

1 **Dilution-based Evaluation of Airborne Infection Risk -**
2 **Thorough Expansion of Wells-Riley Model**

3 **Running Head: Thorough Expansion of Wells-Riley Model**

4 Sheng Zhang*, Zhang Lin*
5 (Division of Building Science and Technology, City University of Hong Kong, Hong
6 Kong, China

7 *Corresponding author. E-mail: shezhang@cityu.edu.hk (Sheng Zhang);
8 bsjzl@cityu.edu.hk (Zhang Lin))

9 **Abstract**

10 Evaluation of airborne infection risk with spatial and temporal resolutions is
11 indispensable for the design of proper interventions fighting infectious respiratory
12 diseases (*e.g.*, COVID-19), because the distribution of aerosol contagions is both
13 spatially and temporally non-uniform. However, the well-recognized Wells-Riley
14 model and modified Wells-Riley model (*i.e.*, the rebreathed-fraction model) are limited
15 to the well-mixed condition and unable to evaluate airborne infection risk spatially and
16 temporally, which could result in overestimation or underestimation of airborne
17 infection risk. This study proposes a dilution-based evaluation method for airborne
18 infection risk. The method proposed is benchmarked by the Wells-Riley model and
19 modified Wells-Riley model, which indicates that the method proposed is a thorough
20 expansion of the Wells-Riley model for evaluation of airborne infection risk with both
21 spatial and temporal resolutions. Experiments in a mock hospital ward also demonstrate
22 that the method proposed effectively evaluates the airborne infection risk both spatially
23 and temporally.

24 **Keywords:** Infectious respiratory disease; Airborne infection risk; Dilution; Spatial
25 and temporal; Wells-Riley model

26

1 **1. Introduction**

2 Infectious respiratory diseases (*e.g.*, tuberculosis, influenza, and aspergillosis) are
3 severe threats to people's health and economic development [1]. Particularly, the global
4 pandemic of COVID-19 results in substantial loss of human lives and jeopardizes
5 human development (social, economic, *etc.*). Airborne infection due to the inhalation
6 of pathogen-laden aerosols is one major transmission pathway of infectious respiratory
7 diseases [2]. Infectors' coughing, sneezing, talking, and breathing generate tens of
8 thousands of infectious droplets, and most of the generated infectious droplets
9 evaporate into the air as infectious droplet nuclei [3, 4]. A COVID-19 infector can yield
10 infectious droplets with 100,000 virions every minute of speaking [4, 5]. The airborne
11 transmission of the infectious droplet nuclei can occur over a long distance, causing
12 cross infections. For example, Yu et al. [6] found that SARS airborne infections
13 occurred between different rooms and between adjacent buildings. Liu et al. [7]
14 measured the concentration of airborne COVID-19 RNA in isolation wards and
15 ventilated patient rooms, and suggested that COVID-19 could be transmitted via
16 aerosols. More and more evidence reveals the airborne infection risk of COVID-19 [8,
17 9].

18 Evaluation of airborne infection risk should take into account the spatially and
19 temporally non-uniform distribution of pathogen-laden aerosols [1]. The spread of
20 pathogen-laden aerosols is significantly affected by the complicated and transient
21 interactions among the respiratory flows and thermal plumes of occupants, and
22 ventilation flow, which results in the spatially and temporally non-uniform distribution
23 of pathogen-laden aerosols [10]. Since occupants generally spend more than 90% time
24 conducting indoor activities, indoor ventilation is one of the most effective engineering
25 solutions for reducing airborne transmission by diluting the pathogen-laden aerosols
26 with pathogen-free air [11, 12]. Airflow patterns of advanced ventilation with non-
27 uniform aerosol distribution can more effectively reduce airborne transmission risk. For
28 example, displacement ventilation and stratum ventilation target diluting the airborne
29 contaminants in the breathing zone rather than the entire room, thus improve the
30 contaminant removal efficiency of the breathing zone by up to 50% [13].

