

1 Risk assessment of banknotes as a fomite of SARS-CoV-2 in  
2 cash payment transactions

3

4 Jack Schijven<sup>\*§,a,b</sup>, Mark Wind<sup>c</sup>, Daniel Todt<sup>d,e</sup>, John Howes<sup>f</sup>, Barbora Tamele<sup>f</sup>, Eike Steinmann<sup>d</sup>

5

6 <sup>a</sup> Centre for Infectious Disease Control, National Institute for Public Health and the Environment  
7 (RIVM), Bilthoven, the Netherlands

8 <sup>b</sup> Department of Earth Sciences, Utrecht University, Utrecht, the Netherlands

9 <sup>c</sup> Cash Policy Department, De Nederlandsche Bank, Amsterdam, The Netherlands

10 <sup>d</sup> Department of Molecular & Medical Virology, Ruhr University Bochum, 44801 Bochum, Germany

11 <sup>e</sup> European Virus Bioinformatics Centre (EVBC), 07743 Jena, Germany

12 <sup>f</sup> European Central Bank (ECB), 60314 Frankfurt am Main, Germany

13

14 \*Corresponding author:

15 Prof. dr. J.F. Schijven

16 Jack.Schijven@rivm.nl

17 Phone +31 30 274 2994

18

19

## 20 Abstract

21

### 22 Background

23 The COVID 19 pandemic has triggered concerns and assumptions globally about transmission of the  
24 SARS-CoV-2 virus via cash transactions.

### 25 Objectives

26 Assess the risk of contracting COVID-19 through exposure to SARS-CoV-2 via cash acting as a fomite  
27 in payment transactions.

### 28 Methods

29 A quantitative microbial risk assessment was conducted for a worst-case scenario assuming an  
30 infectious person at the onset of symptoms, when virion concentrations in coughed droplets are at  
31 their highest. This person then contaminates a banknote by coughing on it and immediately hands it  
32 over to another person, who might then be infected by transferring the virions with a finger from  
33 the contaminated banknote to a facial mucous membrane. The scenario considered transfer  
34 efficiency of virions on the banknote to fingertips when droplets were still wet and after having dried  
35 up and subsequently being touched by finger printing or rubbing the object.

### 36 Results

37 Accounting for the likelihood of the worst-case scenario to occur by considering 1) a local prevalence  
38 of 100 COVID-19 cases/100,000 persons, 2) a maximum of about 1/5<sup>th</sup> of infected persons transmit  
39 high virus loads and 3) the numbers of cash transactions/person/day, the risk of contracting COVID-  
40 19 via person-to-person cash transactions was estimated to be much lower than once per 39,000  
41 days (107 years) for a single person. In the general populace, there will be a maximum of 2.6  
42 expected cases/100,000 persons/day. The risk for a cashier at an average point of sale was  
43 estimated to be much less than once per 430 working days (21 months).

### 44 Discussion

45 The worst-case scenario is a rare event, therefore, for a single person, the risk of contracting COVID-  
46 19 via person-to-person cash transactions is very low. At a point of sale, the risk to the cashier  
47 proportionally increases but it is still low.

48

49

50 Key words: COVID-19, coronavirus, fomite, risk assessment, QMRA, cash payment, cash transaction,  
51 virus transmission

52

## 53 1. Introduction

54

55 The current SARS-CoV-2 inflicted COVID 19 pandemic has triggered concerns globally based on  
56 general assumptions about transmission of the virus via the exchange of banknotes and coins (Auer  
57 et al., 2020; Central Banking, 2020; Gardner, 2020; Roh, 2020). This was linked to general fears that

58 any frequently touched objects such as banknotes and coins have long been suspected to serve as a  
59 transmission vehicle (fomites) of various pathogenic bacteria, parasites, fungi and viruses and now  
60 including SARS-CoV-2 (Angelakis et al., 2014; Galbadage et al., 2020; Pal and Bhadada, 2020). In the  
61 absence of evidence to the contrary, and based on the relative importance of the four normal viral  
62 transmission routes (direct transmission by droplets and touch, indirect transmission via aerosols  
63 and fomites), a diligent precautionary approach was adopted and promoted by governments and  
64 public health authorities (WHO, 2019; CDC, 2019). On top of that, some central banks also issued  
65 statements that they were temporarily quarantining or disinfecting deposited banknotes before  
66 reissuing them, or even incinerating them (Choi, 2020; Schroeder and Irrera, 2020; Yeung, 2020).  
67 These types of statements undoubtedly had an impact on the means of payments citizens decided to  
68 use for their transactions. Indeed, survey data collected by the European Central Bank in July 2020  
69 among the general public showed that around 40% of the population of the euro area was to a  
70 certain degree concerned about the risk of being infected by handling cash. At the same time, it was  
71 seen that one of the main reasons for respondents changing their payment behaviour was simply  
72 convenience, it was also partially due to the general concern of being infected via the banknotes  
73 themselves, or via hand contact or close proximity to a cashier. It probably was also because of  
74 various governmental recommendations to pay cashless (ECB, 2020), which subsequently led to an  
75 increase in the use of other means of payment. Still, cash plays a very important role in society  
76 worldwide. As stated by the ECB (2020), it is in fact indispensable for a number of reasons, among  
77 which the social inclusion of a substantial number of citizens with limited or no access to alternative  
78 forms of payment. It is therefore in the interests of society to properly assess the risk due to  
79 exposure to SARS-CoV-2 particles via cash as a fomite in payment transactions, and not make  
80 uninformed decisions.

