

1 **Deducing the Dose-response Relation for Coronaviruses from COVID-19,** 2 **SARS and MERS Meta-analysis Results**

3 Xiaole Zhang^{1,2}, Jing Wang^{1,2*}

4 1. Institute of Environmental Engineering (IfU), ETH Zürich, Zürich, CH-8093, Switzerland

5 2. Laboratory for Advanced Analytical Technologies, Empa, Dübendorf, CH-8600, Switzerland

6 * Corresponding author: Prof. Dr. Jing Wang; e-mail address: jing.wang@ifu.baug.ethz.ch

8 **Abstract**

9 The fundamental dose-response relation is still missing for better evaluating and controlling the
10 transmission risk of COVID-19. A recent study by Chu et al. has indicated that the anticipated
11 probability of viral infection is about 12.8% within 1 m and about 2.6% at further distance through a
12 systematic review and meta-analysis. This important information provides us a unique opportunity to
13 assess the dose-response relation of the viruses, if reasonable exposure dose could be estimated. Here
14 we developed a simple framework to integrate the *a priori* dose-response relation for SARS-CoV based
15 on mice experiments, and the recent data on infection risk and viral shedding, to shed light on the dose-
16 response relation for human. The developed dose-response relation is an exponential function with a
17 constant k in the range of 6.19×10^4 to 7.28×10^5 virus copies. The result mean that the infection risk
18 caused by one virus copy in viral shedding is about 1.5×10^{-6} to 1.6×10^{-5} . The developed dose-response
19 relation provides a tool to quantify the magnitude of the infection risk.

20

21 Control of the spread of Corona Virus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) is the urgent challenge throughout
22 the world. It is considered that the causal pathogen, severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2
23 (SARS-CoV-2), could spread via the transmission of virus-laden respiratory particles shed from
24 infected individuals ¹. However the fundamental dose-response relation is still missing for better
25 evaluating and controlling the transmission risk of the disease.

26
27 A recent study by Chu et al. ² has indicated that the anticipated probability of viral infection is about
28 12.8% within 1 m and about 2.6% at further distance through a systematic review and meta-analysis
29 on the betacoronaviruses causing severe acute respiratory syndrome (SARS), Middle East Respiratory
30 Syndrome (MERS) and COVID-19. This important information provides us a unique opportunity to
31 assess the dose-response relation of the viruses, if reasonable exposure dose could be estimated. Here
32 we developed a simple framework to integrate the *a priori* dose-response relation for SARS-CoV ³
33 based on mice experiments, and the recent data on infection risk ² and viral shedding ⁴, to shed light
34 on the dose-response relation for human.

35
36 Watanabe et al. ³ found that the exponential model $p=1-\exp(-d/k)$ could well depict the dose-response
37 relation based on the experiments challenging mice with recombinant SARS-CoV variants ⁵ and
38 Murine Coronavirus Strain 1 (MHV-1) ⁶, where p is the infection probability, d is the exposure dose,
39 and k is the pathogen dependent parameter. With a little mathematics, we could derive that $p \sim d/k$,
40 when the infection risk is below 15%, with the difference between p and d/k smaller than 8%. We
41 assume that the exponential model remains applicable for the dose-response relation for human.

42
43 Recently, Leung et al. ⁴ investigated the respiratory shedding of coronaviruses (NL63, OC43, HKU1
44 and 229E) in exhaled breath in real-life situations with breathing and coughing. The results have shown
45 that about 30% to 40% of the symptomatic individuals in the tests produced viral shedding (E_{virus}) in

46 respiratory particles, with about 10^2 to 10^5 virus copies in samples of 30 min without wearing masks,
47 with a geometric mean of about 10^4 .

