborne, could bound the downwind risk – even in the absence of any data on a dose-response relationship.

Suspectable populations could be protected when high-risk environmental conditions are forecasted [101]–[103]. This response paradigm is in common use for other airborne hazards where evacuation²⁹ and shelter (see next paragraph) are routinely used protective actions [31].

Sheltering has the potential to reduce airborne disease spread, both within a single building as well as further downwind. Sheltering actions may include changes to population locations (e.g., shelter in place) as well as changes to building stock and operations (e.g., weatherization programs to reduce indoor/outdoor air change rates; improved particulate filtration). The use of mass (“cleaner-air”) shelters, such as those currently used to reduce population level outdoor wildfire smoke (air quality) exposures, should be carefully considered in infectious disease settings as some diseases can rapidly spread when many people are in close quarters.

²⁹ The airborne infection probability is predicted to be directly proportional to population density and so reducing the number of people at risk in high density regions, such as through zoning changes or preventative evacuation, could reduce the overall disease spread rate.

M Dillon and
C Dillon

Particle Model for
Airborne Disease Transmission

6. Acknowledgements

The authors are grateful to their family for their support and enduring patience. The authors also thank Ron Baskett and John Nasstrom of the Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory for their considerable assistance in developing the Supplemental Material B: Key Atmospheric Transport and Dispersion Modeling Concepts section. Furthermore, the authors acknowledge the assistance of Brooke Buddemeier, Steve Homann, Brenda Pobanz, Ellen Raber, Antoun Tarabay, and Ken Turteltaub of the Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory; Richard Sextro of Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory; David Brown of Argonne National Laboratory; Dev Jani of the US Department of Homeland Security, Countering Weapons of Mass Destruction Office; Frederick Miller of the National Institute of Health; William Rhodes of Mele Associates, Inc.; Benjamin Arnold of the University of California, San Francisco; Joseph Chang of the RAND Corporation; Michael Mastrangelo of the University of Texas Medical Branch; and Mark Nicas of the University of California, Berkeley during the development of this manuscript. Financial support was provided by the US Department of Homeland Security for related early efforts and the Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory for facilitating the review of this material. Finally, the authors would like to thank Freepik for the icons, designed by Freepik from Flaticon (www.flaticon.com), used, in part, in the development of Figures 1 and D1.

This document was prepared as an account of work sponsored by an agency of the United States government. Neither the United States government nor Lawrence Livermore National Security, LLC, nor any of their employees makes any warranty, expressed or implied, or assumes any legal liability or responsibility for the accuracy, completeness, or usefulness of any information, apparatus, product, or process disclosed, or represents that its use would not infringe privately owned rights. Reference herein to any specific commercial product, process, or service by trade name, trademark, manufacturer, or otherwise does not necessarily constitute or imply its endorsement, recommendation, or favoring by the United States government or Lawrence Livermore National Security, LLC. The views and opinions of authors expressed herein do not necessarily state or reflect those of the United States government or Lawrence Livermore National Security, LLC, and shall not be used for advertising or product endorsement purposes.

Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory is operated by Lawrence Livermore National Security, LLC, for the U.S. Department of Energy, National Nuclear Security Administration under Contract DE-AC52-07NA27344.

M Dillon and
C Dillon

Particle Model for
Airborne Disease Transmission

7. Attestations

Ethics statement

No humans or animals were used this in work

Data accessibility

No primary data were used in this analysis. The referenced supplemental materials have been provided.

Competing interests

The authors have no competing interests for the material provided in this manuscript beyond (a) being and/or previously employed at our respective organizations and (b) receiving funding from the acknowledged sources.

Author's contributions

Michael Dillon (MBD) was responsible for the study concept and design, theory development, modeling, and data analysis.

Charles Dillon (CFD) was responsible for the epidemiologic content (including identification of previously reported outbreak data) and, jointly with MBD, developed the Supplemental Material A: Airborne Disease Transmission Literature Review Discussion and Supplemental Material H: U.S. Coxiella burnetii Infection and Disease Estimates sections.

Ron Baskett (RB) and MBD developed the Supplemental Material B: Key Atmospheric Transport and Dispersion Modeling Concepts (i.e., RB was a co-author on this section). John Nasstrom provided significant feedback and suggestions.

MBD and CFD both participated in literature searches, manuscript drafting, and revision through its many versions.

All authors give approval for release.

Funding statement

MBD was supported, in part, by the US Department of Homeland Security for early efforts.

CFD was self-supported.

8. References

- [1] R. L. Riley *et al.*, “Aerial dissemination of pulmonary tuberculosis. A two-year study of contagion in a tuberculosis ward. 1959,” *Am. J. Epidemiol.*, vol. 142, no. 1, pp. 3–14, Jul. 1995.
- [2] A. D. Langmuir, “Airborne Infection: How Important for Public Health?: I. A Historical Review,” *Am. J. Public Health Nations Health*, vol. 54, no. 10, pp. 1666–1668, Oct. 1964, doi: 10.2105/AJPH.54.10.1666.
- [3] W. F. Wells, *Airborne Contagion and Air Hygiene: An Ecological Study of Droplet Infections*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1955.
- [4] C. Troeger *et al.*, “Estimates of the global, regional, and national morbidity, mortality, and aetiologies of lower respiratory infections in 195 countries, 1990–2016: a systematic analysis for the Global Burden of Disease Study 2016,” *Lancet Infect. Dis.*, vol. 18, no. 11, pp. 1191–1210, Nov. 2018, doi: 10.1016/S1473-3099(18)30310-4.
- [5] “The top 10 causes of death.” <https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/the-top-10-causes-of-death> (accessed Jan. 23, 2020).
- [6] B. Killingley and J. Nguyen-Van-Tam, “Routes of influenza transmission,” *Influenza Other Respir. Viruses*, vol. 7, pp. 42–51, Sep. 2013, doi: 10.1111/irv.12080.
- [7] J. S. Kutter, M. I. Spronken, P. L. Fraaij, R. A. Fouchier, and S. Herfst, “Transmission routes of respiratory viruses among humans,” *Curr. Opin. Virol.*, vol. 28, pp. 142–151, Feb. 2018, doi: 10.1016/j.coviro.2018.01.001.
- [8] J. P. G. Van Leuken, A. N. Swart, A. H. Havelaar, A. Van Pul, W. Van der Hoek, and D. Heederik, “Atmospheric dispersion modelling of bioaerosols that are pathogenic to humans and livestock – A review to inform risk assessment studies,” *Microb. Risk Anal.*, vol. 1, pp. 19–39, Jan. 2016, doi: 10.1016/j.mran.2015.07.002.
- [9] R. E. Britter, “Atmospheric dispersion of dense gases,” *Annu. Rev. Fluid Mech.*, vol. 21, no. 1, pp. 317–344, 1989.
- [10] US Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Air Quality Planning and Standards, “Quality Assurance Handbook for Air Pollution Measurement Systems Volume IV Meteorological Measurements, Version 2.0 (Final),” US Environmental Protection Agency, Research Triangle Park, NC, EPA-454-B-08-002, Mar. 2008.
- [11] US National Weather Service, “Automated Surface Observing System (ASOS) User’s Guide,” US National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, US Department of Defense, US Federal Aviation Administration, and US Navy, Silver Spring, MD, Mar. 1998. [Online]. Available: <https://www.weather.gov/media/asos/aum-toc.pdf>.

M Dillon and
C Dillon

Particle Model for
Airborne Disease Transmission

- 911 [12] US Department of Energy, "Environmental Radiological Effluent Monitoring and
912 Environmental Surveillance," US Department of Energy, Washington DC, DOE Handbook,
913 DOE-HDBK- -2015 1216. [Online]. Available: [https://www.id.energy.gov/ESER/DOC/DOE-](https://www.id.energy.gov/ESER/DOC/DOE-HDBK-1216-2015v2.pdf)
914 HDBK-1216-2015v2.pdf.
- 915 [13] World Meteorological Organization, *Guide to meteorological instruments and methods of*
916 *observation*. Geneva, Switzerland: World Meteorological Organization, 2008.
- 917 [14] US Nuclear Regulatory Commission, "Regulatory Guide 1.23 - Meteorological Monitoring
918 Programs for Nuclear Power Plants (Revision 1)," US Nuclear Regulatory Commission,
919 Office of Nuclear Regulatory Research, Washington DC, Mar. 2007. [Online]. Available:
920 <https://www.nrc.gov/docs/ML0703/ML070350028.pdf>.
- 921 [15] R. J. Brooke, M. E. Kretzschmar, N. T. Mutters, and P. F. Teunis, "Human dose response
922 relation for airborne exposure to *Coxiella burnetii*," *BMC Infect. Dis.*, vol. 13, no. 1, p. 488,
923 2013, doi: 10.1186/1471-2334-13-488.
- 924 [16] D. J. A. Toth *et al.*, "Quantitative Models of the Dose-Response and Time Course of
925 Inhalational Anthrax in Humans," *PLoS Pathog.*, vol. 9, no. 8, p. e1003555, Aug. 2013, doi:
926 10.1371/journal.ppat.1003555.
- 927 [17] R. Hardy, K. Schilling, J. Fromm, X. Dai, and M. Cook, "Technical Background Document:
928 Microbial Risk Assessment and Fate and Transport Modeling of Aerosolized
929 Microorganisms at Wastewater Land Application Facilities in Idaho," Idaho Department of
930 Environmental Quality, Feb. 2006. [Online]. Available:
931 https://www.deq.idaho.gov/media/529643-microbial_risk_assessment.pdf.
- 932 [18] V. Nilsen and J. Wyller, "QMRA for Drinking Water: 1. Revisiting the Mathematical
933 Structure of Single-Hit Dose-Response Models: QMRA: Structure of Single-Hit Dose-
934 Response Models," *Risk Anal.*, vol. 36, no. 1, pp. 145–162, Jan. 2016, doi:
935 10.1111/risa.12389.
- 936 [19] C. N. Haas, "Conditional Dose-Response Relationships for Microorganisms: Development
937 and Application," *Risk Anal.*, vol. 22, no. 3, pp. 455–463, Jun. 2002, doi: 10.1111/0272-
938 4332.00035.
- 939 [20] P. F. M. Teunis *et al.*, "Norwalk virus: How infectious is it?," *J. Med. Virol.*, vol. 80, no. 8,
940 pp. 1468–1476, Aug. 2008, doi: 10.1002/jmv.21237.
- 941 [21] N. Van Abel, M. E. Schoen, J. C. Kissel, and J. S. Meschke, "Comparison of Risk Predicted by
942 Multiple Norovirus Dose-Response Models and Implications for Quantitative Microbial
943 Risk Assessment: Comparison of Risk Predicted by Multiple Norovirus Dose-Response
944 Models," *Risk Anal.*, Jun. 2016, doi: 10.1111/risa.12616.
- 945 [22] N. E. Klepeis *et al.*, "The National Human Activity Pattern Survey (NHAPS): a resource for
946 assessing exposure to environmental pollutants," *J. Expo. Anal. Environ. Epidemiol.*, vol.
947 11, no. 3, pp. 231–252, Jun. 2001, doi: 10.1038/sj.jea.7500165.

M Dillon and
C Dillon

Particle Model for
Airborne Disease Transmission

- 948 [23] K. Teschke, Y. Chow, K. Bartlett, A. Ross, and C. van Netten, "Spatial and temporal
949 distribution of airborne *Bacillus thuringiensis* var. *kurstaki* during an aerial spray program
950 for gypsy moth eradication," *Environ. Health Perspect.*, vol. 109, no. 1, pp. 47–54, 2001.
- 951 [24] B. G. Shelton, K. H. Kirkland, W. D. Flanders, and G. K. Morris, "Profiles of Airborne Fungi in
952 Buildings and Outdoor Environments in the United States," *Appl. Environ. Microbiol.*, vol.
953 68, no. 4, pp. 1743–1753, Apr. 2002, doi: 10.1128/AEM.68.4.1743-1753.2002.
- 954 [25] R.-P. Vonberg and P. Gastmeier, "Nosocomial aspergillosis in outbreak settings," *J. Hosp.*
955 *Infect.*, vol. 63, no. 3, pp. 246–254, Jul. 2006, doi: 10.1016/j.jhin.2006.02.014.
- 956 [26] J. R. Lentino, M. A. Rosenkranz, J. A. Michaels, V. P. Kurup, H. D. Rose, and M. W. Rytel,
957 "Nosocomial aspergillosis: a retrospective review of airborne disease secondary to road
958 construction and contaminated air conditioners," *Am. J. Epidemiol.*, vol. 116, no. 3, pp.
959 430–437, Sep. 1982.
- 960 [27] J. P. Luby, P. M. Southern, C. E. Haley, K. L. Vahle, R. S. Munford, and R. W. Haley,
961 "Recurrent exposure to *Histoplasma capsulatum* in modern air-conditioned buildings,"
962 *Clin. Infect. Dis. Off. Publ. Infect. Dis. Soc. Am.*, vol. 41, no. 2, pp. 170–176, Jul. 2005, doi:
963 10.1086/430907.
- 964 [28] S. Chamany *et al.*, "A large histoplasmosis outbreak among high school students in
965 Indiana, 2001," *Pediatr. Infect. Dis. J.*, vol. 23, no. 10, pp. 909–914, Oct. 2004.
- 966 [29] K. Benedict and R. K. Mody, "Epidemiology of Histoplasmosis Outbreaks, United States,
967 1938–2013," *Emerg. Infect. Dis.*, vol. 22, no. 3, Mar. 2016, doi: 10.3201/eid2203.151117.
- 968 [30] M. B. Dillon, R. G. Sextro, and W. W. Delp, "Regional Shelter Analysis - Inhalation Exposure
969 Application (Particles)," Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, Livermore, CA, LLNL-TR-
970 786237, Aug. 2019.
- 971 [31] M. B. Dillon and C. F. Dillon, "Regional Shelter Analysis - Inhalation Exposure
972 Methodology," Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, Livermore, CA, LLNL-TR-786042,
973 Aug. 2019.
- 974 [32] Z. T. Ai and A. K. Melikov, "Airborne spread of expiratory droplet nuclei between the
975 occupants of indoor environments: A review," *Indoor Air*, vol. 28, no. 4, pp. 500–524, Jul.
976 2018, doi: 10.1111/ina.12465.
- 977 [33] M. Nicas, W. W. Nazaroff, and A. Hubbard, "Toward Understanding the Risk of Secondary
978 Airborne Infection: Emission of Respirable Pathogens," *J. Occup. Environ. Hyg.*, vol. 2, no.
979 3, pp. 143–154, Mar. 2005, doi: 10.1080/15459620590918466.
- 980 [34] W. W. Nazaroff, "Indoor bioaerosol dynamics," *Indoor Air*, vol. 26, no. 1, pp. 61–78, Feb.
981 2016, doi: 10.1111/ina.12174.
- 982 [35] D. Rim and A. Novoselac, "Transient Simulation of Airflow and Pollutant Dispersion Under
983 Mixing Flow and Buoyancy Driven Flow Regimes in Residential Buildings," *ASHRAE Trans.*,
984 vol. 114, Part 2, pp. 130–142, 2008.

M Dillon and
C Dillon

Particle Model for
Airborne Disease Transmission

- 985 [36] W. W. Nazaroff, "Indoor particle dynamics," *Indoor Air*, vol. 14, no. s7, pp. 175–183, Aug.
986 2004, doi: 10.1111/j.1600-0668.2004.00286.x.
- 987 [37] A. Gilsdorf, C. Kroh, S. Grimm, E. Jensen, C. Wagner-Wiening, and K. Alpers, "Large Q fever
988 outbreak due to sheep farming near residential areas, Germany, 2005," *Epidemiol. Infect.*,
989 vol. 136, no. 08, Aug. 2008, doi: 10.1017/S0950268807009533.
- 990 [38] A. Petroff and L. Zhang, "Development and validation of a size-resolved particle dry
991 deposition scheme for application in aerosol transport models," *Geosci. Model Dev.*, vol. 3,
992 no. 2, pp. 753–769, Dec. 2010, doi: 10.5194/gmd-3-753-2010.
- 993 [39] W. C. Hinds, *Aerosol technology: properties, behavior, and measurement of airborne*
994 *particles*, 2. ed. New York: Wiley, 1999.
- 995 [40] B. Schimmer *et al.*, "The use of a geographic information system to identify a dairy goat
996 farm as the most likely source of an urban Q-fever outbreak," *BMC Infect. Dis.*, vol. 10, no.
997 1, p. 69, Dec. 2010, doi: 10.1186/1471-2334-10-69.
- 998 [41] J. P. van Leuken *et al.*, "Improved correlation of human Q fever incidence to modelled C.
999 burnetii concentrations by means of an atmospheric dispersion model," *Int. J. Health*
1000 *Geogr.*, vol. 14, no. 1, p. 14, Dec. 2015, doi: 10.1186/s12942-015-0003-y.
- 1001 [42] J. I. Hawker *et al.*, "A large outbreak of Q fever in the West Midlands: windborne spread
1002 into a metropolitan area?," *Commun. Dis. Public Health PHLS*, vol. 1, no. 3, pp. 180–187,
1003 Sep. 1998.
- 1004 [43] K. Nygard *et al.*, "An Outbreak of Legionnaires Disease Caused by Long-Distance Spread
1005 from an Industrial Air Scrubber in Sarpsborg, Norway," *Clin. Infect. Dis.*, vol. 46, no. 1, pp.
1006 61–69, Jan. 2008, doi: 10.1086/524016.
- 1007 [44] T. M. Nhu Nguyen *et al.*, "A Community-Wide Outbreak of Legionnaires Disease Linked to
1008 Industrial Cooling Towers—How Far Can Contaminated Aerosols Spread?," *J. Infect. Dis.*,
1009 vol. 193, no. 1, pp. 102–111, Jan. 2006, doi: 10.1086/498575.
- 1010 [45] E. Schneider, "A Coccidioidomycosis Outbreak Following the Northridge, Calif,
1011 Earthquake," *JAMA J. Am. Med. Assoc.*, vol. 277, no. 11, p. 904, Mar. 1997, doi:
1012 10.1001/jama.1997.03540350054033.
- 1013 [46] R. W. Jibson, "A Public Health Issue Related to Collateral Seismic Hazards: The Valley Fever
1014 Outbreak Triggered by the 1994 Northridge, California Earthquake," *Surv. Geophys.*, vol.
1015 23, pp. 511–528, 2002.
- 1016 [47] G. J. Boender *et al.*, "Risk Maps for the Spread of Highly Pathogenic Avian Influenza in
1017 Poultry," *PLoS Comput. Biol.*, vol. 3, no. 4, p. e71, 2007, doi: 10.1371/journal.pcbi.0030071.
- 1018 [48] P. J. Bonney *et al.*, "Spatial transmission of H5N2 highly pathogenic avian influenza
1019 between Minnesota poultry premises during the 2015 outbreak," *PLOS ONE*, vol. 13, no. 9,
1020 p. e0204262, Sep. 2018, doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0204262.

M Dillon and
C Dillon

Particle Model for
Airborne Disease Transmission

- 1021 [49] I. Dorigatti, P. Mulatti, R. Rosà, A. Pugliese, and L. Busani, "Modelling the spatial spread of
1022 H7N1 avian influenza virus among poultry farms in Italy," *Epidemics*, vol. 2, no. 1, pp. 29–
1023 35, Mar. 2010, doi: 10.1016/j.epidem.2010.01.002.
- 1024 [50] Y. Hayama, T. Yamamoto, S. Kobayashi, N. Muroga, and T. Tsutsui, "Mathematical model
1025 of the 2010 foot-and-mouth disease epidemic in Japan and evaluation of control
1026 measures," *Prev. Vet. Med.*, vol. 112, no. 3–4, pp. 183–193, Nov. 2013, doi:
1027 10.1016/j.prevetmed.2013.08.010.
- 1028 [51] I. Chis Ster and N. M. Ferguson, "Transmission Parameters of the 2001 Foot and Mouth
1029 Epidemic in Great Britain," *PLoS ONE*, vol. 2, no. 6, p. e502, Jun. 2007, doi:
1030 10.1371/journal.pone.0000502.
- 1031 [52] J. A. Backer, T. J. Hagenaars, H. J. W. van Roermund, and M. C. M. de Jong, "Modelling the
1032 effectiveness and risks of vaccination strategies to control classical swine fever
1033 epidemics," *J. R. Soc. Interface*, vol. 6, no. 39, pp. 849–861, Oct. 2009, doi:
1034 10.1098/rsif.2008.0408.
- 1035 [53] M. B. Dillon, "Skin as a potential source of infectious foot and mouth disease aerosols,"
1036 *Proc. R. Soc. B Biol. Sci.*, vol. 278, no. 1713, pp. 1761–1769, Jun. 2011, doi:
1037 10.1098/rspb.2010.2430.
- 1038 [54] J. K. M. Brown, "Aerial Dispersal of Pathogens on the Global and Continental Scales and Its
1039 Impact on Plant Disease," *Science*, vol. 297, no. 5581, pp. 537–541, Jul. 2002, doi:
1040 10.1126/science.1072678.
- 1041 [55] D. J. Smith *et al.*, "Intercontinental Dispersal of Bacteria and Archaea by Transpacific
1042 Winds," *Appl. Environ. Microbiol.*, vol. 79, no. 4, pp. 1134–1139, Feb. 2013, doi:
1043 10.1128/AEM.03029-12.
- 1044 [56] D. J. Smith *et al.*, "Free Tropospheric Transport of Microorganisms from Asia to North
1045 America," *Microb. Ecol.*, vol. 64, no. 4, pp. 973–985, Nov. 2012, doi: 10.1007/s00248-012-
1046 0088-9.
- 1047 [57] M. Meyer *et al.*, "Quantifying airborne dispersal routes of pathogens over continents to
1048 safeguard global wheat supply," *Nat. Plants*, vol. 3, no. 10, pp. 780–786, Oct. 2017, doi:
1049 10.1038/s41477-017-0017-5.
- 1050 [58] A. I. Donaldson and S. Alexandersen, "Predicting the spread of foot and mouth disease by
1051 airborne virus," *Rev. Sci. Tech. Int. Off. Epizoot.*, vol. 21, no. 3, pp. 569–575, Dec. 2002.
- 1052 [59] N. J. Clark and R. J. Soares Magalhães, "Airborne geographical dispersal of Q fever from
1053 livestock holdings to human communities: a systematic review and critical appraisal of
1054 evidence," *BMC Infect. Dis.*, vol. 18, no. 1, p. 218, Dec. 2018, doi: 10.1186/s12879-018-
1055 3135-4.
- 1056 [60] "Q Fever | Summary | NNDSS." <https://wwwn.cdc.gov/nndss/conditions/q-fever/>
1057 (accessed Feb. 11, 2020).

M Dillon and
C Dillon

Particle Model for
Airborne Disease Transmission

- 1058 [61] A. Anderson *et al.*, "Diagnosis and management of Q fever--United States, 2013:
1059 recommendations from CDC and the Q Fever Working Group [see also Errata in MMWR
1060 Recomm Rep 2013 62(35):730]," *MMWR Recomm. Rep. Morb. Mortal. Wkly. Rep.*
1061 *Recomm. Rep. Cent. Dis. Control*, vol. 62, no. RR-03, pp. 1–30, Mar. 2013.
- 1062 [62] A. D. Anderson *et al.*, "Seroprevalence of Q Fever in the United States, 2003-2004," *Am. J.*
1063 *Trop. Med. Hyg.*, vol. 81, no. 4, pp. 691–694, Oct. 2009, doi: 10.4269/ajtmh.2009.09-0168.
- 1064 [63] T. O. Berge and E. H. Lennette, "World distribution of Q fever: human, animal and
1065 arthropod infection," *Am. J. Hyg.*, vol. 57, no. 2, pp. 125–143, Mar. 1953.
- 1066 [64] R. S. Hopkins *et al.*, "Summary of Notifiable Diseases --- United States, 2003," *Morb.*
1067 *Mortal. Wkly. Rep.*, vol. 52, no. 54, pp. 1–85, Apr. 2005.
- 1068 [65] R. A. Jajosky *et al.*, "Summary of Notifiable Diseases --- United States, 2004," *Morb.*
1069 *Mortal. Wkly. Rep.*, vol. 53, no. 53, pp. 1–79, Jun. 2006.
- 1070 [66] "Epidemiology and Statistics | Q Fever | CDC," Sep. 16, 2019.
1071 <https://www.cdc.gov/qfever/stats/index.html> (accessed Feb. 06, 2020).
- 1072 [67] K. Cassell, P. Gacek, T. Rabatsky-Ehr, S. Petit, M. Cartter, and D. M. Weinberger,
1073 "Estimating the True Burden of Legionnaires' Disease," *Am. J. Epidemiol.*, vol. 188, no. 9,
1074 pp. 1686–1694, Sep. 2019, doi: 10.1093/aje/kwz142.
- 1075 [68] T. A. Rasmussen *et al.*, "Use of population based background rates of disease to assess
1076 vaccine safety in childhood and mass immunisation in Denmark: nationwide population
1077 based cohort study," *BMJ*, vol. 345, no. sep17 1, pp. e5823–e5823, Sep. 2012, doi:
1078 10.1136/bmj.e5823.
- 1079 [69] V. H. Hackert *et al.*, "Q Fever: Evidence of a Massive Yet Undetected Cross-Border
1080 Outbreak, With Ongoing Risk of Extra Mortality, in a Dutch-German Border Region,"
1081 *Transbound. Emerg. Dis.*, p. tbed.13505, Feb. 2020, doi: 10.1111/tbed.13505.
- 1082 [70] J. Qian, D. Hospodsky, N. Yamamoto, W. W. Nazaroff, and J. Peccia, "Size-resolved
1083 emission rates of airborne bacteria and fungi in an occupied classroom: Size-resolved
1084 bioaerosol emission rates," *Indoor Air*, vol. 22, no. 4, pp. 339–351, Aug. 2012, doi:
1085 10.1111/j.1600-0668.2012.00769.x.
- 1086 [71] D. Hospodsky *et al.*, "Human Occupancy as a Source of Indoor Airborne Bacteria," *PLoS*
1087 *ONE*, vol. 7, no. 4, p. e34867, Apr. 2012, doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0034867.
- 1088 [72] M. Ludlow *et al.*, "Infection of lymphoid tissues in the macaque upper respiratory tract
1089 contributes to the emergence of transmissible measles virus," *J. Gen. Virol.*, vol. 94, no.
1090 Pt_9, pp. 1933–1944, Sep. 2013, doi: 10.1099/vir.0.054650-0.
- 1091 [73] J. Yan *et al.*, "Infectious virus in exhaled breath of symptomatic seasonal influenza cases
1092 from a college community," *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.*, vol. 115, no. 5, pp. 1081–1086, Jan.
1093 2018, doi: 10.1073/pnas.1716561115.

M Dillon and
C Dillon

Particle Model for
Airborne Disease Transmission

- 1094 [74] W. G. Lindsley *et al.*, “Viable influenza A virus in airborne particles expelled during coughs
1095 versus exhalations,” *Influenza Other Respir. Viruses*, vol. 10, no. 5, pp. 404–413, Sep. 2016,
1096 doi: 10.1111/irv.12390.
- 1097 [75] Z. Y. Han, W. G. Weng, and Q. Y. Huang, “Characterizations of particle size distribution of
1098 the droplets exhaled by sneeze,” *J. R. Soc. Interface*, vol. 10, no. 88, p. 20130560, Nov.
1099 2013, doi: 10.1098/rsif.2013.0560.
- 1100 [76] J. P. Duguid, “The size and the duration of air-carriage of respiratory droplets and droplet-
1101 nuclei,” *Epidemiol. Infect.*, vol. 44, no. 6, pp. 471–479, Sep. 1946, doi:
1102 10.1017/S0022172400019288.
- 1103 [77] J. Lee *et al.*, “Quantity, Size Distribution, and Characteristics of Cough-generated Aerosol
1104 Produced by Patients with an Upper Respiratory Tract Infection,” *Aerosol Air Qual. Res.*,
1105 vol. 19, no. 4, pp. 840–853, 2019, doi: 10.4209/aaqr.2018.01.0031.
- 1106 [78] W. Yang and L. C. Marr, “Dynamics of Airborne Influenza A Viruses Indoors and
1107 Dependence on Humidity,” *PLoS ONE*, vol. 6, no. 6, p. e21481, Jun. 2011, doi:
1108 10.1371/journal.pone.0021481.
- 1109 [79] R. M. Jones, “Critical Review and Uncertainty Analysis of Factors Influencing Influenza
1110 Transmission: Factors Influencing Influenza Transmission,” *Risk Anal.*, vol. 31, no. 8, pp.
1111 1226–1242, Aug. 2011, doi: 10.1111/j.1539-6924.2011.01598.x.
- 1112 [80] S. Asadi, A. S. Wexler, C. D. Cappa, S. Barreda, N. M. Bouvier, and W. D. Ristenpart,
1113 “Aerosol emission and superemission during human speech increase with voice loudness,”
1114 *Sci. Rep.*, vol. 9, no. 1, p. 2348, Dec. 2019, doi: 10.1038/s41598-019-38808-z.
- 1115 [81] W. C. Noble, “Dispersal of skin microorganisms*,” *Br. J. Dermatol.*, vol. 93, no. 4, pp. 477–
1116 485, Oct. 1975, doi: 10.1111/j.1365-2133.1975.tb06527.x.
- 1117 [82] D. A. Edwards *et al.*, “Inhaling to mitigate exhaled bioaerosols,” *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.*, vol.
1118 101, no. 50, pp. 17383–17388, Dec. 2004, doi: 10.1073/pnas.0408159101.
- 1119 [83] R. J. Brooke, N. T. Mutters, O. Péter, M. E. E. Kretzschmar, and P. F. M. Teunis, “Exposure
1120 to low doses of *Coxiella burnetii* caused high illness attack rates: Insights from combining
1121 human challenge and outbreak data,” *Epidemics*, vol. 11, pp. 1–6, Jun. 2015, doi:
1122 10.1016/j.epidem.2014.12.004.
- 1123 [84] T. E. P. Kimkes and M. Heinemann, “How bacteria recognise and respond to surface
1124 contact,” *FEMS Microbiol. Rev.*, vol. 44, no. 1, pp. 106–122, Jan. 2020, doi:
1125 10.1093/femsre/fuz029.
- 1126 [85] M. T. Silva, “Classical labeling of bacterial pathogens according to their lifestyle in the host:
1127 inconsistencies and alternatives,” *Front. Microbiol.*, vol. 3, p. 71, 2012, doi:
1128 10.3389/fmicb.2012.00071.
- 1129 [86] R. P. Clark and M. L. de Calcina-Goff, “Some aspects of the airborne transmission of
1130 infection,” *J. R. Soc. Interface*, vol. 6, no. Suppl_6, pp. S767–S782, Dec. 2009, doi:
1131 10.1098/rsif.2009.0236.focus.

