

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

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

Katia Koelle<sup>a,b,\*</sup>, Jack Lin<sup>a</sup>, Huisheng Zhu<sup>a</sup>, Rustom Antia<sup>a,b</sup>, Anice C. Lowen<sup>b,c</sup>, Daniel Weissman<sup>a,d</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Department of Biology, Emory University, Atlanta, GA

<sup>b</sup> Emory Center of Excellence for Influenza Research and Response [CEIRR], Atlanta, GA

<sup>c</sup> Department of Microbiology and Immunology, Emory University, Atlanta, GA

<sup>d</sup> Department of Physics, Emory University, Atlanta, GA

\* corresponding author: [katia.koelle@emory.edu](mailto:katia.koelle@emory.edu)

29 Abstract

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

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

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

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

60

61

62

63

64

## 65 Introduction

66 The efficacy of masks in reducing infection risk has been shown in the context of SARS-CoV-2<sup>1</sup>  
67 and for other respiratory viruses<sup>2</sup>. Masks reduce the amount of virus shed in exhaled breath of  
68 infected individuals<sup>3</sup>, reducing viral transmission potential. Although less effective than ‘source  
69 control’<sup>1,2</sup>, masking on the part of a contact also reduces infection risk. During the COVID-19  
70 pandemic, an additional benefit of masking has been hypothesized: that masks can reduce  
71 disease severity in individuals who become infected despite masking<sup>4-6</sup>. The initial articles  
72 arguing that ‘masks do more’ than reduce viral transmission have been heavily cited<sup>4,5,7</sup>, with  
73 several follow-up articles that either express support of this hypothesis<sup>6,8</sup> or are critical of it  
74 based on the extent of evidence presented<sup>9-11</sup> or on findings from subsequent studies<sup>12</sup>.

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

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

## 90 Methods

91 ***The relationship between inoculum dose and infection risk.*** The basic reproduction number  $R_0$   
92 in epidemiology quantifies the expected number of secondary cases resulting from a single  
93 infected case in an otherwise susceptible host population<sup>13</sup>. Given a value of  $R_0$  and a measure  
94 of the extent of transmission heterogeneity between individuals, the probability of an emerging  
95 infectious agent establishing, rather than going stochastically extinct, can be calculated<sup>14</sup>. These  
96 epidemiological calculations have analogies at the within-host level, where the within-host  
97 basic reproduction number ( $R_{0, \text{within}}$ ) quantifies the expected number of cells that will become  
98 infected by virus progeny produced from a single infected cell early on in infection when target  
99 cells are readily available and host immune responses have not yet developed. We thus use  
100 mathematical expressions from the epidemiological literature to project how inoculum dose

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

107 ***The relationship between inoculum dose and the risk of developing severe disease.*** Within-  
108 host models are commonly used to understand viral load and immune response dynamics<sup>16</sup>. To  
109 project the relationship between inoculum dose and the risk of developing severe disease, we  
110 use an existing mathematical model for the viral and immune response dynamics during SARS-  
111 CoV-2 infection<sup>15</sup>. This model incorporates uninfected target cells, infected target cells, free  
112 virus, and the innate immune response. We extend this model to further incorporate an  
113 adaptive immune response, given the documented importance of the cellular immune response  
114 in clearing SARS-CoV-2 infection and in modulating disease severity<sup>17</sup>. We further add an  
115 equation to model tissue damage, which we ultimately use to quantify the extent of disease  
116 severity. Model equations and parameterizations are provided in the Supplemental Material.  
117 For any given parameterization (reflecting a given individual), we simulate the within-host  
118 model starting with different values for the initial number of infected cells.

119 ***The inoculum dose in natural infections.*** To estimate the inoculum dose in natural SARS-CoV-2  
120 infections, we used empirical estimates of the transmission bottleneck size of SARS-CoV-2<sup>18-21</sup>.  
121 The transmission bottleneck size  $N_b$  is defined as the number of viral particles that establish  
122 genetic lineages in an infected host. By contrast, inoculum dose is defined herein as the number  
123 of initially infected cells, which may be greater than  $N_b$ . Under each considered inoculum dose,  
124 we analytically calculated the probability of  $N_b$  being 1, 2, 3, etc. viral particles, conditional on  
125 host infection (Supplemental Material). We used these probabilities to calculate the mean  
126 bottleneck size under any given inoculum dose. We compared these mean bottleneck sizes  
127 against the empirical mean estimate<sup>18</sup> of  $N_b = 1.21$  to determine a plausible range of natural  
128 inoculum doses.

