

1 Exposure assessment for airborne
2 transmission of SARS-CoV-2 via breathing,
3 speaking, coughing and sneezing
4

5 Supplementary Material
6
7

8 Jack Schijven*^{§,a,b}

9 Lucie C. Vermeulen*^a

10 Arno Swart^a

11 Adam Meijer^a

12 Erwin Duizer^a

13 Ana Maria de Roda Husman^{a,c}
14

15 * shared first author
16

17 ^a Centre for Infectious Disease Control, National Institute for Public Health and the
18 Environment (RIVM), Bilthoven, the Netherlands

19 ^b Department of Earth Sciences, Utrecht University, Utrecht, the Netherlands

20 ^c Institute for Risk Assessment Sciences, Utrecht University, Utrecht, the Netherlands
21

22 [§] corresponding author: Jack Schijven, jack.schijven@rivm.nl, National Institute for
23 Public Health and the Environment, P.O. Box 1 , 3720 BA Bilthoven, the Netherlands
24

25 *The authors declare they have no actual or potential competing financial interests.*
26

27 Supplementary material

28 S1. SARS-CoV-2 swab data

29

30 SARS-CoV-2 concentrations in mucus from oropharyngeal (throat) and nasopharyngeal (nose) swab
31 are often expressed as Ct values. Ct values are inversely related to viral RNA copy number. From the
32 Ct values, the number of RNA copies / mL of the original sample can be estimated. The RdRp gene
33 fragment was used. For the two datasets of Zou et al. (2020) and the RIVM own data, the conversion
34 was as follows:

$$35 \log_{10} C_Z = -0.271 \times Ct_Z + 12.494$$

$$36 \log_{10} C_R = -0.3231 \times Ct_R + 14.115$$

37 Where C_Z is the RNA concentration in the original samples (copies / mL) of the Zou et al. data, C_R is
38 the RNA concentration in the original samples (copies / mL) of the RIVM own data, Ct_Z is the Ct value
39 as provided by Zou et al., Ct_R is the Ct value as provided by RIVM. These conversions were estimated
40 based on the method calibration by the authors. Viral RNA concentration is taken as proxy for viral
41 concentration in our study.

42 Observational swab data can be intermittently negative (Zou et al. 2020), e.g. a throat swab of an
43 infected person can test positive one day, negative the next, and then positive again. Zou et al.
44 followed 18 patients over time, thus the data contain such intermittent negative results, which were
45 included in the fit as observations below the detection limit. In contrast, the swab data from RIVM
46 were mostly single observations per person. Samples that were negative for the SARS-CoV-2 RdRp-
47 gene, but positive for Sarbeco E gene were considered positive for SARS-CoV-2 and classified as non-
48 detects by RdRp assay.

49

50

51 **S2. Selection of expelled particle number and size distribution data**

52 Hugely varying ranges of number of aerosol particles expelled by expiratory activities are reported in
53 literature. Here we discuss more in-depth the available data and the choices that were made for the
54 data selected for this study. In the selection of data from literature, studies concerning bacterial
55 infections were not included, as bacteria are typically much larger than viruses. Table S2 gives an
56 overview of the size distribution data used for the different scenarios in this study, showing the
57 counted droplet diameter ranges, the employed method and the health status of the investigated
58 subjects.

59 **Table S2. Overview of the size distribution data used for the different scenarios in this study**

Scenario	Reference	Counted droplet diameter ranges	Counting method	Investgated subjects
Breathing	Fabian et al. (2011)	0.3 - >10 µm	Optical particle counter	Human rhinovirus-infected
Speaking Low	Asadi (2019)	0.5 – 20 µm	Aerodynamic particle sizer, TSI model 3321	Healthy
Speaking High	Duguid (1946)	0.25 – 20 µm	Impaction and counting under a microscope	Healthy
Coughing Low	Lindsley et al. (2012)	0.35 to 10 µm	Laser aerosol particle spectrometer	Influenza virus-infected
Coughing High	Duguid (1946)	0.25 – 20 µm	Impaction and counting under a microscope	Healthy
Sneezing Low	Gerone et al. (1966)	<1 – 15 µm	Large funnel with a particle-size analyser based on light-scattering (Mumma et al. 1962)	Coxsackie virus-infected
Sneezing High	Duguid (1946)	0.25 – 20 µm	Impaction and counting under a microscope	Healthy