M Dillon and
C Dillon

Particle Model for
Airborne Disease Transmission

- 1132 [87] T. Šantl-Temkiv *et al.*, “Bioaerosol field measurements: Challenges and perspectives in
1133 outdoor studies,” *Aerosol Sci. Technol.*, vol. 54, no. 5, pp. 520–546, May 2020, doi:
1134 10.1080/02786826.2019.1676395.
- 1135 [88] B. Lighthart, B. T. Shaffer, B. Marthi, and L. M. Ganio, “Artificial wind-gust liberation of
1136 microbial bioaerosols previously deposited on plants,” *Aerobiologia*, vol. 9, no. 2–3, pp.
1137 189–196, Dec. 1993, doi: 10.1007/BF02066261.
- 1138 [89] S. A. Isard, S. H. Gage, P. Comtois, and J. M. Russo, “Principles of the Atmospheric Pathway
1139 for Invasive Species Applied to Soybean Rust,” *BioScience*, vol. 55, no. 10, p. 851, 2005,
1140 doi: 10.1641/0006-3568(2005)055[0851:POTAPF]2.0.CO;2.
- 1141 [90] S. A. Isard and S. H. Gage, *Flow of life in the atmosphere: an airscape approach to*
1142 *understanding invasive organisms*. East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 2001.
- 1143 [91] A. Rieux *et al.*, “Long-Distance Wind-Dispersal of Spores in a Fungal Plant Pathogen:
1144 Estimation of Anisotropic Dispersal Kernels from an Extensive Field Experiment,” *PLoS*
1145 *ONE*, vol. 9, no. 8, p. e103225, Aug. 2014, doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0103225.
- 1146 [92] S. A. Isard, J. M. Russo, and A. Ariatti, “The Integrated Aerobiology Modeling System
1147 applied to the spread of soybean rust into the Ohio River valley during September 2006,”
1148 *Aerobiologia*, vol. 23, no. 4, pp. 271–282, Dec. 2007, doi: 10.1007/s10453-007-9073-z.
- 1149 [93] P. Skelsey, G. J. T. Kessel, A. A. M. Holtslag, A. F. Moene, and W. van der Werf, “Regional
1150 spore dispersal as a factor in disease risk warnings for potato late blight: A proof of
1151 concept,” *Agric. For. Meteorol.*, vol. 149, no. 3–4, pp. 419–430, Mar. 2009, doi:
1152 10.1016/j.agrformet.2008.09.005.
- 1153 [94] M. Meyer, L. Burgin, M. C. Hort, D. P. Hodson, and C. A. Gilligan, “Large-Scale Atmospheric
1154 Dispersal Simulations Identify Likely Airborne Incursion Routes of Wheat Stem Rust Into
1155 Ethiopia,” *Phytopathology*, p. PHYTO-01-17-003, Aug. 2017, doi: 10.1094/PHYTO-01-17-
1156 0035-FI.
- 1157 [95] B. A. Walther and P. W. Ewald, “Pathogen survival in the external environment and the
1158 evolution of virulence,” *Biol. Rev.*, vol. 79, no. 4, pp. 849–869, Nov. 2004, doi:
1159 10.1017/S1464793104006475.
- 1160 [96] W. D. Griffiths and G. A. L. DeCosemo, “The assessment of bioaerosols: A critical review,”
1161 *J. Aerosol Sci.*, vol. 25, no. 8, pp. 1425–1458, Dec. 1994, doi: 10.1016/0021-
1162 8502(94)90218-6.
- 1163 [97] J. W. Tang, “The effect of environmental parameters on the survival of airborne infectious
1164 agents,” *J. R. Soc. Interface*, vol. 6, no. Suppl_6, pp. S737–S746, Dec. 2009, doi:
1165 10.1098/rsif.2009.0227.focus.
- 1166 [98] R. Sinclair, S. A. Boone, D. Greenberg, P. Keim, and C. P. Gerba, “Persistence of Category A
1167 Select Agents in the Environment,” *Appl. Environ. Microbiol.*, vol. 74, no. 3, pp. 555–563,
1168 Feb. 2008, doi: 10.1128/AEM.02167-07.

M Dillon and
C Dillon

Particle Model for
Airborne Disease Transmission

- 1169 [99] C. D. Lytle and J.-L. Sagripanti, "Predicted Inactivation of Viruses of Relevance to
1170 Biodefense by Solar Radiation," *J. Virol.*, vol. 79, no. 22, pp. 14244–14252, Nov. 2005, doi:
1171 10.1128/JVI.79.22.14244-14252.2005.
- 1172 [100] US Environmental Protection Agency and Centers for Disease Control and Prevention,
1173 "Interim Clearance Strategy for Environments Contaminated with *Bacillus anthracis*,"
1174 Washington DC, Jul. 2012. [Online]. Available: [https://www.epa.gov/emergency-](https://www.epa.gov/emergency-response/epacdc-interim-clearance-strategy-environments-contaminated-anthrax)
1175 [response/epacdc-interim-clearance-strategy-environments-contaminated-anthrax](https://www.epa.gov/emergency-response/epacdc-interim-clearance-strategy-environments-contaminated-anthrax).
- 1176 [101] D. Villanueva and K. Schepanski, "Investigation of atmospheric conditions fostering the
1177 spreading of legionnaires' disease in outbreaks related to cooling towers," *Int. J.*
1178 *Biometeorol.*, vol. 63, no. 10, pp. 1347–1356, Oct. 2019, doi: 10.1007/s00484-019-01751-
1179 9.
- 1180 [102] A. D. Hagerman *et al.*, "Temporal and geographic distribution of weather conditions
1181 favorable to airborne spread of foot-and-mouth disease in the coterminous United
1182 States," *Prev. Vet. Med.*, vol. 161, pp. 41–49, Dec. 2018, doi:
1183 10.1016/j.prevetmed.2018.10.016.
- 1184 [103] A. Russo, C. M. Gouveia, P. M. M. Soares, R. M. Cardoso, M. T. Mendes, and R. M. Trigo,
1185 "The unprecedented 2014 Legionnaires' disease outbreak in Portugal: atmospheric driving
1186 mechanisms," *Int. J. Biometeorol.*, vol. 62, no. 7, pp. 1167–1179, Jul. 2018, doi:
1187 10.1007/s00484-018-1520-8.
- 1188 [104] S. M. Burrows, W. Elbert, M. G. Lawrence, and U. Pöschl, "Bacteria in the global
1189 atmosphere – Part 1: Review and synthesis of literature data for different ecosystems,"
1190 *Atmospheric Chem. Phys.*, vol. 9, no. 23, pp. 9263–9280, Dec. 2009, doi: 10.5194/acp-9-
1191 9263-2009.
- 1192 [105] S. M. Burrows *et al.*, "Bacteria in the global atmosphere – Part 2: Modeling of emissions
1193 and transport between different ecosystems," *Atmospheric Chem. Phys.*, vol. 9, no. 23, pp.
1194 9281–9297, Dec. 2009, doi: 10.5194/acp-9-9281-2009.
- 1195 [106] V. R. Després *et al.*, "Primary biological aerosol particles in the atmosphere: a review,"
1196 *Tellus B*, vol. 64, no. 0, Feb. 2012, doi: 10.3402/tellusb.v64i0.15598.
- 1197 [107] R. M. Bowers, A. P. Sullivan, E. K. Costello, J. L. Collett, R. Knight, and N. Fierer, "Sources
1198 of Bacteria in Outdoor Air across Cities in the Midwestern United States," *Appl. Environ.*
1199 *Microbiol.*, vol. 77, no. 18, pp. 6350–6356, Sep. 2011, doi: 10.1128/AEM.05498-11.
- 1200 [108] P. H. Gregory, *Microbiology of the Atmosphere*, 2nd ed. Aylesbury: Leonard Hill Books,
1201 1973.
- 1202 [109] A. M. Jones and R. M. Harrison, "The effects of meteorological factors on atmospheric
1203 bioaerosol concentrations—a review," *Sci. Total Environ.*, vol. 326, no. 1–3, pp. 151–180,
1204 Jun. 2004, doi: 10.1016/j.scitotenv.2003.11.021.

M Dillon and
C Dillon

Particle Model for
Airborne Disease Transmission

- 1205 [110] Pan-American Aerobiology Association, M. Muilenberg, and H. Burge, Eds., *Aerobiology:*
1206 *proceedings of the Pan-American Aerobiology Association*. Boca Raton: Lewis Publishers,
1207 1996.
- 1208 [111] H. Salem, S. A. Katz, and Royal Society of Chemistry (Great Britain), Eds., *Aerobiology:*
1209 *the toxicology of airborne pathogens and toxins*. Cambridge: Royal Society of Chemistry,
1210 2016.
- 1211 [112] N. I. Stilianakis and Y. Drossinos, "Dynamics of infectious disease transmission by
1212 inhalable respiratory droplets," *J. R. Soc. Interface*, vol. 7, no. 50, pp. 1355–1366, Sep.
1213 2010, doi: 10.1098/rsif.2010.0026.
- 1214 [113] J. W. Tang, P. Wilson, N. Shetty, and C. J. Noakes, "Aerosol-Transmitted Infections—a
1215 New Consideration for Public Health and Infection Control Teams," *Curr. Treat. Options*
1216 *Infect. Dis.*, vol. 7, no. 3, pp. 176–201, Sep. 2015, doi: 10.1007/s40506-015-0057-1.
- 1217 [114] U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, "Meningococcal Disease," in *The Pink*
1218 *Book: Course Textbook - Epidemiology and Prevention of Vaccine-Preventable Diseases*,
1219 13th ed., J. Hamborsky, A. Kroger, and S. Wolfe, Eds. Washington DC: Public Health
1220 Foundation, 2015.
- 1221 [115] J. M. McLaughlin, F. L. Khan, E. A. Thoburn, R. E. Isturiz, and D. L. Swerdlow, "Rates of
1222 hospitalization for community-acquired pneumonia among US adults: A systematic
1223 review," *Vaccine*, vol. 38, no. 4, pp. 741–751, Jan. 2020, doi:
1224 10.1016/j.vaccine.2019.10.101.
- 1225 [116] Y. Li *et al.*, "Role of ventilation in airborne transmission of infectious agents in the built
1226 environment - a multidisciplinary systematic review," *Indoor Air*, vol. 17, no. 1, pp. 2–18,
1227 Feb. 2007, doi: 10.1111/j.1600-0668.2006.00445.x.
- 1228 [117] I. Eames, J. W. Tang, Y. Li, and P. Wilson, "Airborne transmission of disease in hospitals,"
1229 *J. R. Soc. Interface*, vol. 6, no. Suppl_6, pp. S697–S702, Dec. 2009, doi:
1230 10.1098/rsif.2009.0407.focus.
- 1231 [118] W. Kowalski, *Hospital Airborne Infection Control*. Boca Raton: CRC Press, 2011.
- 1232 [119] J. Alzona, B. L. Cohen, H. Rudolph, H. N. Jow, and J. O. Frohlinger, "Indoor-outdoor
1233 relationships for airborne particulate matter of outdoor origin," *Atmospheric Environ.*
1234 1967, vol. 13, no. 1, pp. 55–60, Jan. 1979, doi: 10.1016/0004-6981(79)90244-0.
- 1235 [120] A. G. Arruda *et al.*, "Aerosol Detection and Transmission of Porcine Reproductive and
1236 Respiratory Syndrome Virus (PRRSV): What Is the Evidence, and What Are the Knowledge
1237 Gaps?," *Viruses*, vol. 11, no. 8, p. 712, Aug. 2019, doi: 10.3390/v11080712.
- 1238 [121] B. W. Mitchell and D. J. King, "Effect of negative air ionization on airborne transmission
1239 of Newcastle disease virus," *Avian Dis.*, vol. 38, no. 4, pp. 725–732, Dec. 1994.
- 1240 [122] H. Hakim *et al.*, "Aerosol Disinfection Capacity of Slightly Acidic Hypochlorous Acid
1241 Water Towards Newcastle Disease Virus in the Air: An In Vivo Experiment," *Avian Dis.*, vol.
1242 59, no. 4, pp. 486–491, Dec. 2015, doi: 10.1637/11107-042115-Reg.1.

M Dillon and
C Dillon

Particle Model for
Airborne Disease Transmission

- 1243 [123] S. Dee, S. Otake, and J. Deen, "Use of a production region model to assess the efficacy of
1244 various air filtration systems for preventing airborne transmission of porcine reproductive
1245 and respiratory syndrome virus and Mycoplasma hyopneumoniae: Results from a 2-year
1246 study," *Virus Res.*, vol. 154, no. 1–2, pp. 177–184, Dec. 2010, doi:
1247 10.1016/j.virusres.2010.07.022.
- 1248 [124] D. D. Ferguson, T. C. Smith, K. J. Donham, and S. J. Hoff, "The Efficiency of Biofilters at
1249 Mitigating Airborne MRSA from a Swine Nursery," *J. Agric. Saf. Health*, vol. 21, no. 4, pp.
1250 217–227, Oct. 2015, doi: 10.13031/jash.21.10716.
- 1251 [125] P. J. Hitchcock *et al.*, "Improving performance of HVAC systems to reduce exposure to
1252 aerosolized infectious agents in buildings; recommendations to reduce risks posed by
1253 biological attacks," *Biosecurity Bioterrorism Biodefense Strategy Pract. Sci.*, vol. 4, no. 1,
1254 pp. 41–54, 2006, doi: 10.1089/bsp.2006.4.41.
- 1255 [126] P. V. Nielsen, "Control of airborne infectious diseases in ventilated spaces," *J. R. Soc.*
1256 *Interface*, vol. 6, no. suppl_6, Dec. 2009, doi: 10.1098/rsif.2009.0228.focus.
- 1257 [127] F. Memarzadeh, R. N. Olmsted, and J. M. Bartley, "Applications of ultraviolet germicidal
1258 irradiation disinfection in health care facilities: Effective adjunct, but not stand-alone
1259 technology," *Am. J. Infect. Control*, vol. 38, no. 5, pp. S13–S24, Jun. 2010, doi:
1260 10.1016/j.ajic.2010.04.208.
- 1261 [128] D. J. Alexander, "Newcastle disease and other avian paramyxoviruses," *Rev. Sci. Tech.*
1262 *Int. Off. Epizoot.*, vol. 19, no. 2, pp. 443–462, Aug. 2000.
- 1263 [129] D. J. Alexander, E. W. Aldous, and C. M. Fuller, "The long view: a selective review of 40
1264 years of Newcastle disease research," *Avian Pathol.*, vol. 41, no. 4, pp. 329–335, Aug.
1265 2012, doi: 10.1080/03079457.2012.697991.
- 1266 [130] D. E. Swayne, "Avian influenza vaccines and therapies for poultry," *Comp. Immunol.*
1267 *Microbiol. Infect. Dis.*, vol. 32, no. 4, pp. 351–363, Jul. 2009, doi:
1268 10.1016/j.cimid.2008.01.006.
- 1269 [131] M. Hugh-Jones, W. H. Allan, F. A. Dark, and G. J. Harper, "The evidence for the airborne
1270 spread of Newcastle disease," *J. Hyg. (Lond.)*, vol. 71, no. 02, pp. 325–339, Jun. 1973, doi:
1271 10.1017/S0022172400022786.
- 1272 [132] J. Gloster, "Analysis of two outbreaks of Newcastle disease," *Agric. Meteorol.*, vol. 28,
1273 no. 2, pp. 177–189, Feb. 1983, doi: 10.1016/0002-1571(83)90006-7.
- 1274 [133] P. Vittoz and R. Engler, "Seed dispersal distances: a typology based on dispersal modes
1275 and plant traits," *Bot. Helvetica*, vol. 117, no. 2, pp. 109–124, Dec. 2007, doi:
1276 10.1007/s00035-007-0797-8.
- 1277 [134] S. J. Wright *et al.*, "Understanding strategies for seed dispersal by wind under
1278 contrasting atmospheric conditions," *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.*, vol. 105, no. 49, pp. 19084–
1279 19089, Dec. 2008, doi: 10.1073/pnas.0802697105.

M Dillon and
C Dillon

Particle Model for
Airborne Disease Transmission

- 1280 [135] M. B. Soons, R. Nathan, and G. G. Katul, "Human Effects on Long-Distance Wind
1281 Dispersal and Colonization by Grassland Plants," *Ecology*, vol. 85, no. 11, pp. 3069–3079,
1282 Nov. 2004, doi: 10.1890/03-0398.
- 1283 [136] P. M. Severns, K. E. Sackett, D. H. Farber, and C. C. Mundt, "Consequences of Long-
1284 Distance Dispersal for Epidemic Spread: Patterns, Scaling, and Mitigation," *Plant Dis.*, vol.
1285 103, no. 2, pp. 177–191, Feb. 2019, doi: 10.1094/PDIS-03-18-0505-FE.
- 1286 [137] C. M. Brown *et al.*, "A community outbreak of Legionnaires' disease linked to hospital
1287 cooling towers: an epidemiological method to calculate dose of exposure," *Int. J.*
1288 *Epidemiol.*, vol. 28, no. 2, pp. 353–359, Apr. 1999, doi: 10.1093/ije/28.2.353.
- 1289 [138] J. Castilla *et al.*, "A large Legionnaires' disease outbreak in Pamplona, Spain: early
1290 detection, rapid control and no case fatality," *Epidemiol. Infect.*, vol. 136, no. 06, pp. 823–
1291 832, Jun. 2008, doi: 10.1017/S0950268807009077.
- 1292 [139] M. Sabria *et al.*, "A community outbreak of Legionnaires' disease: evidence of a cooling
1293 tower as the source," *Clin. Microbiol. Infect.*, vol. 12, no. 7, pp. 642–647, Jul. 2006, doi:
1294 10.1111/j.1469-0691.2006.01447.x.
- 1295 [140] C. R. Phares *et al.*, "Legionnaires' disease among residents of a long-term care facility:
1296 The sentinel event in a community outbreak," *Am. J. Infect. Control*, vol. 35, no. 5, pp.
1297 319–323, Jun. 2007, doi: 10.1016/j.ajic.2006.09.014.
- 1298 [141] A. García-Fulgueiras *et al.*, "Legionnaires' Disease Outbreak in Murcia, Spain," *Emerg.*
1299 *Infect. Dis.*, vol. 9, no. 8, pp. 915–921, Aug. 2003, doi: 10.3201/eid0908.030337.
- 1300 [142] L. E. Garrison *et al.*, "Vital Signs: Deficiencies in Environmental Control Identified in
1301 Outbreaks of Legionnaires' Disease — North America, 2000–2014," *MMWR Morb. Mortal.*
1302 *Wkly. Rep.*, vol. 65, no. 22, pp. 576–584, Jun. 2016, doi: 10.15585/mmwr.mm6522e1.
- 1303 [143] D. Weiss *et al.*, "A Large Community Outbreak of Legionnaires' Disease Associated With
1304 a Cooling Tower in New York City, 2015," *Public Health Rep.*, vol. 132, no. 2, pp. 241–250,
1305 Mar. 2017, doi: 10.1177/0033354916689620.
- 1306 [144] R. Fitzhenry *et al.*, "Legionnaires' Disease Outbreaks and Cooling Towers, New York City,
1307 New York, USA," *Emerg. Infect. Dis.*, vol. 23, no. 11, Nov. 2017, doi:
1308 10.3201/eid2311.161584.
- 1309 [145] A. T. Chamberlain, J. D. Lehnert, and R. L. Berkelman, "The 2015 New York City
1310 Legionnaires' Disease Outbreak: A Case Study on a History-Making Outbreak," *J. Public*
1311 *Health Manag. Pract.*, vol. 23, no. 4, pp. 410–416, 2017, doi:
1312 10.1097/PHH.0000000000000558.
- 1313 [146] M.-P. Brenier-Pinchart *et al.*, "Influence of internal and outdoor factors on filamentous
1314 fungal flora in hematology wards," *Am. J. Infect. Control*, vol. 37, no. 8, pp. 631–637, Oct.
1315 2009, doi: 10.1016/j.ajic.2009.03.013.

M Dillon and
C Dillon

Particle Model for
Airborne Disease Transmission

- 1316 [147] C. C. Chang *et al.*, "Consensus guidelines for implementation of quality processes to
1317 prevent invasive fungal disease and enhanced surveillance measures during hospital
1318 building works, 2014: Quality processes in prevention of IFD," *Intern. Med. J.*, vol. 44, no.
1319 12b, pp. 1389–1397, Dec. 2014, doi: 10.1111/imj.12601.
- 1320 [148] J. E. Blair, Y.-H. H. Chang, Y. Ruiz, S. Duffy, B. E. Heinrich, and D. F. Lake, "Distance from
1321 Construction Site and Risk for Coccidioidomycosis, Arizona, USA," *Emerg. Infect. Dis.*, vol.
1322 20, no. 9, pp. 1464–1471, Sep. 2014, doi: 10.3201/eid2009.131588.
- 1323 [149] R. S. Dungan, "Estimation of Infectious Risks in Residential Populations Exposed to
1324 Airborne Pathogens During Center Pivot Irrigation of Dairy Wastewaters," *Environ. Sci.*
1325 *Technol.*, vol. 48, no. 9, pp. 5033–5042, May 2014, doi: 10.1021/es405693v.
- 1326 [150] R. S. Dungan, "BOARD-INVITED REVIEW: Fate and transport of bioaerosols associated
1327 with livestock operations and manures," *J. Anim. Sci.*, vol. 88, no. 11, pp. 3693–3706, Nov.
1328 2010, doi: 10.2527/jas.2010-3094.
- 1329 [151] N. Wery, "Bioaerosols from composting facilities - a review," *Front. Cell. Infect.*
1330 *Microbiol.*, vol. 4, Apr. 2014, doi: 10.3389/fcimb.2014.00042.
- 1331 [152] E. D. Berry *et al.*, "Effect of Proximity to a Cattle Feedlot on Escherichia coli O157:H7
1332 Contamination of Leafy Greens and Evaluation of the Potential for Airborne Transmission,"
1333 *Appl. Environ. Microbiol.*, vol. 81, no. 3, pp. 1101–1110, Feb. 2015, doi:
1334 10.1128/AEM.02998-14.
- 1335 [153] P. Douglas *et al.*, "Use of dispersion modelling for Environmental Impact Assessment of
1336 biological air pollution from composting: Progress, problems and prospects," *Waste*
1337 *Manag.*, vol. 70, pp. 22–29, Dec. 2017, doi: 10.1016/j.wasman.2017.08.023.
- 1338 [154] P. Douglas *et al.*, "Predicting Aspergillus fumigatus exposure from composting facilities
1339 using a dispersion model: A conditional calibration and validation," *Int. J. Hyg. Environ.*
1340 *Health*, vol. 220, no. 1, pp. 17–28, Jan. 2017, doi: 10.1016/j.ijheh.2016.09.017.
- 1341 [155] Y. Li, H. Zhang, X. Qiu, Y. Zhang, and H. Wang, "Dispersion and Risk Assessment of
1342 Bacterial Aerosols Emitted from Rotating-Brush Aerator during Summer in a Wastewater
1343 Treatment Plant of Xi'an, China," *Aerosol Air Qual. Res.*, vol. 13, no. 6, pp. 1807–1814,
1344 2013, doi: 10.4209/aaqr.2012.09.0245.
- 1345 [156] M. L. Cain, B. G. Milligan, and A. E. Strand, "Long-distance seed dispersal in plant
1346 populations," *Am. J. Bot.*, vol. 87, no. 9, pp. 1217–1227, Sep. 2000.
- 1347 [157] R. Nathan, "Long-Distance Dispersal of Plants," *Science*, vol. 313, no. 5788, pp. 786–788,
1348 Aug. 2006, doi: 10.1126/science.1124975.
- 1349 [158] R. Nathan *et al.*, "Mechanistic models of seed dispersal by wind," *Theor. Ecol.*, vol. 4, no.
1350 2, pp. 113–132, May 2011, doi: 10.1007/s12080-011-0115-3.
- 1351 [159] D. E. Aylor, "Spread of Plant Disease on a Continental Scale: Role of Aerial Dispersal of
1352 Pathogens," *Ecology*, vol. 84, no. 8, pp. 1989–1997, Aug. 2003, doi: 10.1890/01-0619.

M Dillon and
C Dillon

Particle Model for
Airborne Disease Transmission

- 1353 [160] J. Gloster *et al.*, "Airborne spread of foot-and-mouth disease – Model intercomparison,"
1354 *Vet. J.*, vol. 183, no. 3, pp. 278–286, Mar. 2010, doi: 10.1016/j.tvjl.2008.11.011.
- 1355 [161] J. Gloster, A. Freshwater, R. F. Sellers, and S. Alexandersen, "Re-assessing the likelihood
1356 of airborne spread of foot-and-mouth disease at the start of the 1967–1968 UK foot-and-
1357 mouth disease epidemic," *Epidemiol. Infect.*, vol. 133, no. 05, p. 767, Apr. 2005, doi:
1358 10.1017/S0950268805004073.
- 1359 [162] J. Gloster, L. Burgin, A. Jones, and R. Sanson, "Atmospheric dispersion models and their
1360 use in the assessment of disease transmission," *Rev. Sci. Tech. Int. Off. Epizoot.*, vol. 30,
1361 no. 2, pp. 457–465, Aug. 2011.
- 1362 [163] H. P. Spijkerboer *et al.*, "Ability of the Gaussian plume model to predict and describe
1363 spore dispersal over a potato crop," *Ecol. Model.*, vol. 155, no. 1, pp. 1–18, Sep. 2002, doi:
1364 10.1016/S0304-3800(01)00475-6.
- 1365 [164] M. C. Fisher *et al.*, "Emerging fungal threats to animal, plant and ecosystem health,"
1366 *Nature*, vol. 484, no. 7393, pp. 186–194, Apr. 2012, doi: 10.1038/nature10947.
- 1367 [165] D. E. Aylor, G. S. Taylor, and G. S. Raynor, "Long-range transport of tobacco blue mold
1368 spores," *Agric. Meteorol.*, vol. 27, no. 3–4, pp. 217–232, Dec. 1982, doi: 10.1016/0002-
1369 1571(82)90007-3.
- 1370 [166] M. Blanco-Meneses, I. Carbone, and J. B. Ristaino, "Population structure and migration
1371 of the Tobacco Blue Mold Pathogen, *Peronospora tabacina*, into North America and
1372 Europe," *Mol. Ecol.*, vol. 27, no. 3, pp. 737–751, Feb. 2018, doi: 10.1111/mec.14453.
- 1373 [167] V. R. Brown and S. N. Bevins, "A review of virulent Newcastle disease viruses in the
1374 United States and the role of wild birds in viral persistence and spread," *Vet. Res.*, vol. 48,
1375 no. 1, p. 68, Dec. 2017, doi: 10.1186/s13567-017-0475-9.
- 1376 [168] J. Davis, M. G. Garner, and I. J. East, "Analysis of Local Spread of Equine Influenza in the
1377 Park Ridge Region of Queensland," *Transbound. Emerg. Dis.*, vol. 56, no. 1–2, pp. 31–38,
1378 Mar. 2009, doi: 10.1111/j.1865-1682.2008.01060.x.
- 1379 [169] A. Ssematimba, T. J. Hagenaars, and M. C. M. de Jong, "Modelling the Wind-Borne
1380 Spread of Highly Pathogenic Avian Influenza Virus between Farms," *PLoS ONE*, vol. 7, no.
1381 2, p. e31114, Feb. 2012, doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0031114.
- 1382 [170] R. J. F. Ypma *et al.*, "Genetic Data Provide Evidence for Wind-Mediated Transmission of
1383 Highly Pathogenic Avian Influenza," *J. Infect. Dis.*, vol. 207, no. 5, pp. 730–735, Mar. 2013,
1384 doi: 10.1093/infdis/jis757.
- 1385 [171] J. Gloster, "Risk of airborne spread of foot-and-mouth disease from the continent to
1386 England," *Vet. Rec.*, vol. 111, no. 13, pp. 290–295, Sep. 1982.
- 1387 [172] J. Gloster, R. F. Sellers, and A. I. Donaldson, "Long distance transport of foot-and-mouth
1388 disease virus over the sea," *Vet. Rec.*, vol. 110, no. 3, pp. 47–52, Jan. 1982.