## 129 Results

130 ***The expected relationship between inoculum dose and infection risk.*** To parameterize the  
131 infection risk model, we consider three values of  $R_{0, \text{within}}$ : 7.4, 2.6, and 14.9, corresponding to  
132 the mean, low, and high estimates derived from a within-host viral dynamic model that was fit  
133 to viral load data from 17 infected individuals<sup>15</sup>. With  $R_{0, \text{within}} = 7.4$  and in the absence of cell-to-  
134 cell heterogeneity ( $k = \infty$ ), the risk of infection was close to 100% in the case of the inoculum  
135 dose being one or more initially infected cells (**Figure 1**). At any given inoculum dose, the risk of  
136 infection was lower at higher levels of cell-to-cell heterogeneity. However, even at extreme  
137 levels of cell-to-cell heterogeneity, infection risk saturated at 100% with inoculum doses of  
138 approximately 100-1000 initially infected cells. The overall patterns of infection risk were

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

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

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

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

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

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

190 *Inference of inoculum dose in natural infections.* **Figure 3A** shows the expected transmission  
191 bottleneck size under a range of inoculum doses, under the same set of values of  $R_{0, \text{within}}$  and  
192 cell-to-cell heterogeneity levels considered in Figure 1. Even at an extreme level of cell-to-cell  
193 heterogeneity ( $k = 0.001$ ), the inoculum dose that yields an expected transmission bottleneck  
194 size of 1.21 does not exceed 124 initially infected cells. Even if transmission bottleneck sizes  
195 were an order of magnitude higher ( $\sim 10$  viral particles), the inoculum dose would not exceed  
196  $\sim 3000$  initially infected cells. These results indicate that the inoculum dose in natural SARS-CoV-  
197 2 infections is very low. In this range of inoculum doses, reductions in dose would be expected  
198 to decrease the risk of infection but not have an effect on the risk of developing severe disease.  
199 In **Figure 3B**, we show the distribution of transmission bottleneck sizes that has been previously  
200 inferred from empirical studies<sup>18</sup>. **Figures 3C-G** show that expected distributions of transmission  
201 bottleneck sizes under different cell-to-cell heterogeneity levels, parameterized with inoculum  
202 doses that yield mean  $N_b$  estimates that are closest to the value of 1.21, quantitatively  
203 reproduce the inferred empirical distribution.

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

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

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

229 A second study<sup>23</sup> examined SARS-CoV-2 transmission efficiency from inoculated to contact  
230 animals, also using the Syrian hamster model. The study found that transmission efficiency was  
231 high in exposures that lasted one or more hours when the index animals were inoculated with  
232  $1 \times 10^4$  PFU of virus. In a follow-up experiment that examined transmission efficiency at different  
233 points in time following index inoculation, the authors allowed contact between sentinel and  
234 index cases for one to two hours, at different time periods post-inoculation. Transmission was  
235 found to be most efficient when viral load in the inoculated animal was high (17 h to 2 d post-  
236 inoculation), consistent with the risk of infection of a contact animal depending on dose when  
237 doses are low. However, infected contact animals across the different exposure time blocks did  
238 not exhibit statistically significant differences in infection severity as measured by weight loss  
239 (all  $p$ -values  $> 0.05$ ; two-sample t-test; Supplemental Material), even though one would expect  
240 exposure during high viral load of the index case to increase inoculum dose. However, infected  
241 contact animals did exhibit a statistically significant ( $p = 0.004$ ; two-sample t-test), yet small,  
242 amount of weight loss relative to their uninfected counterparts. These results are consistent  
243 with other experimental transmission studies on Syrian hamsters that found either small or  
244 insignificant amounts of weight loss in infected contact animals<sup>24,25</sup>.

245 Another set of studies that has the potential to give insight into the effect of dose on disease  
246 outcomes are those that modulate inoculum dose across a wide range of values in  
247 experimentally challenged donor animals. One such study<sup>26</sup> assessed the effect of SARS-CoV-2  
248 inoculum dose on seroconversion and fever development in a non-human primate model.  
249 Positive relationships were observed between deposited dose and seroconversion (an indicator  
250 of infection, albeit an imperfect one; **Figure 4A**) and also between deposited dose and fever  
251 development (**Figure 4B**). A similar effect was maintained when we reanalyzed the data by  
252 estimating the relationship between deposited dose and fever development, conditional on  
253 seroconversion (**Figure 4B**; Supplemental Material). As already remarked on in the original data  
254 analysis<sup>26</sup>, the median infectious dose that resulted in fever development was significantly  
255 higher than the median infectious dose that resulted in seroconversion (256 TCID50 vs. 52  
256 TCID50), a result that was maintained when fever development was conditioned on  
257 seroconversion (**Figure 4**). We further fit an alternative model to these data to allow for a non-

258 zero probability of developing fever at low inoculum doses, conditional on infection. The  
259 extended model, which was statistically preferred over the original logistic model, predicted an  
260 even higher inoculum dose for the median infectious dose that resulted in fever development  
261 (460 TCID<sub>50</sub>; **Figure 4B**). This analysis therefore provides empirical support for the modeling  
262 results presented above: at low inoculum doses, an increase in dose increases the risk of  
263 infection but not the risk of developing disease.

