1 Effects of surgical masks on droplet and aerosol dispersion under various oxygen

2 delivery modalities

3 Takahiro TAKAZONO^{1,2*}, Kazuko YAMAMOTO^{1,3†}, Ryuta OKAMOTO⁴, Masato

4 TASHIRO², Shimpei Morimoto^{5, 6}, Naoki HOSOGAYA⁵, Taiga MIYAZAKI^{1,2}, Katsunori

5 YANAGIHARA⁷, Koichi IZUMIKAWA^{2,3}, and Hiroshi MUKAE¹

6 ¹*Department of Respiratory Medicine, Nagasaki University Hospital, Nagasaki, Japan*

7 ²*Department of Infectious Diseases, Nagasaki University Graduate School of Biomedical*

8 *Sciences, Nagasaki, Japan*

9 ³*Infection Control and Education Center, Nagasaki University Hospital, Nagasaki, Japan*

10 ⁴*Visual Solution Division, Shin Nippon Air Technologies, Tokyo, Japan*

11 ⁵*Clinical Research Center, Nagasaki University Hospital, Nagasaki, Japan*

12 ⁶*Innovation Platform & Office for Precision Medicine, Nagasaki University Graduate School*

13 *of Biomedical Sciences, Nagasaki, Japan.*

14 ⁷*Department of Laboratory Medicine, Nagasaki University Graduate School of Biomedical*

15 *Sciences, Nagasaki, Japan*

16 †, co-first author

17 *Correspondence:

18 Takahiro TAKAZONO, M.D., Ph.D.

19 Department of Infectious Diseases, Nagasaki University Graduate School of Biomedical

20 Sciences

21 1-7-1 Sakamoto, Nagasaki 852-8501, Japan

22 Phone: +81 -95-819-7273

23 Fax: +81-95-849-7285

24 [E-mail: takahiro-takazono@nagasaki-u.ac.jp](mailto:takahiro-takazono@nagasaki-u.ac.jp)

25 **Author contributions:** T.T., K. Yamamoto, R.O., N.H., and H.M performed study design.

26 T.T., K. Yamamoto, and R.O. supervised the experiments. T.T., K. Yamamoto, M.T., T.TM.

27 K. Yanagihara, K.I., and H.M interpreted the data. S.M. supervised statical analysis. T.T. and

28 K.Y. wrote the draft, and all the authors critically reviewed the manuscript and approved the

29 final version of the manuscript.

30 **All source(s) of support:** Financial support to conduct the study was provided by Fisher &

31 Paykel Healthcare Co, Ltd. The funding source was not involved in the study design; in the

32 collection, analysis, or interpretation of data; in the writing of the manuscript; or in the

33 decision to submit the manuscript for publication.

34 **Running title:** Dispersion under HFNC with surgical masks

35 **Subject Category List:** 4.13 Ventilation: Non-Invasive/Long-Term/Weaning

36 **Total word counts:** 2284

37 *This article has an online data supplement, which is accessible from this issue's table of

38 content online at www.atsjournals.org.

39

40 **ABSTRACT**

41 **Rationale**

42 Aerosol dispersion under various oxygen delivery modalities, including high flow nasal
43 cannula, is a critical concern for healthcare workers who treat acute hypoxemic respiratory
44 failure during the coronavirus disease 2019 pandemic. Effects of surgical masks on droplet
45 and aerosol dispersion under oxygen delivery modalities are not yet clarified.

46 **Objectives**

47 To visualize and quantify dispersion particles under various oxygen delivery modalities and
48 examine the protective effect of surgical masks on particle dispersion.

49 **Methods**

50 Three and five healthy men were enrolled for video recording and quantification of particles,
51 respectively. Various oxygen delivery modalities including high flow nasal cannula were
52 used in this study. Particle dispersions during rest breathing, speaking, and coughing were
53 recorded and automatically counted in each condition and were evaluated with or without
54 surgical masks.