1 However, it is challenging to evaluate the airborne infection risk with spatial and
2 temporal resolutions in practice. The dose-response model and Wells-Riley model are
3 two methods for quantitative evaluation of the airborne infection risk [14]. Since the
4 dose-response model requires the information which is costly to obtain during
5 experimental and on-site studies, *e.g.*, the particle sizes and infectivity (involving
6 medical and microbiological sciences), the dose-response model is less frequently used
7 than the Wells-Riley model [1, 10, 15]. The Wells-Riley model is a simple and quick
8 evaluation method of the airborne infection risk, because it uses the concept of quantum
9 to implicitly consider the infectivity, infectious source strength, biological decay of
10 pathogens, *etc.* [14]. As a result, the Wells-Riley model has been widely used in the
11 studies of infectious respiratory diseases [1, 10, 15]. However, the Wells-Riley model
12 is based on the well-mixed and steady assumption that the distribution of pathogen-
13 laden aerosols is spatially and temporally uniform. With this assumption, the airborne
14 infection risk could be underestimated by the Wells-Riley model, and the interventions
15 for reducing airborne infection risk suggested by the Wells-Riley model could be
16 improper [1, 10, 16]. For example, the Wells-Riley model suggests a larger ventilation
17 rate. However, increasing the ventilate rate might deteriorate indoor air quality due to
18 the potential negative effects of the increased ventilation rate on the contaminant
19 removal efficiency of non-uniform airflow pattern [17].

20 Rudnick and Milton [18] proposed the concept of rebreathed fraction, and used it to
21 modify the Wells-Riley model for the transient condition. The rebreathed fraction is
22 calculated from the difference between indoor and outdoor CO₂ concentrations [18].
23 The rebreathed-fraction model has been well recognized for the airborne infection risk
24 with a temporal resolution [10, 19, 20]. However, the rebreathed-fraction model is also
25 based on the well-mixed assumption, and thus cannot evaluate the airborne infection
26 risk spatially [18]. Numerical simulations (*e.g.*, computational fluid dynamics) have
27 been used to provide the spatial quantum concentration of airborne pathogens for the
28 Wells-Riley model to evaluate the airborne infection risk spatially [21, 22]. However,
29 this method is inapplicable to physical experiments because it is impossible to measure
30 the quantum concentration of airborne pathogens for experimental and on-site studies
31 [1, 10, 18]. Although numerical simulations are powerful in epidemical studies,

1 physical experiments are indispensable for reliable results [10]. Thus, there is an urgent
2 need for an evaluation method of airborne infection risk with spatial and temporal
3 resolutions for practical applications.

4 This study will provide a dilution-based evaluation method of the airborne infection
5 risk for both spatial and temporal resolutions. The proposed model is illustrated in
6 Section 2, and benchmarked by the Wells-Riley model under the well-mixed and steady
7 condition in Section 3, and by the rebreathed-fraction model under the well-mixed and
8 transient condition in Section 4. Experiments of a mock hospital ward served by
9 displacement ventilation are conducted in Section 5 to demonstrate the applicability of
10 the method proposed to evaluate airborne infection risk spatially and temporally.

11 **2. Dilution-based airborne infection risk estimation proposed**

12 The concept of dilution is diluting the airborne contaminants with clean air so that the
13 concentration of airborne contaminants is reduced. Dilution is the mechanism of
14 ventilation in reducing airborne infection risk [1]. According to the concept of dilution,
15 the dilution ratio is defined as the ratio between the source concentration to the
16 contaminant concentration at the target position (Equation 1). The dilution ratio can
17 vary among different positions relative to the contaminant source transiently. With the
18 dilution ratio, the quantum concentration of airborne pathogens at the target position is
19 calculated with Equation 2, which is the quantum concentration exhaled by the infector
20 diluted at the target position. The quantum is an infectious dose unit [23], and one
21 quantum is the quantity of pathogens required to cause an infection risk of 63.2% (*i.e.*,
22 $1-e^{-1}$) [19]. For example, the quantum generate rate of a Tuberculosis infector as
23 suggested by Andrews et al. [24] is 1.25 quanta/h, and that of an asymptomatic infector
24 COVID-19 is 142 quanta/h [25]. It is noted that the factor of infectious virus removal
25 in Equation 2 (φ) is used to account for the effects of interventions in reducing the
26 airborne infection risk except ventilation [14], *e.g.*, facial masks [26, 27] and air
27 purifiers [28] recommended for controlling COVID-19.

$$28 \quad D = \frac{C_{\text{source}}}{C_{\text{target}}} \quad (1)$$

1
$$C_{\text{quantum}} = \frac{\varphi q}{p_{\text{infector}} D} \quad (2)$$

2 where C_{source} and C_{target} are the airborne contaminant concentrations at the source and
3 target position respectively (ppm); C_{quantum} is the airborne quantum concentration at the
4 target position (quanta/m³); D is the dilution ratio at the target position; p_{infector} is the
5 breathing rate of the infector (m³/s); q is the quantum generation rate (quanta/s); φ is
6 the factor of infectious virus removal.