M Dillon and
C Dillon

Particle Model for
Airborne Disease Transmission

- 1389 [173] J. Gloster, R. M. Blackall, R. F. Sellers, and A. I. Donaldson, "Forecasting the airborne
1390 spread of foot-and-mouth disease," *Vet. Rec.*, vol. 108, no. 17, pp. 370–374, Apr. 1981.
- 1391 [174] L. S. Christensen, "Analysis of the epidemiological dynamics during the 1982-1983
1392 epidemic of foot-and-mouth disease in Denmark based on molecular high-resolution strain
1393 identification," *J. Gen. Virol.*, vol. 86, no. 9, pp. 2577–2584, Sep. 2005, doi:
1394 10.1099/vir.0.80878-0.
- 1395 [175] T. Mikkelsen *et al.*, "Investigation of airborne foot-and-mouth disease virus transmission
1396 during low-wind conditions in the early phase of the UK 2001 epidemic," *Atmospheric*
1397 *Chem. Phys.*, vol. 3, no. 6, pp. 2101–2110, Nov. 2003, doi: 10.5194/acp-3-2101-2003.
- 1398 [176] J. H. Sorensen, D. K. J. Mackay, C. O. Jensen, and A. I. Donaldson, "An integrated model
1399 to predict the atmospheric spread of foot-and-mouth disease virus," *Epidemiol. Infect.*,
1400 vol. 124, no. 3, pp. 577–590, 2000.
- 1401 [177] H. Tissot-Dupont, M.-A. Amadei, M. Nezri, and D. Raoult, "Wind in November, Q Fever in
1402 December," *Emerg. Infect. Dis.*, vol. 10, no. 7, pp. 1264–1269, Jul. 2004, doi:
1403 10.3201/eid1007.030724.
- 1404 [178] H. Tissot-Dupont, S. Torres, M. Nezri, and D. Raoult, "Hyperendemic focus of Q fever
1405 related to sheep and wind," *Am. J. Epidemiol.*, vol. 150, no. 1, pp. 67–74, Jul. 1999.
- 1406 [179] G. Dupuis, J. Petite, O. Péter, and M. Vouilloz, "An Important Outbreak of Human Q
1407 Fever in a Swiss Alpine Valley," *Int. J. Epidemiol.*, vol. 16, no. 2, pp. 282–287, 1987, doi:
1408 10.1093/ije/16.2.282.
- 1409 [180] V. H. Hackert *et al.*, "Q Fever: Single-Point Source Outbreak With High Attack Rates and
1410 Massive Numbers of Undetected Infections Across an Entire Region," *Clin. Infect. Dis.*, vol.
1411 55, no. 12, pp. 1591–1599, Dec. 2012, doi: 10.1093/cid/cis734.
- 1412 [181] P. M. Schneeberger, C. Wintenberger, W. van der Hoek, and J. P. Stahl, "Q fever in the
1413 Netherlands – 2007–2010: What we learned from the largest outbreak ever," *Médecine*
1414 *Mal. Infect.*, vol. 44, no. 8, pp. 339–353, Aug. 2014, doi: 10.1016/j.medmal.2014.02.006.
- 1415 [182] W. van der Hoek *et al.*, "Q fever in the Netherlands: an update on the epidemiology and
1416 control measures," *Euro Surveill. Bull. Eur. Sur Mal. Transm. Eur. Commun. Dis. Bull.*, vol.
1417 15, no. 12, Mar. 2010.
- 1418 [183] A. Parr, E. A. Whitney, and R. L. Berkelman, "Legionellosis on the Rise: A Review of
1419 Guidelines for Prevention in the United States," *J. Public Health Manag. Pract.*, vol. 21, no.
1420 5, pp. E17–E26, 2015, doi: 10.1097/PHH.000000000000123.
- 1421 [184] P. Ulleryd *et al.*, "Legionnaires' disease from a cooling tower in a community outbreak in
1422 Lidköping, Sweden- epidemiological, environmental and microbiological investigation
1423 supported by meteorological modelling," *BMC Infect. Dis.*, vol. 12, no. 1, p. 313, 2012, doi:
1424 10.1186/1471-2334-12-313.

M Dillon and
C Dillon

Particle Model for
Airborne Disease Transmission

- 1425 [185] E. Wedege *et al.*, "Seroepidemiological Study after a Long-Distance Industrial Outbreak
1426 of Legionnaires' Disease," *Clin. Vaccine Immunol.*, vol. 16, no. 4, pp. 528–534, Apr. 2009,
1427 doi: 10.1128/CVI.00458-08.
- 1428 [186] C. Nguyen *et al.*, "Recent Advances in Our Understanding of the Environmental,
1429 Epidemiological, Immunological, and Clinical Dimensions of Coccidioidomycosis," *Clin.*
1430 *Microbiol. Rev.*, vol. 26, no. 3, pp. 505–525, Jul. 2013, doi: 10.1128/CMR.00005-13.
- 1431 [187] D. J. D'Alessio, R. H. Heeren, S. L. Hendricks, P. Ogilvie, and M. L. Furcolow, "A starling
1432 roost as the source of urban epidemic histoplasmosis in an area of low incidence," *Am.*
1433 *Rev. Respir. Dis.*, vol. 92, no. 5, pp. 725–731, Nov. 1965, doi: 10.1164/arrd.1965.92.5.725.
- 1434 [188] F. E. Tosh, I. L. Doto, D. J. D'Alessio, A. A. Medeiros, S. L. Hendricks, and T. D. Chin, "The
1435 second of two epidemics of histoplasmosis resulting from work on the same starling
1436 roost," *Am. Rev. Respir. Dis.*, vol. 94, no. 3, pp. 406–413, Sep. 1966, doi:
1437 10.1164/arrd.1966.94.3.406.
- 1438 [189] T. F. Sellers, "An Epidemic of Erythema Multiforme and Erythema Nodosum Caused by
1439 Histoplasmosis," *Ann. Intern. Med.*, vol. 62, no. 6, pp. 1244–1262, Jun. 1965, doi:
1440 10.7326/0003-4819-62-6-1244.
- 1441 [190] W. F. Schlech *et al.*, "Recurrent urban histoplasmosis, Indianapolis, Indiana, 1980-1981,"
1442 *Am. J. Epidemiol.*, vol. 118, no. 3, pp. 301–312, Sep. 1983.
- 1443 [191] D. J. Drutz, "Urban Coccidioidomycosis and Histoplasmosis: Sacramento and
1444 Indianapolis," *N. Engl. J. Med.*, vol. 301, no. 7, pp. 381–382, Aug. 1979, doi:
1445 10.1056/NEJM197908163010711.
- 1446 [192] L. J. Wheat, "A Large Urban Outbreak of Histoplasmosis: Clinical Features," *Ann. Intern.*
1447 *Med.*, vol. 94, no. 3, pp. 331–337, Mar. 1981, doi: 10.7326/0003-4819-94-3-331.
- 1448 [193] A. Lauer *et al.*, "Combining Forces - The Use of Landsat TM Satellite Imagery, Soil
1449 Parameter Information, and Multiplex PCR to Detect Coccidioides immitis Growth Sites in
1450 Kern County, California," *PLoS ONE*, vol. 9, no. 11, p. e111921, Nov. 2014, doi:
1451 10.1371/journal.pone.0111921.
- 1452 [194] W. J. Harris and P. D. Roffers, "Assessing Erosion Potential and Coccidioides immitis
1453 Probability Using Existing Geologic and Soils Data," in *Digital Mapping Techniques '10—*
1454 *Workshop Proceedings* U.S. Geological Survey Open-File Report 2012–1171, Sacramento,
1455 CA, 2010, [Online]. Available: <http://pubs.usgs.gov/of/2012/1171/>.
- 1456 [195] G. Thompson, J. Brown, K. Benedict, and B. Park, "Coccidioidomycosis: epidemiology,"
1457 *Clin. Epidemiol.*, p. 185, Jun. 2013, doi: 10.2147/CLEP.S34434.
- 1458 [196] G. Sondermeyer, L. Lee, D. Gilliss, F. Tabnak, and D. Vugia, "Coccidioidomycosis-
1459 associated Hospitalizations, California, USA, 2000–2011," *Emerg. Infect. Dis.*, vol. 19, no.
1460 10, Oct. 2013, doi: 10.3201/eid1910.130427.

M Dillon and
C Dillon

Particle Model for
Airborne Disease Transmission

- 1461 [197] D. Q. Tong, J. X. L. Wang, T. E. Gill, H. Lei, and B. Wang, "Intensified dust storm activity
1462 and Valley fever infection in the southwestern United States: Dust and Valley Fever
1463 Intensification," *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, vol. 44, no. 9, pp. 4304–4312, May 2017, doi:
1464 10.1002/2017GL073524.
- 1465 [198] K. Benedict and B. J. Park, "Invasive Fungal Infections after Natural Disasters," *Emerg.*
1466 *Infect. Dis.*, vol. 20, no. 3, pp. 349–355, Mar. 2014, doi: 10.3201/eid2003.131230.
- 1467 [199] R. W. Jibson, E. L. Harp, E. Schneider, R. A. Hajjeh, and R. A. Spiegel, "An outbreak of
1468 coccidioidomycosis (valley fever) caused by landslides triggered by the 1994 Northridge,
1469 California, earthquake," *Geol. Soc. Rev. Eng. Geol.*, vol. 12, pp. 53–61, 1998.
- 1470 [200] S. E. Thompson and G. G. Katul, "Implications of nonrandom seed abscission and global
1471 stalling for migration of wind-dispersed plant species," *Glob. Change Biol.*, vol. 19, no. 6,
1472 pp. 1720–1735, Jun. 2013, doi: 10.1111/gcb.12173.
- 1473 [201] Y. Mazar, E. Cytryn, Y. Erel, and Y. Rudich, "Effect of Dust Storms on the Atmospheric
1474 Microbiome in the Eastern Mediterranean," *Environ. Sci. Technol.*, vol. 50, no. 8, pp. 4194–
1475 4202, Apr. 2016, doi: 10.1021/acs.est.5b06348.
- 1476 [202] H. Behzad, K. Mineta, and T. Gojobori, "Global Ramifications of Dust and Sandstorm
1477 Microbiota," *Genome Biol. Evol.*, vol. 10, no. 8, pp. 1970–1987, Aug. 2018, doi:
1478 10.1093/gbe/evy134.
- 1479 [203] T. Weil *et al.*, "Legal immigrants: invasion of alien microbial communities during winter
1480 occurring desert dust storms," *Microbiome*, vol. 5, no. 1, p. 32, Dec. 2017, doi:
1481 10.1186/s40168-017-0249-7.
- 1482 [204] H. Peter, P. Hörtnagl, I. Reche, and R. Sommaruga, "Bacterial diversity and composition
1483 during rain events with and without Saharan dust influence reaching a high mountain lake
1484 in the Alps," *Environ. Microbiol. Rep.*, vol. 6, no. 6, pp. 618–624, Dec. 2014, doi:
1485 10.1111/1758-2229.12175.
- 1486 [205] C. A. Kellogg *et al.*, "Characterization of Aerosolized Bacteria and Fungi From Desert
1487 Dust Events in Mali, West Africa," *Aerobiologia*, vol. 20, no. 2, pp. 99–110, Jun. 2004, doi:
1488 10.1023/B:AERO.0000032947.88335.bb.
- 1489 [206] D. W. Griffin, "Atmospheric Movement of Microorganisms in Clouds of Desert Dust and
1490 Implications for Human Health," *Clin. Microbiol. Rev.*, vol. 20, no. 3, pp. 459–477, Jul. 2007,
1491 doi: 10.1128/CMR.00039-06.
- 1492 [207] P. N. Polymenakou, "Atmosphere: A Source of Pathogenic or Beneficial Microbes?,"
1493 *Atmosphere*, vol. 3, no. 4, pp. 87–102, Jan. 2012, doi: 10.3390/atmos3010087.
- 1494 [208] D. Pappagianis and H. Einstein, "Tempest from Tehachapi takes toll or Coccidioides
1495 conveyed aloft and afar," *West. J. Med.*, vol. 129, no. 6, pp. 527–530, Dec. 1978.
- 1496 [209] J. E. Hermansen, U. Torp, and L. P. Prahm, "Studies of Transport of Live Spores of Cereal
1497 Mildew and Rust Fungi across the North Sea," *Grana*, vol. 17, no. 1, pp. 41–46, Apr. 1978,
1498 doi: 10.1080/00173137809428851.

M Dillon and
C Dillon

Particle Model for
Airborne Disease Transmission

- 1499 [210] C. C. Mundt, L. D. Wallace, T. W. Allen, C. A. Hollier, R. C. Kemerait, and E. J. Sikora,
1500 "Initial epidemic area is strongly associated with the yearly extent of soybean rust spread
1501 in North America," *Biol. Invasions*, vol. 15, no. 7, pp. 1431–1438, Jul. 2013, doi:
1502 10.1007/s10530-012-0381-z.
- 1503 [211] N. M. Flynn *et al.*, "An Unusual Outbreak of Windborne Coccidioidomycosis," *N. Engl. J.*
1504 *Med.*, vol. 301, no. 7, pp. 358–361, Aug. 1979, doi: 10.1056/NEJM197908163010705.
- 1505 [212] "desertdust.jpeg (JPEG Image, 890 × 690 pixels)."
1506 <https://geochange.er.usgs.gov/sw/impacts/geology/dust/desertdust.jpeg> (accessed Jan.
1507 27, 2020).
- 1508 [213] P. L. Williams, D. L. Sable, P. Mendez, and L. T. Smyth, "Symptomatic Coccidioidomycosis
1509 following a Severe Natural Dust Storm," *Chest*, vol. 76, no. 5, pp. 566–570, Nov. 1979, doi:
1510 10.1378/chest.76.5.566.
- 1511 [214] W. A. Sprigg *et al.*, "Regional dust storm modeling for health services: The case of valley
1512 fever," *Aeolian Res.*, vol. 14, pp. 53–73, Sep. 2014, doi: 10.1016/j.aeolia.2014.03.001.
- 1513 [215] A. De Visscher, *Air dispersion modeling: foundations and applications*. Hoboken, New
1514 Jersey: John Wiley & Sons, Inc, 2014.
- 1515 [216] S. R. Hanna, G. A. Briggs, and R. P. Hosker, "Handbook of Atmospheric Diffusion," US
1516 Department of Energy, Springfield, VA, DOE/TIC-11223, 1982.
- 1517 [217] *Tracking and Predicting the Atmospheric Dispersion of Hazardous Material Releases:*
1518 *Implications for Homeland Security*. Washington, D.C.: National Academies Press, 2003.
- 1519 [218] D. Randerson, "Atmospheric science and power production," DOE/TIC-27601, 6503687,
1520 Jul. 1984. doi: 10.2172/6503687.
- 1521 [219] S. P. Arya, *Air pollution meteorology and dispersion*. New York: Oxford University Press,
1522 1999.
- 1523 [220] D. B. Turner, "Workbook of Atmospheric Dispersion Estimates," US Environmental
1524 Protection Agency, Office of Air Programs, Research Triangle Park, NC, AP-26, 1970.
- 1525 [221] M. Z. Jacobson, *Fundamentals of atmospheric modeling*, 2nd ed. Cambridge, UK ; New
1526 York: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- 1527 [222] R. B. Stull, *An Introduction to Boundary Layer Meteorology*. Dordrecht: Springer
1528 Netherlands, 1988.
- 1529 [223] D. H. Slade (Ed.), "Meteorology and Atomic Energy," Air Resources Laboratories for the
1530 US Atomic Energy Commission, Jul. 1968.
- 1531 [224] S. K. Shah and E. Bou-Zeid, "Direct numerical simulations of turbulent Ekman layers with
1532 increasing static stability: modifications to the bulk structure and second-order statistics,"
1533 *J. Fluid Mech.*, vol. 760, pp. 494–539, Dec. 2014, doi: 10.1017/jfm.2014.597.

M Dillon and
C Dillon

Particle Model for
Airborne Disease Transmission

- 1534 [225] S. M. I. Gohari and S. Sarkar, "Stratified Ekman layers evolving under a finite-time
1535 stabilizing buoyancy flux," *J. Fluid Mech.*, vol. 840, pp. 266–290, Apr. 2018, doi:
1536 10.1017/jfm.2018.58.
- 1537 [226] J. C. Chang and S. R. Hanna, "Air quality model performance evaluation," *Meteorol.*
1538 *Atmospheric Phys.*, vol. 87, no. 1–3, Sep. 2004, doi: 10.1007/s00703-003-0070-7.
- 1539 [227] P. Zannetti, Ed., *Air quality modeling: theories, methodologies, computational*
1540 *techniques, and available databases and software*, vol. IV-Advances and Updates. United
1541 States of America: EnviroComp ; Air & Waste Management Association, 2010.
- 1542 [228] G. Sugiyama *et al.*, "Atmospheric Dispersion Modeling: Challenges of the Fukushima
1543 Daiichi Response," *Health Phys.*, vol. 102, no. 5, pp. 493–508, May 2012, doi:
1544 10.1097/HP.0b013e31824c7bc9.
- 1545 [229] J. S. Nasstrom, G. Sugiyama, R. L. Baskett, S. C. Larsen, and M. M. Bradley, "The National
1546 Atmospheric Release Advisory Center modelling and decision-support system for
1547 radiological and nuclear emergency preparedness and response," *Int. J. Emerg. Manag.*,
1548 vol. 4, no. 3, p. 524, 2007, doi: 10.1504/IJEM.2007.014301.
- 1549 [230] J. C. Weil, "Evaluation of the NARAC Modeling System Final Report to the Lawrence
1550 Livermore National Laboratory," Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, Livermore, CA,
1551 UCRL-AR-217329, Nov. 2005.
- 1552 [231] K. T. Foster, G. Sugiyama, J. S. Nasstrom, J. M. L. Jr., S. T. Chan, and B. M. Bowen, "The
1553 use of an operational model evaluation system for model intercomparison," *Int. J. Environ.*
1554 *Pollut.*, vol. 14, no. 1/2/3/4/5/6, p. 77, 2000, doi: 10.1504/IJEP.2000.000528.
- 1555 [232] S. Warner, J. F. Heagy, N. Platt, and M. B. Dillon, "Transport and Dispersion Model
1556 Predictions of Elevated Source Tracer Experiments in the Copenhagen Area: Comparisons
1557 of Hazard Prediction and Assessment Capability (HPAC) and National Atmospheric Release
1558 Advisory Center (NARAC) Emergency Response Model Predictions," Institute of Defense
1559 Analysis, Alexandria, VA, Technical Report D-3276, Jul. 2006.
- 1560 [233] J. S. Nasstrom and J. C. Pace, "Evaluation of the effect of meteorological data resolution
1561 on Lagrangian particle dispersion simulations using the ETEX experiment," *Atmos.*
1562 *Environ.*, vol. 32, no. 24, pp. 4187–4194, Dec. 1998, doi: 10.1016/S1352-2310(98)00180-0.
- 1563 [234] S. G. Perry *et al.*, "AERMOD: A Dispersion Model for Industrial Source Applications. Part
1564 II: Model Performance against 17 Field Study Databases," *J. Appl. Meteorol.*, vol. 44, no. 5,
1565 pp. 694–708, May 2005, doi: 10.1175/JAM2228.1.
- 1566 [235] US Environmental Protection Agency, "Exposure Factors Handbook 2011 Edition (Final),"
1567 US Environmental Protection Agency, Washington DC, EPA/600/R-09/052F.
- 1568 [236] E. C. Riley, G. Murphy, and R. L. Riley, "Airborne spread of measles in a suburban
1569 elementary school," *Am. J. Epidemiol.*, vol. 107, no. 5, pp. 421–432, May 1978, doi:
1570 10.1093/oxfordjournals.aje.a112560.

M Dillon and
C Dillon

Particle Model for
Airborne Disease Transmission

- 1571 [237] G. N. Sze To and C. Y. H. Chao, "Review and comparison between the Wells–Riley and
1572 dose-response approaches to risk assessment of infectious respiratory diseases," *Indoor*
1573 *Air*, vol. 20, no. 1, pp. 2–16, Feb. 2010, doi: 10.1111/j.1600-0668.2009.00621.x.
- 1574 [238] C. B. Keil, "A Tiered Approach to Deterministic Models for Indoor Air Exposures," *Appl.*
1575 *Occup. Environ. Hyg.*, vol. 15, no. 1, pp. 145–151, Jan. 2000, doi:
1576 10.1080/104732200301962.
- 1577 [239] T. L. Thatcher, M. M. Lunden, K. L. Revzan, R. G. Sextro, and N. J. Brown, "A
1578 Concentration Rebound Method for Measuring Particle Penetration and Deposition in the
1579 Indoor Environment," *Aerosol Sci. Technol.*, vol. 37, no. 11, pp. 847–864, Nov. 2003, doi:
1580 10.1080/02786820300940.
- 1581 [240] F. H. Shair and K. L. Heitner, "Theoretical model for relating indoor pollutant
1582 concentrations to those outside," *Environ. Sci. Technol.*, vol. 8, no. 5, pp. 444–451, May
1583 1974, doi: 10.1021/es60090a006.
- 1584 [241] S. R. Hayes, "Use of an Indoor Air Quality Model (IAQM) to Estimate Indoor Ozone
1585 Levels," *J. Air Waste Manag. Assoc.*, vol. 41, no. 2, pp. 161–170, Feb. 1991, doi:
1586 10.1080/10473289.1991.10466833.
- 1587 [242] J. M. Leone, J. S. Nasstrom, D. M. Maddix, D. J. Larson, G. Sugiyama, and D. L. Ermak,
1588 "Lagrangian Operational Dispersion Integrator (LODI) User's Guide v1.0," Lawrence
1589 Livermore National Laboratory, Livermore, CA, UCRL-AM-212798, 2001.
- 1590 [243] G. Sugiyama and S. T. Chan, "A new meteorological data assimilation model for real-
1591 time emergency response," presented at the Tenth Joint Conference on the Applications
1592 of Air Pollution Meteorology, Phoenix, AZ, Jan. 1998, pp. 285–289.
- 1593 [244] "Residential Energy Consumption Survey (RECS) - Data - U.S. Energy Information
1594 Administration (EIA)." <https://www.eia.gov/consumption/residential/data/2015/>
1595 (accessed Jan. 19, 2020).
- 1596 [245] M. Georgiev *et al.*, "Q fever in humans and farm animals in four European countries,
1597 1982 to 2010," *Euro Surveill. Bull. Eur. Sur Mal. Transm. Eur. Commun. Dis. Bull.*, vol. 18,
1598 no. 8, Feb. 2013.
- 1599 [246] National Association of State Public Health Veterinarians and National Assembly of State
1600 Animal Health Officials, "Prevention and Control of *Coxiella burnetii* Infection among
1601 Humans and Animals: Guidance for a Coordinated Public Health and Animal Health
1602 Response," 2013. Accessed: Mar. 01, 2020. [Online]. Available:
1603 http://nasphv.org/Documents/Q_Fever_2013.pdf.
- 1604 [247] T. J. O'Neill, J. M. Sargeant, and Z. Poljak, "The Effectiveness of *Coxiella burnetii* Vaccines
1605 in Occupationally Exposed Populations: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis,"
1606 *Zoonoses Public Health*, vol. 61, no. 2, pp. 81–96, Mar. 2014, doi: 10.1111/zph.12054.

M Dillon and
C Dillon

Particle Model for
Airborne Disease Transmission

- 1607 [248] P. M. Reeves, S. R. Paul, A. E. Sluder, T. A. Brauns, and M. C. Poznansky, "Q-vaxcelerate:
1608 A distributed development approach for a new Coxiella burnetii vaccine," *Hum. Vaccines*
1609 *Immunother.*, vol. 13, no. 12, pp. 2977–2981, Dec. 2017, doi:
1610 10.1080/21645515.2017.1371377.
- 1611 [249] C. Eldin *et al.*, "From Q Fever to Coxiella burnetii Infection: a Paradigm Change," *Clin.*
1612 *Microbiol. Rev.*, vol. 30, no. 1, pp. 115–190, Jan. 2017, doi: 10.1128/CMR.00045-16.
- 1613 [250] J. H. McQuiston and J. E. Childs, "Q fever in humans and animals in the United States,"
1614 *Vector Borne Zoonotic Dis. Larchmt. N*, vol. 2, no. 3, pp. 179–191, 2002, doi:
1615 10.1089/15303660260613747.
- 1616 [251] G. J. Kersh *et al.*, "Presence of Coxiella burnetii DNA in the Environment of the United
1617 States, 2006 to 2008," *Appl. Environ. Microbiol.*, vol. 76, no. 13, pp. 4469–4475, Jul. 2010,
1618 doi: 10.1128/AEM.00042-10.
- 1619 [252] S. R. Porter, G. Czaplicki, J. Mainil, R. Guattéo, and C. Saegerman, "Q Fever: Current
1620 State of Knowledge and Perspectives of Research of a Neglected Zoonosis," *Int. J.*
1621 *Microbiol.*, vol. 2011, pp. 1–22, 2011, doi: 10.1155/2011/248418.
- 1622 [253] N. R. Parker, J. H. Barralet, and A. M. Bell, "Q fever," *The Lancet*, vol. 367, no. 9511, pp.
1623 679–688, Feb. 2006, doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(06)68266-4.
- 1624 [254] S. Bacci, S. Villumsen, P. Valentiner-Branth, B. Smith, K. A. Krogfelt, and K. Mølbak,
1625 "Epidemiology and clinical features of human infection with Coxiella burnetii in Denmark
1626 during 2006-07," *Zoonoses Public Health*, vol. 59, no. 1, pp. 61–68, Feb. 2012, doi:
1627 10.1111/j.1863-2378.2011.01419.x.
- 1628 [255] H. K. Miller *et al.*, "Trends in Q fever serologic testing by immunofluorescence from four
1629 large reference laboratories in the United States, 2012–2016," *Sci. Rep.*, vol. 8, no. 1, p.
1630 16670, Dec. 2018, doi: 10.1038/s41598-018-34702-2.
- 1631 [256] H. W. Kaufman, Z. Chen, J. Radcliff, H. J. Batterman, and J. Leake, "Q fever: an under-
1632 reported reportable communicable disease," *Epidemiol. Infect.*, vol. 146, no. 10, pp. 1240–
1633 1244, Jul. 2018, doi: 10.1017/S0950268818001395.
- 1634 [257] "NHANES 2003-2004: Coxiella Burnetii (Q Fever) Antibodies - Serum (Surplus) Data
1635 Documentation, Codebook, and Frequencies." [https://wwwn.cdc.gov/Nchs/Nhanes/2003-](https://wwwn.cdc.gov/Nchs/Nhanes/2003-2004/SSQFEV_C.htm)
1636 [2004/SSQFEV_C.htm](https://wwwn.cdc.gov/Nchs/Nhanes/2003-2004/SSQFEV_C.htm) (accessed Feb. 06, 2020).
- 1637 [258] M. G. Walsh, "Assessing Q fever in a representative sample from the United States
1638 population: identification of a potential occupational hazard," *Epidemiol. Infect.*, vol. 140,
1639 no. 1, pp. 42–46, Jan. 2012, doi: 10.1017/S0950268811000227.
- 1640 [259] F. S. Dahlgren, D. L. Haberling, and J. H. McQuiston, "Q Fever is Underestimated in the
1641 United States: A Comparison of Fatal Q Fever Cases from Two National Reporting
1642 Systems," *Am. J. Trop. Med. Hyg.*, vol. 92, no. 2, pp. 244–246, Feb. 2015, doi:
1643 10.4269/ajtmh.14-0502.

M Dillon and
C Dillon

Particle Model for
Airborne Disease Transmission

- 1644 [260] B. Schimmer *et al.*, “Low seroprevalence of Q fever in The Netherlands prior to a series
1645 of large outbreaks,” *Epidemiol. Infect.*, vol. 140, no. 1, pp. 27–35, Jan. 2012, doi:
1646 10.1017/S0950268811000136.
- 1647 [261] H. F. Gidding *et al.*, “Q fever seroprevalence in Australia suggests one in twenty people
1648 have been exposed,” *Epidemiol. Infect.*, vol. 148, p. e18, 2020, doi:
1649 10.1017/S0950268820000084.
1650

M Dillon and
C Dillon

Particle Model for
Airborne Disease Transmission

Supplemental Material A: Airborne Disease Transmission Literature Review

Air is not a sterile medium, as initially demonstrated in the early 19th century experiments of Louis Pasteur. Bacteria and fungi are ubiquitous in the atmosphere and reach concentrations of about 10^4 and 10^3 cells m^{-3} in air, respectively [104]–[107]. These facts are well understood and elucidated in the field of Aerobiology which has documented the life cycles, including transport and dispersion, of naturally occurring airborne viruses, microorganisms, and bioaerosols [108]–[111]. However, there appears to be much confusion on the potential for airborne disease transmission, particularly at longer spatial scales due likely in part to the dispersed nature of this literature.