55 **Measurements and Main Results**

Coughing led to the maximum amount and distance of particle dispersion, regardless of modalities. Droplet dispersion was not visually increased by oxygen delivery modalities compared to breathing at room air. With surgical masks over the nasal cannula or high-flow nasal cannula, droplet dispersion was barely visible. Oxygen modalities did not increase the particle dispersion counts regardless of breathing patterns. Wearing surgical masks significantly decreased particle dispersion in all modalities while speaking and coughing, regardless of particle sizes, and reduction rates were approximately 95 and 80-90 % for larger ($> 5 \mu\text{m}$) and smaller ($> 0.5 \mu\text{m}$) particles, respectively.

Conclusions

Surgical mask over high flow nasal cannula may be safely used for acute hypoxemic respiratory failure including coronavirus disease 2019 patients.

Number of words in the abstract: 250

Keywords: Droplet, Aerosol, COVID-19, high flow nasal cannula

74 INTRODUCTION

75 Severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus-2 (SARS-CoV-2), which causes
76 coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19), transmits by droplets and bioaerosols from
77 COVID-19 patients (1). Based on the initial reports on the COVID-19 pandemic, around
78 5–30% of COVID-19 patients develop severe respiratory distress and require intensive care
79 unit admission to receive advanced respiratory support in terms of oxygen therapy and
80 non-invasive and invasive ventilatory support (2). High flow nasal cannula (HFNC) is a
81 non-invasive oxygen delivery system that allows for administration of humidified air-oxygen
82 blends as high as 60 L/min and a titratable fraction of inspired oxygen as high as 100%.
83 Recent studies found that HFNC use in the management of respiratory failure caused by
84 COVID-19 was associated with a reduced rate of invasive mechanical ventilation (3, 4).
85 However, resources, including ventilators, as well as manpower of healthcare workers, during
86 the COVID-19 pandemic are limited. Some patients with chronic hypoxemic respiratory
87 insufficiency need palliative respiratory care, and some bedridden elderly patients do not
88 wish to be intubated. Therefore, it is important to wisely utilize non-invasive respiratory care,
89 including HFNC, for both patients and healthcare workers.

90 HFNC and non-invasive positive pressure ventilation (NPPV) have been categorized as
 91 aerosol-generating procedures (AGPs) (5) based on the hypothesis that the high-velocity gas
 92 flow may promote aerosolization of patients' secretions containing viable viruses, which may
 93 then be dispersed in the environment and be inhaled by healthcare workers, thereby resulting
 94 in nosocomial infection during COVID-19 respiratory care (6). Therefore, evaluation of
 95 particle dispersion under these AGP-associated respiratory supports is critical for effective
 96 and safe treatment in severe COVID-19 patients. Some simulation studies showed that HFNC
 97 increased the dispersion amount and distance of large droplets (7, 8) and aerosols (9), while
 98 other clinical environmental studies found no significant increase in dispersed microbes (10)
 99 or aerosols (11) by HFNC. These findings indicate that the effects of HFNC on the dispersion
 100 of droplets and aerosols are controversial.

101 Notably, a study using coronavirus other than SARS-CoV-2 indicates that surgical masks
 102 reduce the number of droplets, aerosols, and viruses in the exhaled breath (12); however, no
 103 studies have investigated whether surgical masks prevent generation of droplets or small
 104 particles under respiratory management. Accordingly, this study aimed to visualize and
 105 quantify the particles generated from the human respiratory tract exposed to HFNC and other

oxygen delivery modalities. Additionally, the effects of surgical masks on particle dispersion under oxygen delivery modalities were also investigated.

METHODS

Participants

Three and five healthy men (average height and weight: 173.6 ($\pm$ 7.4) cm and 68.6 ($\pm$ 5.6) kg, respectively) were voluntarily recruited for video recording and quantitative analysis of droplets, respectively. Inclusion criteria were as follows: 1) age $\geq$ 20 years; 2) no respiratory or systemic symptoms for 14 days before the experiments; and 3) no contact history with COVID-19 patients. Written informed consent was obtained from all the participants. All the staffs worked for these experiments wore the appropriate personal protective equipment including N95 mask and eye goggles inside the room. This study protocol was approved by the Nagasaki University Graduate School of Biomedical Sciences Research Ethics Committee (Approval number: 20092503).

