

- 1 Title page
- 2 Title: Low risk of SARS-CoV-2 transmission via fomite, even in cold-chain
- 3 Author names and affiliations: Julia S. Sobolik, MS^{a1}, Elizabeth T. Sajewski, MS^a, Lee-Ann Jaykus, PhD^b,
- 4 D. Kane Cooper, MSPH^a, Ben A. Lopman, PhD^a, Alicia NM. Kraay, PhD^a, P. Barry Ryan, PhD^a, Jodie L.
- 5 Guest, PhD^a, Amy Webb-Girard, PhD^a, Juan S. Leon, PhD^a
- 6 ^aRollins School of Public Health, Emory University, Atlanta, GA, USA, 30322
- 7 ^bFood, Bioprocessing and Nutrition Sciences, North Carolina State University, Raleigh, NC, USA, 27695
- 8 ¹Corresponding author: Julia S. Sobolik; 1518 Clifton Road NE, Atlanta, GA, 30322, USA; phone number:
- 9 (404) 727-7443; fax: (404) 727-4590; email: julia.sobolik@emory.edu.
- 10
- 11 Preprint servers: manuscript was deposited as a preprint on <https://www.medrxiv.org/> with the following
- 12 licensing information: CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license.
- 13
- 14 Competing interest statement: The authors declare no competing interest.

15 Summary

16 Background: Countries continue to debate the need for decontamination of cold-chain food packaging to
17 reduce possible SARS-CoV-2 fomite transmission among workers. While laboratory-based studies
18 demonstrate persistence of SARS-CoV-2 on surfaces, the likelihood of fomite-mediated transmission under
19 real-life conditions is uncertain.

20 Methods: Using a quantitative risk assessment model, we simulated in a frozen food packaging facility 1)
21 SARS-CoV-2 fomite-mediated infection risks following worker exposure to contaminated plastic
22 packaging; and 2) reductions in these risks attributed to masking, handwashing, and vaccination.

23 Findings: In a representative facility with no specific interventions, SARS-CoV-2 infection risk to a
24 susceptible worker from contact with contaminated packaging was 2.8×10^{-3} per 1h-period (95%CI: $6.9 \times$
25 10^{-6} , 2.4×10^{-2}). Implementation of standard infection control measures, handwashing and masks (9.4×10^{-6}
26 risk per 1h-period, 95%CI: 2.3×10^{-8} , 8.1×10^{-5}), substantially reduced risk (99.7%). Vaccination of the
27 susceptible worker (two doses Pfizer/Moderna, vaccine effectiveness: 86-99%) combined with
28 handwashing and masking reduced risk to less than 1.0×10^{-6} . Simulating increased
29 infectiousness/transmissibility of new variants (2-, 10-fold viral shedding) among a fully vaccinated
30 workforce, handwashing and masks continued to mitigate risk (2.0×10^{-6} - 1.1×10^{-5} risk per 1h-period).
31 Decontamination of packaging in addition to these interventions reduced infection risks to below the $1.0 \times$
32 10^{-6} risk threshold.

33 Interpretation: Fomite-mediated SARS-CoV-2 infection risks were very low under cold-chain conditions.
34 Handwashing and masking provide significant protection to workers, especially when paired with
35 vaccination.

36 Funding: U.S. Department of Agriculture

37

38 Key words: COVID-19, quantitative microbial risk assessment, cold-chain fomite-mediated transmission,
39 plastic packaging.

40 1. Introduction

41
42 According to the WHO¹ and U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention,² fomite-mediated
43 transmission of SARS CoV-2 is rare.³⁻⁷ This is especially in the context of overall SARS-CoV-2
44 transmission and relative to the predominant aerosol and droplet transmission modes.⁸⁻¹⁰ Fomite-mediated
45 transmission can occur when an uninfected individual transfers infectious particles from a contaminated
46 surface to their facial mucosa, typically via their hands.¹¹ These surfaces can become contaminated from
47 an infected individual by: 1) shedding onto hands which then touch a surface; or 2) expelled respiratory
48 aerosols and droplets (coughs, speaks, sneezes etc.,)^{12,13} which then fall to a surface.¹⁴ However, definitive
49 epidemiological evidence of fomite transmission is lacking. Only a few case reports implicate fomites as a
50 possible SAR-CoV-2 source¹⁵⁻¹⁷ of which, asymptomatic aerosol transmission could not be eliminated as
51 an alternative transmission mode (aerosol, droplet, fomite-mediated).

