

1 Assessing the efficacy of interventions to control indoor SARS-Cov-2 transmission: an agent-  
2 based modeling approach

3  
4 Trevor S. Farthing & Cristina Lanzas

5  
6 **Appendix S2 – Rationale for model parameterization to simulate a SARS-CoV-2**  
7 **superspreading event**

8  
9 As noted in the main text, for benchmarking purposes, we simulated the Skagit County,  
10 Washington, USA March 2020 SARS-CoV-2 superspreading event as case scenario. Because  
11 this superspreading event is thought to be the result of transmission from a single infectious  
12 individual (Hamner *et al.* 2020), all simulations contained only one infectious person. The  
13 infectious person was assumed to be symptomatic during the choir practice. We assumed all  
14 droplets were expelled from this individual at a height of 1.7 m, the approximate mean height of  
15 U.S. adults (Fryar *et al.* 2018). We make the assumption that the cough frequency for a  
16 symptomatic COVID-19 patient is equal to that of individuals with a chronic cough condition.  
17 Therefore, every minute our infectious individual had a 19% probability to expel droplets  
18 through coughing (Lee *et al.* 2012), and an 81% chance to expel droplets through an unspecified  
19 other activity (e.g., speaking, singing, etc.). Using the procedure described by Railsback &  
20 Grimm (2011), droplet travel distances for coughing and non-coughing expectoration events  
21 were randomly drawn from lognormal distributions with known means and standard deviations.  
22 Travel distances for coughing events were drawn from a distribution with a mean of 5 m and  
23 standard deviation of 0.256 m (Bourouiba *et al.* 2014). Travel distances for non-coughing events  
24 were drawn from a distribution with a mean of 0.55 m and standard deviation of 0.068 m (Das *et*  
25 *al.* 2020). The angle of droplet spread during coughing and non-coughing expectorations were  
26 35° and 63.5°, respectively, in accordance with median values of mouth-angle ranges described  
27 by Kwon *et al.* (2012). We set the inhalation rate for simulated individuals to 0.023 m<sup>3</sup> air/min, a  
28 rate consistent with adults participating in light activity (Adams 1993).

29  
30 We know from the Hamner et al. (2020) case report that the choir practice lasted 150 minutes  
31 in total, split into 4 distinct time intervals lasting 40, 50, 15, and 45 minutes. During the first time  
32 interval, all 61 attendees practiced together in the 180 m<sup>2</sup> main hall for 40 minutes. In the second  
33 interval, the group split into two subsets of unspecified sizes. One subset rearranged themselves  
34 within the main hall, and the second subset moved into a separate room. The subsets rehearsed  
35 separately for 50 minutes. The third time interval was a 15-minute break period when individuals  
36 mixed freely. During the final time interval, all attendees returned to the main hall to practice as  
37 a single group once more for 45 minutes. When practicing as single group during intervals 1 and  
38 4, individuals sat in assigned seats (Miller et al. 2020) with chairs spaced 15.24 – 25.4 cm apart  
39 (Hamner et al. 2020). In our simulations, we decided to rearrange agents in our model after 40,  
40 90, and 105 minutes to recreate mixing associated with changing time intervals. At timestep 105,  
41 individuals moved back to their initial placements, representing their adherence to assigned  
42 seating during interval 4 (i.e., minutes 105 – 150). The seating chart has not been shared due to  
43 privacy concerns (Miller et al. 2020) however, from the spacing estimate we can assume that a  
44 maximum of 2 people could be within 1-m<sup>2</sup> patches in our model scenario. Our ability to  
45 simulate mixing rates during specific time intervals was limited to this extent because we do not

46 know specific seating arrangements, subset size or configuration, secondary room size, or  
47 interaction rates during the break period.

48  
49 Miller *et al.* (2020) estimated that the infectious individual in the Skagit County case study  
50 emitted  $970 \pm 390$  SARS-CoV-2 quanta/hr. A quantum is the number of aerosolized infectious  
51 particles required to infect  $1 - 1/e$  % (i.e.,  $\approx 63\%$ ) of a susceptible population, assuming that all  
52 individuals were exposed to the same number of particles (Wells 1955). Here we describe how  
53 we estimated the virion risk associated with  $1 \text{ quanta min}^{-1}$  to be used in our SARS-CoV-2  
54 transmission efforts. To do this, we ran a modified version of our agent-based model, wherein  
55 the droplet fallout procedure (see Supplemental Materials I) was carried out before the infection  
56 procedure, and droplets were homogenously dispersed throughout the entirety of the simulated  
57 world immediately after expectoration. We parameterized our modified model to reflect the  
58 choral super-spreading event described by Hamner *et al.* 2020 (Table S2-1). We varied 22 virion  
59 infection risk levels across 220,000 simulations (i.e., 10,000 simulations per level). All  
60 simulations lasted only a single time step, after which we recorded the percentage of susceptible  
61 individuals infected. After evaluation, all simulations were aggregated into a single data set, and  
62 we carried out a linear regression to relate the percentage of susceptible people infected to the  
63 virion risk:

