

1 Exhaled CO<sub>2</sub> as COVID-19 infection risk proxy for different indoor  
2 environments and activities

3

4 Zhe Peng<sup>a</sup> and Jose L. Jimenez<sup>a,\*</sup>.

5 <sup>a</sup> Cooperative Institute for Research in Environmental Sciences and Department of Chemistry,  
6 University of Colorado, Boulder, Colorado 80309, USA.

7 \* Corresponding author: Jose L. Jimenez.

8 **Email:** jose.jimenez@colorado.edu


9

10 **Abstract**

11 CO<sub>2</sub> is co-exhaled with aerosols containing SARS-CoV-2 by COVID-19 infected people and can  
12 be used as a proxy of SARS-CoV-2 concentrations indoors. Indoor CO<sub>2</sub> measurements by low-  
13 cost sensors hold promise for mass monitoring of indoor aerosol transmission risk for COVID-19  
14 and other respiratory diseases. We derive analytical expressions of CO<sub>2</sub>-based risk proxies and  
15 apply them to various typical indoor environments. The relative infection risk in a given  
16 environment scales with excess CO<sub>2</sub> level, and thus keeping CO<sub>2</sub> as low as feasible in a space  
17 allows optimizing the protection provided by ventilation. We show that the CO<sub>2</sub> level  
18 corresponding to a given absolute infection risk varies by over 2 orders of magnitude for different  
19 environments and activities. Although large uncertainties, mainly from virus exhalation rates, are  
20 still associated with infection risk estimates, our study provides more specific and practical  
21 recommendations for low-cost CO<sub>2</sub>-based indoor infection risk monitoring.

22

23 **Table of Contents Graphic**



24

25

## 1 Introduction


2

3 Coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) is currently sweeping the world and causing major losses  
4 of human lives.<sup>1</sup> Lockdowns imposed to various extent worldwide for the COVID-19 transmission  
5 reduction are not supposed to be long-term measures, otherwise they would lead to unaffordable  
6 social and economic costs. On the other hand, resumption of social, educational, and business  
7 activities raises concerns about transmission resurgence.

8 In last few months, there has been rapidly mounting evidence for COVID-19 transmission via  
9 aerosols,<sup>2-5</sup> i.e., severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2)-containing  
10 particles with diameters  $<100 \mu\text{m}$  that can float in the air for minutes to hours. Such aerosols  
11 have been detected in exhaled air of COVID-19 patients<sup>6</sup> and in hospital air<sup>7,8</sup> and the behaviors  
12 of smaller ones among them out of proximity of sources have been shown to be similar to gas.<sup>9,10</sup>  
13 Transmission is much easier indoors than outdoors, which is most consistent with aerosols.<sup>4,11,12</sup>  
14 As humans spend most time in indoor environments, where air volumes are limited and virus-  
15 laden aerosols may easily accumulate, mitigation of indoor COVID-19 transmissions is a subject  
16 of high interest<sup>13,14</sup> and is key to a successful societal and economic reopening. Practical,  
17 affordable, and widely applicable measures to monitor and limit indoor transmission risks are  
18 urgently needed.

19 Direct measurements of virus-containing aerosols are extremely difficult and slow. Indoor  $\text{CO}_2$   
20 has been suggested as an indicator of ventilation of indoor spaces in 19<sup>th</sup> century,<sup>15</sup> and more  
21 recently as a practical proxy of respiratory infectious disease transmission risk,<sup>16</sup> as pathogen-  
22 containing aerosols and  $\text{CO}_2$  are co-exhaled by those infected (Fig. 1). Since background  
23 (ambient)  $\text{CO}_2$  level is almost stable and indoor excess  $\text{CO}_2$  is usually only from human  
24 exhalation, measurements of indoor  $\text{CO}_2$  concentration by low-cost  $\text{CO}_2$  sensors can often be  
25 good indicators of infection risk and suitable for mass deployment.<sup>17,18</sup> However, the  $\text{CO}_2$  level  
26 corresponding to a given COVID-19 infection risk is largely unknown. A few guideline limit  
27 concentrations have been proposed, but without solid and quantitative basis.<sup>19,20</sup> In particular,  
28 only a single  $\text{CO}_2$  threshold was recommended in each of these proposed guidelines. Whether a  
29 single  $\text{CO}_2$  concentration ensures low COVID-19 infection risk in all common indoor environments  
30 remains an open question, but is also critical for effective  $\text{CO}_2$ -based mass risk monitoring.