7 With the quantum concentration at the target position, the quanta inhaled by a
8 susceptible at the target position over a given exposure period is calculated by Equation
9 3. With the inhaled quanta, the airborne infection risk of a susceptible at the target
10 position over that exposure period is estimated based on Poisson distribution (Equation
11 4). The pathogens are discrete matters and distribute in a medium randomly following
12 Poisson distribution [14, 18, 20, 29]. The airborne infection risk is the probability of
13 that susceptible to be infected because of the inhaled airborne pathogens. The dilution-
14 based airborne infection risk proposed is obtained as Equation 5 by combining
15 Equations 2-4.

16
$$N_{\text{quantum}} = \int_0^T p_{\text{susceptible}} C_{\text{quantum}}(t) dt \quad (3)$$

17
$$P_D = 1 - e^{-N_{\text{quantum}}} \quad (4)$$

18
$$P_D = 1 - e^{-\int_0^T \frac{\varphi p_{\text{susceptible}} q}{p_{\text{infector}} D(t)} dt} \quad (5)$$

19 Where $C_{\text{quantum}}(t)$ and $D(t)$ are the quantum concentration (quanta/m³) and dilution ratio
20 at the target position at time t during a given exposure period of T respectively; N_{quantum}
21 is the inhaled quanta by a susceptible at the target position during the given exposure
22 period; P_D is the airborne infection risk at the target position during the given exposure
23 period estimated by the dilution-based estimation method proposed; $p_{\text{susceptible}}$ is the
24 breathing rate of the susceptible (m³/s), which can be different from that of the infector
25 because the infector and susceptible have different health conditions and might have
26 different activity levels [25].

27

28 Since the method proposed employs the concept of the quantum, it has the merit as the
29 Wells-Riley model of implicitly considering the biological complexities of the

1 infectivity, infectious source strength, biological decay of pathogens, *etc.*, which makes
2 the evaluation of the airborne infection risk by the method proposed simple and quick
3 [14]. Moreover, compared with the Wells-Riley model, the method proposed has two
4 advantages. First, the method proposed can estimate the airborne infection risk for any
5 target position during any exposure period (Equation 5), *i.e.*, the method proposed
6 evaluates the airborne infection risk for both spatial and temporal resolutions. Second,
7 the method proposed is more convenient for practical applications. The Wells-Riley
8 model (Equation 6) requires knowing the numbers of infectors, but the method
9 proposed does not. The information on the numbers of infectors is not always available,
10 particularly when asymptomatic infectors present. It was reported that the
11 asymptomatic infectors were responsible for 79% COVID-19 infections in Wuhan [4,
12 30]. Besides, the Wells-Riley model (Equation 6) requires the input of the ventilation
13 rate which is inconvenient to measure in practice [18]. For example, Wu et al. [31]
14 measured on-site tracer gas concentration in a residential building, and approximated
15 the ventilation rate from the measured tracer gas concentration for the Wells-Riley
16 model to evaluate the airborne infection risk. The approximation of the ventilation rate
17 from the tracer gas concentration increases the evaluation complexity and decreases the
18 evaluation reliability. In contrast, the dilution ratio can be conveniently and reliably
19 obtained from the tracer gas concentration (Equation 1) for the method proposed to
20 evaluate the airborne infection risk, which will be further demonstrated in Section 5.

$$21 \quad P_{WR} = 1 - e^{-\frac{I p q t}{Q}} \quad (6)$$

22 Where I is the number of infectors; P_{WR} is the airborne infection risk estimated by the
23 Wells-Riley model; p is the breathing rate of a typical person (m^3/s); Q is the ventilation
24 rate (m^3/s); t is the time length of the exposure period (s).