$$\% \text{ infected} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \text{virionRisk}.$$

64  
65  
66  
67 We determined that

$$\% \text{ infected} = 0.0027 + 10.06 \text{virionRisk}.$$

68  
69  
70  
71 Given this formula, we calculated that a virion risk value of 0.0624 is required to infect 63% of  
72 susceptible in our parameterized quantum-simulation model. We adopted this value as the virion  
73 risk in all primary simulations.

74  
75 The number of droplets produced by the infectious individual in our simulations each minute  
76 was independent of coughing status, and like droplet travel distance estimation, was drawn from  
77 a log-normal distribution. The known mean and standard deviation values for this distribution  
78 were  $9.7e^5$  and  $3.9e^5$  droplets, respectively, to recreate the  $970 \pm 390$  quanta/hr estimated by  
79 Miller *et al.* (2020). We assumed a virion decay rate of 1.05 %/min (van Doremalen *et al.* 2020).

80  
81 We assume that airborne droplets naturally diffuse throughout the simulated environment at a  
82 fixed rate of  $1.5e^{-3} \text{ m}^3/\text{min}$  (Castillo & Weibel 2018) regardless of size. Additionally, we know  
83 that the ventilation system in the main hall of the church consists of three supply vents that push  
84 a mixture of outdoor and recirculated air towards a single return vent on the opposite wall,  
85 though the true direction of forced airflow (e.g., North to South) is unclear from reports (Miller  
86 *et al.* 2020). Because it is uncertain whether or not the forced-air system was turned on during  
87 the choir practice (Miller *et al.* 2020), however, we decided to run our simulations in two sets:  
88 ventilation-on (i.e., both forced-air effects and natural diffusion moved droplets between patches)  
89 and ventilation-off (i.e., only natural diffusion moved droplets between patches). In the  
90 ventilation-on set, we additionally assume that droplets move from supply vents towards the  
91 return vent at a fixed rate of 0.043 %/min (Miller *et al.* 2020), and that 90% of droplets were

92 filtered prior to recirculation (Miller *et al.* 2020). Because we do not know the true direction of  
93 forced airflow, we simulated both North-to-South and East-to-West forced airflow movement in  
94 the ventilation-on set (Figure S2-1).