1



2

3 **Figure 1.** Schematic illustrating the exhalation, inhalation, and other loss processes of SARS-  
 4 CoV-2-containing aerosols and the exhalation, inhalation, and other source and sink of CO<sub>2</sub> in an  
 5 indoor environment.

6 In this study, we derive the analytical expressions of the probability of indoor COVID-19 infection  
 7 through room-level aerosol transmission only (i.e., assuming social distance is kept so that close  
 8 proximity aerosol and droplet pathways are eliminated; fomite transmission is not included),  
 9 human-exhaled CO<sub>2</sub> concentration, and subsequently a few CO<sub>2</sub>-based quantities as infection  
 10 risk proxies. Based on available data, we apply these expressions to common indoor settings to  
 11 answer the abovementioned open question.

12

13

#### 14 Derivation of CO<sub>2</sub>-based infection risk proxies

15

16 To derive the SARS-CoV-2 aerosol concentration in indoor air, we assume well-mixed air (Fig. 1).  
 17 The degree of inhomogeneity can be easily quantified with portable low-cost sensors. If  
 18 significant inhomogeneity in indoor air is present, the indoor space can often be approximated as  
 19 several compartments, each of them having relatively well-mixed air. Ventilation with outdoor air,  
 20 virus decay and deposition onto surfaces, and additional control measures (e.g., air filtration and  
 21 use of germicidal UV) result in losses of infective virus from indoor air. Other sinks (e.g.,  
 22 inhalation by humans and animals indoors) are assumed to be insignificant. This model will  
 23 underestimate the risk in environments with significant non-respiratory sources of infective  
 24 aerosols (e.g., bathrooms due to toilet flushing, resuspension in healthcare facilities due to  
 25 personal-protective-equipment donning/doffing). The amount of the virus infectious doses ( $n$  –  
 26 “quanta”) inhaled by a susceptible person determines their probability of infection ( $P$ ) (see Table  
 27 S1 for the list of symbols in this study). According to the Wells-Riley model of aerosol infection,<sup>21</sup>

28

$$P = 1 - e^{-n} \quad (1)$$

29 One SARS-CoV-2 quantum corresponds to a probability of infection of 1-1/e (63%). The expected  
 30 value of  $n$  ( $\langle n \rangle$ ) for an originally uninfected person corresponding to a given level of immunity in  
 31 local population (probability of an occupant being immune,  $\eta_{im}$ ), can be calculated as follows

32

$$\langle n \rangle = (1 - \eta_{im})c_{avg}BD(1 - m_{in}) \quad (2)$$

1 where  $c_{avg}$ ,  $B$ ,  $D$ , and  $m_{in}$  are the average virus concentration (quanta  $m^{-3}$ ), breathing rate of the  
 2 susceptible person ( $m^3 h^{-1}$ ), duration of the event (h), and mask filtration efficiency for inhalation,  
 3 respectively.  $(1 - \eta_{im})$  is included since quanta inhaled by an immune uninfected individual will  
 4 not lead to infection and should be excluded. Under the assumption of no occupants and no  
 5 SARS-CoV-2 in the indoor air at the start of the event, the analytical expression of the expected  
 6 value of  $c_{avg}$  based on the prevalence of infectors in local population (probability of an occupant  
 7 being infector,  $\eta_I$ ),  $\langle c_{avg} \rangle$ , is (see Section S1 for the derivation)

$$8 \quad \langle c_{avg} \rangle = \frac{\eta_I(N-1)E_p(1-m_{ex})}{V} \cdot \left( \frac{1}{\lambda} - \frac{1-e^{-\lambda D}}{\lambda^2 D} \right) \quad (3)$$

9 where  $N$  is number of occupants,  $E_p$  is the SARS-CoV-2 exhalation rate by an infector (quanta  $h^{-1}$ ),  
 10  $m_{ex}$  mask filtration efficiency for exhalation,  $V$  indoor environment volume ( $m^3$ ), and  $\lambda$  first-order  
 11 overall rate constant of the virus infectivity loss ( $h^{-1}$ ) that includes the ventilation with outdoor air  
 12 and all other virus removal and deactivation processes.