81 The US Centres for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) has recently published a “Science brief” on  
82 the possible transmission of SARS-CoV-2 from surfaces (CDC, 2021). Here, it is pointed out that the  
83 risk of fomite-mediated transmission is dependent on the infection prevalence rate in the  
84 community, the amount of virus that infected people expel, the deposition of expelled virus particles  
85 onto surfaces (fomites), the interaction with environmental factors, the time between surface  
86 contamination and a person touching the surface, the transfer efficiency of virus particles from  
87 fomite surfaces to hands and from hands to mucous membranes on the face (nose, mouth, eyes)  
88 and, lastly, the dose of virus needed to cause infection through the mucous membrane route. In this  
89 science brief, it is concluded that the risk of fomite transmission of SARS-CoV-2 is considered low  
90 compared with direct contact, droplet transmission, or airborne transmission, whilst referring to  
91 Kampf et al. (2020) and Meyerowitz et al. (2020). Also in this science brief, references to reports are  
92 given that indicate that SARS-CoV-2 is transmitted between people by touching surfaces that an ill  
93 person has recently coughed or sneezed upon, and then immediately touching their mouth, nose, or  
94 eyes (Harvey et al., 2020, Pitol and Julian, 2020, Wilson et al., 2021). The frequency of contact with  
95 fomites as part of the risk assessment was not however mentioned in this science brief.

96 Recently, Todt et al. (2021) examined the stability of SARS-COV-2 on different means of payment  
97 and developed a touch transfer method to examine transfer efficiency from contaminated surfaces  
98 to fingertips. The transfer efficiencies as well as the persistence of the virus from Todt et al. (2021)  
99 indicated that the transmission of SARS-CoV-2 via contaminated coins and banknotes requires high  
100 viral loads and a timely order of specific events.

101 To understand this better, a quantitative microbial risk assessment (QMRA) was conducted in order  
102 to quantify the risks related to a simple but worst-case scenario where an infectious person  
103 (provider) contaminated a banknote by coughing on it, and then immediately handed it over to a

104 second person (acceptor). The acceptor was then possibly infected by transferring SARS-CoV-2  
105 virions with their fingers from the contaminated banknote to a facial mucous membrane. The  
106 transfer data of Todt et al. (2021) was analysed to pave the way to assess the risk of SARS-CoV-2  
107 transmission by banknotes and coins, between two people. The risk assessment was focussed on  
108 banknotes and not on coins, because it can be assumed that coins generate a lower risk compared to  
109 banknotes simply due to their much-reduced exposed surface areas.

## 110 2. Methods

111

### 112 2.1 Scenario

113

114 The risk assessment comprised the following sequence of events thus defining a worst-case scenario  
115 as schematically depicted in Figure 1:

- 116 1. A highly infectious person holds a banknote to make a payment and coughs upon it. The  
117 cough generates a plume of respiratory droplets and droplet nuclei containing SARS-CoV-2  
118 virions. Part of the plume contaminates the banknote with virions.
- 119 2. The infectious person then passes the banknote to another person (acceptor). Virions are  
120 transferred from the banknote to the fingers of the acceptor via touching the freshly  
121 contaminated banknote.
- 122 3. Virions are then transferred from the acceptor's fingers to their eyes, nose or mouth by  
123 touching. This number of transferred virions is considered to be the dose.

124 Note that the assessment did not cover the many other likely permutations of the possible transfer  
125 route, i.e., the possible intermediary role of wallets, cash machines, pockets, other precautionary  
126 measures such as face masks, hand cleaning and the use of rubber gloves as these routes most  
127 probably would lead to a lower amount of virions transferred.

128 The risk characterisation entailed the dose response relationship, expressing the risk per event as  
129 described in the exposure assessment, and a sensitivity analysis.

130 Because only short time frames were considered in this sequence of events, and SARS-CoV-2 has  
131 been observed to remain infectious in aerosols and on banknotes for hours (Fears et al. 2020; van  
132 Doremalen et al. 2020, Todt et al. 2021), decay over time was not modelled in this study. Due to the  
133 drying of virus-containing droplets on a surface, virus inactivation proceeds initially faster as shown  
134 by Todt et al. (2021). But in a timeframe of seconds to a minute this does not play a role in this  
135 assessment and has not been taken into account. The lower transfer efficiencies under dry  
136 conditions may be due to picking up virions less efficiently in combination with the numbers of  
137 virions that were already reduced due to the drying.

138 This assessment concludes with an estimate of the likelihood of this depicted worst-case scenario  
139 while putting the risk assessment in perspective for the general risk per person per day, for both  
140 person-to-person and points-of-sale cash transactions.

141

### 142 2.2 Risk assessment

143

#### 144 **Virus concentration**

145 It was assumed that the viral concentration  $C$  [virus RNA copies/mL] in droplets from a cough were  
146 the same as determined in throat and nasal swabs from infected persons. To this end, viral  
147 concentration data collected during the pandemic before July 2020 as published by Schijven et al.  
148 (2021) were used. Here, only the onset of symptoms when the concentrations are highest was  
149 considered. Table 1 lists the corresponding parameters.

#### 150 **Total volume of droplets in a cough**

151 Data on numbers and size distributions of expiratory droplets expelled during coughing were kindly  
152 provided by Chao et al. (2009), who measured droplet size using the interferometric Mie imaging. In  
153 that study, measurements were conducted at 1 cm in front of the mouth. Therefore, evaporation of  
154 the droplets (which would decrease their volume and, hence, increase the concentration of virions in  
155 the droplets) was not considered. Because of the 20 cm – 50 cm distance between the mouth of the  
156 infectious person and his/her hand holding a banknote, the whole spectrum of expelled droplets as  
157 found by Chao et al. (2009) was considered. Chao et al. (2009) used a factor of 18.94 to obtain a  
158 mean total droplet count of 2085. Chao's data encompassed variability in measurements from ten  
159 healthy volunteers. For each volunteer  $i$ , data was collected in seventeen size bins of different  
160 diameters ranging from 1 to 2000  $\mu\text{m}$ , that were converted to mean volumes  $V_{i,j}$  [millilitres] per size  
161 bin  $j$ :

$$162 \quad V_{i,j} = 10^{-12} \frac{\pi}{6} (d_{i,j,min}^3 + d_{i,j,max}^3) / 2 \quad (1)$$

163 where  $d$  is the diameter [ $\mu\text{m}$ ] and  $min$  and  $max$  designate minimum and maximum values per size  
164 bin, respectively.

165 The total volume of droplets from a cough per volunteer,  $V_i$  [ml] was calculated by summing  $n_{i,j}$   
166 samples of  $V_{i,j}$  for each  $V_i$ :

$$167 \quad V_i = \sum_{j=1}^{17} V_{i,j} n_{i,j} \quad (2)$$

168 Finally, a normal distribution that was truncated between zero and infinity was fitted to the ten  $V_i$   
169 values.