60

61 **Breathing**

62 Only one study was identified that reported both counted particle numbers and their size
63 distribution in the range 0.3 - 20 µm for breathing, the work by Fabian et al. (2011), allowing for
64 calculation of exhaled volumes of aerosolized droplets. This study employed an optical particle
65 counter for six size bins, and measured during normal tidal breathing for human rhinovirus-infected
66 subjects. Fabian et al. found that HRV-infected subjects exhaled from 0.1 to 7200 particles / L of
67 exhaled air during tidal breathing. The data in Figure 5 of Fabian et al. were extracted using a plot
68 digitizer <https://apps.automeris.io/wpd/> and used as the basis for this study. The median
69 concentration determined from this figure is ~15 particles / L.

70 Several other studies on particle emission during breathing were considered (Edwards et al. 2004;
71 Fabian et al. 2008; Johnson and Morawska 2009; Leung et al. 2020; Papineni and Rosenthal 1997).
72 All these studies were found not to contain suitable data that could be used to calculated exhaled
73 volumes of aerosolized droplets, but they report results that are generally in line with the data from
74 Fabian et al. (2011), giving confidence in the approach taken in this study.

75 Fabian et al. (2008) studied exhaled breath in influenza-infected subjects using an optical particle
76 counter. They report that concentrations ranged from 67 to 8,500 particles / L of air. The results
77 were reported for four size bins, concentrations in the various bins ranged from 61 - 3848 / L
78 (particles between 0.3 - 0.5 µm), 5 - 2756 / L (0.5 - 1 µm), 1 to 1916 / L (1 - 5 µm), and 0 to 9 / L (>5

79 μm). Only ranges were given, that are similar if somewhat higher than the data in Fabian (2011). As
80 Fabian et al. (2011) reported for six size bins and also reported quantiles and medians, the data by
81 Fabian et al. (2011) were more suitable for calculations. Papineni and Rosenthal (1997) report
82 exhaled particle counts for two size bins (<1 and $>1 \mu\text{m}$) in exhaled breath of healthy human
83 subjects. From Table 2 in Papineni and Rosenthal, the mean observed counts are 12.5 and 4.7
84 particles $< 1 \mu\text{m} / \text{L}$ for mouth and nose breathing, respectively, and 1.9 and 0.7 particles $>1 \mu\text{m} / \text{L}$
85 for mouth and nose breathing respectively. The mouth breathing mean count is very similar to the
86 median found by Fabian et al. (2011). Papineni and Rosenthal report that their optical particle
87 counter detected particles of $>0.3 \mu\text{m}$, but the upper end of the size range is unclear, and only two
88 size bins were used, which does not allow for volume calculations. Johnson and Morawska (2009)
89 employed an aerodynamic particle sizer, the EDIS system, for counting particles of $0.5 - 20 \mu\text{m}$ in
90 exhaled breath in healthy subjects. The Johnson and Morawska particle counts are not reported for
91 different size classes, and thus do not allow for the volume calculations that are necessary for our
92 study. However, Figure 7 contains data on the total concentration of particles in exhaled breath,
93 these were extracted using the abovementioned plot digitizer. The average observed particle
94 concentration from this figure was calculated to be ~ 250 particles / L, which is approximately one
95 order of magnitude higher than the median of Fabian et al., but well within the range found by
96 Fabian et al. (2011). Edwards et al. (2004) employed an optical particle counter for exhaled particles
97 $>150 \text{ nm}$ in healthy subjects. They report that the number of exhaled particles / L varied dramatically
98 over time and among subjects, ranging from a low of one particle / L to a high of $>10^4$ particles / L, so
99 a similar if bit wider range than Fabian et al. However, Edwards et al. do not report particle counts
100 for the exhaled breath of human subjects for different sizes classes, thus not allowing for volume
101 calculations. Leung et al. (2020) report experiments on particle counts in breath collected for half an
102 hour during which participants also coughed. Leung et al. measured in subjects infected with
103 different viruses, among which a coronavirus (not SARS-CoV-2). For the coronavirus-infected
104 subjects, Leung et al. report up to 10^5 particles $<5 \mu\text{m}$ per breath sample (collected for 30
105 minutes)(Leung et al. Figure 1a). Assuming a tidal breathing rate of $\sim 7 \text{ L} / \text{minute}$, this would mean
106 up to ~ 500 particles / L exhaled breath, which is approximately one order or magnitude lower than
107 the maximum of the range observed by Fabian et al. (2011). The relative contribution of breathing
108 and coughing cannot be deducted from the Leung et al. data, making these unsuitable for our
109 purposes.