25 **3. Benchmark with Wells-Riley model under well-mixed and steady condition**

26 As introduced in Section 1, the Wells-Riley model has been well recognized to provide
27 a reliable evaluation of the airborne infection risk under the well-mixed and steady
28 condition. Since the method proposed evaluates the airborne infection risk for both
29 spatial and temporal resolutions, the well-mixed and steady condition is one of the
30 special cases. When the method proposed applies to the well-mixed and steady

1 condition, it should produce identical or similar results to those from the Wells-Riley
2 model. This is proofed as follows. According to the mass conservation law, the variation
3 of contaminants in the space is the generated contaminants in the space minus the
4 contaminants removed from the space by ventilation, which is described by Equation 7
5 when contaminants are well mixed in the space air [20, 31]. When the contaminants
6 refer to the exhaled air by the infectors (Equation 8) and the contaminants in the
7 ventilation air supply is zero (clean air), the contaminant concentration in the exhaled
8 air is unity and the dilution ratio is the reciprocal of the contaminant concentration in
9 the space air (Equation 9). For the steady condition, the variation of the contaminant
10 concentration in the space air is zero (Equation 10). From Equations 8-10, the dilution
11 ratio under the well-mixed and steady condition is obtained as the function of the
12 ventilation rate, numbers of infectors, and breathing rate of infectors (Equation 11),
13 implying that the dilution ratio implicitly takes into account the ventilation rate,
14 numbers of infectors, and breathing rate of infectors, which makes the implementation
15 of the method proposed convenient in practice as discussed in Section 2. Combing
16 Equations 5 and 11, the method proposed for the well-mixed and steady condition is
17 obtained as Equation 12. In Equation 12, the breathing rate by the susceptible can be
18 the same as that of a typical person and the factor of infectious virus removal can be
19 unity as assumed by the Wells-Riley model. As a result, the proposed model for the
20 well-mixed and steady condition (Equation 12) produces the same airborne infection
21 risk as the Wells-Riley model (Equation 6). This indicates that the method proposed is
22 an expansion of the Wells-Riley model for the evaluation of airborne infection risk with
23 both spatial and temporal resolutions.

$$24 \quad V \frac{dC_{in}}{dt} = G - Q(C_{in} - C_o) \quad (7)$$

$$25 \quad G = Ip_{infectior} \quad (8)$$

$$26 \quad D(t) = \frac{1}{C_{in}(t)} \quad (9)$$

$$27 \quad 0 = G - QC_{in} \quad (10)$$

$$28 \quad D_{ms} = \frac{Q}{Ip_{infectior}} \quad (11)$$

$$29 \quad P_{D,ms} = 1 - e^{-\frac{\phi I p_{susceptible} q t}{Q}} \quad (12)$$

1 Where C_{in} and C_o are the contaminant concentrations in the space air and ventilation air
2 supply respectively (ppm); D_{ms} is the dilution ratio under the well-mixed and steady
3 condition; G is the contaminant generation rate in the space (m^3/s); $P_{D,ms}$ is the airborne
4 infection risk estimated by the dilution-based estimation method proposed under the
5 well-mixed and steady condition; V is the volume of the space (m^3).

6 **4. Benchmark with rebreathed-fraction model under well-mixed and dynamic** 7 **condition**

8 The rebreathed-fraction model (Equations 13 and 14) is a modified Wells-Riley model
9 for a reliable evaluation of the airborne infection risk under the well-mixed and transient
10 condition [10, 18-20]. Since the method proposed can evaluate the airborne infection
11 risk for both spatial and temporal resolutions, the well-mixed and transient condition is
12 one of the special cases. When the method proposed applies to the well-mixed and
13 transient condition, it should produce identical or similar results to those from the
14 rebreathed-fraction model. This is proofed as follows. By integrating Equation 7, the
15 transient contaminant concentration in the space air is obtained as Equation 15 [18, 20].
16 When the contaminants refer to the exhaled air by infectors, the dilution ratio under the
17 well-mixed and transient condition is obtained as Equation 16 from Equations 8, 9 and
18 15 with the contaminant concentrations in the exhaled air and the ventilation air supply
19 of unity and zero respectively. When the contaminant is CO_2 , the contaminant
20 generation rate in the space is the CO_2 generated by all occupants (Equation 17), and
21 Equation 15 is transferred to be Equation 18. According to the definition of the
22 rebreathed fraction (Equation 14) [18] and Equation 18, the rebreathed fraction is
23 expressed as Equation 19. From Equations 16 and 19, the relationship between the
24 dilution ratio and rebreathed fraction under the well-mixed and transient condition is
25 obtained as Equation 20. With Equation 20 to replace the dilution ratio in Equation 5,
26 the method proposed under the well-mixed and transient condition is expressed as
27 Equation 21. In Equation 21, the breathing rate by the susceptible can be the same as
28 that of a typical person and the factor of infectious virus removal can be unity as
29 assumed by the rebreathed-fraction model. As a result, the proposed model for the well-
30 mixed and transient condition (Equation 21) produces the same airborne infection risk
31 as the rebreathed-fraction model (Equation 13). This indicates that while the