#### 170 **Caught fraction of projected cough plume**

171 It was assumed that at the moment of coughing, the infectious person held a banknote in their hand  
172 at a distance  $X$  from the face, and only a fraction of the cough plume directed to the banknote  
173 actually contaminated the banknote. Subsequently, the exposed person accepted the banknote and  
174 touched part of its surface area with their fingertips where transfer of virions from the banknote to  
175 the fingertips could take place. The fraction of the projected cough plume on the banknote that is  
176 touched by the fingertips and thereby caught by the exposed person,  $f_a$ , was calculated as:

$$177 \quad f_a = \frac{A}{\pi[(X+4)\tan\theta]^2} \quad (3)$$

178 where  $A$  is the surface area [ $\text{cm}^2$ ] of the fingertips touching the banknote,  $X$  is the distance [cm]  
179 between the mouth of the infectious person and the banknote at the time of coughing. Distance  $X$   
180 was augmented by 4 cm to include the distance from the throat (the origin of the plume) to the  
181 mouth opening.  $\theta$  is the opening angle of the cough plume (Bourouiba et al.,2014).  $A$ ,  $X$  and  $\theta$  were  
182 all modelled as triangular distributions. See Table 1 for the corresponding distribution parameter  
183 values.

#### 184 **Transfer efficiencies from banknote to hand**

185 The transfer efficiency data of infectious SARS-CoV-2 virions from surfaces of banknotes and coins to  
186 artificial skin as reported by Todt et al. (2021) were analysed by means of a multivariate linear  
187 regression for the relationship between the transfer efficiencies and the input concentrations, types  
188 of surfaces, and transfer methods and conditions. (Input concentrations and transfer efficiencies: log  
189 base 10; types of surfaces: €0,10 coin, €10 banknote, PVC, steel; transfer condition: wet = immediate  
190 contact after inoculation, dry = after desiccation of the droplet; transfer method: by finger print of  
191 finger rubbing; regression analyses: R (version 3.5.2 (2018-12-20) - "Eggshell Igloo") and lm  
192 (Chambers, 1992; Wilkinson and Rogers, 1973)). Note that data for input concentrations less than  
193 2320 infectious virions per ml were excluded from the analysis, because those values as well as the  
194 output concentrations (after transfer) were near or below the detection limit and did not allow to  
195 determine a transfer efficiency. The model with the lowest Akaike's Information Criterion (AIC) was  
196 selected using the step-function (parameter  $k=3.84$ ). For graphical presentation of the data package  
197 ggplot2 was used (Wickham, 2016). Transfer efficiencies were grouped along the significance of the  
198 effects of type of surface, transfer condition and method. For each group of transfer efficiencies, a  
199 Beta distribution was fitted and labelled  $k_{1,group}$ . Note that it was assumed that the transfer  
200 efficiencies from Todt et al. (2021) for infectious virions also applied to virus RNA copies.

201 The rate of hand contact with target facial membranes (mouth, eyes, nostrils) was estimated to be  
202 on average 15.7 per hour (Nicas and Best, 2008), i.e., once every 4 minutes, and, therefore, frequent  
203 enough to justify almost immediate transfer to the facial membranes after having touched the  
204 contaminated banknote. For transfer efficiency,  $k_2$ , of SARS-CoV-2 from contaminated fingers to the  
205 face, i.e., lips, nose, eyes, the value 0.34 for transfer of bacteriophage PRD1 was taken from Rusin et  
206 al. (2002). Bacteriophage PRD1 is an environmentally persistent virus, which is strongly negatively  
207 charged, and, therefore, can be considered as a conservative model virus regarding virus persistence  
208 and attachment to surfaces (Schijven and Hassanizadeh, 2000).

## 209 Dose and risk

210 The dose  $D$  was computed as follows:

$$211 D \sim \text{Pois}(f_v k_1 k_2 f_a CV) \quad (4)$$

212 Where  $f_v = 1/80$  and is a conservative estimate of the fraction of intact virions that are able to infect  
213 specific cells in a tissue culture (Schijven et al., 2021).

214 Finally, the risk of contracting COVID-19,  $P_{ill}$ , was computed using the exponential dose response  
215 model:

$$216 P_{ill} = 1 - e^{-rD} \quad (5)$$

217 where  $r$  is the preliminary dose response parameter proposed by Haas (2021). Haas (2021)  
218 recommended to use the dose response data for human coronavirus 229E as representative for  
219 SARS-CoV-2. For human coronavirus 229E, it was found that each plaque forming unit (pfu) has a  
220 probability of  $r=1/18$  of causing illness symptoms.

## 221 Fitting of distributions and Monte Carlo simulation

222 Fitting distributions to data of  $V$  and  $k_{1,group}$  and drawing 10 000 Monte Carlo samples of  $C$ ,  $V$ ,  $A$ ,  $X$ ,  $\square$   
223 and  $k_{1,group}$  were conducted in Mathematica (version 12.3.0.0, Wolfram Inc, Champaign, IL, USA).

224

### 225 3. Results

226

227 Table 3 lists the numbers of virus RNA copies present in a single cough ("coughed"), caught on a  
228 banknote area of a size covered by fingertips ("caught on fingertip area"), then actually transferred  
229 to the fingertips and, finally to a mucosal site of the facial area ("dose"). These numbers varied by  
230 many orders of magnitude, which stemmed from a combination of the large variation in virus  
231 concentration in patient material and the large variation in volume of coughed droplets. The  
232 numbers caught on the banknote on a fingertip-sized area were about 400 times lower than the  
233 numbers present in a single cough. Under wet conditions, the numbers transferred to the fingertips  
234 were lowered by about 5 times. Under dry conditions, the virus RNA copy numbers were reduced 20  
235 and 400 times by printing and rubbing, respectively. The amount transferred from the fingertip to  
236 the facial area, the dose, was about one-third of the numbers on the fingertips. At the end, the dose  
237 was on average about 5,000, 25,000 and 500,000 times lower than the numbers of coughed virions  
238 for the wet, dry/print and dry/rub scenarios, respectively.