52
53 Despite these sparse epidemiological data, a recent report of the isolation of infectious SARS-CoV-2 from
54 a single environmental sample of imported frozen cod packaging in Qingdao, China¹⁸ has raised alarm for
55 fomites as viral vectors for SARS-CoV-2 transmission, particularly in the context of seeding SARS-CoV-
56 2 into areas that have controlled transmission.¹⁹ Exacerbating this concern, laboratory studies suggest
57 prolonged infectivity (days to perhaps weeks) of SARS-CoV-2²⁰ on a variety of surfaces^{11,21-23} and low
58 temperatures and humidity (common in cold-chain conditions) are associated with enhanced virus stability
59 (months or longer).²⁴ In addition, SARS-CoV-2 viral RNA has been detected on surfaces in playgrounds
60 and water fountains,²⁵ high-touch community fomites,²⁶ on surfaces in households with asymptomatic
61 patients,²⁷ and on surfaces in close proximity to infected individuals in healthcare settings.²⁸⁻³⁶ However,
62 the relationship between detectable viral RNA and infectious virus is tenuous.³⁷ Of an identified 63
63 published studies testing for SARS-CoV-2 RNA from environmental surface samples, only 13 attempted
64 to isolate infectious virus. Of these, viable SARS-CoV-2 virus was identified in only four instances: frozen
65 cod packaging,¹⁸ a nightstand within a household of a COVID-19 confirmed case,³⁸ an isolation room of
66 patients undergoing mechanical ventilation,³⁹ and on a windowsill of a patient's quarantine unit.⁴⁰ In the
67 context of a cold-chain occupational setting, evidence is lacking on the frequency of SARS-CoV-2
68 contamination on food packaging and the association between its detection by RT-qPCR and infectious
69 virus.

70
71 The relative importance of fomite-mediated transmission as investigated by modeling studies is also
72 inconclusive, especially across diverse settings. Using a quantitative microbial risk assessment (QMRA)
73 framework, several studies involving contact with community-based fomites estimated SARS-CoV-2
74 infection risks to be low (on the order of 1 in 10,000).^{26,41,42} In occupational settings, relative risks associated
75 with fomite transmission of SARS-CoV-2 were higher (range: 2×10^{-2} – 3.2×10^{-1} infection risks) in child
76 daycare centers,⁴³ hospitals,^{44,45} and a food manufacturing facility.⁴⁶ Higher still was the mathematical
77 modeling of the Diamond Princess cruise ship outbreak⁴⁷ which suggests a 30% attribution of COVID-19
78 cases to fomites.

79
80 In an effort to prevent and control potential SARS-CoV-2 outbreaks associated with imported food
81 products, China has implemented procedures to test all imported cold-chain (temperature-controlled
82 transport and storage) products and their packaging, including disinfection and wet wiping⁴⁸ of plastic
83 packaging.¹⁹ However, there is no definitive evidence of SARS-CoV-2 fomite transmission from contact
84 with contaminated food or food packaging,⁵ suggesting that these decontamination measures may be
85 extreme.^{4-7,49} Given this, there is a need to inform the frozen and cold-chain food industries on the possible
86 risk of SARS-CoV-2 contamination of, and transmission from, food packaging, under cold-chain
87 conditions, and the impact of infection control measures. In this study, a stochastic QMRA model is used
88 to quantify the risks and relative risk reductions attributed to fomite-mediated SARS-CoV-2 transmission
89 and infection control measures among workers in a representative frozen food packaging facility under
90 cold-chain conditions. We also investigate the need for additional plastic packaging decontamination.

91

92 2. Materials and Methods

93

94 2.1 Model overview

95 Quantitative microbial risk assessment (QMRA) is a mathematical modeling framework used to evaluate
96 health risks associated with direct and indirect transmission pathways and the efficacy of infection control
97 strategies. For this work, we applied the validated QMRA model of Sobolik, *et al.*,⁴⁶ to simulate
98 contamination of plastic packaging (individual cartons and plastic-wrapped palletized cartons) with
99 respiratory particles via the coughing of two infected workers. SARS-CoV-2 exposure doses and infection
100 risks resulting exclusively from fomite transmission were simulated for a susceptible worker in a receiving
101 warehouse.