1 rebreathed-fraction model is a limited expansion of the Wells-Riley model with a
2 temporal resolution of airborne infection risk, the method proposed is a thorough
3 expansion of the Wells-Riley model with both spatial and temporal resolutions of
4 airborne infection risk.

$$5 \quad P_{\text{RF}} = 1 - e^{-\int_0^T Iqf(t) \frac{dt}{n}} \quad (13)$$

$$6 \quad f = \frac{C_{\text{in,CO}_2} - C_{\text{o,CO}_2}}{C_{\text{b,CO}_2}} \quad (14)$$

$$7 \quad C_{\text{in}}(t) = C_{\text{o}} + \frac{G}{Q} (1 - e^{-\frac{Qt}{V}}) \quad (15)$$

$$8 \quad \frac{1}{D_{\text{mt}}(t)} = \frac{Ip_{\text{infectior}}}{Q} (1 - e^{-\frac{Qt}{V}}) \quad (16)$$

$$9 \quad G_{\text{CO}_2} = npC_{\text{b,CO}_2} \quad (17)$$

$$10 \quad C_{\text{in,CO}_2}(t) = C_{\text{o,CO}_2} + \frac{npC_{\text{b,CO}_2}}{Q} (1 - e^{-\frac{Qt}{V}}) \quad (18)$$

$$11 \quad f(t) = \frac{np}{Q} (1 - e^{-\frac{Qt}{V}}) \quad (19)$$

$$12 \quad D_{\text{mt}}(t) = \frac{np}{If(t)p_{\text{infectior}}} \quad (20)$$

$$13 \quad P_{\text{D,mt}} = 1 - e^{-\int_0^T \frac{p_{\text{susceptible}} q f(t)}{np} dt} \quad (21)$$


14 Where $C_{\text{b,CO}_2}$, $C_{\text{in,CO}_2}$ and $C_{\text{o,CO}_2}$ are the CO₂ concentrations in the exhaled air, space
15 air and ventilation air supply respectively (ppm); D_{mt} is the dilution ratio under the well-
16 mixed and transient condition; f is the rebreathed fraction; n is the number of occupants
17 in the space; P_{RF} are $P_{\text{D,ms}}$ are the airborne infection risks under the well-mixed and
18 transient condition estimated by the rebreathed-fraction model and the dilution-based
19 estimation method proposed respectively.

20 **5. Demonstration of applicability of method proposed for both spatial and** 21 **temporal resolutions**

22 Experiments are conducted to demonstrate the effectiveness of the method proposed for
23 the evaluation of airborne infection risk for both spatial and temporal resolutions. The
24 environmental chamber, with dimensions of 8.8 m (length) × 6.1 m (width) × 2.4 m
25 (height), is configured as a mock hospital ward with multiple beds (Figure 1). The ward


1 is served with displacement ventilation that the conditioned air is supplied near the floor
2 level (S1-S14) (with the supply air temperature around 20°C and supply airflow rate
3 around 12 ACH) and exhausted from the ceiling (E1- E3). Displacement ventilation has
4 an airflow pattern with high contaminant removal efficiency at the breathing level [13].
5 SF₆ (released from the mouth of the infector in Figure 1) is used as the tracer gas to
6 represent the airborne contaminants [31-33]. Three target positions (L1-L3) with the
7 standing susceptible occupants are concerned, and the tracer gas concentrations at the
8 three target positions are measured at the breathing level (*i.e.*, at the height of 1.5 m
9 above the floor). INNOVA 1412i is used to measure the concentration of SF₆ with a
10 measurement accuracy of 0.06 ppm.