Visualization of droplet dispersion

In the visualization experiment, four different oxygen delivery modes, including nasal canula at 5 L/min (non-humidified, Nakamura Medical Industry Co., Ltd.), simple oxygen mask at 10 L/min (non-humidified, Nakamura Medical Industry Co., Ltd.), HFNC at

60 L/min (humidified, AIRVO2/Opti flow+, Fisher & Paykel Healthcare), and NPPV with an inspiratory positive airway pressure/expiratory positive airway pressure of 10/4 cm H₂O at FiO₂ of 21% (humidified, Philips Respironics V60/Amara Gel full face mask) were used. Particle dispersion under room air, nasal cannula, and HFNC and the dispersion patterns with or without surgical masks were recorded in the sitting position. Three breathing patterns, including rest breathing, 3 sets of speaking of sound (ta-chi-tsu-te-to and pa-pi-pu-pe-po), and 3 sets of coughing, were recorded in three participants. Generalized droplets from mouths were flashed continuously by Parallel Eye D (Shin Nippon Air Technologies). Scattering light from droplets was recorded by a super high-sensitive camera (Eye Scope, Shin Nippon Air Technologies) and analyzed by Image processing software (particle eye viewer, Shin Nippon Air Technologies). The recording area was 1 meter from participants' mouths. The room temperature and humidity were maintained at 22 °C and 50%, respectively.

Quantitative evaluation of droplet dispersion

For quantitative evaluation, the droplet dispersion under four conditions including room air, nasal canula at 5 L/min, and HFNC at 30 L/min or 60 L/min (humidified) and two patterns for each condition with or without surgical masks were measured. Also, the dispersion under three breathing patterns, including rest breathing for 30 seconds, 5 sets of

speaking of sound (ta-chi-tsu-te-to and pa-pi-pu-pe-po), and 5 sets of coughing, were measured in five participants. Particles dispersed from participants' mouths were recorded as described above and counted by the Fine Particle Visualization System (Type-S, Shin Nippon Air Technologies) with a 1/30 sec speed, which was located in two linear columns at 25-45 and 60-80 cm from the mouth, respectively (Supplement Figure 1). Particles sized $> 5 \mu\text{m}$ and $> 0.5 \mu\text{m}$ were automatically counted independently. The study was performed in an air-controlled room with a down-flow of 0.3 m/sec from the air supply system. The room temperature and humidity were maintained at 27 °C and 40%, respectively. Recorded movies were blinded to participants during both experiments, and participants had a 10 ml of water to keep the oral cavity hydrated between each experiment condition.

Statistical Analysis

Differences in continuous numbers between the two groups were analyzed by ratio paired t-test. A p-value of < 0.05 was considered statistically significant. All the graphs were drawn using GraphPad Prism ver.8 (GraphPad Software).

RESULTS

Evaluation of visualization of droplet dispersion under various oxygen delivery modalities

Individual differences were observed in the amounts of droplets; however, three participants showed similar trends at each condition. The accumulated droplet ($> 5 \mu\text{m}$) dispersion in a representative participant is shown in Figure 1, and movies are shown in Supplemental videos. In the room air, droplet particles were barely visible at rest breathing but were observed while speaking and coughing. Some droplets reached over 60 and 100 cm from mouths while speaking and coughing. While coughing, visible particles had the largest amounts, the farthest distance, and the largest size. Visible droplet dispersion was neither increased nor farther reached among oxygen delivery modalities. Notably, by wearing a surgical mask over the nasal cannula or HFNC, droplet dispersion was barely visible, even while speaking and coughing.

With the simple oxygen mask of 10 L/min, small amounts of visible droplets floated from the slit between the oxygen mask and face while coughing. With the NPPV mode, droplets were visible through the expiration port of full-face NPPV masks and floated beyond the distance of 50 cm. These findings were observed in two of the three participants (Figure 1 and Supplement Figure 2 and 3).