To provide the reader context for the main manuscript, this section briefly presents a set of well-documented airborne disease transmission examples on spatial scales ranging from a meter to thousands of kilometers. The specific cases discussed here are from the human disease as well as veterinary and agricultural biosafety³⁰ literatures and have multiple studies showing airborne disease transmission. This synopsis is not intended to be comprehensive and we do not cite all relevant literature. We note that [8] is a useful literature review of atmospheric dispersion modeling for infectious diseases, with a focus on human and veterinary studies.

Near Range (< 5 m)

Near distance airborne disease spread (≤ 5 m) is common and occurs when infected individuals generate large quantities of infectious droplet (and droplet nuclei) particles when coughing or sneezing [33], [112]. Tuberculosis and the Measles virus (Rubeola) have long been known to transmit over this distance [1], [2]. Bordetella pertussis (Whooping Cough), Varicella Zoster virus (Chickenpox), Mumps virus, Rubella virus (German Measles) and Neisseria meningitidis (bacterial meningitis) are additional examples [113], [114]. This near range airborne disease spread is known to contribute to the overall disease burden as lower respiratory infections and Tuberculosis are the 4th and 10th leading causes of death world-wide [5]. Finally, two percent of US adults (6.5 million) are hospitalized each year for treatment of community acquired pneumonias caused in part by the near-range airborne transmission of common bacteria and viruses including Influenza [115].³¹

³⁰ airborne microbial threats to animal livestock or resulting from agricultural activities

³¹ The airborne disease transmission pathway can contribute to overall disease transmission, even when other – droplet ($> 5 \mu m$ AD particles) and contact – pathways are important, e.g., [6], [7].

M Dillon and
C Dillon

Particle Model for
Airborne Disease Transmission

1682 **Short Range (5 m to 50 m)**

1683 Airborne disease spread is also known to occur over short distances (5 m to 50 m) [34]. The
1684 spread of human pathogens within buildings has been particularly well documented in hospital
1685 environments [97], [116]–[118]. Furthermore, outdoor airborne particles are known to infiltrate
1686 indoors and cause disease in building occupants.³² Building air filtration systems and other
1687 measures are in active use to reduce the incidence of airborne animal diseases, e.g., Newcastle
1688 Disease virus, and porcine reproductive and respiratory syndrome (PRRS virus) [120]–[123].
1689 Research also indicates that air filtration is beneficial to control MRSA in veterinary settings
1690 [124]. Furthermore, high-risk patient areas in hospitals are designed with physical and
1691 ventilation barriers to minimize infections in immune compromised patients. Hospital design
1692 features include, but are not limited to, permanently sealed hospital room windows and HEPA
1693 air filtration [116], [125], [126]. Ultraviolet germicidal irradiation is also routinely used to
1694 reduce airborne disease risk in hospital and other facilities, especially for Tuberculosis control
1695 [127].

1696 The Newcastle Disease (ND) virus, an avian paramyxovirus, is one well-known example of an
1697 airborne disease that can transmit over short distances. ND virus is a commercially important
1698 pathogen in poultry production and virulent strains can be devastating, with flock mortality
1699 approaching 100% [128], [129]. ND virus has multiple routes of transmission, including
1700 airborne. ND vaccines have been a mainstay of ND control, but a number of pandemics have
1701 occurred and the disease remains endemic in many countries [129]. With regards to the
1702 plausibility of airborne transmission, we note some ND live virus vaccines are delivered via fine
1703 aerosolized powders [130]. Furthermore, experimental field studies have documented short-
1704 range (60 m) airborne dispersion based on positive viral cultures of air samples [131], [132].
1705 Recent experimental work has reconfirmed an airborne transmission route for ND virus [129].
1706 Furthermore, outfitting buildings with negative air ionization and dilute viricidal chlorine
1707 aerosols may be useful in attenuating airborne disease transmission [121], [122].

1708 In plant biology and biosafety studies, short-range (<50 m) airborne particle and pathogen
1709 transmissions are thought to be the most frequent scenarios. For example, initial median
1710 windborne (anemochorous) plant seed dispersals are typically short (<10 m) but the 95%th
1711 percentile for airborne seed dispersion occurs over longer distances and varies significantly by
1712 species [133]–[135]. In plant pathology studies of Wheat Stripe Rust (*Puccinia striiformis* f. sp.
1713 *Tritici*) and the wind-dispersed banana plant fungus *Mycosphaerella fijiensis* [91], [136], single-

³² The physics of outdoor-origin particles penetrating buildings and exposing indoor individuals has been studied, e.g., [30] and is demonstrated by (a) indoor measurements of outdoor-origin PM_{2.5} particles [34], [119] and (b) airborne *Bacillus thuringiensis* bacteria infiltration into buildings [23].

M Dillon and
C Dillon

Particle Model for
Airborne Disease Transmission

1714 field experimental studies are used to model initial local plot/field-level airborne pathogen
1715 dispersal and clearly demonstrate short-range airborne infection transmissions. These studies
1716 have been also used to develop source (emission) estimates for larger scale long-distance
1717 disease spread and propagated epidemics.

1718

1719 **Medium Range (50 m to 500 m)**

1720 Medium range airborne dispersions of infectious pathogens are well-documented in the plant
1721 biosafety, veterinary and human disease Epidemiology literature. These papers include both
1722 observational and experimental field studies coupled with physics-based airborne transport and
1723 dispersion modeling. Human data for downwind infections are primarily from epidemiology
1724 studies of unexpected disease outbreaks, supported by toxicology, clinical studies and
1725 environmental studies using background disease rate data.

1726 Epidemiologic disease outbreak studies provide human data for medium range (≤ 500 m)
1727 airborne transmission of disease. Well-documented examples include ongoing community-level
1728 outbreaks of Legionnaire's Disease (*Legionella pneumophila*) from building cooling towers
1729 [137]–[145]; Q Fever (*Coxiella burnetii*) transmission from livestock farms to their surrounding
1730 communities [37]; as well as Histoplasmosis (*Histoplasma capsulatum*) and Aspergillosis
1731 *fumigatus* and *flavus* dispersions from construction work or sites where contaminated soil is
1732 disturbed [25]–[29], [146].

1733 On this spatial scale, best-practices and regulatory standards aim to reduce the risk of airborne
1734 transport of infectious particles. Guidelines exist to control occupational and environmental
1735 construction-associated dust during building renovations. In endemic regions these guidelines
1736 are codified into law to reduce infections [147], [148]. Furthermore, there is a long standing, yet
1737 still evolving, literature that supports existing regulatory standards aimed at protecting workers
1738 and nearby communities from airborne pathogen dispersal from environmental sites such as
1739 composting facilities, sewage processing and waste-water aerosols, agricultural gray water
1740 aerosols, livestock feed yards and land applications of manure [17], [149]–[155]. As one
1741 example, a protective ring of up to 250 m is commonly specified under the assumption that
1742 existing air monitors detect little to no airborne material beyond that point [152], [153].

1743

1744

M Dillon and
C Dillon

Particle Model for
Airborne Disease Transmission

1745 Long Range (500 m to 500 km)

1746 Long range airborne infectious pathogen transmission is also well-documented in plant biology,
1747 the plant and veterinary biosafety literature, as well as in human disease outbreak
1748 epidemiology studies. Long-distance atmospheric transmission mechanisms, termed LDD in this
1749 literature, have been shown to play a crucial ecological role in plant species invasion, migration
1750 and survival as well as plant pathogen dispersal [54], [57], [156]–[159]. This field is well
1751 advanced in its understanding of the connection between airborne pathogen transport and
1752 dispersion and disease epidemics [58], [160]–[163].

1753 Biosafety experimental field studies also clearly demonstrate kilometer-range dispersion of
1754 plant pathogens. For example, fungal plant pathogens are currently an increasing threat to
1755 world food security [164]. A wind-dispersed banana plant fungus (*Mycosphaerella fijiensis*) field
1756 experiment documented 1 km airborne dispersal in one generation [91]. Studies such as these
1757 and others, e.g., [90], together with the above cited plant biology and biosafety literature,
1758 demonstrate that the infection probability first decreases quickly with distance which is
1759 followed by regimen of kilometer-range LDD events (termed a long “dispersion tail”).

1760 In the United States, long-distance airborne spread of economically significant plant disease
1761 across the landscape is an ongoing concern. Predictable seasonal airborne pathogen incursion
1762 pathways across the continent are well-identified and routinely monitored to protect crop
1763 yields. These continental-scale incursions typically proceed in a stepwise series of shorter (long-
1764 distance) airborne dispersals. Chief examples are the seasonal airborne south to north US
1765 dispersion incursion pathways across the Midwest Great Plains for wheat stem rust (*Puccinia*
1766 *graminis* f. *sp. tritici*); the pandemic spread of tobacco blue mold spores (*Peronospora tabacina*)
1767 across the Eastern US; and the seasonal US airborne invasion of soybean rust (*Phakopsora*
1768 *pachyrhizi* Sydow) [89], [93], [159], [165], [166].

1769 In the Veterinary literature there are many examples of probable kilometer-range airborne
1770 infection transmission. For example, Newcastle Disease virus, Equine Influenza (A/H3N8), Highly
1771 Pathogenic Avian Influenza A(H7N7) are important ongoing diseases and each has evidence for
1772 long-range airborne virus transmission [132], [167]–[170]. The best described long distance
1773 airborne transmitted disease in animals is Foot and Mouth Disease virus, an economically
1774 significant disease of veterinary livestock. Long-distance FMDV aerosols are suspected to have
1775 contributed to a number of costly, regional-scale disease outbreaks in Europe, including
1776 airborne transmission from continental Europe to the United Kingdom [171], [172]. This disease
1777 has motivated the significant development and testing of scientific models for long distance
1778 infectious aerosol dispersals with the aim of limiting epidemic spread [58], [160]–[162], [173]–
1779 [176].

M Dillon and
C Dillon

Particle Model for
Airborne Disease Transmission

1780 In the human epidemiology literature, many well documented examples exist for airborne
1781 disease transmissions over distances greater than 1 kilometer downwind. *Coxiella burnetii*, an
1782 endemic disease of ruminants and livestock, is also the cause of Q Fever in humans [59]. Long-
1783 distance airborne transmission disease outbreaks from animal farms to human populations
1784 have occurred in many European countries [42], [83], [177]–[179]. Notably the recent regional-
1785 scale Q Fever epidemic in 2007-2010 in the Netherlands was caused by infectious aerosols
1786 emitted from small animal farms [40], [41], [180]–[182]. The epidemic resulted in 4,000 clinical
1787 cases and 2,700 hospitalizations [180]. A more recent 2018 follow up of this outbreak showed
1788 that among the 519 chronic Q Fever cases identified, 86 patients had died [69]. *Legionella*
1789 *pneumophila* dispersions from building cooling towers are also an ongoing source of kilometer-
1790 range community Legionnaire’s Disease outbreaks despite the introduction of preventive legal
1791 regulations for cooling equipment maintenance [142], [183]. Significant airborne Legionnaire’s
1792 disease outbreaks have been reported in many countries including the US, France, Norway,
1793 Sweden, and Spain [43], [44], [137]–[141], [143]–[145], [184], [185].

1794 The fungal pathogens *Histoplasma capsulatum* and *Coccidioides immitis* and *posadasii* cause
1795 significant human disease due to inhalation (Histoplasmosis and Coccidioidomycosis [or Valley
1796 Fever], respectively). Both are endemic in the US: Histoplasmosis in the Eastern and
1797 Midwestern states, Coccidioidomycosis in the American West and Southwest [29], [186]. Based
1798 on observational epidemiologic studies, three city-wide airborne outbreaks of Histoplasmosis
1799 have occurred, two at a community level [187]–[189] and the third being a series of 3 large
1800 outbreaks that occurred in urban Indianapolis, IN [190]–[192].

1801 Coccidioidomycosis occurs after inhalation of fungal spores which are widely distributed in
1802 southwestern US soils [193], [194]. Forty percent of exposed persons will have clinical
1803 symptoms, ranging from an influenza-like illness to disseminated disease and chronic
1804 meningitis. Symptomatic disseminated disease requires aggressive treatment and has increased
1805 rates of hospitalization and mortality [195], [196]. Desert dust cloud dispersions containing
1806 *Coccidioides* spores are an important ongoing cause of disease in endemic areas [197]. In
1807 addition long-distance airborne dust cloud *Coccidioides* dispersal events triggered by natural
1808 disasters have caused significant regional Coccidioidomycosis outbreaks in the US state of
1809 California [198]. Kilometer-scale airborne transmission occurred in the Los Angeles area
1810 following the 1994 Northridge earthquake, where strong aftershocks generated landslides on
1811 the slopes of the Santa Susana Mountains creating large, contaminated dust clouds [45], [46],
1812 [199]. These clouds were blown by ambient winds into the urban Simi Valley and Ventura
1813 County areas – causing a Coccidioidomycosis outbreak (203 total cases; 55 hospitalizations; 3
1814 fatalities).

1815

M Dillon and
C Dillon

Particle Model for
Airborne Disease Transmission

1816 Continental and Global Range (> 500 km)

1817 Continental-scale airborne dispersion events, especially plant seed dispersions, have been well
1818 studied and influence the spread of invasive species, metapopulation dynamics, and plant
1819 diversity [134], [156], [157], [200]. Continental-scale transport of common environmental
1820 bacteria species, either on normal atmospheric air currents or in association with dust cloud
1821 dispersions, has also been well-demonstrated [55], [105], [201], [202]. As one example,
1822 bacterial communities from the Saharan desert are known to travel airborne to high European
1823 Alpine lakes [203], [204]. Pathogenic bacteria have also been observed in the ambient
1824 atmosphere, including plant, animal, and human pathogens [205]–[207]. Furthermore, airborne
1825 transmission of *Neisseria meningitidis*, a major cause of Meningitis world-wide, is currently
1826 under investigation in the endemic Sahel region of North Africa as outbreaks occur most often
1827 in dry months with frequent dust storms [202], [206].

1828 Airborne continental-scale disease spread often proceeds as a series of sequential long range
1829 airborne transmission events over the landscape (saltatory transmission). However, individual
1830 continental-scale airborne disease transmission events, i.e., a single airborne plume
1831 transporting pathogens more than 500 km, are also documented in the literature [54], [89],
1832 [208], [209]. Most but not all of the existing examples are from agricultural biosafety studies
1833 where these events are termed “single-step” LDD pathogen invasions [54]. These types of
1834 events are thought to be rare and often associated with extreme weather events or natural
1835 disasters [89], [198]. However, routinely occurring, “single-step” LDD events could be more
1836 frequent, although the possibility has not been systematically investigated. For example, a
1837 sentinel study LDD of airborne pathogenic plant fungi (*Erysiphe graminis*, f.sp. *hordei* [barley
1838 mildew] and *Erysiphe graminis*, f.sp. *tritici* [wheat mildew]) demonstrated transmission over a
1839 distance of 650 km across the North Sea from Great Britain to Scandinavia [209]. Samples were
1840 obtained using disease-free receptor plant populations compared to unexposed control plants
1841 and a multi-year series of samples were obtained in the highest expected transmission regions.

1842 A major weather-related “single-step” LDD event was the 2,000 km airborne dispersion of Asian
1843 soybean rust (*Phakopsora pachyrhizi*) across the Caribbean from northwestern South America
1844 to the US during Hurricane Ivan [89]. This 2004 event marked the invasion of Asian soybean rust
1845 into the North American continent. The event was anticipated as the spread of Asian soybean
1846 rust from Brazil northward in South America was being monitored and Brazil had lost a
1847 significant fraction of its soybean production to this pathogen. Among other measures (and
1848 prior to the event itself), predictive atmospheric dispersion modeling for potential transport to
1849 the US during tropical cyclone seasons were conducted and the US Department of Agriculture
1850 deployed disease forecasting systems and field-tested a detailed response plan for use in the
1851 event the soybean rust was identified [89]. Soybean rust was detected infesting soybean fields

M Dillon and
C Dillon

Particle Model for
Airborne Disease Transmission

1852 in Louisiana (as predicted) within two weeks after Hurricane Ivan had passed. Subsequently
1853 Asian soybean rust has remained endemic in many southern states, especially in the initial
1854 epidemic outbreak area [210].
1855
1856 A clear human-disease example of single-plume continental-scale airborne disease transmission
1857 is the 600 km dispersion of *Coccidioides immitis* spores in California which resulted in
1858 widespread Coccidioidomycosis outbreaks [211]. In this 1977 event, a 160 km h⁻¹ windstorm
1859 scoured 15 cm of *Coccidioides immitis* contaminated topsoil from Kern County, located in the
1860 southernmost basin of California's great central San Joaquin Valley, carrying a resulting dust
1861 cloud to an altitude of 1,500 meters (Image, reference [212]). The dust was transported
1862 northward and dispersed over a 87,000 km² area [191], [208], [211], [213] - burying freeways
1863 and shutting down interstate transportation. There were 3 immediate storm-related fatalities
1864 and 3 firefighters died in a forest fire spread by the strong winds. Sacramento, a low endemicity
1865 area 500 km to the north, experienced a large Coccidioidomycosis outbreak (115 cases and 6
1866 fatalities reported vs. a background incidence of 0 to 6 cases per year). Overall fifteen California
1867 counties northward in the dust cloud dispersion area reported a ten-fold increase in
1868 Coccidioidomycosis cases and 9 counties reported lesser increases [211]. This 1977 *Coccidioides*
1869 *intimus* dispersion, with a total of more than 379 new cases, serves as a historical benchmark
1870 for the potential magnitude of Coccidioidomycosis cases from a significant dust storm [208].
1871 Integrated Coccidioidomycosis case surveillance and dust storm forecasting are currently
1872 standard in US endemic areas [214].
1873

M Dillon and
C Dillon

Particle Model for
Airborne Disease Transmission

1874 **Supplemental Material B: Key Atmospheric Transport and Dispersion** 1875 **Modeling Concepts**

1876 Atmospheric physics, as well as atmospheric transport and dispersion models of airborne
1877 hazards, are well-established and extensive fields. This supplemental material aims to briefly
1878 introduce the reader to key concepts needed for this report. We note that while the theory
1879 developed in this study is applicable at a wide range of spatial and temporal scales, the
1880 epidemiological datasets that are compared to theoretical predictions relate to exposures that
1881 occur near the earth's surface (in the atmospheric boundary layer), from 0.05 km to a few tens
1882 of km downwind of an airborne release, and less than a few hours from the time of initial
1883 release. The interested reader is referred to [215]–[222] for further details of atmospheric air
1884 flow physics, dispersion, and modeling including those present at other spatial and temporal
1885 scales.

1886 1887 **Mean Air Flow in the Atmosphere**

1888 The mean (time-averaged) air flows are driven by a spatial gradient in atmospheric pressure.
1889 When the horizontal surface pressure gradient between two locations is a few millibar over a
1890 hundred kilometers (tenths of mb km^{-1}), as occurs near the center of a high-pressure weather
1891 system; the atmosphere is relatively calm and horizontal surface mean wind speeds are light,
1892 typically less than 2 m s^{-1} . Larger surface pressure gradients, several to tens of mb km^{-1} , result in
1893 moderate surface winds (3 to 7 m s^{-1}) which are sufficient to stir leaves and twigs. Finally, larger
1894 pressure gradients, which can occur during storms, produce strong winds ($> 8 \text{ m s}^{-1}$). The spatial
1895 and temporal distribution of wind, i.e., the “wind field,” may be quite complex as local
1896 topography can steer the direction of local winds. For example, winds can be channeled along
1897 river and mountain valleys and within urban streets or be blocked by hills or mountains.

1898
1899

M Dillon and
C Dillon

Particle Model for
Airborne Disease Transmission

1900 Atmospheric Turbulence

1901 In addition to the regional (mean) air flow described in the previous paragraph, smaller scale
1902 motions (turbulent eddies) are typically present in the atmosphere. These turbulent motions
1903 are due to two major causes. *Mechanically generated* turbulent motions are generated by drag
1904 resulting from the wind moving over and around physical objects on the earth's surface. The
1905 largest mechanically generated eddy size is proportional to the height above ground and
1906 obstacle size. *Buoyancy generated* turbulent motions are generated, for example, when the
1907 solar heating of the earth's surface causes warmer (buoyant) air to rise and be replaced by
1908 colder air. Buoyancy forces can also decrease turbulent motions, for example, when the surface
1909 is cooler than the air. The size of the largest buoyancy generated eddies depends on the
1910 atmospheric conditions and can be up to approximately 4,000 m.

1911 Once generated, atmospheric eddies interact with each other and the earth's surface. These
1912 interactions result in the original eddies breaking into smaller eddies. The original eddy's
1913 (turbulent kinetic) energy is transferred to the smaller eddies. This process continues,
1914 generating successively smaller eddies until the millimeter size eddies dissipate into heat. This
1915 breakdown process results in a well-characterized spectrum of eddy sizes for a given set of
1916 atmospheric and surface conditions. One important consequence is that turbulent motions in
1917 the atmosphere are correlated over shorter distances (and times) and become uncorrelated at
1918 larger distances (and times). Commonly, turbulent motions are correlated on a few minutes
1919 timescale.

1920 For many common atmospheric conditions, atmospheric eddies are at least an order of
1921 magnitude smaller (spatially and temporally) than the scales of motion present in the regional
1922 (mean) air flow. This separation provides a natural division of air motions that transport (mean
1923 winds) and dilute (turbulent eddies) contaminated air [222]. This separation results in a gap in
1924 the atmospheric energy spectra associated with timescales on the order of an hour.

1925

M Dillon and
C Dillon

Particle Model for
Airborne Disease Transmission

1926 Atmospheric Dispersion Physics

1927 If a small amount of airborne material is added to a mass of air (called an air parcel), its
1928 presence will not significantly affect the regional wind, eddies, or other atmospheric
1929 properties.³³ Thus the *transport and dilution of these contaminated air parcels can be*
1930 *determined from atmospheric (meteorological) and surface considerations alone and does not*
1931 *depend on properties of the contaminant.* Furthermore, the *airborne exposure to such dilute*
1932 *materials can be mathematically represented as the sum of the exposure to many simpler*
1933 *releases* at specific locations and short time periods (superposition principle). Consequently,
1934 insights (and model results) derived for the transport and dilution of single particles released
1935 from a single location and time directly contribute to the characterization of more complex
1936 cases.

1937 During transport by ambient winds, dispersion occurs when the turbulent eddies, described in
1938 the prior subsection, mix surrounding air with the contaminated air parcel which reduces the
1939 contamination concentration in the original air parcel and increases the contamination in
1940 neighboring air parcels. **Figure B1** shows photographs of this process using point-source smoke
1941 aerosol released at a constant rate into a constant airflow. The upper two panels are
1942 instantaneous snapshots which clearly demonstrate high moment-to-moment (stochastic)
1943 variations in plume concentrations that result from the effect of turbulent eddies. The bottom
1944 panel shows a time-lapse photograph of a smoke plume taken over several minutes. This panel
1945 shows two important turbulent dispersion regimes: First, near the release, the time-average
1946 plume crosswind spread (“width”) depends linearly on distance (and time) from the release
1947 because the turbulent motions dispersing the plume are correlated with each other. Second,
1948 and farther downwind, the plume spread becomes proportional to the square root of distance
1949 (time) from the release because the turbulent motions that disperse the contamination are no
1950 longer correlated with the motions present at the time of pollutant release to the atmosphere.

1951 The plume crosswind spread increases with increasing averaging time since larger turbulent
1952 motions affect the plume spread at larger averaging times, see **Figure B2**. In some cases, the
1953 growth rate of the plume width can dramatically slow after the plume outgrows the size of
1954 typical mechanically or buoyancy generated eddies. However, other processes can result in the
1955 plume width continuing to grow, for example, due to differential advection – where different
1956 parts of the plume are blown in different directions and at different speeds by variations in the

³³ The number of particles required to change the behavior of the atmospheric depends on the (a) atmospheric volume of interest, (b) particle size and density, (c) release duration, and (d) ambient wind speed [9]. For context, assuming a light wind (1 m s^{-1}) and monodisperse particles as dense as water (1000 kg m^{-3}); a 1 m^3 release volume can contain at least 10^{16} $0.1 \text{ }\mu\text{m}$ diameter particles, 10^{13} $1 \text{ }\mu\text{m}$ diameter particles, or 10^{10} $10 \text{ }\mu\text{m}$ diameter particles without violating this assumption.

M Dillon and
C Dillon

Particle Model for
Airborne Disease Transmission

mean wind. Differential advection can occur under several conditions including, but not limited to, (a) variation of the mean wind with height, (b) regional scale, horizontal, mean wind variability, and (b) variation of the mean wind with time, e.g., diurnal wind cycles. Differential advection effects are not shown in **Figures B1** and **B2**. *We note that in the absence of additional loss mechanisms (such as radioactive decay or deposition to the earth's surface), an airborne plume will continue to transport (and dilute) far downwind – indeed plumes of airborne material have been observed on global scales.*

Figure B1. Laboratory photographs of plume dispersion (air flows from left to right). The top two frames are show a snapshot of an individual plume at two different times which highlight the effects of the individual eddies. The bottom frame shows a time averaged concentration over several minutes and more clearly highlight the changes in the growth rate of the plume width with time and downwind distance. (Adapted from image provided by Snyder, EPA)

M Dillon and
C Dillon

Particle Model for
Airborne Disease Transmission

Figure B2. Illustration of the increase in plume width with averaging time taken from Slade [223]. The left panel shows the nominal plume outline for one of three exemplar averaging time (wind blows along the x-axis). The right panel shows the crosswind (y axis) relative plume concentration at a single, nominal downwind point for the three averaging times considered.

Atmospheric Dispersion Models

Atmospheric transport and dispersion models simulate the previously discussed physical processes of mean wind transport and turbulent diffusion. Direct Numerical Simulation modeling, which explicitly considers all physical processes, can simulate all relevant air motions and contaminant concentrations, e.g., [224], [225]. However, due to their high computational burden and extensive, and often unavailable, input data requirements, these models are not practical outside a research environment. As such, *all practical dispersion models resolve only a portion of the atmospheric motions and physical processes while the effects of the unresolved processes are parameterized, often using statistical descriptions of turbulent motions and fits to empirical data.* As a consequence, these model results are inherently statistical in nature and, depending on the model type, predict (a) the ensemble-average (expected value) result (vast majority of models), (b) the distribution of results (concentration fluctuation models), or (c) a single realization from a distribution of possible flows (Computational Fluid Dynamics models using Large Eddy Simulation). Due to their ubiquity and relevance to the theory developed in this paper, we focus here on the ensemble average models. By analogy, the actual plume at any given time is one of the top two panels in **Figure B1** while the ensemble average dispersion model is predicting the time-averaged bottom panel (in steady state conditions).

M Dillon and
C Dillon

Particle Model for
Airborne Disease Transmission

1998 There are several common types of ensemble average models, including the classic Gaussian
1999 plume model, in which downwind concentrations are calculated analytically; Gaussian puff
2000 models, in which one or more expanding “puffs” of contaminant are transported downwind;
2001 and Lagrangian particle models, in which downwind concentrations are inferred from the
2002 Monte Carlo simulations of the trajectories of computational marker particles.³⁴ These model
2003 types differ in their ability to resolve key spatial and temporal features as well as to describe
2004 complex scenarios. The more detailed model types typically have enhanced computational and
2005 input data requirements relative to the simpler models. All of these models will produce nearly
2006 identical results for basic scenarios and simpler flows (e.g., constant wind speed and direction)
2007 in which in the simpler models are valid (and have been validated against experimental data).
2008 Gaussian plume models are analytic solutions to transport and diffusion equations for simple
2009 conditions are often used as part of the verification process for the more complex numerical
2010 models. *We note that the scenarios used in this study are closely related to a set of classic,*
2011 *straightforward scenarios and so the modeling results presented in this report are expected to*
2012 *be very similar to those that would be produced by different models.*

2013 Atmospheric transport and dispersion models are generally considered to be accurate when
2014 they can reproduce individual measurements paired in time and space to within a factor of ten
2015 (or better) for a variety of different terrains, downwind distances, and environmental
2016 conditions [226], [227]. For example, one modeling system (which is used in this study) is the
2017 LLNL ADAPT/LODI diagnostic wind field and Lagrangian particle models [228], [229]. The LLNL
2018 ADAPT/LODI models have been validated against a wide range of source terms, environmental
2019 conditions, and downwind distances (0.05 to 1,500 km) [230]–[233]. About 50% of the model-
2020 measurement comparisons are (a) within a factor of 2 to 5 for simpler releases (source terms)
2021 and environmental conditions and (b) within a factor of 10 for more complex conditions. Most
2022 of these validation studies use gas tracers; however one experiment used particulate matter.

2023 *When model and measurement data are compared in a way that reduces the importance of*
2024 *stochastic variability, model accuracy can markedly improve.* One case is the Quartile-Quartile
2025 (Q-Q) plot which is used, in part, to validate operational transport and dispersion models, e.g.,
2026 [230], [234]. This plot compares *distributions* of measured and modeled concentration data and
2027 does not have the requirement that the model/measurement data is paired in time or space. As
2028 one example, when comparing model predictions and measurements from a single tracer study
2029 that took place in Copenhagen, 38% of the point to point comparisons are within a factor of 2
2030 but the Q-Q plot demonstrates much better agreement, see **Figure B3** [230]. Another useful

³⁴ These computational marker particles are a large sample from the possible particles emitted and are used in estimating downwind concentrations along the prescribed contaminant emission amount. These particles do NOT directly represent individual physical aerosols.