13 If there are no other significant CO<sub>2</sub> sources/sinks (e.g., gas/coal stove and pets/plants), i.e., if  
 14 indoor excess CO<sub>2</sub> (relative to the background outdoor level) production is only due to human  
 15 exhalation and its loss is ventilation, similar quantities for CO<sub>2</sub> can be expressed as follows (see  
 16 Section S1 for the derivation)

$$17 \quad n_{\Delta CO_2} = \Delta c_{avg, CO_2} B D \quad (4)$$

$$18 \quad \Delta c_{avg, CO_2} = \frac{N E_{p, CO_2}}{V} \cdot \left( \frac{1}{\lambda_0} - \frac{1-e^{-\lambda_0 D}}{\lambda_0^2 D} \right) \quad (5)$$

19 where  $n_{\Delta CO_2}$ ,  $\Delta c_{avg, CO_2}$ , and  $E_{p, CO_2}$  are inhaled excess (human-exhaled) CO<sub>2</sub> volume ( $m^3$ ), excess  
 20 CO<sub>2</sub> volume mixing ratio, and CO<sub>2</sub> exhalation rate per person ( $m^3 h^{-1}$ ), respectively, and  $\lambda_0$  is the  
 21 ventilation rate ( $h^{-1}$ ).

22 When  $P$  is low, as it should be for a safe reopening,  $P \approx n$ . As airborne SARS-CoV-2 and excess  
 23 CO<sub>2</sub> are co-exhaled and co-inhaled, in principle  $n_{\Delta CO_2}$  can be a proxy of  $\langle n \rangle$ , and thus  $P$ . The ratio  
 24 of  $n_{\Delta CO_2}$  to  $\langle n \rangle$  (in  $m^3$  quantum<sup>-1</sup>),

$$25 \quad \frac{n_{\Delta CO_2}}{\langle n \rangle} = \frac{N E_{p, CO_2}}{(1-\eta_{im})\eta_I(N-1)E_p(1-m_{ex})(1-m_{in})} \cdot \frac{\frac{1}{\lambda_0} - \frac{1-e^{-\lambda_0 D}}{\lambda_0^2 D}}{\frac{1}{\lambda} - \frac{1-e^{-\lambda D}}{\lambda^2 D}} \quad (6)$$

26 indicates the *volume* of inhaled excess CO<sub>2</sub> corresponding to a unit inhaled quantum. However,  
 27 this quantity, involving inhaled CO<sub>2</sub> volume that is difficult to measure, is not practical for  
 28 widespread transmission risk monitoring, which usually requires a fast decision-making process  
 29 simply based on indoor CO<sub>2</sub> concentration reading (usually in ppm) of a low-cost sensor.  
 30 Therefore, we propose, as another proxy of the risk of an environment with  $\eta_I = 0.1\%$ , reference  
 31 excess CO<sub>2</sub> level ( $\Delta c_{CO_2}^*$ ), i.e., the volume mixing ratio of excess CO<sub>2</sub> that an uninfected individual  
 32 inhales for a typical duration (1 h) in that environment for a typical probability of infection (0.01%).

$$33 \quad \Delta c_{CO_2}^* = \frac{0.0001/1 h \times N E_{p, CO_2}}{(1-\eta_{im})\eta_I(N-1)E_p(1-m_{ex})(1-m_{in})B} \cdot \frac{\frac{1}{\lambda_0} - \frac{1-e^{-\lambda_0 D}}{\lambda_0^2 D}}{\frac{1}{\lambda} - \frac{1-e^{-\lambda D}}{\lambda^2 D}} \quad (7)$$

34 This quantity is closely related to the excess CO<sub>2</sub> level corresponding to the unity basic  
 35 reproduction number ( $R_0$ )<sup>16</sup> (see Section S2), and can be directly and easily compared to CO<sub>2</sub>  
 36 sensor readings. The ratio of the excess CO<sub>2</sub> reading to  $\Delta c_{CO_2}^*$  is that of the probability of infection  
 37 of an originally uninfected person in that environment for 1 h to 0.01%.  $\Delta c_{CO_2}^*$  scales (roughly)  
 38 linearly with most of the parameters in Eq. 7 (see discussions below).  $P = 0.01\%$  being chosen as


1 reference does *not* imply safety at this  $P$  in all situations, since when  $N$  and/or  $D$  are large, and/or  
2 the event is repeated many times (e.g., in school/university settings), the overall probability of  
3 infection for one susceptible person and/or total infections may still be significant.