102

103 2.2 Model structure

104 The overall model structure initiated with two infected workers in a representative frozen food
105 manufacturing facility (Figure 1). The first worker was located within close proximity (≤ 3 feet) of a
106 conveyor belt which transported between 144 and 216 individual plastic cartons (dimensions: [0.38m x
107 0.28m x 0.15m] or [0.38m x 0.30m x 0.23m]) per hour. The second infected worker transferred these
108 individual plastic cartons onto a wooden pallet (36-54 cartons/pallet), either manually or by automation,
109 and then wrapped the pallet in plastic wrap (four pallets processed/hour). Contamination events occurred
110 through expelled aerosol ($< 50 \mu\text{m}$) and droplet (50-750 μm) respiratory particles generated from cough
111 events by the two infected workers. Plastic wrapped, palletized cartons were then transported under cold-
112 chain storage to a receiving warehouse where a single susceptible worker was exposed to the virus
113 exclusively by direct contact with contaminated plastic wrap and/or surface-contaminated individual plastic
114 cartons during manual unpacking of the pallets.

115

116 The two model outcomes included: 1) SARS-CoV-2 infection risks from fomite-mediated exposures to
117 plastic packaging (individual plastic cartons and plastic wrapped pallets) following a 1-hour period; and 2)
118 relative reduction in SARS-CoV-2 infection risk attributed to infection control interventions (masking,
119 handwashing, vaccination, and package surface decontamination). The model was developed in R (version
120 4.0.3; R Development Core Team; Vienna, Austria) using the mc2d package for Monte Carlo
121 simulations.^{50,51} For each simulation, 10,000 iterations were run. Please refer to *SI Appendix* for additional
122 details on model assumptions, vetting, and sensitivity analyses.

123

124 2.3 Data sources

125 Model parameters were derived from the peer-reviewed literature (see *SI Appendix*, Table S1) and included:
126 (i) viral shedding through cough events; (ii) fomite-mediated transmission parameters; (iii) dose-response
127 parameters for SARS-CoV-2 infection risk; and (iv) risk mitigation interventions.

128

129 2.4 Fomite-mediated transmission modeling

130 SARS-CoV-2 contamination of the individual plastic cartons was calculated using the combined aerosol
131 and droplet particle fallout, $Fall_{t,a}$ (infectious virus) and $Fall_t$ (infectious virus/ m^3), expelled from coughs
132 by the first infected worker as described in Sobolik *et al.*⁴⁶ Contamination of the palletized cartons and the
133 plastic wrapped-pallets was calculated using the combined aerosol and droplet particle spray, $C_{t,aerosol}$
134 (PFU/ m^3) and $C_{t,droplet}$ (PFU/ m^3), expelled from coughs by the second infected worker as previously
135 described⁴⁶ with the resulting viral contamination on the fomite surfaces, $Fomite_{cartons}$ and $Fomite_{plasticwrap}$
136 (PFU/ m^2):

137

138 Viral concentration on individual cartons (PFU/ m^2):

$$139 \quad Fomite_{cartons} = \frac{Fall_{t,a} \cdot H_{sa}}{SA_{contamcompcart} \cdot SA_{compcart}} + \frac{Fall_t \cdot f_v \cdot H_{sa}}{SA_{contamcompcart} \cdot SA_{compcart}}$$

140

141 Viral concentration on plastic wrap pallets (PFU/m²):

$$142 \quad Fomite_{plasticwrap} = \frac{C_{t,aerosol} \cdot f_v \cdot H_{sa}}{SA_{contamcompw} \cdot SA_{compw}} + \frac{C_{t,droplet} \cdot f_v \cdot H_{sa}}{SA_{contamcompw} \cdot SA_{compw}}$$