Quantitative evaluation of droplet dispersion under various oxygen delivery modalities

173 The quantification results of droplet and aerosol dispersion are shown in Figure 2.

174 Droplet dispersion counts at coughing without surgical masks showed a 1-log increase

175 compared to those at speaking and more than a 2-log increase compared to those at rest

176 breathing. At rest breathing, particle counts were not different among all oxygen delivery

177 modalities with surgical mask usage. Counts of droplets ($> 5 \mu\text{m}$) and smaller particles

178 including aerosols ($> 0.5 \mu\text{m}$) were not different under nasal cannula or HFNC and room air

179 while speaking and coughing. Furthermore, the increased flow rate of HFNC (from 30 L/min

180 to 60 L/min) did not affect the particle counts in each pattern, even while coughing.

181 We examined the reduction ratios of wearing surgical masks in the particle count of

182 each size under each oxygen delivery modality at each breathing pattern (Table 1). As a result,

183 at speaking and coughing under the nasal cannula or the HFNC, we observed decreases in the

184 particle counts by wearing surgical masks ($P < 0.05$, the t-test for the null-difference within a

185 participant between the usage of the surgical mask.). At speaking and coughing, reduction

186 ratios of particle dispersion by wearing surgical masks were approximately 95% and 80-90%

187 in droplets ($> 5 \mu\text{m}$) and smaller particles including aerosols ($> 0.5 \mu\text{m}$), respectively (Table

188 1). Interestingly, reduction efficacy of dispersion by surgical masks tended to be higher under

189 NHFC than under nasal cannula while speaking.

In terms of dispersion distance of droplets and aerosols, the number of particles obtained from two separate counters is shown in Figure 3. Dispersion distance of droplets ($> 5 \mu\text{m}$) and smaller particles including aerosols ($> 0.5 \mu\text{m}$) decreased at the far side compared to the near side. Smaller particles including aerosols ($> 0.5 \mu\text{m}$) obviously decreased at the far side compared to the near side while speaking; however, they remained at the far side while coughing. Surgical masks effectively reduced aerosol dispersion, even while coughing. Compared to nasal cannula, HFNC did not increase aerosol dispersion in the near or far side. Moreover, the flow rate of 60 L/min did not increase aerosol dispersion compared to that of 30 L/min in the near or far side.

DISCUSSION

In this study, we performed two experiments in different oxygen delivery modes and modalities. Based on the particle visualization study, we found that visible droplets reached 60–80 cm while speaking and 1 m while coughing in a sitting position; the findings are similar to those in a recent study (13). In addition, these findings support results in a systematic meta-analysis, which showed that a physical distance of 1 m or more is optimum to reduce person-to-person virus transmission and to keep healthcare workers from contracting the SARS-CoV-2 infection (14). Surgical masks obviously reduced visible

droplets in our study; these findings in photos and videos confirm the effect of surgical masks on transmission of viral particles in society and in hospitals caring for oxygen-delivered patients during the pandemic. Based on our quantification study, the majority of particles produced by the HFNC mode were smaller particles or aerosols; the finding is supported by a previous study, which measured the median diameter of particles (range, 1.19-1.42 μ m) produced by HFNC (11). Coughing increased the amount and distance of dispersing smaller particles, suggesting that aerosols from lung alveoli were especially dispersed by coughing. HFNC did not increase the number of smaller particles or aerosols compared to conventional nasal cannula or room air while coughing. These findings suggest that oxygen delivery devices investigated in this study are potential aerosol-dispersing procedures, but not AGPs (15).

In the NPPV mode, although only one type of NPPV mask was evaluated in this study, floated droplets were visible while coughing and might harm bioaerosol dispersion during treatment. In addition, droplets and aerosols were approximately 10-times more during coughing than during speaking, regardless of types of oxygen devices. The difference is larger than that in a previous study (11), which showed about a twice increased number of particles while coughing in any devices; however, those particles were assessed only about 5