4

## 5 **Results and Discussion**

6 Reference excess CO<sub>2</sub> level is a function of a number of variables. A priori, varying any of them  
7 can result in a different value of  $\Delta c_{CO_2}^*$  even for similar settings. As an example, we study a set of  
8 model cases for a typical university class. The cases are specified in Table S2. The  $\Delta c_{CO_2}^*$  and  
9  $\frac{n_{\Delta CO_2}}{n}$  in these cases are shown in Figs. 2A and S1A, respectively.

10 In the base class case, the infector is assumed to be the instructor. Compared to the case with a  
11 student being infector,  $\Delta c_{CO_2}^*$  in the base case is ~1.5 orders of magnitude lower, just because the  
12 vocalization of the instructor, who usually speaks, greatly enhances  $E_p$ ,<sup>22,23</sup> while virus exhalation  
13 by students, who are assumed here to speak little, is much less efficient. In the case of a physical  
14 education (PE) class in the same indoor environment, where occupants are assumed to be doing  
15 heavy exercise and no talking,  $\Delta c_{CO_2}^*$  is much lower than for the infected student case in a  
16 traditional lecture (Fig. 2A). Compared to sitting, heavy exercise increases both occupants' virus  
17 and CO<sub>2</sub> exhalation rates to similar extents,<sup>22-24</sup> which does not significantly change reference  
18 excess CO<sub>2</sub> level. However, breathing rates of occupants doing intense activities are much higher  
19 than those sitting.<sup>25</sup> Even if CO<sub>2</sub> and SARS-CoV-2 concentrations are the same as in the infected  
20 student case, a susceptible person in the PE class case can still inhale a larger dose of SARS-  
21 CoV-2 and more excess CO<sub>2</sub>, and have a remarkably different  $P$ . As a result, a single  
22 recommendation of indoor CO<sub>2</sub> threshold is not valid even for a series of school settings. The  
23 range of CO<sub>2</sub> levels measured in real-world classrooms is very large.<sup>26</sup> Reference excess CO<sub>2</sub>  
24 level of the infectious student case (relatively safe) is exceeded in some classrooms, while that of  
25 the infectious instructor case (relatively risky) is met in other classrooms.



3  
4 **Figure 2.** Excess CO<sub>2</sub> volume mixing ratio (ppm) that an uninfected individual inhales for 1 h for a  
5 probability of infection of 0.01% ( $\Delta c_{CO_2}^*$ ) and probability of infection per ppm excess CO<sub>2</sub>  
6 for 1 hr (inversely proportional to  $\Delta c_{CO_2}^*$ ) with a probability of an occupant being an infector of  
7 0.1% (except the New York City and Boulder, CO cases in **A** and the Choir case in **C**) for (**A**)  
8 variants of the university class case (see Table S2 for the case details), (**B**) various activities (see  
9 Table S3 for details of the activities), and (**C**) several indoor environments (see Table S4 for the  
10 case details).  
11

12 According to Eqs. 2 and 3, whether occupants wear masks and what masks they wear can make  
13 a substantial difference in infection risk through virus filtration in the same indoor setting.  
14 However, masks do not filter CO<sub>2</sub>. The base class case (with surgical masks), that with all  
15 occupants wearing N95 respirators, and that with no mask use have identical CO<sub>2</sub> mixing ratios,  
16 but up to ~2 orders of magnitude different probability of infection (Table S2) due to filtration of  
17 virus-containing particles by mask. Therefore, for the same probability of infection of 0.01%, the  
18 base class case is estimated by Eq. 7 to have a corresponding excess CO<sub>2</sub> level x~30 lower than  
19 the case with all occupants wearing N95 respirators, but x~2 higher than the case with no mask  
20 use (Fig. 2A).

21  $\eta_l$  is obviously another important factor governing the infection risk, as  $P$  proportional to it. Again,  
22 it has no impact on CO<sub>2</sub>. Compared to the base class case ( $\eta_l = 0.001$ ), the estimated situations  
23 of similar classes in New York City (NYC) in April ( $\eta_l = 0.023$ ) and in Boulder, CO in June ( $\eta_l =$   
24  $0.0003$ ) have x~20 higher and x~2 lower  $P$ , respectively (Table S2), and hence  $\Delta c_{CO_2}^*$   
25 proportionally lower and higher, respectively (Fig. 2A). Note that  $\Delta c_{CO_2}^*$  is smaller than the current  
26 typical accuracy of low-cost CO<sub>2</sub> sensors ( $\pm 50$  ppm)<sup>27</sup> and cannot be meaningfully measured by  
27 those sensors in very risky situations such as the NYC case here. Closure of environments with  
28 such low permissible  $\Delta c_{CO_2}^*$  is likely needed. However,  $\eta_{im}$  usually cannot result in a difference in

1  $P$  greater than a factor of 2 under conditions of interest, since if  $\eta_{im} > 50\%$ , the population has  
2 reached or is close to herd immunity<sup>28</sup> and widespread transmission risk monitoring is no longer  
3 needed.