143

144 where f_v was the air volume of the facility (m³), H_{sa} was the surface area of the susceptible worker's hand
 145 that touched the fomite surface (m²), $SA_{contamcompw}$ was the cross-sectional area of the composite
 146 contaminated individual cartons (m²), SA_{compw} was the cross-sectional area of the composite individual
 147 cartons (m²), $SA_{contamcompw}$ was the cross-sectional area of the contaminated plastic wrap (m²), and SA_{compw}
 148 was the cross-sectional area of the composite total plastic wrap (m²). Homogenous mixing of aerosol
 149 particles was assumed when calculating the aerosol contamination of the individual cartons and plastic-
 150 wrapped pallets. The ability of droplets (50-750 μm) to contaminate fomites as fallout or spray was
 151 determined by their size, particle transport properties (i.e. ballistic gravitational trajectories), and distance
 152 traveled. The proportion of droplets that reached the plastic cartons (droplet fallout) or plastic wrap (droplet
 153 spray) within 0 to 3 feet distancing was derived from previous modeling work.⁵²

154 To calculate the concentration of SARS-CoV-2 transferred to a hand, $C_{hand, carton}$ (PFU/h), following contact
 155 with the individual cartons, $Fomite_{cartons}$ (PFU/ m²), we applied an approach previously use for influenza A
 156 virus exposure.⁵³

$$157 \quad C_{hand, carton}(t) = \frac{H_{surface, carton} \cdot Fomite_{cartons} \cdot TE_{fh}}{\lambda_{v, hand}} \cdot [1 - exp(-\lambda_{v, hand} \cdot t)]$$

158 Where $H_{surface, carton}$ was the frequency of contacts between the hand and the cartons per minute
 159 (contacts/min), $Fomite_{cartons}$ was the viral concentration on the cartons (PFU/m²), at time t , TE_{fh} was the
 160 proportion of virus transferred from fomite to hand, and $\lambda_{v, hand}$ was the viral decay of SARS-CoV-2 on the
 161 hand. Similarly, we calculated the concentration of SARS-CoV-2 transferred to a hand, $C_{hand, pw}$ (PFU/h),
 162 following contact with the plastic wrap:

163

$$164 \quad C_{hand, pw}(t) = \frac{H_{surface, pw} \cdot Fomite_{plasticwrap} \cdot TE_{fh}}{\lambda_{v, hand}} \cdot [1 - exp(-\lambda_{v, hand} \cdot t)]$$

165

166 Where $H_{surface, pw}$ was the frequency of contacts between the hand and plastic wrap per minute (contacts/min),
 167 $Fomite_{plasticwrap}$ was the viral concentration on the plastic wrap fomite (PFU/m²), at time t , TE_{fh} was the
 168 proportion of virus transferred from fomite to hand, and $\lambda_{v, hand}$ was the viral decay of SARS-CoV-2 on the
 169 hand.

170

171 2.5 Risk assessment

172 The fomite-mediated dose to the susceptible worker following contact while unloading the palletized
 173 cartons was calculated from the viral contamination on the hand ($C_{hand, carton}$, $C_{hand, pw}$) at time t , the frequency
 174 of hand-to-face contacts (H_{face}), the surface area of the hands (H_{sa}), the surface area ratio of fingers (F_{sa}) to
 175 face ($Face_{sa}$), the fraction of pathogens transferred from hand-to-face (TE_{hm}), and the exposure duration (t):

176

$$177 \quad D_{fomite, carton}(t) = \frac{H_{face} \cdot H_{sa} \cdot F_{sa} \cdot C_{hand, carton}(t) \cdot TE_{hm} \cdot t}{Face_{sa}}$$

178

$$179 \quad D_{fomite, plasticwrap}(t) = \frac{H_{face} \cdot H_{sa} \cdot F_{sa} \cdot C_{hand, pw}(t) \cdot TE_{hm} \cdot t}{Face_{sa}}$$