110

111 Speaking

112 The numbers and size distributions of aerosol droplets expelled by speaking were from Duguid
113 (1945, 1946) and Asadi et al. (2019).

114 Asadi et al. employed an aerodynamic particle sizer (APS, TSI model 3321) on exhaled breath during
115 speaking of healthy subjects into a funnel in a laminar flow hood. The subjects were asked to read
116 aloud a passage from a book. Figure 4B concentration data in particles / cm^3 of Asadi et al. (2019)
117 was digitized using the abovementioned plot digitizer. The average particle concentration in exhaled
118 breath was 2.0×10^2 ($6.0 \times 10^1 - 8.4 \times 10^2$) particles / L. These numbers were scaled to the volume of air
119 a person exhales during speaking a minute using the values for tidal breathing increased by 13.5%
120 (Bunn and Mead 1971). Recovering stain-containing droplet-nuclei from the air onto oiled slides by a
121 slit sampler and counting them under a microscope, Duguid (1945, 1946) counted particles in the
122 initial size range of $0.25 \mu\text{m}$ to $20 \mu\text{m}$. For speaking, Duguid had subjects counting loudly from 1 to
123 100 and measured at a distance of 1.5 feet from the mouth, and found 2.5×10^2 ($5.0 \times 10^1 - 7.7 \times 10^2$)
124 expelled droplets (Table IV from Duguid (1945)). It was assumed that counting from 1 to 100

125 represented an observed speaking time of 1.5 minutes. Duguid reported underestimation of
126 particles less than about 1 μm with highest counts around 2-4 μm . In contrast, Asadi counted
127 particles between 0.5 – 20 μm with highest counts around 1 μm .

128 The size distribution data were, for the Speaking Low scenario, from Asadi (2019), and for the
129 Speaking High scenario from Duguid (1946). For Asadi, the size distribution was sampled from the
130 data in Figure 3D for normal speaking, digitized using the abovementioned plot digitizer. For Duguid,
131 the size distribution was sampled from Table 2 for speaking loudly.

132 Several other studies on particle emission during speaking were considered (Chao et al. 2009;
133 Loudon and Roberts 1967; Papineni and Rosenthal 1997), that were excluded for several reasons.
134 The work by Papineni and Rosenthal (1997) on speaking was excluded for the same reason it was
135 excluded for breathing. Papineni and Rosenthal report that their optical particle counter detected
136 particles of $>0.3 \mu\text{m}$, but the upper end of the size range is unclear, and only two size bins were
137 used, which does not allow for volume calculations. For both breathing and speaking it was observed
138 that studies which looked specifically at smaller size ranges of ~ 0.5 to 10 or 20 μm , e.g. (Asadi et al.
139 2019; Fabian et al. 2011), find highest particle counts in the smallest bins around 1 μm . In contrast,
140 studies that measured over a larger size range (up to $\sim 2000 \mu\text{m}$) e.g. (Chao et al. 2009; Loudon and
141 Roberts 1967), report highest particle counts between 10 and 20 μm and decreasing particle counts
142 in smaller bins. Chao et al. (2009) note in their discussion that the IMI detection system they
143 employed has a lower detection limit of about 2 μm and that this contrasts with other studies that
144 observed peaks in smaller particles, suggesting that the IMI system may not cover the entire size
145 range of expelled particles. As we are specifically interested in the smaller particles that can stay
146 airborne, we chose not to include the data generated by Chao et al. (2009) and Loudon and Roberts
147 (1967), as these are likely underestimating the numbers of particles expelled in the smaller size bins.