4 According to Eq. 7, the other variables that can affect  $\Delta c_{CO_2}^*$  are  $N$ ,  $D$ ,  $\lambda$ , and  $\lambda_0$ .  $\Delta c_{CO_2}^*$  is generally  
5 not highly sensitive to them, although some of them (e.g.,  $\lambda$ ) can have a large impact on  $P$ . As  
6 long as occupants are not only a few,  $\frac{N}{(N-1)}$ , where  $N$  plays a role in Eq. 7, is close to 1. The  
7 fraction term involving  $D$ ,  $\lambda$ , and  $\lambda_0$  (after the product sign) in Eq. 7 usually does not deviate from  
8 1 substantially (Fig. S2). It is close to 1 when  $\lambda D$  is very small, and  $\lambda/\lambda_0$  when  $\lambda D$  is very large. As  
9 long as the indoor environment is not very poorly ventilated nor equipped with very strong virus  
10 removal setups (e.g., substantial filtering of recirculated air, portable HEPA filters, germicidal UV),  
11  $\lambda/\lambda_0$  is relatively close to 1. Compared to the base classroom case ( $\lambda/\lambda_0 \sim 1.3$ ), doubling the  
12 duration or ventilation brings minimal changes to  $\Delta c_{CO_2}^*$ . Increasing  $\lambda/\lambda_0$  to  $\sim 3$  by additional virus  
13 control measures increases  $\Delta c_{CO_2}^*$  more significantly, as those measures do not remove CO<sub>2</sub>. But  
14 this change is still within a factor of 2 for the range of control measures in these examples (Fig.  
15 2A).

16 As discussed above, occupants' activities indoors, to which  $E_p$ ,  $E_{p,CO_2}$ , and  $B$  are all related, are a  
17 major or dominant factor governing the infection risk. We thus compile the data of these  
18 parameters as a function of activity (intensity and vocalization degree) (Table S3). Note that this  
19 compilation has large uncertainties from  $E_p$  data<sup>22,23</sup> and matching of activity categories, which  
20 are all classified differently for  $E_p$ ,  $E_{p,CO_2}$ , and  $B$  (see Section S3 for details). These uncertainties  
21 are currently difficult to quantify, but likely large enough to be the dominant uncertainty sources  
22 for the model output. Other sources of uncertainty are thus not discussed. Further systematic  
23 uncertainty analyses would be of interest. However, the trends shown are clear and thus able to  
24 reveal the *relative* risk of these activities with confidence. Simply, the stronger vocalization, the  
25 higher risk, and the more intense activity, the higher risk. We calculate  $\Delta c_{CO_2}^*$  for these activities  
26 when  $N$  is large,  $D = 1$  h,  $\eta_l = 0.001$ ,  $\lambda_0 = 3$  h<sup>-1</sup>,  $\lambda = 4$  h<sup>-1</sup>, no mask is used (Fig. 2B), a setting  
27 similar to the class case. Three class cases, i.e., base, infected student, and PE cases, can be  
28 easily related to the activity categories of "Standing – loudly speaking", "Resting – breathing", and  
29 "Heavy exercise – breathing", respectively. The related pairs have  $\Delta c_{CO_2}^*$  within  $\times 2$  and their  
30 mask use setting and close but different  $E_p$ ,  $E_{p,CO_2}$ , and  $B$  values can largely explain the  
31 differences in  $\Delta c_{CO_2}^*$ .

32 Then we apply this analysis to a range of real-world settings, in addition to the class case, i.e., the  
33 Skagit County choir superspreading event,<sup>5</sup> a subway car, a supermarket (focused on a worker),  
34 and an event in a stadium, which, though outdoors, often has somewhat stagnant air allowing  
35 virus-laden aerosols to build up and thus can be treated similarly as an indoor environment (see  
36 Table S4 for the specifications of these cases). Figures 2C and S1B shows their  $\Delta c_{CO_2}^*$  and  $\frac{n\Delta CO_2}{n}$ ,  
37 respectively. Again, these values span orders of magnitude. We can still relate these cases to the  
38 activity categories of "Standing – loudly speaking", "Resting – breathing", "Light exercise –  
39 breathing" (or "Light exercise – speaking"), and "Light exercise – speaking" (or "Light exercise –  
40 loudly speaking"), respectively.

