



## 10 **Abstract**

11 A comprehensive understanding of the transmission routes of the severe acute respiratory syndrome  
12 coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) is of great importance for the effective control of the spread of Corona  
13 Virus Disease 2019 (COVID-19). Human-to-human transmission by close contact where large  
14 respiratory droplets play a significant role has been established as the main transmission route. At the  
15 same time the transmission by small aerosol is getting increasing attention. There is no distinct  
16 boundary between droplets and aerosol in nature so it is natural to investigate the infection risk due  
17 to aerosol. Here, we utilized a newly developed dose-response relation, combined with a box model  
18 for the exposure estimation, to quantitatively evaluate the infection risk of SARS-CoV-2 through  
19 aerosol transmission and compared with the risk due to close contact. The results indicated that the  
20 median infection risk via aerosol transmission was about  $3.7 \times 10^{-5}$  (95% confidence interval:  $3.5 \times 10^{-6}$   
21 to  $4.4 \times 10^{-4}$ ) for one hour of exposure in a room with the size of 10 m (width)  $\times$  10 m (length)  $\times$  3 m  
22 (height) with one infected individual in it. The risk was more than three orders of magnitude lower  
23 than the risk at short distance, about 12.8% within 1 m, based on a meta-analysis. A simple  
24 exponential regression model  $Risk = 10^{-0.90 \times D + 0.10}$  ( $D \leq 5$  m) could be utilized to characterize the  
25 magnitude of infection risk in the considered scenario based on the distance  $D$  from the infected  
26 individual. With prolonged exposure duration and large exposed population, the infection caused by  
27 aerosol transmission could be considerable, thus it is necessary to be cautious for the potential  
28 aerosol transmission risk in such situations.

29

30

31 A comprehensive understanding of the transmission routes of the severe acute respiratory syndrome  
32 coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) is of great importance for the effective control of the spread of Corona  
33 Virus Disease 2019 (COVID-19). A recent open letter from 239 scientists <sup>1</sup> appealed to the relevant  
34 communities and organizations to recognize the potential airborne transmission of SARS-CoV-2  
35 through microscopic respiratory particles (aerosols).

36

37 A quantitative assessment of the infection risk through different transmission routes is essential to  
38 evaluate their relative importance and to prioritize the control measures. A recent study by Chu et al.  
39 <sup>2</sup> has estimated the infection risk by close contact, which was about 12.8% within 1 m and about 2.6%  
40 at further distance through a systematic review and meta-analysis on the betacoronaviruses causing  
41 severe acute respiratory syndrome (SARS), Middle East Respiratory Syndrome (MERS) and  
42 COVID-19. However, the studies for aerosol transmission risk are still scarce in part due to the lack  
43 of dose-response relation.

44

45 Recently, we developed a simple framework <sup>3</sup> to deduce the dose-response relation for coronaviruses,  
46 by integrating the *a priori* dose-response relation for SARS-CoV <sup>4</sup> based on mice experiments, the  
47 recent data on infection risks from COVID-19, SARS and MERS meta-analysis <sup>2</sup> and the viral  
48 shedding <sup>5</sup>. Here, we utilized the newly developed <sup>5</sup> dose-response relation, combined with a box  
49 model for the exposure estimation, to quantitatively evaluate the infection risk of SARS-CoV-2  
50 through aerosol transmission.

51

52 An exponential model,  $p=1-\exp(-d/k)$ , was adopted for the dose-response relation, where  $p$  is the  
53 infection risk,  $d$  is the exposure dose, and  $k$  is the pathogen dependent parameter. It was estimated  
54 that  $k$  was from  $6.2\times 10^4$  to  $7.3\times 10^5$  virus copies dependent on the contributions of the airborne  
55 virus-laden particles to the total infection risk <sup>3</sup>. The value of  $k$  was about  $1.5\times 10^5$  if the aerosol

56 transmission contributed half of the infection risk. Monte Carlo simulations were conducted to assess  
57 the risk. Here, it was assumed that  $k$  was a stochastic variable following the triangular distribution  
58 with lower limit, upper limit and mode of  $6.2 \times 10^4$ ,  $7.3 \times 10^5$  and  $1.5 \times 10^5$  copies.

59

60 To illustrate the relative importance of aerosol transmission compared to that of close contact, we  
61 considered a simple scenario of a room with the size of 10 m (width)  $\times$  10 m (length)  $\times$  3 m (height).  
62 The typical ventilation rate for offices <sup>6</sup>, 1 ACH (Air Changes per Hour), was adopted for the  
63 scenario. One infected individual was assumed to be at the center of the room. The infection risk of  
64 close contact from the meta-analysis <sup>2</sup> was induced by various durations from any duration to a  
65 minimum of 1 h. Representative exposure duration of 1 h was utilize for the development of the  
66 dose-response relation. It is close to the total duration of close contact between a nurse / health  
67 worker and a patient per day <sup>7</sup>. One hour of exposure in the room was also adopted for the  
68 assessment of the infection risk here.