148

149 Coughing

150 Hugely varying ranges of number of aerosol particles expelled by coughing are reported in literature.
151 For a lip-cough, Duguid (1945) reported 4.8×10^3 ($4.9 \times 10^2 - 1.6 \times 10^4$) particles and for a tongue-teeth
152 cough, 8.2×10^3 ($1.5 \times 10^3 - 5.2 \times 10^4$) particles. Gerone et al. (1966) reported that a representative
153 cough contained 9×10^4 particles in the size range of less than 1 μm to 15 μm , which corresponds to
154 200 pL. Lindsley et al. (2012) reported that for patients with influenza, their average cough
155 aerosol volume was 38.3 picolitres (pL) of particles per cough (SD 43.7); after patients recovered, the
156 average volume was 26.4 pL per cough (SD 45.6). The number of particles produced per cough was
157 also higher when subjects had influenza (average 7.5×10^4 particles/cough, SD 9.7×10^4) compared
158 with afterward (average 5.2×10^4 , SD 9.9×10^4), although the difference did not reach statistical
159 significance. The average number of particles expelled per cough varied widely from patient to
160 patient, ranging from 9×10^2 to 3.0×10^5 particles/cough while subjects had influenza and 1.1×10^3 to
161 3.1×10^5 particles/cough after recovery. Lindsley et al. (2012) enumerated particles with a size range
162 of 0.35 μm to 10 μm with a laser aerosol particle spectrometer. Yang et al. (2007) detected on
163 average 1000 to 2000 droplets/mL with the more droplets when a person was older, which two
164 orders of magnitude higher than the reported number of droplets/mL.

165 In the QMRA, the number of droplet nuclei from a cough of particles less than 20 μm was simulated
166 as a lognormal distribution with mean 11 and standard deviation 0.8 (Table 2 of the main text).

167 Also, a wide range in particle size distributions in coughs were reported in literature. Lindsley et al.
168 (2012) measured particles in the range of 0.35 μm – 4 μm , whereas Zayas et al. (2012) reported 0.12

169 $\mu\text{m} - 0.8 \mu$. Zayas et al. (2012) enumerated particles two orders of magnitude more than others.
170 Zayas claims that previous studies had limited resolution in the submicrometer ranges or were
171 biased due to sampling air stream. Of the 45 investigated persons, Zayas et al. (2012) identified 10
172 persons as high emitters with one standard deviation of the number of particles higher than
173 average. One high emitter with particle numbers that were two standard deviations higher was
174 excluded.

175 Sneezing

176 Recovering stain-containing droplet-nuclei from the air onto oiled slides by a slit sampler and
177 counting them under a microscope, Duguid (1945) counted particles in the initial size range of 0.25
178 μm to 20 μm . For a natural sneeze, Duguid (1945) reported 1.1×10^6 ($6.5 \times 10^4 - 3.1 \times 10^6$) particles and
179 for a simulated strong sneeze, 9.3×10^6 ($1.5 \times 10^6 - 3.0 \times 10^7$). Gerone et al. (1966) captured expelled
180 particles using a funnel and reported that a representative sneeze contained 1.6×10^6 particles in the
181 size range of less than 1 μm to 15 μm , which corresponds to 6000 picoL. In the QMRA, the number
182 of droplet nuclei from a sneeze of particles less than 20 μm was simulated as a lognormal
183 distribution with mean 14 and standard deviation 0.5 (Table 2 in the main text).


184 As for size range, Gerone et al. (1966) counted relatively more smaller particles than Duguid (1946).
185 Duguid found fewer smaller particles when measuring at a longer distance, so may have
186 underestimated the numbers of smaller particles due to evaporation. In contrast, Gerone et al.
187 (1966) aimed to capture the complete sneeze, but reported not to have enumerated particles larger
188 than 15 μm .

189 Han et al. (2013), enumerated sneezed particles with a laser beam at a short distance and found that
190 the size distribution from about half of the tested persons enumerated sneeze was bimodal, but
191 even the size range of the smaller part of this distribution consisted of particles larger than 20 μm .
192 Possibly, in the narrow laser beam, a large part of the sneeze was missed.