41 For the actual choir case, its  $\eta_l$  is an order of magnitude lower than 0.1% while the estimated  $E_p$  is  
42 an order of magnitude higher (20), resulting in a similar reference excess CO<sub>2</sub> level to that of  
43 "Standing – loudly speaking" shown in Fig. 2B.  $\Delta c_{CO_2}^*$  in the stadium case is between those of  
44 "Light exercise – speaking" and "Light exercise – loudly speaking", as both activities may happen  
45 in the event. The difference of  $\Delta c_{CO_2}^*$  between the supermarket case and its related activities  
46 shown in Fig. 2B is mainly due to the long duration of the event (8 h).  $\Delta c_{CO_2}^*$  of the supermarket  
47 case *divided* by the duration leads to the excess CO<sub>2</sub> threshold for the worker to inhale over 8 h  
48 between those of "Light exercise – breathing" and "Light exercise – speaking".  $\Delta c_{CO_2}^*$  of the

1 subway case is ~1/3 lower than that of “Resting – breathing” in Fig. 2B because of the short  
2 duration (0.33 h) and mask use (universal use of surgical masks or equivalent).

3 As shown above, the infection risk analysis for various settings can be based on the relevant  
4 activities with adjustments for  $\eta$ ,  $D$ , mask use etc. For policy-making concerning acceptable indoor  
5 CO<sub>2</sub> level, we also recommend an activity-dependent approach. Reference excess CO<sub>2</sub> levels for  
6 indoor environments with certain types of activities mainly involved can be found in Fig. 2B. Then  
7 this mixing ratio can be scaled for typical  $D$  (by multiplying it) and target  $P$  (by multiplying its ratio  
8 to 0.01%) to obtain an excess CO<sub>2</sub> threshold, which may be relaxed a little further depending on  
9 the local mask policy. The sum of this value and the local outdoor CO<sub>2</sub> concentration, the latter of  
10 which we recommend measuring regularly due to possible variations,<sup>29</sup> is the final recommended  
11 indoor CO<sub>2</sub> concentration threshold. For more complex setups (e.g., with many CO<sub>2</sub> meters in a  
12 company or school), a meter should be located outdoors to measure CO<sub>2</sub> concentration  
13 continuously. To our knowledge, CO<sub>2</sub> is the only quantity that can be easily measured by fast low-  
14 cost sensors as an infection risk proxy. The relative risk of infection in a given situation has been  
15 shown to scale with the excess CO<sub>2</sub> concentration. The absolute risk can be estimated when the  
16 parameters needed are known. Calculations for various scenarios can be easily performed with the  
17 online COVID-19 aerosol transmission estimator.<sup>30</sup> Then this method can provide a stronger  
18 scientific basis for using CO<sub>2</sub>, than having one threshold for all situations. However, it may still not  
19 be trivial for the general public to estimate the parameters used in our model and implement it.  
20 Regulatory authorities may derive the CO<sub>2</sub> thresholds for different types of indoor spaces, or  
21 provide more assistance for businesses to do so. Even if the parameters are unknown, our study  
22 suggests that simply keeping the CO<sub>2</sub> level and the physical intensity and vocalization level of the  
23 activities as low as practically feasible in indoor environments will still reduce the risk.  
24  
25  
26  
27

## 28 Acknowledgments

29  
30 We thank Demetrios Pagonis and Bertrand Waucquez for useful discussions.  
31