48

49 An overall effective dilution rate is required to convert the viral shedding into the exposure dose at
50 various distances. The overall effective dilution rate should be a combination of various factors, e.g.
51 the dilution when the exhaled air is mixed with the ambient air and the possibility for the exposed
52 person to actually inhale the contaminated plume. The meta-analysis study ² offered a plausible way
53 to estimate this factor. It was shown that the chance of viral infection decreased by about a factor of 5
54 from within 1 m (12.8%) to further distance (2.6%). According to the exponential model, the dose-
55 response relation is nearly linear within the range of $p < 15\%$ (k is a constant), which suggests that the
56 viral shedding from an infected individual should also be effectively diluted by about the same
57 magnitude. “Further distance” is likely within 2 or 3 meters considering the confined indoor space, so
58 we use 5 times per meter as the effective dilution factor (f_{dilu}) to estimate the exposure dose. It was
59 reported in the meta-analysis ² that the duration of exposure varied from any duration to a minimum
60 of 1 h. Here we use 1 h as a representative duration (t_{expo}), which is close to the total duration of close
61 contact between a nurse / health worker and a patient per day ⁷. The exposure (virus copies) at further
62 distance was estimated as $d = E_{virus} / (f_{dilu}) t_{expo}$.

63

64 Monte Carlo simulations were conducted to estimate the exposure dose. Two different fractions (40%,
65 100%) of the infected individuals for positive viral shedding (E_{virus} , virus copies per hour) and two
66 distributions $\log_{10}(E_{virus}) \sim Normal(4, 0.5)$ and $\log_{10}(E_{virus}) \sim Uniform(3, 5)$, namely four different
67 combinations of the configurations were utilized to estimate the exposure dose and the corresponding
68 dose-response relation, and to evaluate the sensitivities of the estimations to the configurations. One
69 million values of E_{virus} were generated for each setting. The deposition of the particles in the respiratory
70 system was estimated based on the size distribution ⁸ of particles generated by breathing and coughing

71 and the deposition model for bioaerosols⁹. The overall deposition ratio was about 90%. The dose-
72 response relation was estimated based on 5 different contribution levels (0.1, 0.25, 0.5, 0.75 and 1) of
73 airborne virus-laden particles to the total dose from both exposure to airborne viruses and contact
74 transmission.

75

76 The final dose-response estimations for k are from 6.19×10^4 to 7.28×10^5 copies dependent on the
77 contribution of the airborne virus-laden particles to the total dose as shown in appendix Figure 1 to 4.
78 The variations among different configurations are limited, which suggests the stability of the
79 estimations. The results mean that the infection risk caused by one virus copy in viral shedding is about
80 1.5×10^{-6} to 1.6×10^{-5} . Watanabe et al. utilized the plaque-forming units (PFU) to quantify the dose. A
81 previous study on SARS-CoV¹⁰ showed that about 300 viral genome copies were present per PFU.
82 Then k in the Watanabe model³ was about 1.23×10^5 , close to our estimation with 50% contribution
83 from airborne particles to the total dose. The results suggest that the experiments based on mice could
84 provide reasonable insight for the human infection risk. However, the conversion factor from PFU to
85 virus copies is still uncertain and needs further evaluation.

86

87 The framework is kept as simple as possible to avoid unnecessary uncertainties. The developed dose-
88 response relation provides a tool to quantify the magnitude of the infection risk and can be used in
89 model assessment of the infection risk in specific cases¹¹. The meta-analysis and evidence based study
90 provide a new opportunity to estimate the human dose-response relation. In the future, the uncertainties
91 could be reduced by using new technology, e.g. personal IoT (internet of things) devices, to record the
92 distance, exposure duration, and environmental factors, which could greatly improve the quality of
93 exposure dose estimation and thus the dose-response relation.