239 Figure 2 presents the boxplots of the transfer efficiency data according to the type of surface and  
240 transfer under wet and dry conditions by printing and rubbing, and shows that the transfer  
241 efficiencies under wet conditions were higher than under dry conditions. It can also be seen that  
242 under wet conditions, transfer efficiencies were similar for printing and rubbing, but that under dry  
243 conditions, transfer efficiencies were lower for rubbing than for printing. According to the statistical  
244 analyses of the transfer efficiency data, input concentration and the type of surface did not  
245 significantly affect transfer efficiency, but, dry/wet conditions and printing/rubbing did significantly  
246 affect transfer efficiency. Under wet conditions, transfer efficiencies were on average 10 times  
247 higher than under dry conditions and transfer efficiencies were on average 3 times lower for rubbing  
248 compared to printing (See estimated coefficients in Table 2). Therefore, for the risk assessment, the  
249 beta distributions were fitted to the transfer efficiencies  $k_1$  of the €10 banknote under wet  
250 conditions, regardless of printing or rubbing and for the dry conditions accounting for printing and  
251 rubbing. The corresponding parameters of the three  $k_1$ 's are listed in Table 1.

252 Figures 3a – 3c depict the corresponding mean risks of 0.17 (=1/6), 0.082 (=1/12) and 0.014 (=1/71)  
253 per cash transaction under the worst-case scenario, which is assuming an infectious person  
254 immediately handed over a heavily contaminated banknote followed by wet, dry/print and dry/rub  
255 transfer conditions, respectively. The risk distributions spanned the range from zero to one due to  
256 the wide ranges of the transferred numbers of virus particles. These risk estimates can also be  
257 expressed as contracting on average COVID-19 once per 6, 12 and 71 cash transactions carried out  
258 under the worst-case scenario for the wet, the dry/print and the dry/rub transfer conditions,  
259 respectively.

260 Figure 3d depicts the mean risk  $P_{ij}$  of contracting COVID-19, as a function of a given number of virus  
261 RNA copies per ml mucus for each of the three transfer scenarios over the concentration range from  
262  $10^7$  to  $10^{11}$  virus RNA copies per ml. In the legend, the corresponding percentiles are given for having  
263 at least a specific virus concentration. From these curves, it can be seen that the risk level of 1% will  
264 be exceeded at a virus concentration of about  $10^7$ ,  $6 \times 10^7$  and  $10^9$  virus RNA copies per ml for the  
265 wet, dry/print and dry/rub transfer scenarios, respectively. The risk level of 10% will be exceeded at  
266 a virus concentration of about  $10^8$ ,  $6 \times 10^8$  and  $10^{10}$  virus RNA copies per ml for the wet, dry/print and  
267 dry/rub transfer scenarios, respectively. In summary, under the worst-case scenario, in which an  
268 infectious person immediately handed over a contaminated banknote, these curves imply that in the  
269 wet transfer scenario, with an about average virus concentration of  $10^8$  virus RNA copies per ml, the

270 risk can be considered high, which is no surprise given the worst-case conditions. But in the dry/rub  
271 scenario, a high virus concentration as produced by a super spreader expelling virus at a  
272 concentration of  $10^{10}$  virus RNA copies per ml would be required to achieve the same risk level.

273

## 274 4 Discussion

275

276 The current study aimed to assess, using a number of worst-case assumptions, the risk of becoming  
277 ill through using cash in a transaction with another person, which acts as a fomite of SARS-CoV2  
278 during cash payment transactions. The worst-case assumptions are as follows:

279 1) The person that expelled the SARS-CoV-2 virions was at the onset of symptoms, when virion  
280 concentrations in the expelled droplets are at their highest.

281 2) The cough was aimed such that the cough plume completely encompassed the banknote which  
282 was held normal to the direction of the cough.

283 3) Contact between the banknote and fingertips and subsequently facial area was immediate,  
284 implying inactivation of virions was negligible.

285 4) 1 PFU corresponded to a conservative estimate of one per 80 virus RNA copies (Schijven et al.,  
286 2021). The latter in combination with the prudent preliminary dose response parameter of 1/18  
287 (Haas et al., 2021), corresponded to 1/1440 virus RNA copies on average leading to illness, which  
288 was not too conservative after all because it matched the number of viral genomes needed to  
289 initiate infection of about 1000 (1-5000) as reported by Popa et al. (2020) based on a transmission  
290 network with thirty-nine transmission events. Basu (2021) estimated an infectious dose of about 100  
291 virions to explain a superspreading event.

292 5) Current preventative measures such as hand cleaning and face masks and physical barriers  
293 between cashiers and the public were not taken into account.

294 To determine the volume of droplets in a single cough using the data from Chao et al. (2009)  
295 variability in numbers of coughed droplets between persons was accounted for. Jones (2020) also  
296 used the Chao data but accounting for variability by using Poisson variance for each diameter class,  
297 which is a much narrower distribution. In contrast, Duguid (1945) reported much wider ranges of  
298 expelled particles of 1 – 100 micrometres by a lip cough of 490 – 16.000 or a tongue-teeth cough of  
299 1500 – 52000.

300 According to the statistical analysis of the transfer efficiency data, the type of surface was apparently  
301 an insignificant factor, nevertheless, risk estimates for a scenario in which a €1 or €2 coin was  
302 handed over should be much lower simply because the fingertips of the payer shield most of the  
303 coin surface area against virus contamination from a cough.

304 The risk assessment demonstrated that risks of contracting COVID-19 could be high in the worst-case  
305 events as described. Transfer efficiencies were derived from the experimental data from Todt et al.  
306 (2021), in which droplet spots of 10 ul (diameter of about 5 mm) were deposited on the different  
307 surfaces. Desiccation has been shown to reduce the numbers of virions by two orders of magnitude  
308 after 7 hours of time (Todt et al., 2021). In the contamination event, the amount of mucus caught on  
309 the banknote is likely dispersed over much smaller droplets, and, hence, desiccation may happen  
310 much faster.