180

181 The total viral dose, $D_{fomite, total}$, (PFU) at time t :

182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205

206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231

$$D_{fomite,total} = D_{fomite,cardon} + D_{fomite,plasticwrap}$$

In the absence of a SARS-CoV-2 dose-response model, the probability of SARS-CoV-2 infection to the susceptible worker was calculated by applying an exponential dose-response model (k_{risk}) (PFU⁻¹) based on pooled data from intranasal administration of SARS-CoV and murine hepatitis virus on infection in mice,^{54,55} and consistent with other SARS-CoV-2 QMRA models.^{26,41,42,44}

$$R(t) = 1 - \exp[-k_{risk} \cdot D_{fomite,total}(t)]$$

2.6 Evaluation of risk mitigation interventions

Standard infection control measures were selected based on current OSHA, CDC, and FDA-recommended guidance and industry practices for worker safety⁵⁶ and COVID-19 prevention.⁵⁷ These interventions included concordant masking (surgical) and hourly handwashing (2 log₁₀ virus removal).⁵⁸ Vaccination (two doses of Pfizer/Moderna) was implemented with and without the standard infection control measures to reduce 1) susceptibility to infection of the worker in the receiving warehouse (susceptible worker vaccinated only); and 2) overall transmissibility when all workers are vaccinated (rare breakthrough infection among vaccinated workers). Please refer to *SI Appendix* for additional details on the vaccination scenarios. Further, we simulated the added effect of surface decontamination (3 log₁₀ virus removal)^{48,59} applied directly to plastic packaging (individual cartons, plastic wrap) as described elsewhere,^{19,48} combined with the standard infection control measures (handwashing, masking). While there are no reference risk thresholds for respiratory pathogens, all fomite-mediated risks were compared to the reference ranges of 1.0 x 10⁻⁴ and 1.0 x 10⁻⁶ risks, which are WHO and U.S. EPA thresholds for water quality for representative infectious diseases.^{60,61}

3. Results

3.1 Fomite-mediated SARS-CoV-2 infection risks associated with exposures to individual plastic cartons and plastic wrap during the unpacking of products under cold-chain conditions, in a receiving warehouse

In the scenario of no vaccination/prior infection, the risk of fomite-mediated transmission without standard infection control measures was 2.8 x 10⁻³ per 1h-period (95%CI: 6.9 x 10⁻⁶, 2.4 x 10⁻²) (Figure 2A). Implementing standard infection control measures substantially reduced risk by 66.7% for masking (9.4 x 10⁻⁴ risk per 1h-period, 95%CI: 2.3 x 10⁻⁶, 8.1 x 10⁻³), by 99.0% for handwashing (2.8 x 10⁻⁵ risk per 1h-period, 95%CI: 6.9 x 10⁻⁸, 2.4 x 10⁻⁴), or by 99.7% for handwashing and masks (9.4 x 10⁻⁶ risk per 1h-period, 95%CI: 2.3 x 10⁻⁸, 8.1 x 10⁻⁵), relative to no infection control measures. The addition of plastic surface decontamination to these infection control measures reduced infection risks by 100% to below the 1 x 10⁻⁶ risk threshold (9.39 x 10⁻⁹ risk per 1h-period, 95%CI: 2.3 x 10⁻¹¹, 8.1 x 10⁻⁸), relative to no infection control measures.

3.2 Impact of vaccination of the susceptible worker and infection control measures on fomite-mediated SARS-CoV-2 infection risks associated with plastic packaging under cold-chain conditions

Vaccination of the susceptible worker with two doses of mRNA vaccine, without additional infection control measures, reduced infection risk by 72.4% (reduced VE 64-80%: 7.8 x 10⁻⁴ risk per 1h-period, 95%CI: 1.9 x 10⁻⁶, 6.7 x 10⁻³), or by 93.6% (optimal VE 86-99%: 1.8 x 10⁻⁴ risk per 1h-period, 95%CI: 4.5 x 10⁻⁷, 1.8 x 10⁻³), relative to no vaccination (Figure 2A). Infection control measures in addition to vaccination of the susceptible worker (reduced VE 64-80%) further reduced risk by 90.7% (masking: 6.5 x 10⁻⁴ risk per 1h-period, 95%CI: 6.4 x 10⁻⁷, 2.3 x 10⁻³), 99.7% (hourly handwashing: 7.8 x 10⁻⁶ risk per 1h-