94

95 **References**


- 96 1 Santarpia, J. L. *et al.* Aerosol and Surface Transmission Potential of SARS-CoV-2. *medRxiv*,
97 2020.2003.2023.20039446, doi:10.1101/2020.03.23.20039446 (2020).
- 98 2 Chu, D. K. *et al.* Physical distancing, face masks, and eye protection to prevent person-to-person transmission of
99 SARS-CoV-2 and COVID-19: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *The Lancet*, doi:10.1016/s0140-
100 6736(20)31142-9 (2020).
- 101 3 Watanabe, T., Bartrand, T. A., Weir, M. H., Omura, T. & Haas, C. N. Development of a Dose-Response Model for
102 SARS Coronavirus. *Risk Analysis* **30**, 1129-1138, doi:10.1111/j.1539-6924.2010.01427.x (2010).
- 103 4 Leung, N. H. L. *et al.* Respiratory virus shedding in exhaled breath and efficacy of face masks. *Nature Medicine*,
104 doi:10.1038/s41591-020-0843-2 (2020).
- 105 5 DeDiego, M. L. *et al.* Pathogenicity of severe acute respiratory coronavirus deletion mutants in hACE-2 transgenic
106 mice. *Virology* **376**, 379-389, doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.virol.2008.03.005 (2008).
- 107 6 De Albuquerque, N. *et al.* Murine Hepatitis Virus Strain 1 Produces a Clinically Relevant Model of Severe Acute
108 Respiratory Syndrome in A/J Mice. *Journal of Virology* **80**, 10382, doi:10.1128/jvi.00747-06 (2006).
- 109 7 Adhikari, U. *et al.* A Case Study Evaluating the Risk of Infection from Middle Eastern Respiratory Syndrome
110 Coronavirus (MERS-CoV) in a Hospital Setting Through Bioaerosols. *Risk Analysis* **39**, 2608-2624,
111 doi:10.1111/risa.13389 (2019).
- 112 8 Morawska, L. *et al.* Size distribution and sites of origin of droplets expelled from the human respiratory tract during
113 expiratory activities. *Journal of Aerosol Science* **40**, 256-269, doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jaerosci.2008.11.002
114 (2009).
- 115 9 Guha, S., Hariharan, P. & Myers, M. R. Enhancement of ICRP's Lung Deposition Model for Pathogenic Bioaerosols.
116 *Aerosol Science and Technology* **48**, 1226-1235, doi:10.1080/02786826.2014.975334 (2014).
- 117 10 Sampath, R. *et al.* Rapid identification of emerging pathogens: coronavirus. *Emerg Infect Dis* **11**, 373-379,
118 doi:10.3201/eid1103.040629 (2005).
- 119 11 Zhang, X. *et al.* Infection risk assessment of COVID-19 through aerosol transmission: a case study of South China
120 Seafood Market. *Environmental Science & Technology*, doi: 10.1021/acs.est.0c02895 (2020).

121

122


123

124 **Appendix**




125

126 Figure 1 Log-normal distribution of viral shedding $\log_{10}(E_{virus}) \sim Normal(4, 0.5)$, with 40% positive viral
 127 shedding. (a) The estimated dose-response relations based on the different contributions (0.1, 0.25, 0.5, 0.75
 128 and 1) of the airborne virus-laden particles to the total dose from both exposure to airborne viruses and contact
 129 transmission; (b) viral shedding and exposure dose for 1 hour duration, zero values are not shown in the figure.




130

131 Figure 2 Log-uniform distribution of viral shedding $\log_{10}(E_{virus}) \sim Uniform(3, 5)$, with 40% positive viral
 132 shedding. (a) The estimated dose-response relations based on the different contributions (0.1, 0.25, 0.5, 0.75
 133 and 1) of the airborne virus-laden particles to the total dose from both exposure to airborne viruses and contact
 134 transmission; (b) viral shedding and exposure dose for 1 hour duration, zero values are not shown in the figure.



135

136 Figure 3 Log-normal distribution of viral shedding $\log_{10}(E_{virus}) \sim Normal(4, 0.5)$, with 100% positive viral
 137 shedding. (a) The estimated dose-response relations based on the different contributions (0.1, 0.25, 0.5, 0.75
 138 and 1) of the airborne virus-laden particles to the total dose from both exposure to airborne viruses and contact
 139 transmission; (b) viral shedding and exposure dose for 1 hour duration, zero values are not shown in the figure.



140

141 Figure 4 Log-uniform distribution of viral shedding $\log_{10}(E_{virus}) \sim Uniform(3, 5)$, with 100% positive viral
 142 shedding. (a) The estimated dose-response relations based on the different contributions (0.1, 0.25, 0.5, 0.75
 143 and 1) of the airborne virus-laden particles to the total dose from both exposure to airborne viruses and contact
 144 transmission; (b) viral shedding and exposure dose for 1 hour duration, zero values are not shown in the figure.

145