311 From equation 4, it is obvious that dose  $D$  is directly proportional to the concentration of virus RNA  
312 copies  $C$ , the volume of droplets in a single cough  $V$ , the fraction of the cough caught by the area  
313 covered by fingertips  $f_a$ , the transfer efficiencies  $k_1$  and  $k_2$ , and, finally, the fraction of infectious  
314 viruses  $f_v$ . Table 1 shows that the 5-percentile - 95-percentile range of  $C$  spanned four orders of  
315 magnitude, but more or less one order for all the other parameters. Therefore, the variability in  $D$  is  
316 by far determined by  $C$ . Figure 3d depicts the mean risk  $P_{III}$  of contracting COVID-19 as a function of  
317 the number of virus RNA copies per ml mucus for each the three transfer scenarios over the  
318 concentration range from  $10^7$  to  $10^{11}$  virus RNA copies per ml. Considering  $10^{10}$  virus RNA copies per  
319 ml representing a super spreader event (Schijven et al., 2021), mean values of  $P_{III}$  become high for all  
320 three transfer scenarios. The viral load of the Delta variant might be at this level because there are  
321 indications that the viral load of the Delta variant is 1000 times higher than the initial variants of  
322 2020 (Li et al., 2021).

323 The virus transmission route that was chosen, i.e., coughing onto a banknote and then immediately  
324 passing it to another person by hand, can be assumed to happen only very rarely in public life  
325 because it is neither socially acceptable nor courteous, and people would normally avoid such an  
326 action. During the pandemic, it probably became even less likely due to hygienic measures, social  
327 distancing, wearing of masks and increased awareness. Evaluation of the likelihood of the depicted  
328 event entails analysing the frequency of cash transactions, prevalence of SARS-CoV-2 infection as  
329 well as physical/biological susceptibility to SARS-CoV-2 infection. According to a study on the  
330 payment attitudes of consumers in the euro area in 2019,  $1.2 \times 10^{11}$  cash transactions ( $1.1 \times 10^{11}$  point-  
331 of-sale and  $8.0 \times 10^9$  person-to-person) were made involving a value of  $\text{€}2.0 \times 10^{12}$  (ECB, 2020). This  
332 amounts to an average of  $\text{€}17$  per cash transactions and may be interpreted that at least one  
333 banknote is involved in each cash transactions. The same study estimated that on average in the  
334 euro area, consumers made 1.1 cash transactions and 0.4 card transactions per person per day (ECB,  
335 2020).

336 As previously stated, in the depicted worst-case event, the risk of contracting COVID-19 under wet  
337 transfer conditions from a banknote was estimated to be 1 per 6 events. In reality, not every  
338 infectious person is at the onset of symptoms when emission of virions is at its highest. About 10 to  
339 20% of people with COVID-19 cause 80% of subsequent infections – which may lead to so-called  
340 superspreading events – while 60-75% of people with COVID-19 infect no one else (Bi et al., 2020;  
341 Chen et al., 2021; Endo et al., 2020; Goyal et al., 2021). Most people with COVID-19 infect no one  
342 because they expel little – if any – infectious SARS-CoV-2 when they talk, breathe, sing or cough, but  
343 highly infectious individuals on the other hand have high concentrations of the virus in their airways,  
344 particularly the first few days after developing symptoms, and can expel tens to thousands of  
345 infectious virus particles per minute (Chen et al., 2021). Interpreting this heterogeneity in  
346 transmissibility and shedding of SARS-CoV-2, in which at maximum about one fifth of infected  
347 persons transmit high loads of virus particles, it may be assumed that estimated risks are at least five  
348 times lower than those estimated for the worst-case scenario with a person at the onset of having  
349 symptoms. Assuming a local prevalence of SARS-CoV-2 infections of 100 per 100,000 persons, which  
350 falls well within an area classified as orange in the standard publicised ECDC charts (ECDC, 2021),  
351 together with the knowledge that there are 1.1 cash transactions per person per day, this would  
352 imply that a person-to-person cash transaction with an infectious person would occur with a  
353 probability of  $1.1/1000$  per day. For a single person, this leads to a risk estimate of contamination of  
354 once per  $5 \times 1000 / (0.17 \times 1.1 \times 0.7) = 39,000$  days (107 years) for person-to-person cash transactions.

355 Also, hardly any person will cough on a banknote when paying, therefore, this risk estimate must  
356 actually be much lower than once per 39,000 days for the average citizen. How much lower because

357 of this is unknown. Additionally, when taking into account that currently in European countries a  
358 substantial part of the population has now acquired immunity by infection or vaccination, this risk  
359 can now be proportionally lowered even further as time progresses. A second conclusion is that in  
360 the general populace, assuming 100 infectious persons per 100,000, there will be much less than  
361  $100,000 \times 1/5 \times 0.17 \times 1.1 \times 0.7 / 1000 = 2.6$  expected cases per 110,000 transactions (100,000 persons)  
362 per day.

363 Point-of-sale and person-to-person cash transactions differ significantly in frequency and exposure  
364 levels and therefore should be considered separately. At any point of sale, a cashier at a  
365 supermarket or similar shop may be dealing with cash transactions many more times per day, and is  
366 therefore, more exposed to the risk of touching contaminated banknotes and objects. At an average  
367 point of sale, with a cashier conducting 100 cash transactions per day, the risk for the cashier with  
368 no protection is obviously proportionally increased compared to the risk per single person-to-person  
369 cash transactions to a rate much lower than once per  $(39,000 \times 1.1 / 100 =)$  430 working days (21  
370 months). This again emphasises that it is important that adequate precautions are taken at points of  
371 sale to protect the cashier. Having an infectious cashier must obviously be avoided at all times,  
372 emphasising the importance of the public messages for regular testing and that every person with  
373 symptoms must self-isolate.

374 To conclude, the overall risk of transmission via banknotes between members of the general public  
375 with no protection is very low (much less than once every 39,000 days). The worst-case scenario as  
376 analysed in this paper may be a high-risk event, but it is also a rare event. Obviously, cashiers are  
377 more at risk than the public (much less than once every 430 days) even if still with a low risk to  
378 contract COVID-19 through exposure to SARS-CoV-2 via cash. In any case, this should not prevent  
379 from following the national and international guidelines in such circumstances.