232 period, 95%CI: 1.91×10^{-8} , 6.8×10^{-5}), and 99.9% (hourly handwashing and masking: 2.6×10^{-6} risk per
233 1h-period, 95%CI: 6.4×10^{-9} , 2.3×10^{-5}), relative to no vaccination. Optimal VE (86-99%) combined with
234 infection control measures further enhanced the risk reduction by 93.6% (masking: 6.0×10^{-5} risk per 1h-
235 period, 95%CI: 1.5×10^{-7} , 6.2×10^{-4}), 97.9% (hourly handwashing: 1.8×10^{-6} risk per 1h-period, 95%CI:
236 4.5×10^{-9} , 1.9×10^{-5}), and 99.9% (hourly handwashing and masking: 6.0×10^{-7} risk per 1h-period, 95%CI:
237 1.5×10^{-9} , 6.2×10^{-6}), relative to no vaccination (Figure 2A). Across all vaccination states of the susceptible
238 worker (no vaccination/no partial immunity, reduced VE 64-80%, and optimal VE 86-99%), combined
239 infection control measures of handwashing and masks ensured SARS-CoV-2 fomite-mediated infection
240 risks were below 10^{-4} . Notably, vaccination of the susceptible worker (VE 86-99%) combined with all
241 standard infection control measures (handwashing, masking) resulted in risk estimates well below one in a
242 million (10^{-6}).

243 244 **3.3 Impact of infection control measures on fomite-mediated SARS-CoV-2 infection risks with** 245 **variants of concern from breakthrough cases**

246
247 To account for variations in the infectiousness or transmissibility of new variants of concern (VOC), we
248 simulated the impact of increased viral shedding concentrations resulting from rare breakthrough infections
249 on SARS-CoV-2 fomite-mediated infection risk among a fully vaccinated workforce (two doses of
250 Pfizer/Moderna; VET 88.5% [95% CI: 82.3%, 94.8%])⁶². Increased viral shedding (7.1 - $8.4 \log_{10}$ infectious
251 virus [10-fold increase relative to baseline shedding level]) resulted in an infection risk of 3.1×10^{-3} per 1h-
252 period (95%CI: 7.8×10^{-6} , 2.5×10^{-2}) (Figure 2B). Implementing standard infection control measures
253 substantially reduced risk by 99.0% for handwashing (3.2×10^{-5} risk per 1h-period, 95%CI: 7.8×10^{-8} , 2.7
254 $\times 10^{-4}$) and by 99.7% for handwashing and masks (1.1×10^{-5} risk per 1h-period, 95%CI: 2.6×10^{-8} , $9.4 \times$
255 10^{-5}), relative to no infection control measures. As expected, similar trends were observed when using a 2-
256 fold increase in infectious virus shedding, with all infection risks falling below the 10^{-4} risk threshold when
257 implementing standard infection control measures (handwashing or handwashing and masking). In the rare
258 event of breakthrough infections of vaccinated workers with a VOC leading to 100-fold increase in viral
259 shedding, fomite-mediated risks remain small when continuing to use standard control measures
260 (handwashing and masking) (*SI Appendix*).

261
262 Additional results on the estimated SARS-CoV-2 concentration on combined plastic packaging under cold-
263 chain conditions are located in *SI Appendix*, Figure S1.

264 265 **4. Discussion**

266
267 In this study, a stochastic QMRA model was used to quantify the relative risks of SARS-CoV-2 infection
268 resulting from exposure to plastic fomites under cold-chain conditions in a representative frozen food
269 packaging facility. Collectively, our modeling results indicate that risks associated with fomite-mediated
270 transmission from plastic packaging under cold-chain conditions are extremely low, below a SARS-CoV-
271 2 infection risk threshold of 10^{-4} .⁶⁰ Across all vaccination states of the susceptible worker (no vaccination/no
272 prior immunity, reduced VE, optimal VE), handwashing alone or with masking resulted in risk estimates
273 below the 10^{-4} infection risk threshold.⁶⁰ In the case of rare breakthrough infections among fully vaccinated
274 workers with new, potentially more infectious/transmissible variants (2- to 10-fold increased viral
275 shedding), application of handwashing or handwashing and mask use, maintained infection risks below the
276 10^{-4} risk threshold. In response to recent concerns of heightened SARS-CoV-2 transmission risk resulting
277 from exposures to contaminated plastic packaging associated with cold-chain food products,^{18,19} we found
278 that decontaminating plastic packaging reduced risk by 3 \log_{10} (9.4×10^{-6} vs 9.4×10^{-9}). Given that the risk
279 of fomite-mediated SARS-CoV-2 infection using standard infection control measures is so low, the benefit
280 of decontaminating plastic packaging seems nominal and might be considered excessively conservative.