69

70 A box model <sup>8</sup> was utilized to estimate the virus concentration and deposition in the room. The box  
71 model assumed that the airborne virus-laden particles were well mixed and the virus concentration  
72 was homogeneous in the room. A recent study based on computational fluid dynamics <sup>9</sup> indicated the  
73 aerosol mainly remained below 2 m for indoor environment, so 2 m was utilized as the mixing height  
74 instead of the room height (3 m). Four key processes were considered in the model, i.e. viral  
75 shedding, biologic decay, ventilation and deposition. Recently, Leung et al. <sup>5</sup> has shown that the viral  
76 shedding ( $E_{virus}$ ) was about  $10^2$  to  $10^5$  virus copies with a geometric mean of about  $10^4$  copies in the  
77 samples of respiratory particles from the symptomatic individuals infected by coronavirus (NL63,  
78 OC43, HKU1 and 229E) for 30 min. In the Monte Carlo simulations, the viral shedding was a  
79 stochastic variable following the distribution  $\log_{10}(E_{virus}) \sim Normal(4, 0.5)$ . The half-life period of the  
80 virus also followed the triangular distribution with the lower limit, upper limit and mode of  $\log_{10}(0.5)$ ,

81  $\log_{10}(100)$  and  $\log_{10}(10)$  based on the data reported in the literature<sup>8</sup>. The deposition velocities were  
82 estimated following the method proposed by Lai et al.<sup>10</sup> based on the size distribution<sup>11</sup> of particles  
83 generated by breathing and coughing. For the exposure estimation, the total respiratory volume was  
84 assumed to be  $0.6 \text{ m}^3$  per hour and the deposition of particles in the respiratory system was estimated  
85 by lung deposition model for bioaerosols<sup>12</sup>.

86

87 The results indicated that the median infection risk to contract COVID-19 via the aerosol route was  
88 about  $3.7 \times 10^{-5}$  (95% confidence interval:  $3.5 \times 10^{-6}$  to  $4.4 \times 10^{-4}$ ) for one hour of exposure, which was  
89 more than three orders of magnitude lower than the risk due to close contact (about 12.8% within 1  
90 m) based on the meta-analysis<sup>2</sup>. It is reasonable to assume that 5 m is far enough to prevent the  
91 transmission routes of close contact (direct/indirect) or large respiratory droplets, so the infection risk  
92 is dominated by aerosol transmission. An additional intermediate data point from the meta-analysis<sup>2</sup>  
93 was that the infection risk was about 2.6% when the distance was  $> 1\text{m}$ . The above results suggested  
94 that the infection risk exponentially decreased with the increasing distance from the infected  
95 individual in the room. A simple exponential regression model  $Risk = 10^{-0.90 \times D + 0.10}$  ( $D \leq 5 \text{ m}$ ) could be  
96 utilized to roughly estimate the magnitude of infection risk for the considered scenario (Figure 1),  
97 where  $D$  is the distance from the infected individual.

98

99 Larger rooms could reduce the infection risk via aerosol by enhancing the dilution of the airborne  
100 virus-laden particles. The decreasing rate of the risk was correlated with the area of the rooms ( $L^2$ ) as  
101 shown in Figure 2. The median risk decreased by about a factor of 4, from  $3.7 \times 10^{-5}$  to  $1.0 \times 10^{-5}$ ,  
102 when the room size increased from 10 m to 20 m. The infection risk decreased slower for further  
103 distance ( $D > 5 \text{ m}$ ) than that within 5 m. The ventilation rates had moderate effects on the infection  
104 risk due to the modulation of deposition. The median risk increased from  $3.7 \times 10^{-5}$  with 1 ACH to  
105  $7.0 \times 10^{-5}$  with 0.1 ACH as shown in Figure 3.

106

107 The recently developed dose-response relation could be utilized to quantify the magnitude of the  
108 infection risk via aerosol transmission. The uncertainties in the estimations were mainly due to the  
109 dose-response relation and the viral shedding. Despite the uncertainties, the assessment could still  
110 improve the understanding of the relative importance of different transmission routes. The infection  
111 risk via aerosol transmission with one-hour exposure ( $10^{-6}$  to  $10^{-4}$ ) was more than three orders of  
112 magnitude lower than the risk caused by close contact ( $10^{-2}$  to  $10^{-1}$ ).