380 Additional research is necessary to assess if the risk increases significantly because of potentially  
381 newer virus variants.

382

## 383 Acknowledgements

384

385 We thank Ana Maria de Roda Husman, Alvin Bartels, Erwin Duizer, Arno Swart and other anonymous  
386 reviewers for their valuable comments on this work.

387

## 388 Literature

389

390 Angelakis E, Azhar EI, Bibi F, Yasir M, Al-Ghamdi AK, Ashshi AM, ... & Raoult D. 2014. Paper money  
391 and coins as potential vectors of transmissible disease. *Future microbiology*, 9(2): 249-261.

392 Auer R, Cornelli G, Frost J. 2020. Covid-19, cash, and the future of payments (No. 3). Bank for  
393 International Settlements.

394 Basu S 2021. Computational characterization of inhaled droplet transport to the  
395 nasopharynx. *Scientific Reports*, 11(1): 1-13.

396 Bi Q, Wu Y, Mei S, Ye C, Zou X, Zhang Z, Liu X, Wei L, Truelove SA, Zhang T, Gao W, Cheng C, Tang X,  
397 Wu X, Wu Y, Sun B, Huang S, Sun Y, Zhang J, Ma T, et al. 2020. Epidemiology and transmission of

- 398 COVID-19 in 391 cases and 1286 of their close contacts in Shenzhen, China: a retrospective cohort  
399 study. *The Lancet Infectious Diseases* 20:911–919. DOI: [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1473-](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1473-3099(20)30287-5)  
400 [3099\(20\)30287-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1473-3099(20)30287-5), PMID: 32353347.
- 401 Bourouiba L, Dehandschoewercker E, Bush John WM. 2014. Violent expiratory events: On coughing  
402 and sneezing. *Journal of Fluid Mechanics* 745:537-563.
- 403 CDC Science Brief (2021) SARS-CoV-2 and surface (fomite) transmission for indoor community  
404 environments, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 5 April 2021.  
405 <https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/more/science-and-research/surface-transmission.html>
- 406 CDC (2019). How COVID-19 Spreads. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Available online at:  
407 <https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/prepare/transmission.html> (accessed March 20,  
408 2020).
- 409 Central Banking: Covid-19 may survive 28 days on banknotes and payment cards  
410 [https://www.centralbanking.com/central-banks/currency/banknotes/7697391/covid-19-may-](https://www.centralbanking.com/central-banks/currency/banknotes/7697391/covid-19-may-survive-28-days-on-banknotes-and-payment-cards)  
411 [survive-28-days-on-banknotes-and-payment-cards](https://www.centralbanking.com/central-banks/currency/banknotes/7697391/covid-19-may-survive-28-days-on-banknotes-and-payment-cards)
- 412 Central Banking: will cash survive COVID-19? [https://www.centralbanking.com/central-](https://www.centralbanking.com/central-banks/currency/7509046/will-cash-survive-covid-19)  
413 [banks/currency/7509046/will-cash-survive-covid-19](https://www.centralbanking.com/central-banks/currency/7509046/will-cash-survive-covid-19)
- 414 Chambers JM, Hastie, TJ. 1992. Linear models. Chapter 4 of statistical models in S. Wadsworth &  
415 Brooks/Cole.
- 416 Chao CYH, Wan MP, Morawska L, Johnson GR, Ristovski ZD, Hargreaves M, et al. 2009.  
417 Characterization of expiration air jets and droplet size distributions immediately at the mouth  
418 opening. *Journal of Aerosol Science* 40:122-133.
- 419 Chen, P. Z., Bobrovitz, N., Premji, Z., Koopmans, M., Fisman, D. N., & Gu, F. X. (2021).  
420 Heterogeneity in transmissibility and shedding SARS-CoV-2 via droplets and aerosols. *Elife*, 10,  
421 e65774.
- 422 Choi H. 2020. “S. Korea’s central bank burns, quarantines cash in coronavirus precaution” Reuters, 6  
423 March 2020 [https://www.reuters.com/article/health-coronavirus-southkorea-money-](https://www.reuters.com/article/health-coronavirus-southkorea-money-idUSL4N2AZ1TL)  
424 [idUSL4N2AZ1TL](https://www.reuters.com/article/health-coronavirus-southkorea-money-idUSL4N2AZ1TL)
- 425 Duguid JP. 1945. The numbers and the sites of origin of the droplets expelled during expiratory  
426 activities. *Edinb Med J* 52:385-401.
- 427 ECB, SPACE Report 2020. Study on the payment attitudes of consumers in the euro area, European  
428 Central Bank, December 2020  
429 <https://www.ecb.europa.eu/pub/pdf/other/ecb.spacereport202012~bb2038bbb6.en.pdf>
- 430 ECDC 2021: [https://www.ecdc.europa.eu/en/covid-19/situation-updates/weekly-maps-coordinated-](https://www.ecdc.europa.eu/en/covid-19/situation-updates/weekly-maps-coordinated-restriction-free-movement)  
431 [restriction-free-movement](https://www.ecdc.europa.eu/en/covid-19/situation-updates/weekly-maps-coordinated-restriction-free-movement)
- 432 Endo A, Abbott S, Kucharski AJ, Funk S, Centre for the Mathematical Modelling of Infectious Diseases  
433 COVID-19 Working Group. 2020. Estimating the overdispersion in COVID-19 transmission using  
434 outbreak sizes outside China. *Wellcome Open Research* 5:67.  
435 DOI: <https://doi.org/10.12688/wellcomeopenres.15842.3>, PMID: 32685698.