281

282 Exposure to plastic packaging under cold-chain conditions, even in the absence of interventions, resulted
283 in very low fomite-mediated infection risks (under 3.0×10^{-3}). This is consistent with Wilson *et al.*, who
284 found an infection risk associated with fomite contacts of approximately 1.0×10^{-3} for a single hand-to-
285 fomite scenario with high SARS-CoV-2 bioburden and no surface disinfection.⁴² Comparable fomite-
286 mediated risks were reported by Pitol *et al.*,⁴¹ and Harvey *et al.*,²⁶ associated with direct tactile events in
287 community spaces (bus stations, gas stations, playgrounds) and on high touch non-porous surfaces
288 (crosswalk buttons, trash can handles, door handles). When implementing standard infection control
289 measures (handwashing, mask use) and no vaccination, risk estimates ranged from 2.8×10^{-5} to 9.4×10^{-6} .
290 Aligned with our study, Pitol *et al.*, also demonstrated that hand hygiene could substantially reduce the risk
291 of SARS-CoV-2 transmission from contaminated surfaces.⁴¹ Our findings indicate that even for a variant
292 for which the virus is 2- to 10-times more transmissible, fully vaccinated workers (two dose mRNA vaccine)
293 and standard infection control measures (handwashing and masking) reduce infection risks to below the 10^{-4}
294 risk threshold. The B.1.617.2 (Delta) SARS-CoV-2 variant should be represented within this range as
295 recent evidence suggest it is 40-60% more transmissible than Alpha.^{63,64} This analysis demonstrates that
296 standard infection control measures and vaccination should effectively mitigate fomite-mediated infection
297 risks under cold-chain conditions even with highly transmissible circulating SARS-CoV-2 strains. Further,
298 these control measures mitigate the likelihood of SARS-CoV-2 being seeded into areas in which the virus
299 is currently not circulating.^{18,19}

300
301 An important contribution of our work is quantitatively demonstrating that vaccination (susceptible worker
302 only or full workforce), when combined with other interventions, reduced all infection risks associated with
303 potentially contaminated frozen food packaging to below 10^{-4} . Given the strong protective effect of
304 immunity from vaccination or prior exposure, involving both reduced viral load⁶⁵ and transmissibility,^{66,67}
305 as more workers become vaccinated, we anticipate fomite risks will continue to decrease in occupational
306 and community-settings alike. This holds true even when considering fomite-mediated transmission
307 dynamics with potentially more infectious/transmissible variants, such as Delta, for which viral shedding
308 is largely unaffected by vaccination status.⁶⁸ Similarly, our results demonstrate that in the rare event of
309 breakthrough infections among a fully vaccinated workforce (VET 88.5%), vaccination paired with
310 standard infection control measures (handwashing, masking) effectively reduced risk (below 1×10^{-4}).
311 Moreover, as these analyses were conducted with a 1:100 infectious to non-infectious particle ratio, fomite-
312 mediated transmission will be even less likely with ratios of 1:1,000–1:1,000,000, as recent studies
313 suggest.⁶⁹⁻⁷¹ Regarding reduced vaccine effectiveness (64-80%), we found fomite-mediated infection risks
314 were reduced by 72.4% (no interventions) to 99.9% (handwashing, masking) when only the susceptible
315 worker was vaccinated. These results are particularly promising as they encompass uncertainties in vaccine
316 effectiveness with waning immunity⁷² and emerging SARS-CoV-2 variants,^{73,74} heterogeneity in vaccine
317 effectiveness and coverage across vaccine types, and variable vaccine protection among higher-risk
318 populations (elderly, immunocompromised).⁷⁵ It is important to note that while the global vaccine rollout
319 continues, maintaining high compliance with mask use and handwashing will be critical given their
320 relatively low cost, high-impact risk mitigation potential, and ease of scaling across diverse food
321 manufacturing settings. In short, vaccination combined with masking and hand hygiene effectively
322 minimize SARS CoV-2 transmission risk to less than 10^{-4} , irrespective of additional controls and within the
323 confines of what is currently known about variants and vaccine effectiveness.