11 Figure 2 shows that the tracer gas distribution is both spatially and temporally non-
12 uniform. The concentration of the tracer gas generally increases first and then tends to
13 be steady, but fluctuates slightly due to the randomness induced by air turbulence (Sze
14 and Chao 2010). The tracer gas concentration at the target position of L1 is higher than
15 those at the other two target positions because it is the closest to the infector. From the
16 tracer gas distribution, the dilution ratio is calculated (Equation 1). The dose rate of the
17 tracer gas is 2 ml/s and the breathing rate of the resting infector is 0.49 m³/h [25],
18 resulting in a contaminant concentration of the source around 14,700 ppm for the
19 calculation of the dilution ratio (Equation 1). Figure 3 shows that the dilution ratio also
20 has spatial and temporal resolutions, varying from around 2000 to 14,000. The dilution
21 ratios at the three target positions decrease first and then tend to be steady, and the
22 dilution ratio of the target position (L1) closest to the infector is the smallest.




1
2 Note: S1-S14 are the air supply terminals; E1- E3 are the exits; L1-L3 are sampling
3 points at the height of 1.5 m above the floor.

4 **Fig.1.** Experimental setup of mock hospital ward with multiple beds served with
5 displacement ventilation.




6
7 **Fig.2.** Variations of tracer gas concentrations at different target positions with time.



1
2 **Fig.3.** Variations of dilution ratio at different target positions with time.

3 With the dilution ratio, the airborne infection risks at the three target positions are
4 calculated (Equation 5) (Figures 4 and 5). The quantum generation rate of a COVID-
5 19 infector is assigned to be 142 quanta/h and the breathing rate of a standing
6 susceptible is 0.54 m³/h [25]. Two scenarios are considered, one with no masks and the
7 other with surgical masks for both the infector and susceptible. Under Scenario 1 with
8 no masks (*i.e.*, with the factor of infectious virus removal of unity) (Figure 4), the
9 airborne infection risks at the three target positions increase with time, and the airborne
10 infection risks at the target positions over the given exposure period (one hour) of L1-
11 L3 are 9.5%, 5.9%, and 6.7% respectively. The large variations of the airborne infection
12 risk indicate that the airborne infection risk should be evaluated both spatially and
13 temporally. Otherwise, the infection airborne risk could be overestimated (*e.g.*, for the
14 target position far away from the source, such as L2 and L3) or underestimated (*e.g.*,
15 for the target position close to the source, such as L1). When surgical masks with an
16 efficiency of 75% [12] are used by both the infector and susceptible under Scenario 2
17 (Figure 5), the factor of infectious virus removal is 0.0625 (*i.e.*, (1-0.75)²), and the
18 airborne infection risks of all the three target positions are largely reduced to be below
19 0.7%, indicating that the surgical masks are effective in reducing the cross infections
20 [4]. These results demonstrate the effectiveness of the method proposed in evaluating

1 the airborne infection risk both spatially and temporally.




2

3

Noted: The infector and susceptible do not wear masks.

4

Fig.4. Variations of airborne infection risks at different target positions with time.



5

6

Noted: The infector and susceptible wear surgical masks.

7

Fig.5. Variations of airborne infection risks at different target positions with time.

8

1 **6. Conclusions**

2 This study proposes an evaluation method for the airborne infection risk based on the
3 concept of dilution. The dilution ratio is used to calculate the inhaled quanta of airborne
4 pathogens with which the airborne infection risk is calculated according to Poisson
5 distribution. The method proposed is benchmarked by the Wells-Riley model under the
6 well-mixed and steady condition, and by a modified Wells-Riley model (*i.e.*,
7 rebreathed-fraction model) under the well-mixed and transient condition, which
8 indicates that the method proposed is a thorough expansion of the Wells-Riley model.
9 Compared with the Wells-Riley model, the method proposed has two advantages of 1)
10 evaluation of airborne infection risk for both spatial and temporal resolutions, and 2)
11 convenience in practical applications. Experiments in a mock hospital ward with
12 multiple beds served with displacement ventilation demonstrate that the method
13 proposed effectively evaluates airborne infection risk both spatially and temporally. The
14 method proposed contributes to the reliable evaluation of airborne infection risk and
15 developing effective interventions for reducing cross infections of infectious respiratory
16 diseases (*e.g.*, COVID-19).