## 32 References

- 33  
34  
35 (1) Organization, W. H. *Coronavirus Disease (COVID-2019) Situation Reports*; 2021.
- 36 (2) Prather, K. A.; Marr, L. C.; Schooley, R. T.; McDiarmid, M. A.; Wilson, M. E.; Milton, D. K.  
37 Airborne Transmission of SARS-CoV-2. *Science*. **2020**, *370* (6514), 303–304.
- 38 (3) Tang, J. W.; Bahnfleth, W. P.; Bluysen, P. M.; Buonanno, G.; Jimenez, J. L.; Kurnitski, J.;  
39 Li, Y.; Miller, S.; Sekhar, C.; Morawska, L.; et al. Dismantling Myths on the Airborne  
40 Transmission of Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus-2 (SARS-CoV-2). *J.*  
41 *Hosp. Infect.* **2021**, *110*, 89–96.
- 42 (4) Morawska, L.; Milton, D. K. It Is Time to Address Airborne Transmission of Coronavirus  
43 Disease 2019 (COVID-19). *Clin. Infect. Dis.* **2020**, in press.
- 44 (5) Miller, S. L.; Nazaroff, W. W.; Jimenez, J. L.; Boerstra, A.; Buonanno, G.; Dancer, S. J.;  
45 Kurnitski, J.; Marr, L. C.; Morawska, L.; Noakes, C. Transmission of SARS- CoV- 2 by  
46 Inhalation of Respiratory Aerosol in the Skagit Valley Chorale Superspreading Event.  
47 *Indoor Air* **2021**, *31* (2), 314–323.
- 48 (6) Ma, J.; Qi, X.; Chen, H.; Li, X.; Zhang, Z.; Wang, H.; Sun, L.; Zhang, L.; Guo, J.;  
49 Morawska, L.; et al. Coronavirus Disease 2019 Patients in Earlier Stages Exhaled Millions



- 1 of Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 Per Hour. *Clin. Infect. Dis.* **2020**, in  
2 press.
- 3 (7) Liu, Y.; Ning, Z.; Chen, Y.; Guo, M.; Liu, Y.; Gali, N. K.; Sun, L.; Duan, Y.; Cai, J.;  
4 Westerdahl, D.; et al. Aerodynamic Analysis of SARS-CoV-2 in Two Wuhan Hospitals.  
5 *Nature* **2020**, *582* (7813), 557–560.
- 6 (8) Lednicky, J. A.; Lauzardo, M.; Fan, Z. H.; Jutla, A.; Tilly, T. B.; Gangwar, M.; Usmani, M.;  
7 Shankar, S. N.; Mohamed, K.; Eiguren-Fernandez, A.; et al. Viable SARS-CoV-2 in the Air  
8 of a Hospital Room with COVID-19 Patients. *Int. J. Infect. Dis.* **2020**, *100*, 476–482.
- 9 (9) Bond, T. C.; Bosco-Lauth, A.; Farmer, D. K.; Francisco, P. W.; Pierce, J. R.; Fedak, K. M.;  
10 Ham, J. M.; Jathar, S. H.; VandeWoude, S. Quantifying Proximity, Confinement, and  
11 Interventions in Disease Outbreaks: A Decision Support Framework for Air-Transported  
12 Pathogens. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* **2021**, in press.
- 13 (10) Ai, Z.; Mak, C. M.; Gao, N.; Niu, J. Tracer Gas Is a Suitable Surrogate of Exhaled Droplet  
14 Nuclei for Studying Airborne Transmission in the Built Environment. *Build. Simul.* **2020**, *13*  
15 (3), 489–496.
- 16 (11) Chen, W.; Zhang, N.; Wei, J.; Yen, H.-L.; Li, Y. Short-Range Airborne Route Dominates  
17 Exposure of Respiratory Infection during Close Contact. *Build. Environ.* **2020**, *176*  
18 (January), 106859.
- 19 (12) Tellier, R.; Li, Y.; Cowling, B. J.; Tang, J. W. Recognition of Aerosol Transmission of  
20 Infectious Agents: A Commentary. *BMC Infect. Dis.* **2019**, *19* (1), 101.
- 21 (13) Qian, H.; Miao, T.; Liu, L.; Zheng, X.; Luo, D.; Li, Y. Indoor Transmission of SARS- CoV-  
22 2. *Indoor Air* **2020**, in press.
- 23 (14) Morawska, L.; Tang, J. W.; Bahnfleth, W.; Bluysen, P. M.; Boerstra, A.; Buonanno, G.;  
24 Cao, J.; Dancer, S.; Floto, A.; Franchimon, F.; et al. How Can Airborne Transmission of  
25 COVID-19 Indoors Be Minimised? *Environ. Int.* **2020**, *142*, 105832.
- 26 (15) de Chaumont, F. On the Theory of Ventilation: An Attempt to Establish a Positive Basis for  
27 the Calculation of the Amount of Fresh Air Required for an Inhabited Air-Space. *Proc. R.*  
28 *Soc. London* **1875**, *23*, 187–201.
- 29 (16) Rudnick, S. N.; Milton, D. K. Risk of Indoor Airborne Infection Transmission Estimated  
30 from Carbon Dioxide Concentration. *Indoor Air* **2003**, *13* (3), 237–245.
- 31 (17) Martin, C. R.; Zeng, N.; Karion, A.; Dickerson, R. R.; Ren, X.; Turpie, B. N.; Weber, K. J.  
32 Evaluation and Environmental Correction of Ambient  
33 CO<sub>2</sub> Measurements from a Low-Cost NDIR  
34 Sensor. *Atmos. Meas. Tech.* **2017**, *10* (7), 2383–2395.
- 35 (18) Mendell, M. J.; Eliseeva, E. A.; Davies, M. M.; Spears, M.; Lobscheid, A.; Fisk, W. J.;  
36 Apte, M. G. Association of Classroom Ventilation with Reduced Illness Absence: A  
37 Prospective Study in California Elementary Schools. *Indoor Air* **2013**, *23* (6), 515–528.
- 38 (19) Jones, E.; Young, A.; Clevenger, K.; Salimifard, P.; Wu, E.; Luna, M. L.; Lahvis, M.; Lang,  
39 J.; Bliss, M.; Azimi, P.; et al. *Healthy Schools: Risk Reduction Strategies for Reopening*  
40 *Schools*; 2020.
- 41 (20) Cheng, S.-Y.; Wang, C. J.; Shen, A. C.-T.; Chang, S.-C. How to Safely Reopen Colleges  
42 and Universities During COVID-19: Experiences From Taiwan. *Ann. Intern. Med.* **2020**,