cm away from mouths in that study (11). Notably, surgical masks significantly reduced dispersion counts of both droplets and aerosols while speaking or coughing, regardless of oxygen delivery modes. Indeed, surgical masks effectively reduced over 90% of droplets and over 95% of aerosols during HFNC. While speaking, the reduction rate of particle dispersion by surgical masks during HFNC was higher than that during nasal cannula. This result is supported by previous findings of velocity map of gas flow experiments (16), which showed that the proportion of droplets ($> 5 \mu\text{m}$) captured by surgical masks was higher during 40 L/min of HFNC than during 6 L/min of nasal cannula, suggesting that high-velocity particles are more likely to be captured into surgical masks than lower velocity particles (16). In our study, 60 L/min of HFNC did not increase counts and dispersion distance of droplets or aerosols compared to 30 L/min of HFNC; the finding is consistent with that in a previous study (11). The particle dispersion may be limited when the cannula of HFNC is properly fitted (9), even at the highest flow rate.

This study has several limitations. First, this study included a relatively small number of individuals. The particle experiments were performed in healthy volunteers, but not in viral pneumonia patients. Second, only one-sided visualization was recorded, and dispersion in the three-dimensional space was not evaluated. Third, the particle quantification

experiment was performed at a mild down flow, which might affect the natural distance of dispersion, and the design of the quantification experiment limited the detection area of particles. Forth, particles with a size of less than 0.5 μm were not detectable in our study; however, these smaller particles are not speculated to contain enough viruses for transmission (17). To date, the virus load of SARS-CoV-2 in aerosols generated from coughing or included in exhaled breath from patients with COVID-19 has not been reported (18), although SARS-CoV-2 has been found to be viable in room air for 3 hours (19). The virus load or concentration required for transmission in humans needs to be further investigated.

In summary, with our study, HFNC did not increase either quantity or distance of droplet and aerosol dispersion compared to standard nasal cannula therapy, and surgical masks decreased particle dispersion and improved safety of healthcare workers during HFNC, even at the highest flow, in appropriate infection control settings. Our findings support that surgical masks should be recommended for patients with acute hypoxemic respiratory failure due to viral pneumonia, including COVID-19 patients. Further studies are warranted to examine viral spread and risks associated with HFNC therapy in COVID-19 patients.

Conflicts of interest

None

258 **Acknowledgement**

259 We would like to thank technical staffs in Shin Nippon Air Technologies for their supports in
260 this study.

261

References

1. Liu Y, Ning Z, Chen Y, Guo M, Liu Y, Gali NK, Sun L, Duan Y, Cai J, Westerdahl D, Liu X, Xu K, Ho KF, Kan H, Fu Q, Lan K. Aerodynamic analysis of SARS-CoV-2 in two Wuhan hospitals. *Nature* 2020; 582:557-560.
2. Kaur R, Weiss TT, Perez A, Fink JB, Chen R, Luo F, Liang Z, Mirza S, Li J. Practical strategies to reduce nosocomial transmission to healthcare professionals providing respiratory care to patients with COVID-19. *Crit Care* 2020; 24:571.
3. Patel M, Gangemi A, Marron R, Chowdhury J, Yousef I, Zheng M, Mills N, Trageser L, Giurintano J, Gupta R, Gordon M, Rali P, D'Alonso G, Fleece D, Zhao H, Patlakh N, Criner G. Retrospective analysis of high flow nasal therapy in COVID-19-related moderate-to-severe hypoxaemic respiratory failure. *BMJ Open Respir Res* 2020; 7:e000650..
4. Demoule A, Vieillard Baron A, Darmon M, Beurton A, Geri G, Voiriot G, Dupont T, Zafrani L, Girodias L, Labbe V, Dres M, Fartoukh M, Azoulay E. High-flow nasal cannula in critically III patients with severe COVID-19. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med* 2020; 202:1039-1042.