M Dillon and
C Dillon

Particle Model for
Airborne Disease Transmission

metric is integration within respect to time and/or space. For the Copenhagen study, all the model predictions agreed within a factor of 2 of the observed concentrations when integrated along arcs equidistant from the release site (crosswind integrated air concentrations), see **Figure B4**.

Figure B3. Observed versus predicted ground-level concentrations in the Copenhagen experiment: a) point-by-point comparison, and b) quantile-quantile comparison; only nonzero concentrations included. Dashed line corresponds to geometric mean (0.78) of LODI predicted concentration (C_{LODI}) to Observed Concentrations (C_{obs}). Image adapted from [230].

Figure B4. Comparison between observed (C_{obs}^y) and predicted (C_{LODI}^y) crosswind-integrated concentration at the surface for all Copenhagen experiments except day 7; dotted lines correspond to factor of 2 over- and under- prediction. Image adapted from [230].

M Dillon and
C Dillon

Particle Model for
Airborne Disease Transmission

2045 **Supplemental Material C: General Theory**

2046 In this supplemental material, we derive key theoretical concepts that are implemented in the
2047 main paper. Theoretically, the total number of infections can be calculated by individually
2048 considering every exposed person. However, this approach can be challenging to implement
2049 due to computational considerations, including the need to acquire high resolution input data,
2050 and such approaches potentially obscure useful interpretations. Therefore to facilitate the use
2051 of **Equations 1, 2, and 3** presented in the main paper, we derive here a series of self-consistent
2052 equations for exposure and infection probability applicable to individuals (indicated by the
2053 index p), (sub)groups of individuals with the same exposure but varying response to exposure
2054 (index s), groups of individuals with varying exposures and response to a given exposure (index
2055 g), and geographic regions containing a group of people (index r).
2056

M Dillon and
C Dillon

Particle Model for
Airborne Disease Transmission

Section Variables Definitions

r = a specific geographic region

r_{ref} = a geographic region used as a reference in a relative incidence analysis

r_{source} = geographic region where infectious airborne particles are emitted

p = an individual person that could be infected (i.e., a susceptible individual)

TP = total number of exposed, susceptible individuals (people)

s = a specific (sub)group of individuals with the same exposure but varying response to that exposure

TS = total number individuals in (sub)group s

g = a specific group of individuals with varying exposures and responses to a given exposure

TSG = total number of subgroups in group g

particle type = specifies particle size and infectivity as a function of time and environmental properties

b = a specific particle type

TB = total number of particle types

$[Adjustment\ Factor](g, b)$ = scaling factor for group g that accounts for the deviation of b -type particle exposure and response from that of the reference exposure and response (no units)

$[Adjustment\ Factor](r, b)$ = scaling factor for region r that accounts for the deviation of b -type particle exposure and response from that of the reference exposure and response (no units)

M Dillon and
C Dillon

Particle Model for
Airborne Disease Transmission

2082

2083 $[Area](r)$ = area of region r (m^2)

2084

2085 $[Effective\ Source\ Term](r, r_{source}, b)$ = mathematical construct used to scale infection
2086 probability from one region to another for b -type particles. ($m^3\ s^{-1}\ people^{-1}$)

2087

2088 $[Exposure](p)$ = number and type of infectious airborne particles in the breathing volume
2089 (respiratory second volume)³⁵ of individual p (particles $s\ m^{-3}$)

2090 $[Exposure](p, b)$ = the number of b -type infectious airborne particles in the breathing
2091 volume (respiratory second volume) of individual p (particles $s\ m^{-3}$)

2092 $[Exposure](s, b)$ = number of b -type infectious airborne particles in each individual's
2093 breathing volume (respiratory second volume) for individuals in (sub)group s (particles s
2094 m^{-3})

2095 $[Exposure]_{ref}(g, b)$ = reference number of b -type airborne particles in the breathing volume
2096 (respiratory second volume) of an individual in group g (particles $s\ m^{-3}$)

2097 $[Exposure]_{ref}(r, b)$ = reference number of b -type airborne particles in the breathing volume
2098 (respiratory second volume) of an individual in region r (particles $s\ m^{-3}$)

2099

2100 $[Exposure\ Adjustment\ Factor](g, s, b)$ = scaling factor that for group g , subgroup s accounts
2101 for the deviation b -type particle exposure from the reference exposure (no units)

2102 $[Exposure\ Adjustment\ Factor](r, s, b)$ = scaling factor that for region r , subgroup s accounts
2103 for the deviation b -type particle exposure from the reference exposure (no units)

2104

2105 $Health\ Effect\ Model(p, [Exposure](p))$ = mathematical model describing the probability
2106 that an individual p will be infected given the individual's specific exposure (no units)

³⁵ Respiratory minute volume is a traditional unit in pulmonary medicine – this study uses respiratory second volume.

M Dillon and
C Dillon

Particle Model for
Airborne Disease Transmission

2107

2108 $[Infection\ Probability](p)$ = probability that an individual p becomes infected (no units)

2109 $[Infection\ Probability](s)$ = mean probability that a random individual in (sub)group s
2110 becomes infected. All individuals in (sub)group s have the same exposure. (no units)

2111 $[Infection\ Probability](g)$ = mean probability that a random individual in group g becomes
2112 infected (no units)

2113 $[Infection\ Probability](r)$ = mean probability that a random individual in region r becomes
2114 infected (no units)

2115 $[Infection\ Probability](r, b)$ = mean probability that a random individual in region r
2116 becomes infected by a b -type particle (no units)

2117

2118 $[Infections]$ = total number of people infected (people)

2119 $[Infections](r, b)$ = total number of people infected by b -type particles in region r (people)

2120

2121 $[Infectious\ People](r_{source})$ = total number of people capable of emitting infectious particles
2122 in source region r_{source} (people)

2123

2124 $[Metric\ of\ Interest\ Probability](p)$ = probability that an individual p exhibits the metric of
2125 interest (no units)

2126

2127 $[Normalized\ TSIAC](r, b)$ = b -type particle air concentration integrated over region r and the
2128 passage of the airborne infectious plume assuming a single particle was released at the
2129 source ($s\ m^{-1}$)

2130 $[Normalized\ TSIAC](r, r_{source}, b)$ = b -type particle air concentration integrated over region r
2131 and the passage of the airborne infectious plume assuming a single particle was released
2132 from source region r_{source} ($s\ m^{-1}$)

2133

M Dillon and
C Dillon

Particle Model for
Airborne Disease Transmission

- 2134 $[Population\ Density](r)$ = population density in region r (people m^{-2})
- 2135
- 2136 $[Population\ Probability](g, s)$ = probability that an individual in group g is in subgroup s (no
2137 units)
- 2138
- 2139 $[Relative\ Infection\ Probability](r, b)$ = ratio of the region r infection probability to
2140 reference region infection probability due to exposure to b -type particles (no units)
- 2141
- 2142 $[Release\ Probability](b)$ = probability that a particle released into the environment is a b -
2143 type particle (dimensionless)
- 2144
- 2145 $[Response\ Adjustment\ Factor](g, s, b)$ = scaling factor that for group g , subgroup s accounts
2146 for the deviation of b -type particle response from the reference response (no units)
- 2147
- 2148 $[Single\ Particle\ Infection\ Probability](p, b)$ = the probability that individual p will become
2149 infected after being exposed to a single b -type particle. This term includes the probability
2150 that particle(s) will be inhaled and deposit in the respiratory system. ($m^3\ s^{-1}\ particle^{-1}$)
- 2151 $[Single\ Particle\ Infection\ Probability](s, b)$ = the mean probability that a random
2152 individual in (sub)group s will become infected after being exposed to a single b -type
2153 particle. This term includes the probability that particle(s) will be inhaled and deposit in the
2154 respiratory system. ($m^3\ s^{-1}\ particle^{-1}$)
- 2155 $[Single\ Particle\ Infection\ Probability]_{ref}(g, b)$ = reference probability that an individual in
2156 group g will become infected after being exposed to a single b -type particle. This term
2157 includes the probability that particle(s) will be inhaled and deposit in the respiratory
2158 system. ($m^3\ s^{-1}\ particle^{-1}$)
- 2159 $[Single\ Particle\ Infection\ Probability]_{ref}(r, b)$ = reference probability that an individual in
2160 region r will become infected after being exposed to a single b -type particle. This term
2161 includes the probability that particle(s) will be inhaled and deposit in the respiratory
2162 system. ($m^3\ s^{-1}\ particle^{-1}$)

M Dillon and
C Dillon

Particle Model for
Airborne Disease Transmission

2163 [*Single Particle Metric of Interest Probability*](p, b) = the probability that individual p
2164 will exhibit the metric of interest after being exposed to a single b -type particle. This term
2165 includes the probability that particle(s) will be inhaled and deposit in the respiratory
2166 system. ($\text{m}^3 \text{s}^{-1} \text{particle}^{-1}$)

2167

2168 [*Source Adjustment Factor*](r_{source}, b) = scaling factor that accounts for the deviation of b -
2169 type particles emitted from the r_{source} region from that of a reference source region (no
2170 units)

2171

2172 [*Subgroup Adjustment Factor*](g, s, b) = scaling factor that accounts for the deviation of
2173 group g , subgroup s , b -type particle exposure and response from that of the reference
2174 exposure and response (no units)

2175

2176 [*Total Particles Released*] = total number of particles released into the atmosphere
2177 (particles)
2178

M Dillon and
C Dillon

Particle Model for
Airborne Disease Transmission

2179 Conceptual Model

2180 The general environmentally-mediated infection process can be mathematically represented by
2181 **Equations C1 and C2.**

2182 (Equation C1)

$$2183 \quad [Infections] = \sum_{p=1}^{TP} [Infection Probability](p)$$

2184 (Equation C2)

$$2185 \quad [Infection Probability](p) = Health\ Effect\ Model(p, [Exposure](p))$$

2186

2187

2188 Rare Exposures

2189 If there are TB different types of particles AND any individual inhales either one or no particles,
2190 then the probability of an individual p becoming infected is shown in **Equation C3**.³⁶

2191 (Equation C3)

$$2192 \quad [Infection Probability](p) \\ 2193 \quad \approx \sum_{b=1}^{TB} ([Exposure](p, b) \cdot [Single\ Particle\ Infection\ Probability](p, b))$$

2194

2195

³⁶ For context, an airborne exposure of 10^4 particles s^{-1} would result in a typical individual inhaling a single particle (assuming a breathing rate of $10^{-4} m^3 s^{-1}$ [235]).

M Dillon and
C Dillon

Particle Model for
Airborne Disease Transmission

2196 Subgroups

2197 Consider a (sub)group s comprised of TS individuals with same exposure, but varying response
2198 to that exposure,³⁷ then **Equations C4** and **C5** provides the mean infection probability for
2199 (sub)group s .

2200 (Equation C4)

2201 $[Infection\ Probability](s)$

$$\begin{aligned} 2202 &\equiv \frac{\sum_{p=1}^{TS} [Infection\ Probability](p)}{TS} \\ 2203 &\approx \frac{\sum_{p=1}^{TS} \sum_{b=1}^{TB} ([Exposure](p, b) \cdot [Single\ Particle\ Infection\ Probability](p, b))}{TS} \\ 2204 &= \sum_{b=1}^{TB} \left([Exposure](s, b) \cdot \frac{\sum_{p=1}^{TS} [Single\ Particle\ Infection\ Probability](p, b)}{TS} \right) \\ 2205 &= \sum_{b=1}^{TB} ([Exposure](s, b) \cdot [Single\ Particle\ Infection\ Probability](s, b)) \end{aligned}$$

2206 (Equation C5)

$$\begin{aligned} 2207 &[Single\ Particle\ Infection\ Probability](s, b) \\ 2208 &\equiv \frac{\sum_{p=1}^{TS} [Single\ Particle\ Infection\ Probability](p, b)}{TS} \end{aligned}$$

2209

³⁷ One example is a group of people in a room where the air is well mixed.

M Dillon and
C Dillon

Particle Model for
Airborne Disease Transmission

2210 Groups

2211 When exposures within a group of people are not constant,³⁸ each subgroup can be considered
2212 a separate, constant exposure group and the overall group's (mean) infection probability is
2213 equal to the population weighted average of the individual subgroup infection probabilities, see
2214 **Equation C6.**

2215 (Equation C6)

$$\begin{aligned}
 2216 \quad [Infection\ Probability](g) &= \sum_{s=1}^{TSG} ([Population\ Probability](g, s) \cdot [Infection\ Probability](s)) \\
 2217 \quad &\approx \sum_{b=1}^{TB} \sum_{s=1}^{TSG} \left(\frac{[Population\ Probability](g, s)}{[Single\ Particle\ Infection\ Probability](s, b)} \cdot [Exposure](s, b) \right)
 \end{aligned}$$

2218
2219

³⁸ One example is a neighborhood where people are in different buildings that provide varying degrees of protection from an outdoor plume of airborne, infectious particles.

M Dillon and
C Dillon

Particle Model for
Airborne Disease Transmission

2220 We assume that the individual exposures and health effects can be defined as a ratio to a
2221 reference exposure and response, respectively. While these ratios can take any value and vary
2222 by individual, the individual-specific value cannot change. With these assumptions, **Equation C6**
2223 can be re-written as **Equation C7 to C11**.

2224 **(Equation C7)**

$$2225 \quad [Infection\ Probability](g) = \sum_{b=1}^{TB} \left(\begin{array}{l} [Single\ Particle\ Infection\ Probability]_{ref}(g, b) \\ \cdot [Exposure]_{ref}(g, b) \\ \cdot [Adjustment\ Factor](g, b) \end{array} \right)$$

2226 **(Equation C8)**

$$2227 \quad [Adjustment\ Factor](g, b) = \sum_{s=1}^{TSG} \left(\begin{array}{l} [Population\ Probability](g, s) \\ \cdot [Subgroup\ Adjustment\ Factor](g, s, b) \end{array} \right)$$

2228 **(Equation C9)**

$$\begin{aligned} 2229 \quad & [Subgroup\ Adjustment\ Factor](g, s, b) \\ 2230 \quad & = [Exposure\ Adjustment\ Factor](g, s, b) \\ 2231 \quad & \cdot [Response\ Adjustment\ Factor](g, s, b) \end{aligned}$$

2232 **(Equation C10)**

$$2233 \quad [Exposure\ Adjustment\ Factor](g, s, b) = \frac{[Exposure](s, b)}{[Exposure]_{ref}(g, b)}$$

2234 **(Equation C11)**

$$\begin{aligned} 2235 \quad & [Response\ Adjustment\ Factor](g, s, b) \\ 2236 \quad & = \frac{[Single\ Particle\ Infection\ Probability](s, b)}{[Single\ Particle\ Infection\ Probability]_{ref}(g, b)} \end{aligned}$$

2237

M Dillon and
C Dillon

Particle Model for
Airborne Disease Transmission

2238 Absolute Infection Probability for Geographic Regions

2239 Geographic regions, e.g., zip codes and census tracts, are often used when reporting
2240 epidemiological data and defining outbreak response zones, e.g., quarantine and/or
2241 vaccination. For this case, we define region r as a type of group and **Equation C7** can be
2242 rewritten as **Equation C12** where the reference exposure is defined by **Equation C13**.

2243 (Equation C12)

$$\begin{aligned}
 & [Infection\ Probability](r) \\
 & \approx [Total\ Particles\ Released] \\
 & \quad \sum_{b=1}^{TB} \left(\begin{aligned} & [Release\ Probability](b) \\ & \cdot [Single\ Particle\ Infection\ Probability]_{ref}(r, b) \\ & \cdot [Adjustment\ Factor](r, b) \\ & \cdot [Normalized\ TSIAC](r, b) \end{aligned} \right) \\
 & \times \frac{[Area](r)}{[Area](r)}
 \end{aligned}$$

2247 (Equation C13)

$$\begin{aligned}
 & [Exposure]_{ref}(r, b) \\
 & = \frac{[Total\ Particles\ Released] \cdot [Release\ Probability](b) \cdot [Normalized\ TSIAC](r, b)}{[Area](r)}
 \end{aligned}$$

2250

2251 When considering outdoor plumes of infectious particles, we adapt the Regional Shelter
2252 Analysis (RSA) methodology to assign each location (subgroup s) a “protection factor” which is
2253 defined as the ratio of the outdoor to indoor exposures. As shown in [30], [31]; building
2254 protection factors depend only on the building operating conditions, environmental
2255 parameters, and the particle type. Thus, for a given particle type, the assigned protection
2256 factors are identical to the inverse of the $[Exposure\ Adjustment\ Factor](r, s, b)$ where
2257 $[Exposure]_{ref}(r, b)$ is the outdoor time-integrated air concentration of b -type particles during
2258 the passage of the airborne infectious plume over region r .

2259

M Dillon and
C Dillon

Particle Model for
Airborne Disease Transmission

2260 Relative Infection Probability for Geographic Regions

2261 Given a plume of airborne infectious particles from a single source, then **Equation C12** implies
2262 **Equation C14** when a single particle type dominates the exposures. **Equation C14** does not
2263 depend on the release or the infectivity of individual particles. When the two regions are similar
2264 (e.g., both r and r_{ref} are residential areas with similar demographics) the adjustment factor ratio
2265 is unity. We demonstrate the utility of **Equation C14** in the 4. *Results* and 5. *Discussion* sections.

2266 (Equation C14)

$$\begin{aligned} 2267 \quad [Relative\ Infection\ Probability](r, b) &= \frac{[Infection\ Probability](r, b)}{[Infection\ Probability](r_{ref}, b)} \\ 2268 \quad &= \left(\frac{[Normalized\ TSIAC](r, b)}{[Normalized\ TSIAC](r_{ref}, b)} \right) \cdot \left(\frac{[Area](r_{ref})}{[Area](r)} \right) \\ 2269 \quad &\cdot \left(\frac{[Adjustment\ Factor](r, b)}{[Adjustment\ Factor](r_{ref}, b)} \right) \end{aligned}$$

2270

2271

2272 Extrapolating Regional Infection Probabilities

2273 When a clear case of region-to-region airborne disease transmission has been identified and a
2274 single particle type dominates the exposures, **Equation C16**, derived from **Equations C15(a-b)**,
2275 estimates an effective source term for each infectious person in the source region.

2276 (Equation C15a)

$$\begin{aligned} 2277 \quad [Infections](r_{ref}, b) & \\ 2278 \quad &\approx [Total\ Particles\ Released] \cdot [Release\ Probability](b) \\ 2279 \quad &\cdot [Normalized\ TSIAC](r_{ref}, r_{source\ 1}, b) \\ 2280 \quad &\cdot [Single\ Particle\ Infection\ Probability]_{ref}(r_{ref}, b) \\ 2281 \quad &\cdot [Adjustment\ Factor](r_{ref}, b) \cdot [Population\ Density](r_{ref}) \end{aligned}$$

2282

2283

2284

M Dillon and
C Dillon

Particle Model for
Airborne Disease Transmission

2285 (Equation C15b)

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \left(\begin{aligned} & [Total\ Particles\ Released] \cdot [Release\ Probability](b) \\ & \cdot [Single\ Particle\ Infection\ Probability]_{ref}(r_{ref}, b) \\ & \cdot [Adjustment\ Factor](r_{ref}, b) \end{aligned} \right) \\
 & \approx \frac{[Infections](r_{ref}, b)}{[Normalized\ TSIAC](r_{ref}, r_{source\ 1}, b) \cdot [Population\ Density](r_{ref})}
 \end{aligned}$$

2288 (Equation C16)

$$\begin{aligned}
 & [Effective\ Source\ Term](r_{ref}, r_{source\ 1}, b) \\
 & \equiv \frac{\left(\begin{aligned} & [Total\ Particles\ Released] \cdot [Release\ Probability](b) \\ & \cdot [Single\ Particle\ Infection\ Probability]_{ref}(r_{ref}, b) \\ & \cdot [Adjustment\ Factor](r_{ref}, b) \end{aligned} \right)}{[Infectious\ People](r_{source\ 1})} \\
 & = \frac{[Infection\ Probability](r_{ref}) \cdot [Area](r_{ref})}{[Normalized\ TSIAC](r_{ref}, r_{source\ 1}, b) \cdot [Infectious\ People](r_{source\ 1})}
 \end{aligned}$$

2292

2293 Given the effective source term (**Equation C16**), the infection rates in other regions and times

2294 can then be estimated with **Equation C17a**. Alternately, **Equation C17b** can be used without the

2295 need to calculate the intermediate “effective source” quantity. The new term, the source

2296 adjustment factor, is introduced which adjusts for the number of airborne infectious particles

2297 emitted, e.g., a reduction in cough-emitted infectious particles due to use of respiratory masks.

2298 As with **Equation C14**, the reference and source regions disease adjustment factor may also be

2299 similar, i.e., their ratio may be unity, if buildings and demographics are similar in both source

2300 and target regions.

2301

2302

2303

2304

M Dillon and
C Dillon

Particle Model for
Airborne Disease Transmission

2305 (Equation C17a)

2306 $[Infection\ Probability](r)$

$$2307 \quad = \frac{\left([Effective\ Source\ Term](r_{ref}, r_{source\ 1}, b) \right. \\ \cdot [Normalized\ TSIAC](r, r_{source\ 2}, b) \\ \cdot [Infectious\ People](r_{source\ 2}) \left. \right)}{[Area](r)}$$

$$2308 \quad \cdot \left(\frac{[Adjustment\ Factor](r, b)}{[Adjustment\ Factor](r_{ref}, b)} \right)$$

$$2309 \quad \cdot \left(\frac{[Source\ Adjustment\ Factor](r_{source\ 2}, b)}{[Source\ Adjustment\ Factor](r_{source\ 1}, b)} \right)$$

2310 (Equation C17b)

2311 $[Infection\ Probability](r)$

$$2312 \quad = [Infection\ Probability](r_{ref}) \cdot \left(\frac{[Normalized\ TSIAC](r, r_{source\ 2}, b)}{[Normalized\ TSIAC](r_{ref}, r_{source\ 1}, b)} \right)$$

$$2313 \quad \cdot \left(\frac{[Infectious\ People](r_{source\ 2})}{[Infectious\ People](r_{source\ 1})} \right) \cdot \left(\frac{[Adjustment\ Factor](r, b)}{[Adjustment\ Factor](r_{ref}, b)} \right)$$

$$2314 \quad \cdot \left(\frac{[Source\ Adjustment\ Factor](r_{source\ 2}, b)}{[Source\ Adjustment\ Factor](r_{source\ 1}, b)} \right) \cdot \left(\frac{[Area](r_{ref})}{[Area](r)} \right)$$

2315

M Dillon and
C Dillon

Particle Model for
Airborne Disease Transmission

2316 Relationship to Disease and Other Metrics

2317 The Supplemental Material equations presented up to this point focus on infection probability.
2318 However, not all infections result in disease. In addition, other metrics, such as probability of
2319 needing medical resources, may also be of interest. When the probability of the metric of
2320 interest, e.g., disease, can be linearly related to exposure, see **Equation C18**, then it is
2321 straightforward to adapt the prior equations for the metric of interest by replacing
2322 $[Infection\ Probability](p)$ with $[Metric\ of\ Interest\ Probability](p)$. We note that while
2323 $[Single\ Particle\ Metric\ of\ Interest\ Probability](p, b)$ can take any value and vary by
2324 individual and/or particle type, the value for a specific individual and particle type cannot
2325 change. We note that the adjustment factors can vary by metric.

2326 *The relative incidence of multiple metrics of interest, such as infection and disease are the same,*
2327 *since **Equation C14** is unchanged by this substitution.*

2328 (Equation C18)

$$2329 \quad [Metric\ of\ Interest\ Probability](p)$$

$$2330 \quad = \sum_{b=1}^{TB} \left(\frac{[Exposure](p, b)}{[Single\ Particle\ Probability\ for\ Metric\ of\ Interest](p, b)} \right)$$

2331

M Dillon and
C Dillon

Particle Model for
Airborne Disease Transmission

2332 **Supplemental Material D: Indoor Particle Dynamics**

2333 This supplemental material derives equations to estimate three related, but distinct building
2334 properties: (1) the degree to which indoor individuals are exposed to outdoor-origin airborne
2335 particulates, (2) the degree to which indoor individuals are exposed to indoor-origin airborne
2336 particulates, and (3) the fraction of indoor-origin particulates that exit the building and enter the
2337 outdoor atmosphere. The first section, building protection, is adapted (with minor edits) from a
2338 prior publication [30] which also provides detailed discussion on the relevant indoor particle
2339 dynamics and representative estimates for both (a) parameter values (which are also used in
2340 the other sections) and (b) protection estimates for US buildings and Census Tracts. The other
2341 two subsections, which extend the building protection material, are new.

2342 While we do not discuss prior approaches in detail in this report, we note the Wells-Riley model
2343 which estimated the indoor infection risk to susceptible populations who share the same
2344 building as potentially infectious individuals. The Wells-Riley model also provided quantitative
2345 guidance on the indoor loss rates and ventilation rates required to reduce disease spread [3],
2346 [236]. Later extensions of this model have addressed many of its original limitations. However,
2347 all versions retain the concept of a “quantum of infection” whose definition combines many key
2348 physical properties, including the probability of infection when there is exposure to infectious
2349 particles [237].

2350

M Dillon and
C Dillon

Particle Model for
Airborne Disease Transmission

2351 Section Variables Definitions

2352

2353 $\lambda_{dep}(\text{particle size})$ = the particle size dependent indoor deposition loss rate (h^{-1})

2354 λ_{decay} = the “generic” first-order airborne decay (loss) rate (h^{-1})

2355 λ_{in} = the rate at which outdoor airborne particles enters the building – typically via infiltration
2356 or ventilation. Includes losses that occur during transport from outdoor to indoor (h^{-1})

2357 λ_{inf} = the air infiltration rate at which air enters a building, i.e., the air change rate (h^{-1})

2358 $\lambda_{internal}$ = the rate at which indoor airborne particles are lost within the building – typically by
2359 deposition to surfaces or by filtration (h^{-1})

2360 λ_{out} = the rate at which indoor airborne particles exit the building – typically via exfiltration or
2361 ventilation (h^{-1})

2362 λ_T = the total building ventilation rate = sum of the infiltration and mechanical ventilation rates
2363 (h^{-1})

2364

2365 [*Building Exit Fraction*] = fraction of indoor airborne material that exits the building and
2366 enters the outdoor atmosphere. (no units)

2367 [*Building Floor Area*] = floor area of the building (m^2)

2368 [*Building Protection Factor*] = ratio of the outdoor to indoor exposure. Similar to sunscreen
2369 and personal protective respirator rating systems, higher protection factor values indicate
2370 lower exposures and thus increased protection. (protection factor)

2371 [*Building Volume*] = volume of the building (m^3)

2372 [*Normalized TSIAC*]_{indoor} = indoor time and space integrated air concentration assuming a
2373 unit amount of material is released (s m^{-1})

2374 [*Room Height*] = height of building occupied space (m)

2375 [*Total Particles Released*] = total number of particles released into the indoor air (particles)

M Dillon and
C Dillon

Particle Model for
Airborne Disease Transmission

- 2376
- 2377 $C_{Indoor}(t)$ = the indoor particle air concentration at time t (g m^{-3})
- 2378 $C_{Outdoor}(t)$ = the outdoor particle air concentration at time t (g m^{-3})
- 2379 $L_{inf}(\text{particle size})$ = the particle size dependent efficiency by which particles can penetrate
- 2380 the building shell (dimensionless)
- 2381 $L_{out}(\text{particle size})$ = the particle size dependent efficiency by which particles in indoor air exit
- 2382 the building through cracks and other penetrations in the building shell (dimensionless)
- 2383 $F_{filter}(\text{particle size})$ = the particle size dependent filtration efficiency (dimensionless)
- 2384 F_{oa} = the fraction of outdoor air passing through the HVAC supply fan (dimensionless)
- 2385 $F_{r,fan}$ = the fraction of time the forced air furnace recirculation fan is on, i.e., the fan's duty
- 2386 cycle (dimensionless)
- 2387 r_{fan} = the rate at which a building volume of air recirculates through the furnace systems when
- 2388 the fan is on (h^{-1})
- 2389 v_{fan} = the rate at which a ventilation or HVAC supply fan delivers air to the building when the
- 2390 fan is on and combines the outside and recirculation air rates (building volume h^{-1})
- 2391 t = time (h)
- 2392 τ = an integration variable (h)
- 2393

M Dillon and
C Dillon

Particle Model for
Airborne Disease Transmission

2394 **Building Protection Against Outdoor-Origin Particles**

2395 Indoor individuals can be exposed to particles of outdoor origin when these contaminants enter
2396 buildings through mechanical ventilation, e.g., heating, ventilation and air conditioning (HVAC)
2397 systems, natural ventilation (e.g., open windows), and/or infiltration (e.g., exterior wall cracks).
2398 Particles may also be transported into buildings via deposition on outdoor surfaces or fomites
2399 that are subsequently tracked indoors by individuals, or otherwise transported, into the
2400 building and then resuspended into the indoor air. These transport pathways are illustrated in
2401 the top panel of **Figure D1**. Once indoors, airborne particles can be removed from the indoor air
2402 through (a) air leaving the building through mechanical or natural ventilation and exfiltration;
2403 (b) active filtration within ventilation systems (if present); (c) deposition on indoor surfaces
2404 (some particles may resuspend); and (d) other processes, including radioactive decay, chemical
2405 reactions, stand-alone indoor air filtration systems, and the loss of infectivity of airborne
2406 infectious agents, among others. The latter three loss terms are illustrated in the bottom panel
2407 of **Figure D1**.