17 **Acknowledgement**

18 The work described in this paper is supported by the National Natural Science
19 Foundation of China (Project No. 51878585). The help of Ms. Yalin Lu in the
20 experiments is highly appreciated.

21 **Competing interests**

22 Authors declare no competing interests.

23 **References**

24 [1] Aliabadi AA, Rogak SN, Bartlett KH, Green SI. 2011. Preventing airborne disease
25 transmission: review of methods for ventilation design in health care facilities.
26 *Advances in Preventive Medicine*, 2011.

- 1 [2] Li Y, Leung GM, Tang JW, Yang X, Chao CY, Lin JZ, Lu JW, Nielsen PV, Niu J,
2 Qian H, Sleigh AC, Su HJJ, Sundell J, Wong TW, Yuen PL. 2007. Role of
3 ventilation in airborne transmission of infectious agents in the built environment-a
4 multidisciplinary systematic review. *Indoor Air*, 17(1), 2-18.
- 5 [3] Nicas M, Nazaroff WW, Hubbard A. 2005. Toward understanding the risk of
6 secondary airborne infection: emission of respirable pathogens. *Journal of*
7 *Occupational and Environmental Hygiene*, 2(3), 143-154.
- 8 [4] Prather KA, Wang CC, Schooley RT. 2020. Reducing transmission of SARS-CoV-
9 2. *Science*, 10.1126/science.abc6197
- 10 [5] Stadnytskyi V, Bax CE, Bax A, Anfinrud P. 2020. The airborne lifetime of small
11 speech droplets and their potential importance in SARS-CoV-2 transmission.
12 *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 117(22), 11875-11877.
- 13 [6] Yu IT, Li Y, Wong TW, Tam W, Chan AT, Lee JH, Leung DY, Ho T. 2004. Evidence
14 of airborne transmission of the severe acute respiratory syndrome virus. *New*
15 *England Journal of Medicine*, 350(17), 1731-1739.
- 16 [7] Liu Y, Ning Z, Chen Y, Guo M, Liu Y, Gali NK, Sun L, Duan Y, Cai J, Westerdahl
17 D, Liu X, Xu K, Ho K, Kan H, Fu Q, Lan K. 2020. Aerodynamic analysis of SARS-
18 CoV-2 in two Wuhan hospitals. *Nature*, 582(7813), 557-560.
- 19 [8] Allen JG, Marr LC. 2020. Recognizing and controlling airborne transmission of
20 SARS-CoV-2 in indoor environments. *Indoor Air*, 30(4), 557.
- 21 [9] Morawska L, Cao J. 2020. Airborne transmission of SARS-CoV-2: The world
22 should face the reality. *Environment International*, 139, 105730.
- 23 [10] Ai ZT, Melikov AK. 2018. Airborne spread of expiratory droplet nuclei between
24 the occupants of indoor environments: A review. *Indoor Air*, 28(4), 500-524.
- 25 [11] ASHRAE, 2020. Position Document on Airborne Infectious Diseases,
26 <https://www.ashrae.org/file%20library/about/position%20documents/airborne->
27 [infectiousdiseases.](https://www.ashrae.org/file%20library/about/position%20documents/airborne-infectiousdiseases)
- 28 [12] Zhang J. 2020. Integrating IAQ control strategies to reduce the risk of