95  
96 *References*

- 97  
98 1. Adams WC. Measurement of breathing rate and volume in routinely performed daily  
99 activities. 1993. Final Report, Contract No. A033-205. California Air Resources Board,  
100 Sacramento, CA, USA.  
101 <https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/sites/default/files/classic//research/apr/past/a033-205.pdf>.  
102
- 103 2. Bourouiba L, Dehandschoewercker E, Bush JWM. Violent expiratory events: on coughing  
104 and sneezing. *J Fluid Mech.* 2014;745(2014):537-563. doi: 10.1017/jfm.2014.88.  
105
- 106 3. Castillo JE, Weibel JA. A point sink superposition method for predicting droplet interaction  
107 effects during vapor-diffusion-driven dropwise condensation in humid air. *Int J Heat Mass*  
108 *Trans.* 2018;118(2018):708-719. doi: 10.1016/j.ijheatmasstransfer.2017.11.045.  
109
- 110 4. Das SK, Alam J, Plumari S, Greco V. Transmission of airborne virus through sneezed and  
111 coughed droplets. *Phys Fluids.* 2020;32:097102. doi: 10.1063/5.0022859.  
112
- 113 5. van Doremalen N, Bushmaker T, Morris DH, Holbrook MG, Williamson BN, Tamin A, et al.  
114 Aerosol and surface stability of SARS-CoV-2 as compared with SARS-CoV-1. *N Engl J*  
115 *Med.* 2020;2020(382):1564-1567. doi: 10.1056/NEJMc2004973.  
116
- 117 6. Fryar CD, Kruszon-Moran D, Gu Q, Ogden CL. Mean body weight, height, waist  
118 circumference, and body mass index among adults: United States, 1999–2000 through 2015–  
119 2016. National Health Statistics Reports, No. 122. United States National Center for Health  
120 Statistics, Hyattsville, MD, USA. 2018. <https://stacks.cdc.gov/view/cdc/61430>.  
121
- 122 7. Hamner L, Dubbel P, Capron I, Ross A, Jordan A, Lee J, et al. High SARS-CoV-2 attack rate  
123 following exposure at a choir practice – Skagit County, Washington, March 2020. *Morb*  
124 *Mortal Wkly Rep.* 2020; 69:606-610. doi: 10.15585/mmwr.mm6919e6.  
125
- 126 8. Kwon S-B, Park J, Jang J, Cho Y, Park D-S, Kim C, et al. Study on the initial velocity  
127 distribution of exhaled air from coughing and speaking. *Chemosphere.* 2012;87(11):1260-  
128 1264. doi: 10.1016/j.chemosphere.2012.01.032.  
129
- 130 9. Lee KK, Savani A, Matos S, Evans DH, Pavord ID, Birring SS. Four-hour cough frequency  
131 monitoring in chronic cough. *CHEST.* 2012;142(5):1237-1243. doi: 10.1378/chest.11-3309.  
132
- 133 10. Miller SL, Nazaroff WW, Jimenez JL, Boerstra A, Buonanno G, Dancer SJ, et al.  
134 Transmission of SARS-CoV-2 by inhalation of respiratory aerosol in the Skagit Valley  
135 Chorale superspreading event. *Indoor Air.* 2020;00:1-10. doi: 10.1111/ina.12751.  
136


137 11. Railsback SF, Grimm V. Agent-Based and Individual-Based Modeling: a Practical  
 138 Introduction, 1<sup>st</sup> edition. Princeton University Press: Princeton, New Jersey, U.S.A. 2011. pp.  
 139 195-208.  
 140  
 141 12. Stadnytskyi V, Bax CE, Bax A, Anfinrud P. The airborne lifetime of small speech droplets  
 142 and their potential importance to SARS-CoV-2 transmission. PNAS. 2020; 117(22):11875-  
 143 11877. doi: 10.1073/pnas.2006874117.  
 144  
 145 13. Wells WF. Airborne contagion and air hygiene: an ecological study of droplet infections.  
 146 JAMA. 1955;159(1):90. doi: 10.1001/jama.1955.02960180092033.  
 147  
 148 14. Wölfel R, Corman VM, Guggemos W, Sailmaier M, Zange S, Müller MA, et al. Virological  
 149 assessment hospitalized patients with COVID-2019. Nature 2020;581(2020): 465-469. doi:  
 150 10.1038/s41586-020-2196-x.  
 151

152 *Tables*

153 Table S2-1. Parameters for SARS-CoV-2 quantum simulation.  
 154

Parameter	Value(s)	Reference(s)
Area (m <sup>2</sup> )	180	Hamner <i>et al.</i> 2020
Cough frequency (coughs/min)	0.19	Lee <i>et al.</i> 2012
Droplet count (droplets/expectoration)	60,000	Stadnytskyi <i>et al.</i> 2020
Expectoration height (m)	1.7	Fryar <i>et al.</i> 2018
Inhalation rate (m <sup>3</sup> air/min)	0.023	Adams 1993
Maximum people in a single 1-m <sup>2</sup> patch (people)	2	Hamner <i>et al.</i> 2020
virion count (virions/mL fluid)	2.35e <sup>9</sup>	Wölfel <i>et al.</i> 2020
virion decay rate (%/min)	1.05	van Doremalen <i>et al.</i> 2020
virion infection risk (%/inhaled virion)	1.0e <sup>-5</sup> , 3.0e <sup>-5</sup> , 5.0e <sup>-5</sup> , 8.0e <sup>-5</sup> , 1.0e <sup>-4</sup> , 3.0e <sup>-4</sup> , 5.0e <sup>-4</sup> , 8.0e <sup>-4</sup> , 0.001, 0.003, 0.005, 0.008, 0.01, 0.02, 0.03, 0.04, 0.05, 0.06, 0.07, 0.08, 0.09, 0.1	—

155  
 156 *Figures*  
 157



158

159 Figure S2-1. Airborne infectious droplets in North-to-South and East-to-West forced airflow  
160 schemas have different maximum travel distances due to the shape of the simulated world.