264 Another SARS-CoV-2 experimental challenge study examined disease outcomes at more than  
265 one dose<sup>27</sup>. However, this study considered dose ranges that ranged from high to very high  
266 (referred to as “low” and “high” dose, respectively, in their study) with all challenged animals  
267 becoming infected. At these dose levels, we expect that there might be a positive relationship  
268 between dose and disease severity. The findings from this study meet this expectation<sup>27</sup> but do  
269 not provide support in favor of the variolation hypothesis because the inoculum doses used in  
270 this study lie outside the range of natural ones.

## 271 Discussion

272 Here, we have used mathematical models to study the relationships between inoculum dose  
273 and the risks of infection and of developing severe disease. Based on parameterizations of  
274 these models for SARS-CoV-2, we argue that decreases in the inoculum dose, for example  
275 through masking, will only result in lower probabilities of infection when the natural inoculum  
276 dose is low. We further argue that decreases in the inoculum dose will only result in less severe  
277 disease when the natural inoculum dose is high. Our comparison of expected and empirical  
278 estimates of transmission bottleneck size indicates that natural inoculum doses are very low,  
279 such that masking (as documented<sup>1</sup>) is expected to reduce transmission potential. However,  
280 this means that masking is highly unlikely to reduce the risk of developing severe disease,  
281 conditional on infection. Our results thereby undermine the plausibility of the variolation  
282 hypothesis. Our results are consistent with experimental challenge studies, which have not  
283 found a significant difference in disease outcomes in contact animals infected with different but  
284 small inoculum doses; however, disease outcomes in index animals that are inoculated with  
285 high doses have been shown to differ, with higher doses resulting in more severe disease<sup>27</sup>.

286 We restricted our analyses to ones involving experimental challenge studies. While there are  
287 observational studies that have argued against the variolation hypothesis<sup>12</sup>, we feel that these  
288 studies offer an absence of evidence rather than evidence of absence, owing to uncertainty in  
289 the data. Other studies have been invoked to instead support the variolation hypothesis. For  
290 example, it has been argued that the higher asymptomatic rate on board of the Greg Mortimer  
291 ship destined for Antarctica (81%)<sup>28</sup> relative to the asymptomatic rate on board of the Diamond  
292 Princess (17.9%)<sup>29</sup> was due to masking on the Greg Mortimer<sup>5</sup>. However, alternative  
293 explanations, such as differences in the age distribution of the passengers or differences in the  
294 SARS-CoV-2 tests used, were not considered.



295 An alternative hypothesis to consider is that masks may modulate disease severity not by  
296 decreasing inoculum dose but by modulating the mode of transmission<sup>30</sup>. A viral inoculum  
297 delivered in larger droplets, such as those that comprise a spray, would become trapped in the  
298 nasal passages and upper airways. Conversely, small aerosolized particles can penetrate the  
299 lower lungs, where infection is more likely to result in severe symptoms. While masks that  
300 create a seal around the nose and mouth can limit inhalation of aerosols, most are more  
301 effective at limiting transfer of a droplet spray. Thus, while masking is expected to lower the  
302 overall number of infections, it could increase the proportion of cases resulting from inhalation  
303 directly to the lower respiratory tract. For this reason, we suggest that an effect of masking on  
304 modes of transmission is not consistent with the variolation hypothesis.

305 Our finding that masking and measures of social distancing that reduce inoculum dose are  
306 unlikely to do more than protect against infection has relevance to other respiratory viruses  
307 such as influenza, which is also characterized by a small transmission bottleneck size<sup>31</sup>. Masking  
308 would be expected to reduce incidence of infection, helping to limit the impact of influenza at a  
309 population level. To reduce disease in those infected, whether it be with influenza, SARS-CoV-2,  
310 or another respiratory virus characterized by a small inoculum dose, vaccination likely remains  
311 the most effective countermeasure<sup>32,33</sup>.

312

## 313 Acknowledgments

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

323

## 324 References

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

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

364 19 Lythgoe KA, Hall M, Ferretti L, *et al.* SARS-CoV-2 within-host diversity and transmission. *Science* 2021;  
365 **372**: eabg0821.