2408 Modeling indoor contaminant concentrations requires choosing among a variety of models with
2409 increasing complexity, ranging from simple single-compartment models to multizone models to
2410 highly detailed computational fluid dynamics models. While increasingly detailed and complex
2411 models may reduce modeling conservatism and uncertainty, the number and fidelity of the
2412 input parameters also increases (see [238] for a general discussion). Detailed parameters are
2413 not generally available for many buildings of interest therefore we make two key modeling
2414 assumptions: (a) that indoor volumes can be represented as a single compartment, which can
2415 be used to describe the time evolution of indoor contaminant concentrations, and (b) that
2416 concentrations within that single compartment are spatially uniform [36], [119], [239], [240].³⁹

2417

³⁹ We note that the contaminants of concern here are from the outdoors which, due to the air change mechanisms, can result in a relatively uniform indoor spatial contaminant distribution. For example in modeling indoor concentrations of outdoor ozone, *Hayes* [241] demonstrated that the indoor/outdoor ozone concentration ratio was insensitive to the degree of indoor mixing in both single- and multicompartments models for residences and office buildings. For context, the mixing time constants for both buoyant and mechanical flow conditions in laboratory studies of room mixing are short, 10 min to < 1 h, compared to the exposure times of interest [35], [36].

M Dillon and
C Dillon

Particle Model for Airborne Disease Transmission

Figure D1. Illustrations of (top) mechanisms by which airborne material and fomites can travel between the outdoor and indoor environments and (bottom) indoor loss mechanisms.

These assumptions are codified in the single box model (**Equation D1a**) which can be used to describe the time evolution of indoor air concentrations after outdoor contaminants have entered a given building. This study includes the additional, commonly used assumption that the transport and loss terms, i.e., the λ parameters, are independent of both time and air concentration on the timescales of interest. **Equation D1a** thus reduces to **Equation D1b**. Derivations provided in the methodology report [31] demonstrate that **Equation D2** provides the building protection factor (the ratio of outdoor to indoor exposure).⁴⁰

⁴⁰ These equations assume that (a) initial ($t = 0$) indoor air concentrations are zero and (b) material removed from the indoor air is not reintroduced at a later time (e.g., resuspension of deposited particles).

M Dillon and
C Dillon

Particle Model for
Airborne Disease Transmission

2431 (Equation D1a)

$$2432 \quad \frac{dC_{Indoor}}{dt} = \lambda_{in} \cdot C_{Outdoor}(t) - (\lambda_{out} + \lambda_{internal}) \cdot C_{Indoor}(t)$$

2433 (Equation D1b)

$$2434 \quad C_{Indoor}(t) = \lambda_{in} \cdot \int_0^t C_{Outdoor}(\tau) \cdot e^{-(\lambda_{out} + \lambda_{internal})(t-\tau)} d\tau$$

2435 (Equation D2)

$$2436 \quad [Building Protection Factor] = \frac{\int C_{Outdoor}(t)dt}{\int C_{Indoor}(t)dt} = \frac{(\lambda_{out} + \lambda_{internal})}{\lambda_{in}}$$

2437

2438 We adapt **Equation D2** to develop two generalized building PF equations to cover the range of
2439 building types typically found in the US. The equation terms are grouped to correspond to the
2440 λ_{in} , λ_{out} , and $\lambda_{internal}$ terms in **Equation D2**. Each PF equation is based on one of two common
2441 combinations of (a) the three airflow mechanisms described above and (b) the relevant indoor
2442 loss mechanisms. In addition to any filtration that might be present, and already incorporated
2443 into the airflow terms, we consider two additional indoor loss mechanisms: (1) deposition of
2444 airborne particles to indoor surfaces, λ_{dep} , and (2) a generic first-order airborne loss
2445 mechanism, λ_{decay} , which can be used to represent radioactive decay (radiological hazards) or
2446 airborne loss of infectivity (biological hazards). Several parameters are particle size dependent.
2447 For readability, these dependencies are not shown in the equations themselves, but are noted
2448 in the variable list definitions above. See [30] for a detailed discussion of parameters and their
2449 common values.

2450

M Dillon and
C Dillon

Particle Model for
Airborne Disease Transmission

2451 **Equation D3** specifies the protection factor for buildings with filtered recirculation. In the US,
2452 these are typically residences. Outdoor airborne material enters the building only through the
2453 infiltration pathway. The forced air furnace recirculation air filter, if present, removes indoor
2454 airborne particles.

2455 (Equation D3)

$$2456 \quad [Building Protection Factor] = \frac{\lambda_{inf} + (F_{filter} \cdot F_{r,fan} \cdot r_{fan} + \lambda_{dep} + \lambda_{decay})}{(\lambda_{inf} \cdot L_{inf})}$$

2457

2458 **Equation D4** specifies the protection factor for buildings with an active HVAC system. In the US,
2459 these are typically commercial buildings. Outdoor airborne material enters the building through
2460 either infiltration or the HVAC system outdoor air intake. The HVAC system air filter removes
2461 airborne particles from both the entering and recirculating air. This equation implicitly assumes
2462 that the HVAC system is always moving building air although not necessarily heating or cooling
2463 it, i.e., the fan duty cycle is 100%.

2464 (Equation D4)

$$2465 \quad [Building Protection Factor] = \frac{\lambda_T + (F_{filter} \cdot v_{fan} \cdot (1 - F_{oa}) + \lambda_{dep} + \lambda_{decay})}{(\lambda_{inf} \cdot L_{inf} + v_{fan} \cdot F_{oa} \cdot (1 - F_{filter}))}$$

2466

2467

M Dillon and
C Dillon

Particle Model for
Airborne Disease Transmission

2468 **Normalized Indoor Exposures**

2469 With the additional assumptions that outdoor concentrations are zero and all indoor emissions
2470 occur at a single time ($t = 0$), **Equation D1a** simplifies to **Equations D5(a-b)**. When a unit
2471 amount of material is released at $t = 0$, **Equation D5** reduces to **Equation D6**.

2472 (Equation D5a)

$$2473 \quad \frac{dC_{Indoor}(t)}{dt} = -(\lambda_{out} + \lambda_{internal}) \cdot C_{Indoor}(t)$$

2474 (Equation D5b)

$$2475 \quad C_{Indoor}(t) = C_{Indoor}(t = 0) \cdot e^{-(\lambda_{out} + \lambda_{internal})t}$$

2476 (Equation D6)

$$2477 \quad [Normalized\ TSIAC]_{indoor} = [Building\ Floor\ Area] \cdot \int_0^{\infty} C_{Indoor}(t) dt$$

$$2478 \quad = [Building\ Floor\ Area] \times \left(\frac{1}{[Building\ Volume]} \right) \times (\lambda_{out} + \lambda_{internal})^{-1}$$

$$2479 \quad = \frac{1}{[Room\ Height] \cdot (\lambda_{out} + \lambda_{internal})}$$

2480

2481

M Dillon and
C Dillon

Particle Model for
Airborne Disease Transmission

2482 We now adapt the general building protection equations to estimate the
2483 $[Normalized\ TSIAC]_{indoor}$. The equation terms are grouped to correspond to the λ_{out} and
2484 $\lambda_{internal}$ terms in **Equation D6**.

2485

2486 **Equation D7** specifies $[Normalized\ TSIAC]_{indoor}$ for buildings with filtered recirculation (US
2487 residences).

2488 (Equation D7)

$$2489 \quad [Normalized\ TSIAC]_{indoor}$$

$$2490 \quad = \frac{1}{[Room\ Height] \cdot (\lambda_{inf} + (F_{filter} \cdot F_{r,fan} \cdot r_{fan} + \lambda_{dep} + \lambda_{decay}))}$$

2491

2492

2493 **Equation D8** specifies $[Normalized\ TSIAC]_{indoor}$ for buildings with an active HVAC system (US
2494 commercial buildings).

2495 (Equation D8)

$$2496 \quad [Normalized\ TSIAC]_{indoor}$$

$$2497 \quad = \frac{1}{[Room\ Height] \cdot (\lambda_T + (F_{filter} \cdot v_{fan} \cdot (1 - F_{oa}) + \lambda_{dep} + \lambda_{decay}))}$$

2498

M Dillon and
C Dillon

Particle Model for
Airborne Disease Transmission

Fraction of Indoor Airborne Particles Released to the Outdoors

Equation D9 shows the fraction of indoor airborne material that exits the building and enters the outdoor atmosphere. This equation is based on (a) the (normalized) indoor concentration, (b) the rate at which indoor air (and airborne material) leaves the building, and (c) particulate losses that occur while airborne particles are suspended in indoor air exiting the building.

(Equation D9)

$$\begin{aligned} [\text{Building Exit Fraction}] &= \frac{\int_0^{\infty} (C_{\text{Indoor}}(t) \cdot [\text{Building Volume}]) \cdot (\lambda_{\text{out}} \cdot L_{\text{out}}) dt}{[\text{Total Particles Released}]} \\ &= [\text{Normalized TSIAC}]_{\text{indoor}} \cdot [\text{Room Height}] \cdot \lambda_{\text{out}} \cdot L_{\text{out}} \\ &= \frac{\lambda_{\text{out}} \cdot L_{\text{out}}}{(\lambda_{\text{out}} + \lambda_{\text{internal}})} \end{aligned}$$

For buildings with filtered recirculation (US residences), outdoor air enters the building only through the infiltration pathway and so $\lambda_{\text{out}} = \lambda_{\text{inf}}$ and **Equation D10** shows the fraction of material released indoors that exits the building. The entrance and exit airflow paths may differ. For examples, outdoor air could enter the building through wall cracks while some of the indoor air could exit the building through exhaust fans. Thus, entrance and exit loss fractions, L_{in} and L_{out} , respectively, can in theory differ. However at a practical level, there is little data on which to estimate the L_{out} term. In addition, small, e.g., 1 μm aerodynamic diameter, particle losses are minimal. Therefore we assume $L_{\text{out}} = L_{\text{inf}}$ and the *[Exit Fraction] is equal to the inverse of the building protection factor as derived in [30]*. For context, 35%, on average, of the airborne, 1 μm aerodynamic diameter, stable (do not lose infectivity in the air) particles released in US single family homes are expected to exit the building (and be released to the outdoor atmosphere) [30].

(Equation D10)

$$\begin{aligned} [\text{Building Exit Fraction}] &= \frac{\lambda_{\text{inf}} \cdot L_{\text{inf}}}{\lambda_{\text{inf}} + (F_{\text{filter}} \cdot F_{r,\text{fan}} \cdot r_{\text{fan}} + \lambda_{\text{dep}} + \lambda_{\text{decay}})} \\ &= \frac{1}{[\text{Building Protection Factor}]} \cdot \left(\frac{L_{\text{out}}}{L_{\text{inf}}} \right) \end{aligned}$$

M Dillon and
C Dillon

Particle Model for
Airborne Disease Transmission

2525 For buildings with an active HVAC system (US commercial buildings), indoor airborne material
2526 exits the building through either infiltration or through mechanical means, e.g., the HVAC
2527 system exhaust. Again we note that the entrance and exit airflow paths may differ, but as a
2528 practical matter assume (a) that they are the same ($\lambda_{out} = \lambda_{inf}$; $L_{out} = L_{inf}$) and (b) no
2529 particles are lost while the indoor air is exiting through the exhaust system. **Equation D11**,
2530 *which shows the fraction of material released indoors that exits the building, is not the same as*
2531 *the building protection factor derived in [30].*

2532 (Equation D11)

$$2533 \quad [Building \text{ Exit Fraction}] = \frac{(\lambda_{inf} \cdot L_{inf} + v_{fan} \cdot F_{oa})}{\lambda_T + (F_{filter} \cdot v_{fan} \cdot (1 - F_{oa}) + \lambda_{dep} + \lambda_{decay})}$$

2534
2535

M Dillon and
C Dillon

Particle Model for
Airborne Disease Transmission

Supplemental Material E: Outdoor Normalized Time and Space Integrated Air Concentrations

Outdoor normalized time and space integrated air concentration (Normalized TSIAC) values are a key component in our estimation of the single particle atmospheric transmission rates discussed in the main text. In this Supplemental Material, we describe how these values were calculated. For context, we also provide absolute and relative infection probabilities for a wider range of input parameter values than discussed in the main text.

We use the Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory Atmospheric Data Assimilation and Parameterization Techniques (ADAPT) and Lagrangian Operational Dispersion Integrator (LODI) meteorological and atmospheric dispersion models to calculate outdoor normalized time and space integrated air concentrations [242], [243]. The LODI/ADAPT model accuracy and validation are discussed in **Supplemental Material B: Key Atmospheric Transport and Dispersion Modeling Concepts**, *Atmospheric Dispersion Models* section.

We consider a suite of atmospheric conditions, **Table E1**, which were chosen to span a reasonably wide, but not comprehensive, range of common atmospheric conditions. The atmospheric conditions were held constant during the plume passage. Following this table, we provide the methodology and specific modeling assumptions used.

Tables E2(a-b) to E5(a-b) provide the predicted outdoor Normalized TSIAC as a function of distance from an emission source, atmospheric conditions, and airborne loss rate. The Normalized TSIAC values are specified for both discs and circle arcs at distances ranging from 50 m to 20 km. Each table corresponds to one airborne (infectivity) loss rate (0, 0.1, 1, or 10 h⁻¹ loss rates were modeled). Each table column corresponds to 1 of 7 commonly encountered wind speeds and atmospheric stabilities as specified in **Table E1**.

For context, **Figures E1 to E4** provide downwind, upper bound estimates for two cases: (a) the average per-person, single particle, absolute infection probability and (b) the corresponding urban area infections. **Figures E5 to E8** provide relative infection probabilities relative to 1 km disc or arc values. Each figure corresponds to a single airborne (infectivity) loss rate.

M Dillon and
C Dillon

Particle Model for
Airborne Disease Transmission

2564 **Table E1. Summary of modeled atmospheric conditions**

Qualitative Description	Stability Class (MO Length in m)	Wind Speed at 10 m above ground level in m s ⁻¹	Boundary Layer Height in m
Clear, cold night with light winds	F (25)	1.0	300
Clear night with gentle breeze	E (50)	4.5	500
Overcast with light winds	C (-50)	1.0	1,000
Overcast with gentle breeze	D (∞)	4.5	800
Overcast with strong breeze	D (∞)	10	800
Clear day with gentle breeze	B (-25)	4.5	1,200
Clear, hot day with light winds	A (-10)	1.0	1,500

2565

M Dillon and
C Dillon

Particle Model for
Airborne Disease Transmission

2566 We modeled the downwind impacts assuming:

- 2567 • The release quantity is one (effective) particle.
- 2568 • All particles have 1 μm aerodynamic diameter.
- 2569 • The released particle has a constant probability of being emitted from a point within
2570 a 1 hr period.
- 2571 • Gravitational settling is the only deposition mechanism considered. The inclusion of
2572 other deposition mechanisms including (but not limited to) Brownian diffusion,
2573 rainout, impaction, and interception would all serve to reduce the modeled air
2574 concentrations and so our neglect of these mechanisms is consistent with the intent
2575 of providing an upper bound on the number of downwind infections.
- 2576 • 4 different 1st order airborne loss rates (in addition to gravitational settling) are
2577 considered: 0, 0.1, 1, and 10 h^{-1} . These airborne loss rates are used to characterize
2578 the effects of airborne loss of particle infectivity.
- 2579 • Resuspension (the re-emission of deposited material back into the atmosphere) is
2580 neglected.
- 2581 • Flat terrain with a surface roughness of 0.1 m corresponding to a suburban setting.
2582 In forested and downtown regions, the earth's surface is typically rougher –
2583 resulting in lower surface air concentrations during stable and neutral atmospheric
2584 conditions.
- 2585 • The modeled wind blew from the west (270°) to the east with no vertical or
2586 horizontal variation in wind direction (modeled wind speeds increase with height
2587 above ground).

2588
2589

M Dillon and
C Dillon

Particle Model for
Airborne Disease Transmission

2590 Downwind concentrations were predicted using 2 modeling grids. The first had a 30 km
2591 horizontal extent and 100 m horizontal resolution grid cells. The second had a 1.5 km horizontal
2592 extent and 6 m horizontal resolution grid cells

2593 For each case, LODI was run with 1,000,000 marker particles⁴¹ to calculate the (ensemble)
2594 average surface (lowest 20 m) normalized air concentrations integrated over the entire plume
2595 passage (i.e., until no marker particles remain in the modeling domain) for each model grid cell.
2596 For each atmospheric condition, the following procedure was used to calculate the normalized
2597 space and time integrated air concentration provided in **Tables E2(a-b) to E5(a-b)**.

2598 First, we developed an interpolation function for each modeling grid using the MATLAB
2599 *griddedInterpolant* function configured to return either the value at the nearest sample
2600 grid point to the requested location (if the requested location is within the sample grid)
2601 or zero (if the requested location is outside the sample grid).

2602 Second, we calculated the normalized time integrated air concentrations for a fixed set
2603 of radial distances by numerically integrating previously developed interpolation
2604 functions (using the MATLAB *integral* and *integral2* functions, as appropriate) for (a) a
2605 disk and (b) circle arc, both centered on the release. For the 1.5 km extent grid, the
2606 distances considered were 50 m to 1,100 m at 50 m increments. For the 30 km extent
2607 grid, the distances considered were 2,000 m to 20,000 m at 1,000 m increments.

2608 Third, we developed a second, linear interpolation function using the *griddedInterpolant*
2609 function from the distances considered and the normalized time integrated air
2610 concentrations calculated in step 2. This function was used for remainder of the
2611 analysis.
2612

⁴¹ These computational marker particles are a large sample from the possible particles emitted and are used in estimating downwind concentrations along the prescribed contaminant emission amount. These particles do NOT directly represent individual physical aerosols.

M Dillon and
C Dillon

Particle Model for
Airborne Disease Transmission

Table E2a. Normalized Time and Space Integrated Particle Air Concentration for a Disc with the specified distance from the release assuming no airborne loss rate ($\lambda_{decay} = 0 \text{ h}^{-1}$).

Distance Downwind (m)	Clear, cold night with light winds (s m ⁻¹)	Clear night with gentle breeze (s m ⁻¹)	Overcast with light winds (s m ⁻¹)	Overcast with gentle winds (s m ⁻¹)	Overcast with strong winds (s m ⁻¹)	Clear day with gentle winds (s m ⁻¹)	Clear, hot day with light winds (s m ⁻¹)
50	2.2E+01	4.4E+00	1.1E+01	3.4E+00	1.5E+00	2.1E+00	7.1E+00
100	4.0E+01	8.0E+00	1.6E+01	5.6E+00	2.5E+00	3.0E+00	9.5E+00
150	5.6E+01	1.1E+01	1.9E+01	7.2E+00	3.3E+00	3.6E+00	1.1E+01
200	7.0E+01	1.3E+01	2.2E+01	8.4E+00	3.8E+00	3.9E+00	1.2E+01
250	8.3E+01	1.5E+01	2.4E+01	9.4E+00	4.3E+00	4.2E+00	1.3E+01
300	9.4E+01	1.7E+01	2.5E+01	1.0E+01	4.6E+00	4.5E+00	1.3E+01
350	1.0E+02	1.9E+01	2.6E+01	1.1E+01	5.0E+00	4.6E+00	1.4E+01
400	1.1E+02	2.0E+01	2.8E+01	1.2E+01	5.3E+00	4.8E+00	1.4E+01
450	1.2E+02	2.2E+01	2.9E+01	1.2E+01	5.5E+00	5.0E+00	1.4E+01
500	1.3E+02	2.3E+01	2.9E+01	1.3E+01	5.8E+00	5.1E+00	1.5E+01
550	1.4E+02	2.4E+01	3.0E+01	1.3E+01	6.0E+00	5.2E+00	1.5E+01
600	1.4E+02	2.5E+01	3.1E+01	1.4E+01	6.2E+00	5.3E+00	1.5E+01
650	1.5E+02	2.6E+01	3.1E+01	1.4E+01	6.4E+00	5.4E+00	1.5E+01
700	1.5E+02	2.7E+01	3.2E+01	1.4E+01	6.5E+00	5.5E+00	1.6E+01
750	1.6E+02	2.8E+01	3.2E+01	1.5E+01	6.7E+00	5.5E+00	1.6E+01
800	1.6E+02	2.9E+01	3.3E+01	1.5E+01	6.8E+00	5.6E+00	1.6E+01
850	1.7E+02	2.9E+01	3.3E+01	1.5E+01	7.0E+00	5.7E+00	1.6E+01
900	1.7E+02	3.0E+01	3.4E+01	1.6E+01	7.1E+00	5.7E+00	1.6E+01
950	1.8E+02	3.1E+01	3.4E+01	1.6E+01	7.2E+00	5.8E+00	1.6E+01
1,000	1.8E+02	3.1E+01	3.4E+01	1.6E+01	7.4E+00	5.8E+00	1.6E+01
1,050	1.8E+02	3.2E+01	3.5E+01	1.6E+01	7.5E+00	5.9E+00	1.7E+01
1,100	1.9E+02	3.3E+01	3.5E+01	1.7E+01	7.6E+00	5.9E+00	1.7E+01
2,000	2.3E+02	3.8E+01	3.6E+01	1.8E+01	8.1E+00	6.7E+00	1.9E+01
3,000	2.6E+02	4.2E+01	3.8E+01	1.9E+01	8.7E+00	7.1E+00	1.9E+01
4,000	2.8E+02	4.6E+01	4.0E+01	2.0E+01	9.2E+00	7.3E+00	2.0E+01
5,000	3.0E+02	4.8E+01	4.1E+01	2.1E+01	9.6E+00	7.5E+00	2.1E+01
6,000	3.1E+02	5.1E+01	4.2E+01	2.2E+01	9.9E+00	7.7E+00	2.1E+01
7,000	3.1E+02	5.3E+01	4.3E+01	2.2E+01	1.0E+01	7.9E+00	2.2E+01
8,000	3.2E+02	5.5E+01	4.4E+01	2.3E+01	1.0E+01	8.0E+00	2.2E+01
9,000	3.3E+02	5.7E+01	4.5E+01	2.3E+01	1.1E+01	8.2E+00	2.2E+01
10,000	3.3E+02	5.8E+01	4.5E+01	2.4E+01	1.1E+01	8.3E+00	2.3E+01
11,000	3.4E+02	6.0E+01	4.6E+01	2.4E+01	1.1E+01	8.4E+00	2.3E+01
12,000	3.4E+02	6.1E+01	4.7E+01	2.4E+01	1.1E+01	8.5E+00	2.4E+01
13,000	3.5E+02	6.2E+01	4.7E+01	2.5E+01	1.2E+01	8.7E+00	2.4E+01
14,000	3.5E+02	6.4E+01	4.8E+01	2.5E+01	1.2E+01	8.8E+00	2.4E+01
15,000	3.5E+02	6.5E+01	4.9E+01	2.6E+01	1.2E+01	8.9E+00	2.5E+01
16,000	3.5E+02	6.6E+01	4.9E+01	2.6E+01	1.2E+01	9.0E+00	2.5E+01
17,000	3.6E+02	6.7E+01	5.0E+01	2.6E+01	1.2E+01	9.1E+00	2.5E+01
18,000	3.6E+02	6.8E+01	5.0E+01	2.6E+01	1.2E+01	9.2E+00	2.6E+01
19,000	3.6E+02	6.9E+01	5.1E+01	2.7E+01	1.3E+01	9.3E+00	2.6E+01
20,000	3.6E+02	7.0E+01	5.1E+01	2.7E+01	1.3E+01	9.4E+00	2.7E+01

M Dillon and
C Dillon

Particle Model for
Airborne Disease Transmission

Table E2b. Normalized Time and Space Integrated Particle Air Concentration for a Circle Arc at the specified distance from the release assuming no airborne loss rate ($\lambda_{decay} = 0 \text{ h}^{-1}$).

Distance Downwind (m)	Clear, cold night with light winds (s m ⁻²)	Clear night with gentle breeze (s m ⁻²)	Overcast with light winds (s m ⁻²)	Overcast with gentle winds (s m ⁻²)	Overcast with strong winds (s m ⁻²)	Clear day with gentle winds (s m ⁻²)	Clear, hot day with light winds (s m ⁻²)
50	4.0E-01	8.0E-02	1.4E-01	5.4E-02	2.4E-02	2.4E-02	6.9E-02
100	3.4E-01	6.4E-02	8.1E-02	3.6E-02	1.6E-02	1.3E-02	3.5E-02
150	3.0E-01	5.3E-02	5.6E-02	2.8E-02	1.2E-02	8.9E-03	2.3E-02
200	2.6E-01	4.5E-02	4.2E-02	2.2E-02	9.9E-03	6.5E-03	1.6E-02
250	2.3E-01	3.9E-02	3.4E-02	1.8E-02	8.3E-03	5.1E-03	1.3E-02
300	2.1E-01	3.4E-02	2.8E-02	1.6E-02	7.1E-03	4.2E-03	1.0E-02
350	1.9E-01	3.1E-02	2.3E-02	1.4E-02	6.2E-03	3.5E-03	8.5E-03
400	1.7E-01	2.8E-02	2.0E-02	1.2E-02	5.5E-03	3.1E-03	7.2E-03
450	1.6E-01	2.5E-02	1.8E-02	1.1E-02	5.0E-03	2.7E-03	6.2E-03
500	1.5E-01	2.3E-02	1.6E-02	9.8E-03	4.5E-03	2.3E-03	5.5E-03
550	1.4E-01	2.2E-02	1.4E-02	9.0E-03	4.1E-03	2.1E-03	4.9E-03
600	1.3E-01	2.0E-02	1.3E-02	8.3E-03	3.8E-03	1.9E-03	4.4E-03
650	1.2E-01	1.9E-02	1.2E-02	7.7E-03	3.5E-03	1.7E-03	3.9E-03
700	1.1E-01	1.8E-02	1.1E-02	7.3E-03	3.3E-03	1.6E-03	3.6E-03
750	1.0E-01	1.7E-02	9.8E-03	6.8E-03	3.1E-03	1.4E-03	3.3E-03
800	9.6E-02	1.6E-02	9.0E-03	6.4E-03	2.9E-03	1.3E-03	3.1E-03
850	9.0E-02	1.5E-02	8.3E-03	6.0E-03	2.8E-03	1.3E-03	2.9E-03
900	8.4E-02	1.4E-02	7.7E-03	5.8E-03	2.6E-03	1.2E-03	2.7E-03
950	7.8E-02	1.4E-02	7.2E-03	5.5E-03	2.5E-03	1.1E-03	2.5E-03
1,000	7.2E-02	1.3E-02	6.7E-03	5.2E-03	2.4E-03	1.0E-03	2.3E-03
1,050	6.7E-02	1.2E-02	6.1E-03	4.9E-03	2.3E-03	9.7E-04	2.2E-03
1,100	5.9E-02	1.2E-02	5.5E-03	4.7E-03	2.2E-03	9.0E-04	2.0E-03
2,000	3.8E-02	5.5E-03	2.6E-03	1.7E-03	7.7E-04	4.5E-04	1.1E-03
3,000	2.3E-02	4.0E-03	1.7E-03	1.2E-03	5.3E-04	2.9E-04	7.3E-04
4,000	1.6E-02	3.1E-03	1.3E-03	8.9E-04	4.2E-04	2.3E-04	5.9E-04
5,000	1.2E-02	2.6E-03	1.1E-03	7.4E-04	3.6E-04	1.9E-04	5.2E-04
6,000	9.5E-03	2.3E-03	9.6E-04	6.4E-04	3.2E-04	1.7E-04	4.6E-04
7,000	7.8E-03	2.0E-03	8.6E-04	5.6E-04	2.8E-04	1.5E-04	4.4E-04
8,000	6.6E-03	1.8E-03	8.1E-04	5.1E-04	2.6E-04	1.4E-04	4.3E-04
9,000	5.7E-03	1.7E-03	7.6E-04	4.7E-04	2.4E-04	1.3E-04	4.0E-04
10,000	4.9E-03	1.5E-03	7.0E-04	4.3E-04	2.3E-04	1.3E-04	3.8E-04
11,000	4.4E-03	1.4E-03	6.9E-04	4.1E-04	2.2E-04	1.3E-04	3.7E-04
12,000	3.9E-03	1.4E-03	6.7E-04	3.9E-04	2.1E-04	1.2E-04	3.7E-04
13,000	3.6E-03	1.3E-03	6.3E-04	3.7E-04	2.0E-04	1.2E-04	3.7E-04
14,000	3.2E-03	1.2E-03	6.1E-04	3.5E-04	1.9E-04	1.1E-04	3.6E-04
15,000	3.0E-03	1.2E-03	5.9E-04	3.3E-04	1.8E-04	1.1E-04	3.6E-04
16,000	2.7E-03	1.1E-03	5.7E-04	3.2E-04	1.7E-04	1.1E-04	3.6E-04
17,000	2.5E-03	1.1E-03	5.9E-04	3.1E-04	1.7E-04	1.1E-04	3.6E-04
18,000	2.4E-03	1.1E-03	5.7E-04	2.9E-04	1.7E-04	1.0E-04	3.5E-04
19,000	2.2E-03	1.0E-03	5.4E-04	2.8E-04	1.6E-04	1.1E-04	3.5E-04
20,000	2.1E-03	9.9E-04	5.2E-04	2.8E-04	1.6E-04	1.0E-04	3.6E-04