- 1 asymptomatic SARS CoV-2 infections in classrooms and open plan offices.
2 Science and Technology for the Built Environment, 26, 1013–1018.
- 3 [13]Yang B, Melikov AK, Kabanshi A, Zhang C, Bauman FS, Cao G, Awbi H, Wigo
4 H, Niu J, Cheong KWD, Tham KW, Sandberg M, Nielsen PV, Kosonen R, Yao R,
5 Kato S, Sekhar SC, Schiavon S, Karimipannah T, Li X, Lin Z. 2019. A review of
6 advanced air distribution methods-theory, practice, limitations and solutions.
7 Energy and Buildings, 109359.
- 8 [14]Sze To GN, Chao CYH. 2010. Review and comparison between the Wells–Riley
9 and dose - response approaches to risk assessment of infectious respiratory
10 diseases. Indoor Air, 20(1), 2-16.
- 11 [15]Qian H, Zheng X. 2018. Ventilation control for airborne transmission of human
12 exhaled bio-aerosols in buildings. Journal of Thoracic Disease, 10, S2295.
- 13 [16]Asadi S, Bouvier N, Wexler AS, Ristenpart WD. 2020. The coronavirus pandemic
14 and aerosols: Does COVID-19 transmit via expiratory particles?. Aerosol Science
15 and Technology, 54(6), 635-638.
- 16 [17]Cheng Y, Zhang S, Huan C, Oladokun MO, Lin Z. 2019. Optimization on fresh
17 outdoor air ratio of air conditioning system with stratum ventilation for both
18 targeted indoor air quality and maximal energy saving. Building and Environment,
19 147, 11-22.
- 20 [18]Rudnick SN, Milton DK. 2003. Risk of indoor airborne infection transmission
21 estimated from carbon dioxide concentration. Indoor Air, 13(3), 237-245.
- 22 [19]Hella J, Morrow C, Mhimbira F, Ginsberg S, Chitnis N, Gagneux S, Mutayoba B,
23 Wood R, Fenner L. 2017. Tuberculosis transmission in public locations in Tanzania:
24 A novel approach to studying airborne disease transmission. Journal of Infection,
25 75(3), 191-197.
- 26 [20]Issarow CM, Mulder N, Wood R. 2015. Modelling the risk of airborne infectious
27 disease using exhaled air. Journal of Theoretical Biology, 372, 100-106.
- 28 [21]Qian H, Li Y, Nielsen PV, Huang X. 2009. Spatial distribution of infection risk of

- 1 SARS transmission in a hospital ward. *Building and Environment*, 44(8), 1651-
2 1658.
- 3 [22]Zhu S, Srebric J, Spengler JD, Demokritou P. 2012. An advanced numerical model
4 for the assessment of airborne transmission of influenza in bus microenvironments.
5 *Building and Environment*, 47, 67-75.
- 6 [23]Wells WF. 1955. *Airborne Contagion and Air Hygiene*, Cambridge MA,
7 Cambridge University Press. 117–122.
- 8 [24]Andrews JR, Morrow C, Wood R. 2013. Modeling the role of public transportation
9 in sustaining tuberculosis transmission in South Africa. *American Journal of*
10 *Epidemiology*, 177(6), 556-561.
- 11 [25]Buonanno G, Stabile L, Morawska L. 2020. Estimation of airborne viral emission:
12 quanta emission rate of SARS-CoV-2 for infection risk assessment. *Environment*
13 *International*, 141, 105794.
- 14 [26]Leung NH, Chu DK, Shiu EY, Chan KH, McDevitt JJ, Hau BJ, Yen H, Li Y, Ip D,
15 Malik Peiris J, Seto WH, Leung G, Milton D, Cowling B. 2020. Respiratory virus
16 shedding in exhaled breath and efficacy of face masks. *Nature Medicine*, 26(5),
17 676-680.
- 18 [27]Zhai J. 2020. Facial mask: A necessity to beat COVID-19. *Building and*
19 *Environment*, 175, 106827.
- 20 [28]Zhao B, Liu Y, Chen C. 2020. Air purifiers: A supplementary measure to remove
21 airborne SARS-CoV-2. *Building and Environment*, 177, 106918.
- 22 [29]Riley EC, Murphy G, Riley RL. 1978. Airborne spread of measles in a suburban
23 elementary school. *American Journal of Epidemiology*, 107(5), 421-432.
- 24 [30]Li R, Pei S, Chen B, Song Y, Zhang T, Yang W, Shaman J. 2020. Substantial
25 undocumented infection facilitates the rapid dissemination of novel coronavirus
26 (SARS-CoV-2). *Science*, 368(6490), 489-493.
- 27 [31]Wu Y, Tung TC, Niu JL. 2016. On-site measurement of tracer gas transmission
28 between horizontal adjacent flats in residential building and cross-infection risk
29 assessment. *Building and Environment*, 99, 13-21.
- 30 [32]Ai Z, Mak CM, Gao N, Niu J. 2020. Tracer gas is a suitable surrogate of exhaled

1 droplet nuclei for studying airborne transmission in the built environment. *Building*
2 *Simulation*, 13, 489-496.

3 [33]Liu L, Li Y, Nielsen PV, Wei J, Jensen RL. 2017. Short-range airborne transmission
4 of expiratory droplets between two people. *Indoor Air*, 27, 452–462.