- 436 Fears AC, Klimstra WB, Duprex P, Hartman A, Weaver SC, Plante KS, et al. 2020. Comparative  
437 dynamic aerosol efficiencies of three emergent coronaviruses and the unusual persistence of sars-  
438 cov-2 in aerosol suspensions. medRxiv:2020.2004.2013.20063784.
- 439 Galbadage T, Peterson BM, Gunasekera RS. 2020. Does COVID-19 spread through droplets  
440 alone? *Frontiers in public health*, 8, 163.
- 441 Gardner B, (2020): "Dirty banknotes may be spreading the coronavirus, WHO suggests", *Daily*  
442 *Telegraph*, 8 March 2020. [https://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/2020/03/02/exclusive-dirty-](https://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/2020/03/02/exclusive-dirty-banknotes-may-spreading-coronavirus-world-health/)  
443 [banknotes-may-spreading-coronavirus-world-health/](https://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/2020/03/02/exclusive-dirty-banknotes-may-spreading-coronavirus-world-health/).
- 444 Goyal, A., Reeves, D. B., Cardozo-Ojeda, E. F., Schiffer, J. T., & Mayer, B. T. (2021). Viral load and  
445 contact heterogeneity predict SARS-CoV-2 transmission and super-spreading events. *Elife*, 10,  
446 e63537.
- 447 Haas, C. N. (2021). Action Levels for SARS-CoV-2 in Air: Preliminary Approach. *Risk Analysis*, 41(5),  
448 705-709.
- 449 Harvey AP, Fuhrmeister ER, Cantrell ME, Pitol AK, Swarthout JM, Powers JE, ... Pickering AJ. 2020.  
450 Longitudinal monitoring of SARS-CoV-2 RNA on high-touch surfaces in a community  
451 setting. *Environmental Science & Technology Letters*, 8(2), 168-175.
- 452 Jones RM. 2020. Relative contributions of transmission routes for COVID-19 among healthcare  
453 personnel providing patient care. *Journal of Occupational and Environmental Hygiene*, 17(9), 408-  
454 415.
- 455 Kampf G, Brüggemann Y, Kaba HE, Steinmann J, Pfaender S, Scheithauer S, Steinmann E. 2020.  
456 Potential sources, modes of transmission and effectiveness of prevention measures against SARS-  
457 CoV-2. *Journal of Hospital Infection*.
- 458 Li B, Deng A, Li K, Hu Y, Li Z, Xiong Q., ... Lu J. 2021. Viral infection and Transmission in a large well-  
459 traced outbreak caused by the Delta SARS-CoV-2 variant. medRxiv. doi:  
460 <https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.07.07.21260122>.
- 461 Meyerowitz, EA, Richterman A, Gandhi RT, Sax PE. 2021. Transmission of SARS-CoV-2: a review of  
462 viral, host, and environmental factors. *Annals of internal medicine*, 174(1), 69-79.
- 463 Nicas M, Best D. 2008. A study quantifying the hand-to-face contact rate and its potential application  
464 to predicting respiratory tract infection. *Journal of occupational and environmental hygiene*, 5(6),  
465 347-352.
- 466 Pal R, Bhadada SK. 2020. Cash, currency and COVID-19. *Postgraduate medical journal*, 96(1137), 427-  
467 428.
- 468 Pitol AK, Julian TR. 2021. Community transmission of SARS-CoV-2 by surfaces: risks and risk  
469 reduction strategies. *Environmental Science & Technology Letters*, 8(3), 263-269.
- 470 Popa A, Genger J-W, Nicholson MD, Penz T, Schmid D, Aberle SW, et al. 2020. Genomic epidemiology  
471 of superspreading events in austria reveals mutational dynamics and transmission properties of sars-  
472 cov-2. *Science Translational Medicine*:eabe2555.
- 473 Roh J. 2020. "Surge in damaged cash as worried South Koreans try to microwave the virus", *Reuters*  
474 31 July 2020 [https://www.reuters.com/article/us-health-coronavirus-southkorea-money-](https://www.reuters.com/article/us-health-coronavirus-southkorea-money-idUSKCN24W1SU)  
475 [idUSKCN24W1SU](https://www.reuters.com/article/us-health-coronavirus-southkorea-money-idUSKCN24W1SU)

- 476 Rusin P, Maxwell S, Gerba C. 2002. Comparative surface-to-hand and fingertip-to-mouth transfer  
477 efficiency of gram-positive bacteria, gram-negative bacteria, and phage. *Journal of Applied*  
478 *Microbiology*, 93(4), 585-592.
- 479 Schijven JF, Hassanizadeh SM. 2000. Removal of viruses by soil passage: Overview of modeling,  
480 processes, and parameters. *Critical reviews in environmental science and technology*, 30(1), 49-127.
- 481 Schijven J, Vermeulen LC, Swart A, Meijer A, Duizer E, de Roda Husman AM. 2021. Quantitative  
482 microbial risk assessment for airborne transmission of SARS-CoV-2 via breathing, speaking, singing,  
483 coughing, and sneezing. *Environmental health perspectives*, 129(4), 047002.
- 484 Schroeder P, Irrera A 2020. "Fed quarantines U.S. dollars repatriated from Asia on coronavirus  
485 caution", Reuters, 6 March. [https://www.reuters.com/article/us-health-coronavirus-fed-dollars-](https://www.reuters.com/article/us-health-coronavirus-fed-dollars-idUSKBN20T1YT)  
486 [idUSKBN20T1YT](https://www.reuters.com/article/us-health-coronavirus-fed-dollars-idUSKBN20T1YT)
- 487 Todt, D., Meister, T. L., Tamele, B., Howes, J., Paulmann, D., Becker, B., ... & Steinmann, E. (2021). A  
488 realistic transfer method reveals low risk of SARS-CoV-2 transmission via contaminated euro coins  
489 and banknotes. *iScience*, 102908.
- 490 Van Doremalen N, Bushmaker T, Morris D, Holbrook M, Gamble A, Williamson B, et al. 2020. Aerosol  
491 and surface stability of sars-cov-2 as compared with sars-cov-1. *The New England Journal of*  
492 *Medicine*.
- 493 WHO: Modes of transmission of virus causing COVID-19: implications for IPC precaution  
494 recommendations; WHO reference number WHO/2019-  
495 nCoV/Sci\_Brief/Transmission\_modes/2020.2; [https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/modes-of-](https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/modes-of-transmission-of-virus-causing-covid-19-implications-for-ipc-precaution-recommendations)  
496 [transmission-of-virus-causing-covid-19-implications-for-ipc-precaution-recommendations](https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/modes-of-transmission-of-virus-causing-covid-19-implications-for-ipc-precaution-recommendations)  
497 [https://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/handle/10665/331616/WHO-2019-nCoV-Sci\\_Brief-](https://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/handle/10665/331616/WHO-2019-nCoV-Sci_Brief-Transmission_modes-2020.2-eng.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y)  
498 [Transmission\\_modes-2020.2-eng.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y](https://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/handle/10665/331616/WHO-2019-nCoV-Sci_Brief-Transmission_modes-2020.2-eng.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y)
- 499 Wickham H, Chang W, Wickham MH. 2016. Package 'ggplot2'. Create Elegant Data Visualisations  
500 Using the Grammar of Graphics. Version, 2(1), 1-189. Wilkinson and Rogers, 1973
- 501 Wilkinson GN, Rogers CE. 1973. Symbolic description of factorial models for analysis of variance.  
502 *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series C (Applied Statistics)*, 22(3), 392-399.
- 503 Wilson AM, Weir MH, Bloomfield SF, Scott EA, Reynolds KA. 2021. Modeling COVID-19 infection risks  
504 for a single hand-to-fomite scenario and potential risk reductions offered by surface  
505 disinfection. *American journal of infection control*, 49(6), 846-848.
- 506 Yeung K. 2020. "China central bank branch to destroy banknotes from coronavirus-hit sectors",  
507 *South China Morning Post*, 16 February 2020. [https://www.scmp.com/economy/china-](https://www.scmp.com/economy/china-economy/article/3050868/fresh-cash-old-china-central-bank-branch-destroy-banknotes)  
508 [economy/article/3050868/fresh-cash-old-china-central-bank-branch-destroy-banknotes](https://www.scmp.com/economy/china-economy/article/3050868/fresh-cash-old-china-central-bank-branch-destroy-banknotes)
- 509
- 510