M Dillon and
C Dillon

Particle Model for
Airborne Disease Transmission

2619 **Table E3a. Normalized Time and Space Integrated Particle Air Concentration for a Disc with**
2620 **the specified distance from the release assuming airborne loss rate ($\lambda_{decay} = 0.1 \text{ h}^{-1}$).**

Distance Downwind (m)	Clear, cold night with light winds (s m ⁻¹)	Clear night with gentle breeze (s m ⁻¹)	Overcast with light winds (s m ⁻¹)	Overcast with gentle winds (s m ⁻¹)	Overcast with strong winds (s m ⁻¹)	Clear day with gentle winds (s m ⁻¹)	Clear, hot day with light winds (s m ⁻¹)
50	2.2E+01	4.4E+00	1.1E+01	3.4E+00	1.5E+00	2.1E+00	7.1E+00
100	4.0E+01	8.0E+00	1.6E+01	5.6E+00	2.5E+00	3.0E+00	9.5E+00
150	5.6E+01	1.1E+01	1.9E+01	7.2E+00	3.3E+00	3.6E+00	1.1E+01
200	7.0E+01	1.3E+01	2.2E+01	8.4E+00	3.8E+00	3.9E+00	1.2E+01
250	8.2E+01	1.5E+01	2.4E+01	9.4E+00	4.3E+00	4.2E+00	1.3E+01
300	9.3E+01	1.7E+01	2.5E+01	1.0E+01	4.6E+00	4.5E+00	1.3E+01
350	1.0E+02	1.9E+01	2.6E+01	1.1E+01	5.0E+00	4.6E+00	1.4E+01
400	1.1E+02	2.0E+01	2.7E+01	1.2E+01	5.3E+00	4.8E+00	1.4E+01
450	1.2E+02	2.2E+01	2.8E+01	1.2E+01	5.5E+00	5.0E+00	1.4E+01
500	1.3E+02	2.3E+01	2.9E+01	1.3E+01	5.8E+00	5.1E+00	1.5E+01
550	1.3E+02	2.4E+01	3.0E+01	1.3E+01	6.0E+00	5.2E+00	1.5E+01
600	1.4E+02	2.5E+01	3.1E+01	1.4E+01	6.2E+00	5.3E+00	1.5E+01
650	1.5E+02	2.6E+01	3.1E+01	1.4E+01	6.3E+00	5.4E+00	1.5E+01
700	1.5E+02	2.7E+01	3.2E+01	1.4E+01	6.5E+00	5.5E+00	1.5E+01
750	1.6E+02	2.8E+01	3.2E+01	1.5E+01	6.7E+00	5.5E+00	1.6E+01
800	1.6E+02	2.8E+01	3.3E+01	1.5E+01	6.8E+00	5.6E+00	1.6E+01
850	1.7E+02	2.9E+01	3.3E+01	1.5E+01	7.0E+00	5.7E+00	1.6E+01
900	1.7E+02	3.0E+01	3.3E+01	1.6E+01	7.1E+00	5.7E+00	1.6E+01
950	1.7E+02	3.1E+01	3.4E+01	1.6E+01	7.2E+00	5.8E+00	1.6E+01
1,000	1.8E+02	3.1E+01	3.4E+01	1.6E+01	7.4E+00	5.8E+00	1.6E+01
1,050	1.8E+02	3.2E+01	3.5E+01	1.6E+01	7.5E+00	5.9E+00	1.6E+01
1,100	1.8E+02	3.2E+01	3.5E+01	1.7E+01	7.6E+00	5.9E+00	1.7E+01
2,000	2.3E+02	3.7E+01	3.6E+01	1.8E+01	8.1E+00	6.7E+00	1.8E+01
3,000	2.5E+02	4.2E+01	3.8E+01	1.9E+01	8.7E+00	7.1E+00	1.9E+01
4,000	2.7E+02	4.5E+01	3.9E+01	2.0E+01	9.1E+00	7.3E+00	2.0E+01
5,000	2.8E+02	4.8E+01	4.0E+01	2.1E+01	9.5E+00	7.5E+00	2.0E+01
6,000	2.9E+02	5.0E+01	4.1E+01	2.1E+01	9.9E+00	7.7E+00	2.1E+01
7,000	3.0E+02	5.2E+01	4.2E+01	2.2E+01	1.0E+01	7.8E+00	2.1E+01
8,000	3.0E+02	5.4E+01	4.3E+01	2.2E+01	1.0E+01	8.0E+00	2.2E+01
9,000	3.1E+02	5.6E+01	4.3E+01	2.3E+01	1.1E+01	8.1E+00	2.2E+01
10,000	3.1E+02	5.7E+01	4.4E+01	2.3E+01	1.1E+01	8.2E+00	2.2E+01
11,000	3.1E+02	5.9E+01	4.4E+01	2.4E+01	1.1E+01	8.4E+00	2.3E+01
12,000	3.2E+02	6.0E+01	4.5E+01	2.4E+01	1.1E+01	8.5E+00	2.3E+01
13,000	3.2E+02	6.1E+01	4.5E+01	2.4E+01	1.1E+01	8.6E+00	2.3E+01
14,000	3.2E+02	6.2E+01	4.6E+01	2.5E+01	1.2E+01	8.7E+00	2.3E+01
15,000	3.2E+02	6.4E+01	4.6E+01	2.5E+01	1.2E+01	8.8E+00	2.4E+01
16,000	3.3E+02	6.5E+01	4.7E+01	2.5E+01	1.2E+01	8.9E+00	2.4E+01
17,000	3.3E+02	6.6E+01	4.7E+01	2.6E+01	1.2E+01	9.0E+00	2.4E+01
18,000	3.3E+02	6.7E+01	4.8E+01	2.6E+01	1.2E+01	9.1E+00	2.4E+01
19,000	3.3E+02	6.8E+01	4.8E+01	2.6E+01	1.3E+01	9.2E+00	2.5E+01
20,000	3.3E+02	6.8E+01	4.8E+01	2.7E+01	1.3E+01	9.3E+00	2.5E+01

2621

M Dillon and
C Dillon

Particle Model for
Airborne Disease Transmission

Table E3b. Normalized Time and Space Integrated Particle Air Concentration for a Circle Arc at the specified distance from the release assuming airborne loss rate ($\lambda_{decay} = 0.1 \text{ h}^{-1}$).

Distance Downwind (m)	Clear, cold night with light winds (s m ⁻²)	Clear night with gentle breeze (s m ⁻²)	Overcast with light winds (s m ⁻²)	Overcast with gentle winds (s m ⁻²)	Overcast with strong winds (s m ⁻²)	Clear day with gentle winds (s m ⁻²)	Clear, hot day with light winds (s m ⁻²)
50	4.0E-01	8.0E-02	1.3E-01	5.4E-02	2.4E-02	2.4E-02	6.9E-02
100	3.4E-01	6.4E-02	8.0E-02	3.6E-02	1.6E-02	1.3E-02	3.5E-02
150	3.0E-01	5.3E-02	5.6E-02	2.8E-02	1.2E-02	8.9E-03	2.3E-02
200	2.6E-01	4.4E-02	4.2E-02	2.2E-02	9.9E-03	6.5E-03	1.6E-02
250	2.3E-01	3.9E-02	3.3E-02	1.8E-02	8.2E-03	5.1E-03	1.3E-02
300	2.1E-01	3.4E-02	2.8E-02	1.6E-02	7.1E-03	4.2E-03	1.0E-02
350	1.9E-01	3.1E-02	2.3E-02	1.4E-02	6.2E-03	3.5E-03	8.4E-03
400	1.7E-01	2.8E-02	2.0E-02	1.2E-02	5.5E-03	3.1E-03	7.1E-03
450	1.5E-01	2.5E-02	1.7E-02	1.1E-02	4.9E-03	2.7E-03	6.1E-03
500	1.4E-01	2.3E-02	1.5E-02	9.8E-03	4.5E-03	2.3E-03	5.4E-03
550	1.3E-01	2.1E-02	1.4E-02	9.0E-03	4.1E-03	2.1E-03	4.8E-03
600	1.2E-01	2.0E-02	1.3E-02	8.3E-03	3.8E-03	1.9E-03	4.3E-03
650	1.1E-01	1.9E-02	1.1E-02	7.7E-03	3.5E-03	1.7E-03	3.8E-03
700	1.1E-01	1.7E-02	1.0E-02	7.2E-03	3.3E-03	1.6E-03	3.5E-03
750	1.0E-01	1.7E-02	9.6E-03	6.7E-03	3.1E-03	1.4E-03	3.3E-03
800	9.3E-02	1.6E-02	8.8E-03	6.3E-03	2.9E-03	1.3E-03	3.0E-03
850	8.6E-02	1.5E-02	8.1E-03	6.0E-03	2.8E-03	1.2E-03	2.8E-03
900	8.0E-02	1.4E-02	7.5E-03	5.7E-03	2.6E-03	1.2E-03	2.6E-03
950	7.5E-02	1.3E-02	7.0E-03	5.4E-03	2.5E-03	1.1E-03	2.4E-03
1,000	6.9E-02	1.3E-02	6.5E-03	5.1E-03	2.4E-03	1.0E-03	2.3E-03
1,050	6.3E-02	1.2E-02	6.0E-03	4.9E-03	2.3E-03	9.7E-04	2.1E-03
1,100	5.6E-02	1.2E-02	5.3E-03	4.6E-03	2.1E-03	8.9E-04	1.9E-03
2,000	3.5E-02	5.4E-03	2.4E-03	1.6E-03	7.6E-04	4.4E-04	1.0E-03
3,000	2.1E-02	3.9E-03	1.6E-03	1.1E-03	5.3E-04	2.9E-04	6.8E-04
4,000	1.4E-02	3.1E-03	1.2E-03	8.7E-04	4.2E-04	2.2E-04	5.3E-04
5,000	1.0E-02	2.5E-03	9.6E-04	7.2E-04	3.5E-04	1.9E-04	4.6E-04
6,000	7.8E-03	2.2E-03	8.3E-04	6.2E-04	3.1E-04	1.6E-04	4.0E-04
7,000	6.2E-03	1.9E-03	7.3E-04	5.4E-04	2.8E-04	1.5E-04	3.7E-04
8,000	5.2E-03	1.7E-03	6.7E-04	4.8E-04	2.6E-04	1.3E-04	3.6E-04
9,000	4.3E-03	1.6E-03	6.2E-04	4.5E-04	2.4E-04	1.3E-04	3.3E-04
10,000	3.7E-03	1.5E-03	5.6E-04	4.1E-04	2.2E-04	1.2E-04	3.0E-04
11,000	3.2E-03	1.4E-03	5.4E-04	3.8E-04	2.1E-04	1.2E-04	2.9E-04
12,000	2.8E-03	1.3E-03	5.1E-04	3.7E-04	2.0E-04	1.1E-04	2.8E-04
13,000	2.5E-03	1.2E-03	4.7E-04	3.5E-04	1.9E-04	1.1E-04	2.8E-04
14,000	2.2E-03	1.1E-03	4.4E-04	3.3E-04	1.9E-04	1.1E-04	2.6E-04
15,000	2.0E-03	1.1E-03	4.2E-04	3.1E-04	1.8E-04	1.0E-04	2.5E-04
16,000	1.8E-03	1.0E-03	4.0E-04	2.9E-04	1.7E-04	9.9E-05	2.5E-04
17,000	1.7E-03	1.0E-03	4.0E-04	2.8E-04	1.7E-04	1.0E-04	2.4E-04
18,000	1.5E-03	9.6E-04	3.8E-04	2.7E-04	1.6E-04	9.4E-05	2.3E-04
19,000	1.4E-03	9.2E-04	3.5E-04	2.5E-04	1.6E-04	9.9E-05	2.3E-04
20,000	1.3E-03	8.9E-04	3.3E-04	2.5E-04	1.5E-04	9.4E-05	2.3E-04

M Dillon and
C Dillon

Particle Model for
Airborne Disease Transmission

Table E4a. Normalized Time and Space Integrated Particle Air Concentration for a Disc with the specified distance from the release assuming airborne loss rate ($\lambda_{decay} = 1 \text{ h}^{-1}$).

Distance Downwind (m)	Clear, cold night with light winds (s m ⁻¹)	Clear night with gentle breeze (s m ⁻¹)	Overcast with light winds (s m ⁻¹)	Overcast with gentle winds (s m ⁻¹)	Overcast with strong winds (s m ⁻¹)	Clear day with gentle winds (s m ⁻¹)	Clear, hot day with light winds (s m ⁻¹)
50	2.1E+01	4.4E+00	1.1E+01	3.4E+00	1.5E+00	2.1E+00	7.0E+00
100	3.9E+01	7.9E+00	1.6E+01	5.6E+00	2.5E+00	3.0E+00	9.4E+00
150	5.3E+01	1.1E+01	1.9E+01	7.2E+00	3.2E+00	3.5E+00	1.1E+01
200	6.6E+01	1.3E+01	2.1E+01	8.4E+00	3.8E+00	3.9E+00	1.2E+01
250	7.6E+01	1.5E+01	2.3E+01	9.3E+00	4.2E+00	4.2E+00	1.2E+01
300	8.6E+01	1.7E+01	2.4E+01	1.0E+01	4.6E+00	4.4E+00	1.3E+01
350	9.4E+01	1.9E+01	2.5E+01	1.1E+01	4.9E+00	4.6E+00	1.3E+01
400	1.0E+02	2.0E+01	2.6E+01	1.1E+01	5.2E+00	4.8E+00	1.4E+01
450	1.1E+02	2.1E+01	2.7E+01	1.2E+01	5.5E+00	4.9E+00	1.4E+01
500	1.1E+02	2.2E+01	2.8E+01	1.3E+01	5.7E+00	5.0E+00	1.4E+01
550	1.2E+02	2.3E+01	2.9E+01	1.3E+01	5.9E+00	5.1E+00	1.4E+01
600	1.2E+02	2.4E+01	2.9E+01	1.3E+01	6.1E+00	5.2E+00	1.5E+01
650	1.3E+02	2.5E+01	3.0E+01	1.4E+01	6.3E+00	5.3E+00	1.5E+01
700	1.3E+02	2.6E+01	3.0E+01	1.4E+01	6.5E+00	5.4E+00	1.5E+01
750	1.4E+02	2.7E+01	3.1E+01	1.4E+01	6.6E+00	5.5E+00	1.5E+01
800	1.4E+02	2.8E+01	3.1E+01	1.5E+01	6.8E+00	5.5E+00	1.5E+01
850	1.4E+02	2.8E+01	3.1E+01	1.5E+01	6.9E+00	5.6E+00	1.5E+01
900	1.5E+02	2.9E+01	3.2E+01	1.5E+01	7.0E+00	5.7E+00	1.5E+01
950	1.5E+02	3.0E+01	3.2E+01	1.6E+01	7.2E+00	5.7E+00	1.6E+01
1,000	1.5E+02	3.0E+01	3.2E+01	1.6E+01	7.3E+00	5.8E+00	1.6E+01
1,050	1.5E+02	3.1E+01	3.2E+01	1.6E+01	7.4E+00	5.8E+00	1.6E+01
1,100	1.5E+02	3.1E+01	3.3E+01	1.6E+01	7.5E+00	5.9E+00	1.6E+01
2,000	1.8E+02	3.6E+01	3.3E+01	1.7E+01	7.9E+00	6.6E+00	1.7E+01
3,000	1.9E+02	3.9E+01	3.4E+01	1.8E+01	8.5E+00	6.9E+00	1.8E+01
4,000	1.9E+02	4.2E+01	3.5E+01	1.9E+01	8.9E+00	7.1E+00	1.8E+01
5,000	2.0E+02	4.4E+01	3.5E+01	2.0E+01	9.3E+00	7.3E+00	1.8E+01
6,000	2.0E+02	4.6E+01	3.5E+01	2.0E+01	9.6E+00	7.4E+00	1.8E+01
7,000	2.0E+02	4.7E+01	3.6E+01	2.1E+01	9.8E+00	7.5E+00	1.8E+01
8,000	2.0E+02	4.8E+01	3.6E+01	2.1E+01	1.0E+01	7.6E+00	1.9E+01
9,000	2.0E+02	4.9E+01	3.6E+01	2.1E+01	1.0E+01	7.7E+00	1.9E+01
10,000	2.0E+02	5.0E+01	3.6E+01	2.1E+01	1.0E+01	7.8E+00	1.9E+01
11,000	2.0E+02	5.1E+01	3.6E+01	2.2E+01	1.1E+01	7.8E+00	1.9E+01
12,000	2.0E+02	5.2E+01	3.6E+01	2.2E+01	1.1E+01	7.9E+00	1.9E+01
13,000	2.0E+02	5.2E+01	3.6E+01	2.2E+01	1.1E+01	8.0E+00	1.9E+01
14,000	2.0E+02	5.3E+01	3.6E+01	2.2E+01	1.1E+01	8.0E+00	1.9E+01
15,000	2.0E+02	5.4E+01	3.6E+01	2.2E+01	1.1E+01	8.1E+00	1.9E+01
16,000	2.0E+02	5.4E+01	3.6E+01	2.3E+01	1.1E+01	8.1E+00	1.9E+01
17,000	2.0E+02	5.5E+01	3.6E+01	2.3E+01	1.1E+01	8.2E+00	1.9E+01
18,000	2.0E+02	5.5E+01	3.6E+01	2.3E+01	1.2E+01	8.2E+00	1.9E+01
19,000	2.0E+02	5.5E+01	3.6E+01	2.3E+01	1.2E+01	8.3E+00	1.9E+01
20,000	2.0E+02	5.6E+01	3.6E+01	2.3E+01	1.2E+01	8.3E+00	1.9E+01

M Dillon and
C Dillon

Particle Model for
Airborne Disease Transmission

Table E4b. Normalized Time and Space Integrated Particle Air Concentration for a Circle Arc at the specified distance from the release assuming airborne loss rate ($\lambda_{decay} = 1 \text{ h}^{-1}$).

Distance Downwind (m)	Clear, cold night with light winds (s m ⁻²)	Clear night with gentle breeze (s m ⁻²)	Overcast with light winds (s m ⁻²)	Overcast with gentle winds (s m ⁻²)	Overcast with strong winds (s m ⁻²)	Clear day with gentle winds (s m ⁻²)	Clear, hot day with light winds (s m ⁻²)
50	3.8E-01	8.0E-02	1.3E-01	5.4E-02	2.4E-02	2.4E-02	6.8E-02
100	3.2E-01	6.3E-02	7.8E-02	3.6E-02	1.6E-02	1.3E-02	3.4E-02
150	2.7E-01	5.2E-02	5.3E-02	2.7E-02	1.2E-02	8.8E-03	2.2E-02
200	2.3E-01	4.3E-02	3.9E-02	2.1E-02	9.8E-03	6.4E-03	1.5E-02
250	2.0E-01	3.8E-02	3.1E-02	1.8E-02	8.2E-03	5.0E-03	1.2E-02
300	1.8E-01	3.3E-02	2.5E-02	1.5E-02	7.0E-03	4.1E-03	9.4E-03
350	1.6E-01	2.9E-02	2.1E-02	1.3E-02	6.1E-03	3.4E-03	7.6E-03
400	1.4E-01	2.7E-02	1.8E-02	1.2E-02	5.4E-03	3.0E-03	6.4E-03
450	1.2E-01	2.4E-02	1.5E-02	1.0E-02	4.9E-03	2.6E-03	5.5E-03
500	1.1E-01	2.2E-02	1.3E-02	9.4E-03	4.4E-03	2.3E-03	4.8E-03
550	1.0E-01	2.0E-02	1.2E-02	8.6E-03	4.0E-03	2.0E-03	4.2E-03
600	9.3E-02	1.9E-02	1.1E-02	7.9E-03	3.7E-03	1.8E-03	3.7E-03
650	8.5E-02	1.8E-02	9.5E-03	7.3E-03	3.5E-03	1.7E-03	3.3E-03
700	7.8E-02	1.6E-02	8.6E-03	6.9E-03	3.2E-03	1.5E-03	3.0E-03
750	7.2E-02	1.5E-02	7.8E-03	6.4E-03	3.0E-03	1.4E-03	2.7E-03
800	6.5E-02	1.4E-02	7.1E-03	6.0E-03	2.9E-03	1.3E-03	2.5E-03
850	6.0E-02	1.4E-02	6.5E-03	5.6E-03	2.7E-03	1.2E-03	2.3E-03
900	5.5E-02	1.3E-02	6.0E-03	5.4E-03	2.6E-03	1.1E-03	2.1E-03
950	5.0E-02	1.2E-02	5.5E-03	5.1E-03	2.4E-03	1.0E-03	2.0E-03
1,000	4.6E-02	1.2E-02	5.0E-03	4.8E-03	2.3E-03	9.7E-04	1.8E-03
1,050	4.1E-02	1.1E-02	4.6E-03	4.6E-03	2.2E-03	9.1E-04	1.7E-03
1,100	3.6E-02	1.1E-02	4.1E-03	4.3E-03	2.1E-03	8.4E-04	1.5E-03
2,000	1.7E-02	4.7E-03	1.5E-03	1.4E-03	7.2E-04	4.0E-04	6.4E-04
3,000	7.5E-03	3.1E-03	8.0E-04	9.5E-04	4.9E-04	2.5E-04	3.5E-04
4,000	3.9E-03	2.3E-03	4.9E-04	6.9E-04	3.8E-04	1.8E-04	2.2E-04
5,000	2.3E-03	1.9E-03	3.3E-04	5.5E-04	3.1E-04	1.5E-04	1.6E-04
6,000	1.4E-03	1.5E-03	2.3E-04	4.5E-04	2.7E-04	1.2E-04	1.1E-04
7,000	9.3E-04	1.3E-03	1.7E-04	3.8E-04	2.3E-04	1.1E-04	8.4E-05
8,000	6.4E-04	1.1E-03	1.3E-04	3.2E-04	2.1E-04	9.1E-05	6.6E-05
9,000	4.5E-04	9.7E-04	1.0E-04	2.9E-04	1.9E-04	8.4E-05	5.0E-05
10,000	3.2E-04	8.6E-04	7.4E-05	2.5E-04	1.8E-04	7.7E-05	3.8E-05
11,000	2.3E-04	7.7E-04	5.9E-05	2.3E-04	1.7E-04	7.2E-05	2.9E-05
12,000	1.7E-04	6.9E-04	4.7E-05	2.1E-04	1.6E-04	6.5E-05	2.3E-05
13,000	1.3E-04	6.3E-04	3.6E-05	1.9E-04	1.5E-04	6.0E-05	1.9E-05
14,000	9.7E-05	5.8E-04	2.8E-05	1.7E-04	1.4E-04	5.6E-05	1.4E-05
15,000	7.4E-05	5.3E-04	2.2E-05	1.5E-04	1.3E-04	5.1E-05	1.1E-05
16,000	5.7E-05	4.8E-04	1.7E-05	1.4E-04	1.2E-04	4.8E-05	9.2E-06
17,000	4.4E-05	4.5E-04	1.4E-05	1.3E-04	1.2E-04	4.7E-05	7.3E-06
18,000	3.4E-05	4.2E-04	1.1E-05	1.2E-04	1.1E-04	4.2E-05	5.8E-06
19,000	2.7E-05	3.8E-04	8.7E-06	1.1E-04	1.1E-04	4.2E-05	4.6E-06
20,000	2.1E-05	3.6E-04	6.9E-06	1.0E-04	1.0E-04	3.8E-05	3.8E-06

M Dillon and
C Dillon

Particle Model for
Airborne Disease Transmission

2631 **Table E5a. Normalized Time and Space Integrated Particle Air Concentration for a Disc with**
2632 **the specified distance from the release assuming airborne loss rate ($\lambda_{decay} = 10 \text{ h}^{-1}$).**

Distance Downwind	Clear, cold night with light winds	Clear night with gentle breeze	Overcast with light winds	Overcast with gentle winds	Overcast with strong winds	Clear day with gentle winds	Clear, hot day with light winds
(m)	(s m ⁻¹)	(s m ⁻¹)	(s m ⁻¹)	(s m ⁻¹)	(s m ⁻¹)	(s m ⁻¹)	(s m ⁻¹)
50	1.7E+01	4.3E+00	9.7E+00	3.3E+00	1.5E+00	2.1E+00	6.5E+00
100	2.8E+01	7.5E+00	1.4E+01	5.4E+00	2.5E+00	2.9E+00	8.5E+00
150	3.6E+01	1.0E+01	1.6E+01	6.8E+00	3.2E+00	3.4E+00	9.4E+00
200	4.1E+01	1.2E+01	1.7E+01	7.8E+00	3.7E+00	3.7E+00	1.0E+01
250	4.4E+01	1.4E+01	1.8E+01	8.6E+00	4.1E+00	4.0E+00	1.0E+01
300	4.7E+01	1.5E+01	1.8E+01	9.2E+00	4.4E+00	4.2E+00	1.1E+01
350	4.9E+01	1.6E+01	1.9E+01	9.8E+00	4.7E+00	4.3E+00	1.1E+01
400	5.1E+01	1.7E+01	1.9E+01	1.0E+01	5.0E+00	4.4E+00	1.1E+01
450	5.2E+01	1.8E+01	2.0E+01	1.1E+01	5.2E+00	4.6E+00	1.1E+01
500	5.3E+01	1.8E+01	2.0E+01	1.1E+01	5.4E+00	4.6E+00	1.1E+01
550	5.3E+01	1.9E+01	2.0E+01	1.1E+01	5.5E+00	4.7E+00	1.1E+01
600	5.4E+01	2.0E+01	2.0E+01	1.2E+01	5.7E+00	4.8E+00	1.1E+01
650	5.4E+01	2.0E+01	2.0E+01	1.2E+01	5.8E+00	4.8E+00	1.1E+01
700	5.5E+01	2.1E+01	2.0E+01	1.2E+01	6.0E+00	4.9E+00	1.1E+01
750	5.5E+01	2.1E+01	2.0E+01	1.2E+01	6.1E+00	4.9E+00	1.1E+01
800	5.5E+01	2.1E+01	2.0E+01	1.2E+01	6.2E+00	5.0E+00	1.1E+01
850	5.5E+01	2.2E+01	2.0E+01	1.3E+01	6.3E+00	5.0E+00	1.1E+01
900	5.5E+01	2.2E+01	2.0E+01	1.3E+01	6.4E+00	5.1E+00	1.1E+01
950	5.5E+01	2.2E+01	2.0E+01	1.3E+01	6.5E+00	5.1E+00	1.1E+01
1,000	5.5E+01	2.3E+01	2.0E+01	1.3E+01	6.6E+00	5.1E+00	1.1E+01
1,050	5.6E+01	2.3E+01	2.0E+01	1.3E+01	6.7E+00	5.2E+00	1.1E+01
1,100	5.6E+01	2.3E+01	2.1E+01	1.3E+01	6.8E+00	5.2E+00	1.1E+01
2,000	6.1E+01	2.5E+01	2.1E+01	1.3E+01	7.0E+00	5.6E+00	1.2E+01
3,000	6.1E+01	2.5E+01	2.1E+01	1.4E+01	7.3E+00	5.7E+00	1.2E+01
4,000	6.1E+01	2.6E+01	2.1E+01	1.4E+01	7.4E+00	5.7E+00	1.2E+01
5,000	6.1E+01	2.6E+01	2.1E+01	1.4E+01	7.6E+00	5.8E+00	1.2E+01
6,000	6.1E+01	2.6E+01	2.1E+01	1.4E+01	7.6E+00	5.8E+00	1.2E+01
7,000	6.1E+01	2.6E+01	2.1E+01	1.4E+01	7.7E+00	5.8E+00	1.2E+01
8,000	6.1E+01	2.6E+01	2.1E+01	1.4E+01	7.7E+00	5.8E+00	1.2E+01
9,000	6.1E+01	2.6E+01	2.1E+01	1.4E+01	7.8E+00	5.8E+00	1.2E+01
10,000	6.1E+01	2.6E+01	2.1E+01	1.4E+01	7.8E+00	5.8E+00	1.2E+01
11,000	6.1E+01	2.6E+01	2.1E+01	1.4E+01	7.8E+00	5.8E+00	1.2E+01
12,000	6.1E+01	2.6E+01	2.1E+01	1.4E+01	7.8E+00	5.8E+00	1.2E+01
13,000	6.1E+01	2.6E+01	2.1E+01	1.4E+01	7.8E+00	5.8E+00	1.2E+01
14,000	6.1E+01	2.6E+01	2.1E+01	1.4E+01	7.8E+00	5.8E+00	1.2E+01
15,000	6.1E+01	2.6E+01	2.1E+01	1.4E+01	7.8E+00	5.8E+00	1.2E+01
16,000	6.1E+01	2.6E+01	2.1E+01	1.4E+01	7.8E+00	5.8E+00	1.2E+01
17,000	6.1E+01	2.6E+01	2.1E+01	1.4E+01	7.9E+00	5.8E+00	1.2E+01
18,000	6.1E+01	2.6E+01	2.1E+01	1.4E+01	7.9E+00	5.8E+00	1.2E+01
19,000	6.1E+01	2.6E+01	2.1E+01	1.4E+01	7.9E+00	5.8E+00	1.2E+01
20,000	6.1E+01	2.6E+01	2.1E+01	1.4E+01	7.9E+00	5.8E+00	1.2E+01

2633

M Dillon and
C Dillon

Particle Model for
Airborne Disease Transmission

Table E5b. Normalized Time and Space Integrated Particle Air Concentration for a Circle Arc at the specified distance from the release assuming airborne loss rate ($\lambda_{decay} = 10 \text{ h}^{-1}$).