193

194

195 S3. Variation in the expelled virus particles by breathing, speaking, coughing and
196 sneezing
197



198

199 **Figure S1. Numbers of expelled virus particles in aerosol droplets by one person by 20 minutes**
200 **breathing, 20 minutes loudly speaking, one cough or one sneeze and numbers of inhaled virus**
201 **particles (dose) by one person during 20 minutes in a bus as a function of virus concentration in**
202 **mucus. The insets show the fraction of Poisson samples with number of viruses > 0 in the Monte**
203 **Carlo simulation, which reflect the probability of expelling and inhaling virus particles. The shaded**
204 **areas are the 95%-confidence intervals of the Monte Carlo samples, whereas the red and blue**
205 **lines are the mean numbers.**

206

207 Literature

208

209 Asadi S, Wexler AS, Cappa CD, Barreda S, Bouvier NM, Ristenpart WD. 2019. Aerosol emission and
210 superemission during human speech increase with voice loudness. *Sci Rep* 9:2348.

211 Bunn JC, Mead J. 1971. Control of ventilation during speech. *Journal of Applied Physiology* 31:870-
212 872.

213 Chao CYH, Wan MP, Morawska L, Johnson GR, Ristovski ZD, Hargreaves M, et al. 2009.
214 Characterization of expiration air jets and droplet size distributions immediately at the mouth
215 opening. *Journal of Aerosol Science* 40:122-133.

216 Duguid JP. 1945. The numbers and the sites of origin of the droplets expelled during expiratory
217 activities. *Edinb Med J* 52:385-401.

218 Duguid JP. 1946. The size and the duration of air-carriage of respiratory droplets and droplet-nuclei.
219 *J Hyg (Lond)* 44:471-479.

220 Edwards DA, Man JC, Brand P, Katstra JP, Sommerer K, Stone HA, et al. 2004. Inhaling to mitigate
221 exhaled bioaerosols. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 101:17383-17388.

222 Fabian P, McDevitt JJ, DeHaan WH, Fung RO, Cowling BJ, Chan KH, et al. 2008. Influenza virus in
223 human exhaled breath: An observational study. *PLoS One* 3:e2691.

224 Fabian P, Brain J, Houseman EA, Gern J, Milton DK. 2011. Origin of exhaled breath particles from
225 healthy and human rhinovirus-infected subjects. *J Aerosol Med Pulm Drug Deliv* 24:137-147.

226 Gerone PJ, Couch RB, Keefer GV, Douglas RG, Derrenbacher EB, Knight V. 1966. Assessment of
227 experimental and natural viral aerosols. *Bacteriological reviews* 30:576-588.

228 Johnson GR, Morawska L. 2009. The mechanism of breath aerosol formation. *J Aerosol Med Pulm
229 Drug Deliv* 22:229-237.

230 Leung NHL, Chu DKW, Shiu EYC, Chan K-H, McDevitt JJ, Hau BJP, et al. 2020. Respiratory virus
231 shedding in exhaled breath and efficacy of face masks. *Nature Medicine*.

232 Lindsley WG, Pearce TA, Hudnall JB, Davis KA, Davis SM, Fisher MA, et al. 2012. Quantity and size
233 distribution of cough-generated aerosol particles produced by influenza patients during and after
234 illness. *J Occup Environ Hyg* 9:443-449.

235 Loudon RG, Roberts RM. 1967. Droplet expulsion from the respiratory tract. *American Review of
236 Respiratory Disease* 95:435-442.

237 Mumma VR, Thomas Jr. AL, Collins III RH. 1962. A particle size analyzer for aerosols. *Annals of the
238 New York Academy of Sciences* 99:298-308.

239 Papineni RS, Rosenthal FS. 1997. The size distribution of droplets in the exhaled breath of healthy
240 human subjects. *Journal of Aerosol Medicine* 10:105-116.

241 Yang S, Lee GW, Chen CM, Wu CC, Yu KP. 2007. The size and concentration of droplets generated by
242 coughing in human subjects. *J Aerosol Med* 20:484-494.

243 Zayas G, Chiang MC, Wong E, MacDonald F, Lange CF, Senthilselvan A, et al. 2012. Cough aerosol in
244 healthy participants: Fundamental knowledge to optimize droplet-spread infectious respiratory
245 disease management. *BMC Pulmonary Medicine* 12:11.

246 Zou L, Ruan F, Huang M, Liang L, Huang H, Hong Z, et al. 2020. Sars-cov-2 viral load in upper
247 respiratory specimens of infected patients. *N Engl J Med* 382:1177-1179.

248