511 **Tables**

512

513 **Table 1. Parameter values**

	Unit	Distribution	Parameter values	Mean	5%	95%
$\text{Log}_{10}c$	$\text{Log}_{10}(\text{N/mL})$	Normal	$\mu=7.5, \sigma=1.3$	7.5	5.4	9.7
$V$	$\mu\text{L}$	Normal, $0-\infty$	$\mu=8.4, \sigma=7.0$	10	1.4	20
$X$	cm	Triangular	min=20, max=50, mode=40	37	25	46
$\varnothing$	$^{\circ}$	Triangular	min=20.5, max=27.3, mode=23.9	24	21	26
$A$	$\text{cm}^2$	Triangular	min=1, max=4, mode=2	2.3	1.4	3.5
$f_a$	-	Equation 3	-	0.0025	0.0011	0.0050
$k_{1,wet}$	-	Beta	$\alpha=1.5, \beta=5.9$	0.20	0.026	0.45
$k_{1,dry,print}$	-	Beta	$\alpha=2.3, \beta=1000$	0.056	0.00071	0.19
$k_{1,dry,rub}$	-	Beta	$\alpha=0.62, \beta=11$	0.0024	0.00051	0.0053
$k_2$	-	-	0.34			
$f_v$	-	-	1/80			
$r$	-	-	1/18			

514

515 **Table 2 Parameter estimates from regression analysis of the  $\text{log}_{10}$  of the transfer efficiencies**

	Estimate	Std. Error	$\text{Pr}(>  t )$
dry/wet: wet	1.0	0.17	$3.5 \times 10^{-7}$
print/rub: rub	-0.5	0.17	$5.7 \times 10^{-3}$

516 Adjusted  $R^2=47\%$ ; 45 degrees of freedom

517

518 **Table 3 Numbers of virus RNA copies in the coughed plume, caught on fingertip area, transferred**  
 519 **to fingertips and dose according wet, dry/print and dry/rub scenarios.**

	Mean	Min	Max	Median	5%	95%
Coughed	$2.5 \times 10^7$	2	$2.0 \times 10^{10}$	$2.5 \times 10^5$	$1.6 \times 10^3$	$4.3 \times 10^7$
Caught on fingertip area	$6.2 \times 10^4$	0	$4.3 \times 10^7$	$5.6 \times 10^2$	3	$1.0 \times 10^5$
Wet: transfer to fingertips	$1.4 \times 10^4$	0	$1.5 \times 10^7$	$8.4 \times 10^1$	0	$1.7 \times 10^4$
Wet: dose	$4.7 \times 10^3$	0	$5.1 \times 10^6$	$2.9 \times 10^1$	0	$5.8 \times 10^3$
Dry/print: transfer to fingertips	$3.1 \times 10^3$	0	$5.6 \times 10^6$	$1.3 \times 10^1$	0	$3.8 \times 10^3$
Dry/print: dose	$1.0 \times 10^3$	0	$1.9 \times 10^6$	5	0	$1.3 \times 10^3$
Dry/rub: transfer to fingertips	$1.5 \times 10^2$	0	$1.4 \times 10^5$	1	0	$2.0 \times 10^2$
Dry/rub: dose	$5.0 \times 10^1$	0	$4.8 \times 10^4$	0	0	$6.9 \times 10^1$

520

521 **Figures**

522

523 **Figure 1 Schematic view of the contamination scenario.**

524

525 **Figure 2 Boxplots of the  $\log_{10}$  transfer efficiency data according to the type of surface and transfer**  
526 **under wet and dry conditions by printing and rubbing. Data from Todt et al. (2021).**

527

528 **Figure 3 Histograms (a, b, c) of the distribution of the risk  $P_{III}$  of contracting COVID-19 according to**  
529 **three transfer scenarios (wet, dry/print and dry/rub transfer) and (d) the mean risk  $P_{III}$  of**  
530 **contracting COVID-19 as a function of the number of virus RNA copies per ml mucus for each the**  
531 **three transfer conditions in the worst-case scenario.**

532 **The probability that an infectious person at the onset of symptoms is expelling at least  $10^5$ ,  $10^6$ ,**  
533  **$10^7$ ,  $10^8$ ,  $10^9$ ,  $10^{10}$  or  $10^{11}$  RNA copies/mL is 100%, 88%, 66%, 36%, 13%, 2.7% and 0.34%,**  
534 **respectively, based on virus load data in the beginning of the pandemic.**

535


536

537


538

539


(a) Wet



(b) Dry/print



(c) Dry/rub



(d)