- 278 5. Judson SD, Munster VJ. Nosocomial transmission of emerging viruses via
279 aerosol-generating medical procedures. *Viruses* 2019; 11:940.
- 280 6. Cheung JC, Ho LT, Cheng JV, Cham EYK, Lam KN. Staff safety during emergency
281 airway management for COVID-19 in Hong Kong. *Lancet Respir Med* 2020; 8:e19.
- 282 7. Elshof J, Hebbink RHJ, Duiverman ML, Hagmeijer R. High-flow nasal cannula for
283 COVID-19 patients: risk of bio-aerosol dispersion. *Eur Respir J* 2020; 56:2003004.
- 284 8. Loh NW, Tan Y, Taculod J, Gorospe B, Teope AS, Somani J, Tan AYH. The impact of
285 high-flow nasal cannula (HFNC) on coughing distance: implications on its use during
286 the novel coronavirus disease outbreak. *Can J Anaesth* 2020; 67:893-894.
- 287 9. Hui DS, Chow BK, Lo T, Tsang OTY, Ko FW, Ng SS, Gin T, Chan MTV. Exhaled air
288 dispersion during high-flow nasal cannula therapy versus CPAP via different masks.
289 *Eur Respir J* 2019; 53:1802339.
- 290 10. Leung CCH, Joynt GM, Gomersall CD, Wong WT, Lee A, Ling L, Chan PKS, Lui PCW,
291 Tsoi PCY, Ling CM, Hui M. Comparison of high-flow nasal cannula versus oxygen
292 face mask for environmental bacterial contamination in critically ill pneumonia
293 patients: a randomized controlled crossover trial. *J Hosp Infect* 2019; 101:84-87.

- 294 11. Gaeckle NT, Lee J, Park Y, Kreykes G, Evans MD, Hogan CJ, Jr. Aerosol generation
295 from the respiratory tract with various modes of oxygen delivery. *Am J Respir Crit*
296 *Care Med* 2020; 202:1115-1124.
- 297 12. Leung NHL, Chu DKW, Shiu EYC, Chan KH, McDevitt JJ, Hau BJP, Yen HL, Li Y, Ip
298 DKM, Peiris JSM, Seto WH, Leung GM, Milton DK, Cowling BJ. Respiratory virus
299 shedding in exhaled breath and efficacy of face masks. *Nat Med* 2020; 26:676-680.
- 300 13. Wang H, Li Z, Zhang X, Zhu L, Liu Y, Wang S. The motion of respiratory droplets
301 produced by coughing. *Phys Fluids (1994)* 2020; 32:125102.
- 302 14. Chu DK, Akl EA, Duda S, Solo K, Yaacoub S, Schunemann HJ, authors C-SURGEs.
303 Physical distancing, face masks, and eye protection to prevent person-to-person
304 transmission of SARS-CoV-2 and COVID-19: a systematic review and meta-analysis.
305 *Lancet* 2020; 395:1973-1987.
- 306 15. Dhand R, Li J. Coughs and Sneezes: Their Role in Transmission of Respiratory Viral
307 Infections, Including SARS-CoV-2. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med* 2020; 202:651-659.
- 308 16. Leonard S, Atwood CW, Jr., Walsh BK, DeBellis RJ, Dungan GC, Strasser W, Whittle
309 JS. Preliminary findings on control of dispersion of aerosols and droplets during

310 high-velocity nasal insufflation therapy using a simple surgical mask: implications for
311 the high-flow nasal cannula. *Chest* 2020; 158:1046-1049.

312 17. Wang Y, Xu G, Huang YW. Modeling the load of SARS-CoV-2 virus in human expelled
313 particles during coughing and speaking. *PLoS One* 2020; 15:e0241539.

314 18. Fennelly KP. Particle sizes of infectious aerosols: implications for infection control.
315 *Lancet Respir Med* 2020; 8:914-924.

316 19. van Doremalen N, Bushmaker T, Morris DH, Holbrook MG, Gamble A, Williamson BN,
317 Tamin A, Harcourt JL, Thornburg NJ, Gerber SI, Lloyd-Smith JO, de Wit E, Munster
318 VJ. Aerosol and Surface Stability of SARS-CoV-2 as Compared with SARS-CoV-1.
319 *N Engl J Med* 2020; 382: 1564-1567.