Distance Downwind (m)	Clear, cold night with light winds (s m ⁻²)	Clear night with gentle breeze (s m ⁻²)	Overcast with light winds (s m ⁻²)	Overcast with gentle winds (s m ⁻²)	Overcast with strong winds (s m ⁻²)	Clear day with gentle winds (s m ⁻²)	Clear, hot day with light winds (s m ⁻²)
50	2.7E-01	7.5E-02	1.1E-01	5.1E-02	2.4E-02	2.3E-02	5.7E-02
100	1.8E-01	5.6E-02	5.5E-02	3.3E-02	1.6E-02	1.2E-02	2.5E-02
150	1.2E-01	4.4E-02	3.3E-02	2.4E-02	1.2E-02	7.9E-03	1.4E-02
200	8.6E-02	3.5E-02	2.1E-02	1.8E-02	9.0E-03	5.6E-03	9.0E-03
250	6.3E-02	2.9E-02	1.5E-02	1.4E-02	7.4E-03	4.2E-03	6.2E-03
300	4.6E-02	2.4E-02	1.1E-02	1.2E-02	6.2E-03	3.4E-03	4.4E-03
350	3.4E-02	2.1E-02	7.9E-03	9.8E-03	5.3E-03	2.8E-03	3.2E-03
400	2.6E-02	1.8E-02	6.0E-03	8.4E-03	4.7E-03	2.3E-03	2.4E-03
450	2.0E-02	1.6E-02	4.6E-03	7.3E-03	4.1E-03	2.0E-03	1.9E-03
500	1.5E-02	1.4E-02	3.6E-03	6.4E-03	3.7E-03	1.7E-03	1.5E-03
550	1.2E-02	1.2E-02	2.9E-03	5.6E-03	3.3E-03	1.5E-03	1.2E-03
600	9.3E-03	1.1E-02	2.3E-03	5.0E-03	3.0E-03	1.3E-03	9.4E-04
650	7.3E-03	9.6E-03	1.9E-03	4.5E-03	2.8E-03	1.1E-03	7.5E-04
700	5.7E-03	8.6E-03	1.5E-03	4.1E-03	2.5E-03	1.0E-03	6.1E-04
750	4.6E-03	7.8E-03	1.3E-03	3.7E-03	2.4E-03	9.0E-04	5.1E-04
800	3.6E-03	7.0E-03	1.0E-03	3.4E-03	2.2E-03	8.1E-04	4.3E-04
850	2.9E-03	6.5E-03	8.6E-04	3.1E-03	2.1E-03	7.4E-04	3.6E-04
900	2.3E-03	5.9E-03	7.2E-04	2.8E-03	1.9E-03	6.7E-04	3.0E-04
950	1.8E-03	5.4E-03	6.0E-04	2.6E-03	1.8E-03	6.0E-04	2.5E-04
1,000	1.5E-03	5.0E-03	5.0E-04	2.4E-03	1.7E-03	5.6E-04	2.1E-04
1,050	1.2E-03	4.6E-03	4.2E-04	2.2E-03	1.6E-03	5.2E-04	1.8E-04
1,100	9.2E-04	4.2E-03	3.4E-04	2.0E-03	1.5E-03	4.7E-04	1.5E-04
2,000	4.9E-05	1.1E-03	2.3E-05	4.1E-04	4.0E-04	1.4E-04	1.2E-05
3,000	2.6E-06	4.1E-04	2.1E-06	1.7E-04	2.2E-04	5.5E-05	1.0E-06
4,000	2.0E-07	1.9E-04	2.5E-07	7.6E-05	1.4E-04	2.6E-05	1.1E-07
5,000	2.1E-08	9.7E-05	3.3E-08	3.9E-05	9.3E-05	1.4E-05	1.4E-08
6,000	2.2E-09	5.2E-05	4.4E-09	2.1E-05	6.6E-05	7.4E-06	1.7E-09
7,000	2.2E-10	2.9E-05	6.0E-10	1.1E-05	4.7E-05	4.2E-06	1.9E-10
8,000	1.3E-11	1.7E-05	6.4E-11	6.5E-06	3.5E-05	2.4E-06	1.7E-11
9,000	3.7E-13	1.0E-05	3.2E-12	3.8E-06	2.7E-05	1.4E-06	5.5E-13
10,000	0.0E+00	6.3E-06	9.3E-14	2.2E-06	2.0E-05	8.5E-07	0.0E+00
11,000	0.0E+00	3.9E-06	0.0E+00	1.3E-06	1.6E-05	5.3E-07	0.0E+00
12,000	0.0E+00	2.5E-06	0.0E+00	8.1E-07	1.2E-05	3.1E-07	0.0E+00
13,000	0.0E+00	1.6E-06	0.0E+00	5.0E-07	9.6E-06	1.9E-07	0.0E+00
14,000	0.0E+00	1.0E-06	0.0E+00	3.0E-07	7.6E-06	1.1E-07	0.0E+00
15,000	0.0E+00	6.8E-07	0.0E+00	1.8E-07	5.8E-06	6.8E-08	0.0E+00
16,000	0.0E+00	4.4E-07	0.0E+00	1.1E-07	4.6E-06	4.3E-08	0.0E+00
17,000	0.0E+00	3.0E-07	0.0E+00	6.9E-08	3.7E-06	2.7E-08	0.0E+00
18,000	0.0E+00	1.9E-07	0.0E+00	4.2E-08	3.0E-06	1.6E-08	0.0E+00
19,000	0.0E+00	1.3E-07	0.0E+00	2.6E-08	2.3E-06	1.0E-08	0.0E+00
20,000	0.0E+00	8.7E-08	0.0E+00	1.7E-08	1.9E-06	6.2E-09	0.0E+00

M Dillon and
C Dillon

Particle Model for
Airborne Disease Transmission

Figure E1. Predicted absolute infection probabilities and infections by distance, wind speed and atmospheric stability for a single airborne particle with 0 h^{-1} airborne loss of infectivity. Legend indicates Pasquill-Gifford-Turner atmospheric stability class (A to F) and the 10 m agl wind speed. Individual person infection probability (top panels) is dimensionless. Urban area infections (bottom panels) assumes a uniform population density of $0.01 \text{ people m}^{-2}$ and has dimensions of people (disc) or people m^{-1} (arc).

Figure E1a. Infection Probabilities and Urban Infections Within a Disc Centered on the Release

M Dillon and
C Dillon

Particle Model for
Airborne Disease Transmission

**Figure E1b. Infection Probabilities and Urban Infections
Along an Arc Centered on the Release Source**

2646

2647

M Dillon and
C Dillon

Particle Model for
Airborne Disease Transmission

Figure E2. Predicted absolute infection probabilities and infections by distance, wind speed and atmospheric stability for a single airborne particle with 0.1 h^{-1} airborne loss of infectivity. Legend indicates Pasquill-Gifford-Turner atmospheric stability class (A to F) and the 10 m agl wind speed. Individual person infection probability (top panels) is dimensionless. Urban area infections (bottom panels) assumes a uniform population density of $0.01 \text{ people m}^{-2}$ and has dimensions of people (disc) or people m^{-1} (arc).

Figure E2a. Infection Probabilities and Urban Infections
Within a Disc Centered on the Release

M Dillon and
C Dillon

Particle Model for
Airborne Disease Transmission

**Figure E2b. Infection Probabilities and Urban Infections
Along an Arc Centered on the Release Source**

2656

2657

M Dillon and
C Dillon

Particle Model for
Airborne Disease Transmission

Figure E3. Predicted absolute infection probabilities and infections by distance, wind speed and atmospheric stability for a single airborne particle with 1 h^{-1} airborne loss of infectivity. Legend indicates Pasquill-Gifford-Turner atmospheric stability class (A to F) and the 10 m agl wind speed. Individual person infection probability (top panels) is dimensionless. Urban area infections (bottom panels) assumes a uniform population density of $0.01 \text{ people m}^{-2}$ and has dimensions of people (disc) or people m^{-1} (arc).

Figure E3a. Infection Probabilities and Urban Infections
Within a Disc Centered on the Release

M Dillon and
C Dillon

Particle Model for
Airborne Disease Transmission

**Figure E3b. Infection Probabilities and Urban Infections
Along an Arc Centered on the Release Source**

2666

2667

M Dillon and
C Dillon

Particle Model for
Airborne Disease Transmission

2668 **Figure E4. Predicted absolute infection probabilities and infections by distance, wind speed**
2669 **and atmospheric stability for a single airborne particle with 10 h^{-1} airborne loss of infectivity.**
2670 **Legend indicates Pasquill-Gifford-Turner atmospheric stability class (A to F) and the 10 m agl**
2671 **wind speed. Individual person infection probability (top panels) is dimensionless. Urban area**
2672 **infections (bottom panels) a uniform population density of $0.01 \text{ people m}^{-2}$ and has**
2673 **dimensions of people (disc) or people m^{-1} (arc).**

**Figure E4a. Infection Probabilities and Urban Infections
Within a Disc Centered on the Release**

M Dillon and
C Dillon

Particle Model for
Airborne Disease Transmission

**Figure E4b. Infection Probabilities and Urban Infections
Along an Arc Centered on the Release Source**

2676

2677

M Dillon and
C Dillon

Particle Model for
Airborne Disease Transmission

2678 **Figure E5. Predicted relative infection probabilities by distance, wind speed and atmospheric**
2679 **stability for a single airborne particle with 0 h^{-1} airborne loss of infectivity. Legend indicates**
2680 **Pasquill-Gifford-Turner atmospheric stability class (A to F) and the 10 m agl wind speed.**
2681 **Relative infection probability is dimensionless.**

**Figure E5. Relative Infection Probabilities
as a Function of Distance from Release**

M Dillon and
C Dillon

Particle Model for
Airborne Disease Transmission

2683 **Figure E6. Predicted relative infection probabilities by distance, wind speed and atmospheric**
2684 **stability for a single airborne particle with 0.1 h^{-1} airborne loss of infectivity. Legend indicates**
2685 **Pasquill-Gifford-Turner atmospheric stability class (A to F) and the 10 m agl wind speed.**
2686 **Relative infection probability is dimensionless.**

2687

M Dillon and
C Dillon

Particle Model for
Airborne Disease Transmission

2688 **Figure E7. Predicted relative infection probabilities by distance, wind speed and atmospheric**
2689 **stability for a single airborne particle with 1 h^{-1} airborne loss of infectivity. Legend indicates**
2690 **Pasquill-Gifford-Turner atmospheric stability class (A to F) and the 10 m agl wind speed.**
2691 **Relative infection probability is dimensionless.**

**Figure E7. Relative Infection Probabilities
as a Function of Distance from Release**

M Dillon and
C Dillon

Particle Model for
Airborne Disease Transmission

2693 **Figure E8. Predicted relative infection probabilities by distance, wind speed and atmospheric**
2694 **stability for a single airborne particle with 10 h^{-1} airborne loss of infectivity. Legend indicates**
2695 **Pasquill-Gifford-Turner atmospheric stability class (A to F) and the 10 m agl wind speed.**
2696 **Relative infection probability is dimensionless.**

2697

M Dillon and
C Dillon

Particle Model for
Airborne Disease Transmission

2698 **Supplemental Material F: Outbreak Model-Measurement Comparison**

2699

2700 see companion excel spreadsheet

2701

M Dillon and
C Dillon

Particle Model for
Airborne Disease Transmission

Supplemental Material G: Infection Estimates

Section Variables Definitions

particle type = specifies particle size and infectivity as a function of time and environmental properties

b = a specific particle type

r = a specific geographic region

$[Adjustment\ Factor](r, b)$ = scaling factor for region r that accounts for the deviation of b -type particle exposure and response from that of the reference exposure and response (no units)

$[Expected\ Number\ of\ Infections\ in\ Region](r, b)$ = number of infections in region r resulting from exposure to b -type particles (people)

$[Normalized\ TSIAC](r, b)$ = b -type particle air concentration integrated over region r and the passage of the airborne infectious plume assuming a single particle was released at the source ($s\ m^{-1}$)

$[Population\ Density](r)$ = population density in region r (people m^{-2})

$[Release\ Probability](b)$ = probability that a particle released into the environment is a b -type particle (dimensionless)

$[Single\ Particle\ Infection\ Probability]_{ref}(r, b)$ = reference probability that an individual in region r will become infected after being exposed to a single b -type particle. This term includes the probability that particle(s) will be inhaled and deposit in the respiratory system. ($m^3\ s^{-1}\ particle^{-1}$)

$[Source\ Adjustment\ Factor](r_{source}, b)$ = scaling factor that accounts for the deviation of b -type particles emitted from the r_{source} region from that of a reference source region (no units)

$[Total\ Particles\ Released]$ = total number of infectious, airborne particles released into the air (particles)

M Dillon and
C Dillon

Particle Model for
Airborne Disease Transmission

2731 Key Equation

2732

2733 Equation G1 is adapted from Equations 1 and 2 in the main text.

2734

2735 (Equation G1)

2736 $[Expected\ Number\ of\ Infections\ in\ Region](r, b)$

$$2737 = \left(\begin{array}{l} [Total\ Particles\ Released] \\ \cdot [Release\ Probability](b) \\ \cdot [Source\ Adjustment\ Factor](r_{source}, b) \\ \cdot [Single\ Particle\ Infection\ Probability]_{ref}(r, b) \\ \cdot [Adjustment\ Factor](r, b) \\ \cdot [Normalized\ TSIAC](r, b) \\ \cdot [Population\ Density](r) \end{array} \right)$$

2738

2739

M Dillon and
C Dillon

Particle Model for
Airborne Disease Transmission

2740 Downwind Infections

2741
2742 (Equation G2)

$$2743 \quad [Expected\ Number\ of\ Infections\ in\ Region](r, b) \\ 2744 \quad = 2 \times 10^{-6} \cdot [Total\ Particles\ Released] \cdot [Release\ Probability](b)$$

2745
2746 Assumptions

2747 1) There is an approximately 20% chance of particles emitted indoors exiting the house
2748 assuming the 1 μm diameter particles lose infectivity at a rate of 1 hr^{-1} :

$$2749 \quad [Source\ Adjustment\ Factor](r_{source}, b) = 0.19 \text{ (no units)}$$

2750 2) Each particle will cause infection if inhaled and each individual has a breathing rate of
2751 $10^{-4} \text{ m}^3 \text{ s}^{-1}$:

$$2752 \quad [Single\ Particle\ Infection\ Probability]_{ref}(r, b) = 10^{-4} \text{ m}^3 \text{ s}^{-1} \text{ particle}^{-1}$$

2753 3) Downwind individuals are fully susceptible, but are physically protected to same degree
2754 as typical US person is protected from an airborne, outdoor, 1 μm diameter particle that
2755 losses infectivity at a rate of 1 hr^{-1} :

$$2756 \quad [Adjustment\ Factor](r, b) = 0.18 \text{ (no units)}$$

2757 4) Exposures occur in an urban area:

$$2758 \quad [Population\ Density](r) = 0.01 \text{ people m}^{-2}$$

2759 5) Downwind individuals are located between 50 m and 20 km from the infected person,
2760 the meteorology corresponds to clear night with a gentle breeze (stable atmospheric
2761 conditions and a 10 m agl wind speed of 4.5 m s^{-1}), each particle has a 1 μm
2762 aerodynamic diameter and the particle loses infectivity in the atmosphere at a rate of 1
2763 hr^{-1} (see Table E4a):

$$2764 \quad [Normalized\ TSIAC](r, b) = 56 \text{ s m}^{-1}$$

M Dillon and
C Dillon

Particle Model for
Airborne Disease Transmission

2766 Within Building Assumptions

2767

2768 (Equation G3)

2769 $[Expected\ Number\ of\ Infections\ in\ Region](r, b)$

2770 $= 4 \times 10^{-6} \cdot [Total\ Particles\ Released] \cdot [Release\ Probability](b)$

2771

2772

2773 *Assumptions*

2774 1) Airborne particles are released indoors:

2775 $[Source\ Adjustment\ Factor](r_{source}, b) = 1$

2776 2) Each particle will cause infection if inhaled and each individual has a breathing rate of
2777 $10^{-4} m^3 s^{-1}$:

2778 3) $[Single\ Particle\ Infection\ Probability]_{ref}(r, b) = 10^{-4} m^3 s^{-1} particle^{-1}$

2779 4) Indoor individuals are fully susceptible and are not protected:

2780 $[Adjustment\ Factor](r, b) = 1$

2781 5) There is one susceptible individual in a typical US home. For context, a typical US single
2782 family home has 200 m² of heated floor area and 2 total residents (Tables HC10.14 and
2783 HC9.1, respectively, per [244]):

2784 $[Population\ Density](r) = 0.005 people m^{-2}$

2785 6) Exposures are determined by **Equation D7** using typical US home values [30] and an
2786 assumed room height of 3 m. Each particle has a 1 μm aerodynamic diameter and the
2787 particle loses infectivity at a rate of 1 hr⁻¹.

2788 $[Normalized\ TSIAC](r, b) = 8.4 s m^{-1}$

2789

M Dillon and
C Dillon

Particle Model for
Airborne Disease Transmission

Supplemental Material H: U.S. Coxiella burnetti Infection and Disease Estimates

Q Fever is a veterinary disease of livestock that can be transmitted to humans by inhalation of infectious aerosols [61] and has caused significant community and regional level disease outbreaks, see **Supplemental Material A: Airborne Disease Transmission Literature Review**. Control measures exist for animal and human Q Fever and vaccines are available in some countries [245]–[248].

Background

In the 1930's, it was first recognized that exposure to infected livestock could cause human disease. During a 1935 disease outbreak, Q Fever was recognized in Australia. Initially the cause was unknown and so investigators called it “Query” (of questionable cause) Fever. The bacterium *Coxiella burnetti*, which causes Q Fever, was named after the two researchers who first identified it (Herald Cox and McFarlane Burnet). Since this time, *Coxiella burnetti* infection in animals has been shown to be common in almost all countries, including the United States [249] and causes significant disease in commercial livestock including, but not limited to, cows, sheep, and goats [250]. A recently summary indicates high US infection rates in goats (41.6%), sheep (16.5%), and cattle (3.4%) [250].

In the US soils, an environmental survey demonstrates widespread contamination, with 23.8% of samples testing positive for *Coxiella* DNA [251]. US state-level positive sample rates range from 6 to 44%. A subset of these samples was tested for viability and *Coxiella* was culturable in the PCR positive specimens. As expected, the *Coxiella* DNA was detected in locations with livestock; however, it was also often found in locations associated with human activity, such as post offices, stores, and schools.

M Dillon and
C Dillon

Particle Model for
Airborne Disease Transmission

2816 Human Infection and Disease Characteristics

2817 Q Fever in humans is characteristically caused by inhalation of airborne bacteria, although
2818 direct contact and ticks are also known infection pathways [61], [249]. The infectious aerosols
2819 may be emitted directly from infected animals or the result of aerosolization of contaminated
2820 particles or soil. Coxiella is highly infectious since exposure to only a few bacteria can cause
2821 infection⁴² and while there is some variation between research studies and also variation by
2822 infectious dosage, in general it is thought that 40% to 50% of humans infected for the first time
2823 become ill with Acute Q Fever. The proportion of infected persons who will develop Chronic Q
2824 Fever is still uncertain as it can be much more difficult to diagnose [61], [249], [252]–[254].

2825 Acute Q Fever often exhibits as a short influenza-like illness, but the disease can be severe with
2826 pneumonia, liver disease, or encephalitis requiring hospitalization. Acute Q Fever can lead to
2827 fatalities, with a death rate of 1 to 2% [61]. Pregnant women are considered to face the same
2828 risks as infected farm animals, namely increased risk abortion, stillbirth, and premature delivery
2829 [249]. High titers of subtype Phase II Q Fever antibody (IgG IFA $\geq 1:128$) are considered
2830 supportive laboratory evidence for Acute Q Fever infection and are often used as a surrogate
2831 surveillance measure for Q Fever in Public Health surveillance [61], [249], [255], [256]. In our
2832 prevalence analysis presented in the next subsection, we use a more selective definition for
2833 laboratory-supportive Acute Q Fever infection to increase the likelihood of identifying true
2834 Acute Q Fever associated infections. Specifically, we define Acute Q Fever infection as a case
2835 with (a) Phase II IgG IFA $\geq 1:128$, (b) Phase II antibodies $\geq 4\times$ Phase I antibodies, and (c) Phase I
2836 IgG IFA $< 1:800$).⁴³

2837 Chronic Q Fever is challenging to diagnose and also to treat with existing antibiotics. It causes
2838 significant heart disease and high mortality rates. Notably, Chronic Q Fever can develop in
2839 infected individuals who have never had Acute Q Fever and so it may go unnoticed for years
2840 after the initial infection. It is usually fatal if left untreated [69], [249]. For example a 2018
2841 follow up of a recent 2008 to 2010 outbreak showed that among the 519 chronic Q Fever cases
2842 identified, 86 patients had died [69]. A persistently high Phase I antibody level (IgG IFA $\geq 1:800$)
2843 that persists after Acute Q Fever infection is a risk factor for Chronic Q Fever but is not
2844 diagnostic [61].

⁴² The dose required to infect 50% of the human subjects is 1.18 bacteria (95% CI: 0.76 to 40.2) [15], [83].

⁴³ Coxiella antibody “Phases” are a laboratory methods notation where Phase I antibodies occur first in embryonated egg cultures and Phase II antibodies later. In human Acute Q Fever, Phase II antibodies peak first at high levels ($\geq 1:128$) 1 to 2 weeks after the start of symptoms when Phase I antibody levels are low. Phase I antibodies peak some weeks after. Our selective acute infection criteria was chosen to reflect these dynamics and relevant human levels [61], [249].

M Dillon and
C Dillon

Particle Model for
Airborne Disease Transmission

2845 Human Infection and Disease Prevalence

2846 It is uncertain how many human Coxiella infections and cases of Q Fever there are as it is widely
2847 acknowledged that many, if not most, cases of Q Fever are unrecognized and do not come to
2848 medical attention [61], [249]. Existing Q Fever disease notification systems are “passive”
2849 surveillance systems in which disease prevalence is determined by the number of cases
2850 diagnosed and then reported by medical providers [252].⁴⁴ “Passive” surveillance systems,
2851 while useful for trends analysis and disease outbreak identification, undercount the disease
2852 prevalence as undiagnosed cases and persons without access to health care are not included. In
2853 contrast, “active” surveillance provides less biased estimates. “Active” surveillance consists of
2854 actively surveying the general population with a scientifically based sampling strategy and
2855 collecting data and blood samples to determine each person’s infection or disease status.

2856 While no country has national estimates of Q Fever prevalence, we provide approximate
2857 estimates for US prevalence here. The US National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey
2858 (NHANES) used active surveillance to provide national representative Coxiella burnetti serum
2859 antibody levels in the 2003 to 2004 survey [62], [257].⁴⁵ Q Fever seroprevalence was
2860 determined by screening with an enzyme-linked immunosorbent assay and confirmed by using
2861 standard immunofluorescent antibody (IFA) testing [61]. The overall US prevalence of any
2862 positive antibody (any Phase I or Phase II IgG IFA $\geq 1:16$) in US adults 20+ years of age was 3.1%
2863 of the population (95%CI 2.1% to 4.3%) [62].^{46,47} This suggests that 6.1 million persons (95% CI:
2864 4.2 to 8.5 million) have some type of Q Fever infection, including acute infections, recovery
2865 phase of acute or chronic infections. We note that while a recent analysis of the NHANES data
2866 demonstrated a clear association with agricultural work, 80% of positive Coxiella NHANES test
2867 results were in persons working in non-agricultural sectors [258]. Similarly, 60% of reported Q
2868 Fever cases had no association with farming or animal processing based on a review of cases in

⁴⁴ In the US there is mandatory reporting of Q Fever to the US Centers for Disease Control and Prevention national disease reporting system, see <https://www.cdc.gov/qfever/info/index.html>.

⁴⁵ The NHANES survey provides nationally representative estimates using a demographically-based complex, multistage survey design to minimize bias [62], [257].

⁴⁶ Antibody prevalence in men and woman was 3.8% and 2.5%, respectively.

⁴⁷ NHANES 2003 to 2004 demographics and Coxiella serology data were downloaded from the NHANES website. Data assembly and analysis used SASTM (Release 9.4, SAS Institute, Inc., Cary, NC). Survey design variables (strata and primary sampling units) and survey sample weights were used to account for differential probabilities of participant selection in the complex multistage survey design. Sample weights provide nationally representative estimates and adjust estimates for nonresponse and noncoverage. Statistical estimates are age-adjusted to the US population. Results with relative standard errors >30%, with <12 degrees of freedom, or low sample sizes are not presented.

M Dillon and
C Dillon

Particle Model for
Airborne Disease Transmission

the US Centers for Disease Control and Prevention's (CDC) National Notifiable Disease Surveillance System (NNDSS) and state and local US Public Health Departments [259].

Acute Q Fever

We further analyzed the NHANES 2003 to 2004 Coxiella dataset to estimate the US seroprevalence Acute Coxiella infection rates. Using the standard criterion (Phase II Q Fever antibody IgG IFA $\geq 1:128$) [255], [256], laboratory supportive evidence of Acute Q Fever infection is 1.5% of the general US adult population (95% CI: 1.0% to 2.0%). This corresponds to 20% of all positive tested samples, an estimated 2.5 million persons. Using our stricter definition, which has a higher likelihood of reflecting Acute Coxiella infection, the US population prevalence was 0.9% of the general US adult population (95% CI: 0.4% to 1.4%), which corresponds to 15% of all positive tested samples and an estimated 1.9 million persons, see **Table H1**.

Assuming 40% of persons acutely infected with Coxiella will develop Q Fever, the US incidence of Acute Q Fever cases is estimated at 0.4% of the general US adult population (95% CI: 0.2% to 0.6%), which corresponds to 820,000 adults (95% CI: 410,000 to 1.2 million adults). Assuming a 1.5% fatality rate, this corresponds to 12,000 deaths (95% CI: 6,000 to 18,000).

As previously mentioned, 70 Q Fever cases were reported (passive surveillance) nationally in 2003 and 2004 and 153 Acute Q Fever cases were reported in 2017 [64]–[66].

2887
2888

M Dillon and
C Dillon

Particle Model for
Airborne Disease Transmission

2889 **Table H1. NHANES 2003 to 2004 Coxiella burnetti IFA Serology Prevalence Analysis**

	N (people)	Cases (people)	Fraction US Adults (%)	95% CI (%)	CPS Total (million people)	CPS 95% CI (million people)
<i>General Serology Estimates</i>						
Any Positive QF Serology $\geq$ 1:16	4437	180	3.1	2.1 to 4.3	6.1	4.2 to 8.5
All QF Phase II Serologies $\geq$ 1:128	4437	91	1.5	1.0 to 2.0	3.1	2.1 to 4.1
<i>More Selective Serology Estimates</i>						
Acute Q Fever Supportive	4437	50	0.9	0.4 to 1.4	1.9	0.8 to 2.9
All Other QF Positive Serologies	4437	130	2.2	1.3 to 3.1	4.5	2.7 to 6.4

2890
2891 Abbreviations:
2892 N = total sample; % = prevalence; 95%CI = 95th% confidence interval; CPS = US Census Current
2893 Population Survey (US adult population); QF = Q Fever; IFA = antibody Immunofluorescence
2894 Assay; Phase II = initial acute disease QF IgG antibodies.

2895
2896 Notes:
2897 Phase II QF antibodies $\geq$ 1:128 is US Centers for Disease Control & Prevention definition of
2898 laboratory supportive evidence of acute Q Fever infection; Selective Acute QF Supportive
2899 infection definition is Coxiella (Phase II antibody $\geq$ 1:128; Phase II IgG IFA $\geq$ 4x Phase I IgG IFA;
2900 and Phase I IgG IFA $<$ 1:800). Total 2003 to 2004 US adult population is 205,284,670 people.

2901

M Dillon and
C Dillon

Particle Model for
Airborne Disease Transmission

2902 **Comparison to Prior Work**

2903 Prior studies suggest that the Q Fever prevalence estimates derived above may be plausible.
2904 First, the overall US population Coxiella infection rate of 3.1% is similar to that reported in
2905 major European outbreak studies that used IFA testing. Second, a small-scale CDC methodology
2906 study examined the 2000 to 2011 Q Fever mortality case underreporting using Capture-
2907 Recapture Analysis. Reported Q Fever cases in the US National Death Index (n = 25) were
2908 compared to the CDC reported Q Fever case fatalities (n = 9). While strongly limited by small
2909 sample sizes, this study estimated a total of 129 fatal Q Fever cases (95% CI: 62 to 1,250 cases)
2910 occurred nationally over this time period [259]. Third, the CDC also performed a separate
2911 Coxiella seroprevalence study using data from US commercial medical laboratories from tests
2912 ordered by medical providers to evaluate symptomatic patients. While this latter survey was
2913 not nationally representative, 16% (2,039) of the 12,821 specimens tested were positive for
2914 Coxiella [255]. Finally, serological analysis of stored sera from population-based epidemiology
2915 studies and medical diagnostic laboratory testing shows Coxiella burnetti infection prevalence
2916 rates in other countries is similar to those seen in the United States (Netherlands 2.4%;
2917 Australia 5.6%) [260], [261].

2918