366 20 Braun KM, Moreno GK, Halfmann PJ, *et al.* Transmission of SARS-CoV-2 in domestic cats imposes a  
367 narrow bottleneck. *PLoS Pathog* 2021; **17**: e1009373.

368 21 Braun K, Moreno G, Wagner C, *et al.* Limited within-host diversity and tight transmission bottlenecks  
369 limit SARS-CoV-2 evolution in acutely infected individuals. *Evolutionary Biology*, 2021  
370 DOI:10.1101/2021.04.30.440988.

371 22 Chan JF-W, Yuan S, Zhang AJ, *et al.* Surgical Mask Partition Reduces the Risk of Noncontact  
372 Transmission in a Golden Syrian Hamster Model for Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19). *Clinical*  
373 *Infectious Diseases* 2020; **71**: 2139–49.

374 23 Ganti K, Ferreri LM, Lee C-Y, *et al.* Timing of exposure is critical in a highly sensitive model of SARS-  
375 CoV-2 transmission. *PLoS Pathog* 2022; **18**: e1010181.

376 24 Port JR, Yinda CK, Avanzato VA, *et al.* Increased small particle aerosol transmission of B.1.1.7  
377 compared with SARS-CoV-2 lineage A in vivo. *Nat Microbiol* 2022; **7**: 213–23.

378 25 Port JR, Yinda CK, Owusu IO, *et al.* SARS-CoV-2 disease severity and transmission efficiency is  
379 increased for airborne compared to fomite exposure in Syrian hamsters. *Nat Commun* 2021; **12**:  
380 4985.

381 26 Dabisch PA, Biryukov J, Beck K, *et al.* Seroconversion and fever are dose-dependent in a nonhuman  
382 primate model of inhalational COVID-19. *PLoS Pathog* 2021; **17**: e1009865.

383 27 Imai M, Iwatsuki-Horimoto K, Hatta M, *et al.* Syrian hamsters as a small animal model for SARS-CoV-2  
384 infection and countermeasure development. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* 2020; : 202009799.

385 28 Ing AJ, Cocks C, Green JP. COVID-19: in the footsteps of Ernest Shackleton. *Thorax* 2020; **75**: 693–4.

386 29 Mizumoto K, Kagaya K, Zarebski A, Chowell G. Estimating the asymptomatic proportion of  
387 coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) cases on board the Diamond Princess cruise ship, Yokohama,  
388 Japan, 2020. *Eurosurveillance* 2020; **25**. DOI:10.2807/1560-7917.ES.2020.25.10.2000180.

389 30 Prather KA, Wang CC, Schooley RT. Reducing transmission of SARS-CoV-2. *Science* 2020; **368**: 1422–4.

390 31 McCrone JT, Woods RJ, Martin ET, Malosh RE, Monto AS, Lauring AS. Stochastic processes constrain  
391 the within and between host evolution of influenza virus. *eLife* 2018; **7**. DOI:10.7554/eLife.35962.

392 32 Gross PA. The Efficacy of Influenza Vaccine in Elderly Persons: A Meta-Analysis and Review of the  
393 Literature. *Ann Intern Med* 1995; **123**: 518.

394 33 Feikin DR, Higdon MM, Abu-Raddad LJ, *et al.* Duration of effectiveness of vaccines against SARS-CoV-  
395 2 infection and COVID-19 disease: results of a systematic review and meta-regression. *The Lancet*  
396 2022; **399**: 924–44.

397

398

399

## 400 Figures

401

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

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

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

430 **Figure 4. The relationship between inoculum dose, seroconversion, and fever development.** Data  
431 derive from a non-human primate SARS-CoV-2 challenge study<sup>26</sup>, with inoculum doses ranging from low  
432 to high. Deposited doses are calculated from inoculum doses, incorporating deposition fraction  
433 estimates and accounting for variation in respiratory geometry. (A) The relationship between deposited  
434 dose and infection risk. Individual-level data points are shown as open black circles. Solid black line  
435 shows the fit of a logistic regression model. The median dose that results in seroconversion is 52 TCID<sub>50</sub>,  
436 as previously reported<sup>26</sup>. (B) The relationship between deposited dose and the probability of developing  
437 fever. Individual-level data points are shown as open black circles. Red asterisks within a subset of these

438 data points indicate the subset of individuals that seroconverted. Solid black line shows the fit of a  
439 logistic regression model to all individual-level data points. Red solid line shows the fit of a logistic  
440 regression model to the subset of individuals that seroconverted. The median dose that results in fever  
441 development is approximately 256 TCID<sub>50</sub> for both models. The red dashed line shows the fit of the  
442 alternative logistic model to the subset of animals that seroconverted.

443