113

114 Keeping distance is not enough to prevent or reduce the exposure to aerosol indoors. Wearing masks  
115 is helpful. The infection risk via aerosol transmission could increase for prolonged exposure duration,  
116 e.g. at home and office. In addition, the expected number of infected cases could be considerable if  
117 there are a large amount of exposed individuals, e.g. in clubs. As a result, it is necessary to be  
118 cautious for the potential aerosol transmission risk in such situations.

119

## 120 **References**

- 121 1 Morawska, L. & Milton, D. K. It is Time to Address Airborne Transmission of COVID-19. *Clinical Infectious*  
122 *Diseases*, doi:10.1093/cid/ciaa939 (2020).
- 123 2 Chu, D. K. *et al.* Physical distancing, face masks, and eye protection to prevent person-to-person transmission of  
124 SARS-CoV-2 and COVID-19: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *The Lancet*,  
125 doi:10.1016/s0140-6736(20)31142-9 (2020).
- 126 3 Zhang, X. & Wang, J. Deducing the Dose-response Relation for Coronaviruses from COVID-19, SARS and  
127 MERS Meta-analysis Results. *medRxiv*, 2020.2006.2026.20140624, doi:10.1101/2020.06.26.20140624 (2020).
- 128 4 Watanabe, T., Bartrand, T. A., Weir, M. H., Omura, T. & Haas, C. N. Development of a Dose-Response Model  
129 for SARS Coronavirus. *Risk Analysis* **30**, 1129-1138, doi:10.1111/j.1539-6924.2010.01427.x (2010).
- 130 5 Leung, N. H. L. *et al.* Respiratory virus shedding in exhaled breath and efficacy of face masks. *Nature Medicine*,  
131 doi:10.1038/s41591-020-0843-2 (2020).
- 132 6 Zaatari, M. *et al.* Ventilation and indoor air quality in retail stores: A critical review (RP-1596). *HVAC&R*  
133 *Research* **20**, 276-294, doi:10.1080/10789669.2013.869126 (2014).
- 134 7 Adhikari, U. *et al.* A Case Study Evaluating the Risk of Infection from Middle Eastern Respiratory Syndrome  
135 Coronavirus (MERS-CoV) in a Hospital Setting Through Bioaerosols. *Risk Analysis* **39**, 2608-2624,  
136 doi:10.1111/risa.13389 (2019).
- 137 8 Zhang, X., Ji, Z., Yue, Y., Liu, H. & Wang, J. Infection risk assessment of COVID-19 through aerosol  
138 transmission: a case study of South China Seafood Market. *Environmental Science & Technology*,  
139 doi:10.1021/acs.est.0c02895 (2020).


- 140 9 Vuorinen, V. *et al.* Modelling aerosol transport and virus exposure with numerical simulations in relation to  
141 SARS-CoV-2 transmission by inhalation indoors. *Safety Science* **130**, 104866,  
142 doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssci.2020.104866> (2020).
- 143 10 K. Lai, A. C. & Nazaroff, W. W. MODELING INDOOR PARTICLE DEPOSITION FROM TURBULENT  
144 FLOW ONTO SMOOTH SURFACES. *Journal of Aerosol Science* **31**, 463-476,  
145 doi:[https://doi.org/10.1016/S0021-8502\(99\)00536-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0021-8502(99)00536-4) (2000).
- 146 11 Morawska, L. *et al.* Size distribution and sites of origin of droplets expelled from the human respiratory tract  
147 during expiratory activities. *Journal of Aerosol Science* **40**, 256-269,  
148 doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jaerosci.2008.11.002> (2009).
- 149 12 Guha, S., Hariharan, P. & Myers, M. R. Enhancement of ICRP's Lung Deposition Model for Pathogenic  
150 Bioaerosols. *Aerosol Science and Technology* **48**, 1226-1235, doi:[10.1080/02786826.2014.975334](https://doi.org/10.1080/02786826.2014.975334) (2014).

151

152

153


154 **Appendix**



155


156 Figure 1 Infection risk at different distances from an infected individual in a room with the size of 10  
157 m (width) $\times$ 10 m (length) $\times$ 3 m (height) for one hour exposure.

158



159

160 Figure 2 Infection risk via aerosol transmission in rooms of various sizes with one infected  
161 individual for one hour exposure.



162

163 Figure 3 Infection risk via aerosol transmission in a room with the size of 10 m (width)×10 m  
164 (length)×3 m (height) with different ventilation rates for one hour exposure.

165