- 1 M20-2927.
- 2 (21) Riley, E. C.; Murphy, G.; Riley, R. L. Airborne Spread of Measles in a Suburban  
3 Elementary School. *Am. J. Epidemiol.* **1978**, *107* (5), 421–432.
- 4 (22) Buonanno, G.; Stabile, L.; Morawska, L. Estimation of Airborne Viral Emission: Quanta  
5 Emission Rate of SARS-CoV-2 for Infection Risk Assessment. *Environ. Int.* **2020**, *141*  
6 (April), 105794.
- 7 (23) Buonanno, G.; Morawska, L.; Stabile, L. Quantitative Assessment of the Risk of Airborne  
8 Transmission of SARS-CoV-2 Infection: Prospective and Retrospective Applications.  
9 *Environ. Int.* **2020**, *145*, 106112.
- 10 (24) Persily, A.; de Jonge, L. Carbon Dioxide Generation Rates for Building Occupants. *Indoor*  
11 *Air* **2017**, *27* (5), 868–879.
- 12 (25) Chapter 6—Inhalation Rates. In *Exposure Factors Handbook*; US Environmental  
13 Protection Agency, 2011.
- 14 (26) Fromme, H.; Heitmann, D.; Dietrich, S.; Schierl, R.; Körner, W.; Kiranoglu, M.; Zapf, A.;  
15 Twardella, D. Raumluftqualität in Schulen - Belastung von Klassenräumen Mit  
16 Kohlendioxid (CO<sub>2</sub>), Flüchtigen Organischen Verbindungen (VOC), Aldehyden,  
17 Endotoxinen Und Katzenallergenen. *Das Gesundheitswes.* **2008**, *70* (2), 88–97.
- 18 (27) Aranet. Wireless Indoor Air Monitoring, CO<sub>2</sub>, Temperature, Humidity Sensor  
19 <https://aranet.com/product/aranet4-sensor/> (accessed Feb 26, 2021).
- 20 (28) Britton, T.; Ball, F.; Trapman, P. A Mathematical Model Reveals the Influence of  
21 Population Heterogeneity on Herd Immunity to SARS-CoV-2. *Science*. **2020**, *369* (6505),  
22 846–849.
- 23 (29) Dias Carrilho, J.; Mateus, M.; Batterman, S.; Gameiro da Silva, M. Air Exchange Rates  
24 from Atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> Daily Cycle. *Energy Build.* **2015**, *92*, 188–194.
- 25 (30) Jimenez, J. L. COVID-19 Aerosol Transmission Estimator [https://tinyurl.com/covid-](https://tinyurl.com/covid-estimator)  
26 [estimator](https://tinyurl.com/covid-estimator).
- 27