320

321

322

Figure Legends

Figure 1. Representative accumulated photographs of droplet (> 5 µm) dispersion at rest breathing, speaking, and coughing at room air and with four different oxygen delivery modalities (5L/min of nasal cannula, 60L/min of HFNC, 10L/min of oxygen mask, and NIPPV(IPAP 10cm, EPAP 4cm)), with and without surgical masks. Abbreviations; HFNC, high flow nasal cannula.

Figure 2. Number of droplet (>5 µm) and particles including aerosol (>0.5 µm) dispersion at room air and with three different oxygen delivery modalities (5L/min of nasal cannula, 30L/min or 60L/min of HFNC), in three breathing patterns (rest breathing, speaking, and coughing), with or without surgical masks. Abbreviations; HFNC, high flow nasal cannula. * $P < 0.05$, analyzed by ratio paired t-test.

Figure 3. Numbers of droplet (>5 µm) and particles including aerosol (>0.5 µm) dispersion and their distance obtained by two separate counters (near side: 25-45 cm and far side: 60-80 cm from the mouth). Those particles were counted at room air and three different oxygen delivery modalities (5L/min of nasal cannula, 30L/min or 60L/min of HFNC), in three

340 breathing patterns (rest breathing, speaking, and coughing), with or without surgical masks.

341 Abbreviations; HFNC, high flow nasal cannula.

342

Table 1. Reduction effect of wearing surgical masks on particle dispersion with various oxygen delivery modalities.

Reduction ratio (Surgical mask +/-)				
		Average (min - max) %		
Particle sizes	Oxygen delivery modes	Rest breathing	Speaking	Coughing
>5 μm	Room air	21.15 (5 - 333.3)	17.81 (3.5 - 33.7)	5.15 (2 - 21.4)
	Nasal canula (5 L/min)	58.97 (19.4 -120)	7.39 (1.9 - 17.6)	4.28 (0.8 - 19.7)
	HFNC (30 L/min)	72.73 (23.1 - 180)	5.35 (1 - 10.9)	3.70 (1.3 - 18.1)
	HFNC (60 L/min)	116.67 (61.5 - 255)	3.64 (0.6 -15.3)	4.29 (2.2 - 26.3)
>0.5 μm	Room air	48.0 (24.7 - 119.2)	26.39 (8.7 - 64.6)	21.71 (14.3 - 23.8)
	Nasal canula (5L/min)	62.79 (39.9 - 121.5)	22.03 (8.8 - 38)	13.01 (5.8 - 37.1)
	HFNC (30 L/min)	50.45 (27.9 - 106.9)	11.65 (5.1 - 25.5)	10.11 (4.6 - 14.2)
	HFNC (60 L/min)	59.03 (30.4 - 157)	10.09 (1.3 - 37.4)	11.50 (8.7 - 16.3)

ONLINE DATA SUPPLEMENT

Supplemental videos.

The movie of droplet ($> 5 \mu\text{m}$) dispersion in a representative participant at rest breathing, while speaking, and while coughing at room air and with four different oxygen delivery modalities, including a nasal cannula at 5 L/min, a simple oxygen mask at 10 L/min, HFNC at 60 L/min, and NPPV at an inspiratory positive airway pressure/expiratory positive airway pressure of 10/4 cm H₂O at FiO₂ of 21% with or without surgical mask. Abbreviations; HFNC, high flow nasal cannula.

Supplemental Figure 1.

Schematic diagram of methods for quantitative evaluation of droplets production. Dispersing particles sized $> 5 \mu\text{m}$ and $> 0.5 \mu\text{m}$ were counted by the Fine Particle Visualization System (Type-S, Shin Nippon Air Technologies), which was located in two linear columns at 25-45 and 60-80 cm from the mouth, respectively.

Supplemental Figures 2 and 3 Accumulated photographs of droplet ($> 5 \mu\text{m}$) dispersion with two other participants. At rest, while breathing, while speaking, and while coughing at room

364 air and with three different oxygen delivery modalities, including a nasal cannula at 5 L/min,
365 HFNC at 30 L/min, and at 60L/min with or without surgical mask. Abbreviations; HFNC,
366 high flow nasal cannula.

Figure 1.

Figure 1.

Figure 2.

Figure 3