324
325 Indeed, our study found minimal added benefit in risk reduction attributed to decontamination of plastic
326 packaging of frozen foods. Fomite-mediated risks were found to already fall below 10^{-4} under standard
327 infection control procedures (hourly handwashing, surgical mask use) and below 10^{-6} by adding vaccination
328 of the susceptible worker (VE 86-99%). Risks lower than 10^{-4} already fall below U.S. EPA and WHO risk
329 guidelines, including thresholds for drinking water (*Cryptosporidium* [9.5×10^{-4}], *Campylobacter* [$7.3 \times$
330 10^{-4}], and rotavirus [2.4×10^{-3}])⁶⁰ and recreational water quality (3.2×10^{-2}).⁶¹ Furthermore, surface
331 decontamination of products meant for human consumption is not without its own risks to workers and
332 consumers. For example, consistent occupational exposure to disinfectants is associated with adverse

333 respiratory health outcomes, including worsening asthma control⁷⁶ and increased risk of chronic obstructive
334 pulmonary disease.⁷⁷ Also, risks to consumers of ingested disinfectants, which could enter products through
335 damaged packaging, range in severity from irritation (nose, sinuses, skin, eyes), dizziness, and nausea to
336 skeletal toxicity and liver damage, depending on the disinfectant type and quantity.^{78,79} Increases in the use
337 of disinfectants since the start of the COVID-19 pandemic has resulted in a 16.4% increase in exposure
338 calls as reported by the U.S National Poison Data System (NPDS), CDC (January–March 2019).⁸⁰ As China
339 is disinfecting the packaging of imported cold-chain products,¹⁹ future studies are warranted to investigate
340 the adverse health effects of increased chemical exposures among workers and consumers. Furthermore,
341 the process of testing imported frozen foods for SARS-CoV-2 and disinfecting packaging¹⁸ potentially
342 introduces delays in product distribution, which could jeopardize the integrity of the products, contributing
343 to food spoilage and waste, and could ultimately lead to shortages and instability in the global food supply
344 chain.^{81,82} A final consideration is that increased use of disinfection products are costly, with global sales
345 of surface disinfectant in 2020 increasing by more than 30% relative to the prior year (totaling US\$4.5
346 billion).⁷ Notably this increased expense does not include labor costs associated with disinfecting products.
347 In sum, additional surface decontamination of food packaging in the cold-chain could be viewed as
348 excessive and is more likely to increase chemical risks to workers, food hazard and quality risks to
349 consumers, and unnecessary added costs to governments and the global food industry.

350
351 Strengths of our model include a detailed exposure assessment design of frozen food packaging facilities
352 vetted by industry and academic partners; leveraging a validated SARS-CoV-2 modeling framework;⁴⁶ and
353 incorporating new data as model parameters on viral persistence, fomite-to-hand transfer efficiencies, and
354 respiratory particle definitions (aerosols and droplets). A limitation of this work is that our analysis focused
355 on a one-hour exposure duration of the susceptible worker to contaminated plastic packaging. This duration
356 was selected as the timing and number of products arriving in a receiving warehouse beyond one hour was
357 unpredictable. However, when extending this to an 8-hour shift, cumulative fomite risks remained very low
358 (handwashing and mask use: 7.5×10^{-5} [95% CI: 1.8×10^{-7} – 1.7×10^{-4}]). A second limitation is that there are
359 limited data on the concentration of the Delta variant shed by infected individuals, beyond the Ct value that
360 estimates approximately 6×10^5 copies/mL in oropharyngeal swabs.⁸³ To simulate increased
361 infectiousness/transmissibility of Delta or other VOC, we increased infectious viral shedding among the
362 infected workers (2-, 10-, and 100-fold), which equates to 2.4×10^6 to 2.4×10^9 infectious virus/mL of
363 saliva. While the Delta variant should clearly fall within or below this range of increased viral shedding,
364 this analysis can be refined as more data become available. This would also serve to reduce the uncertainty
365 in this and other parameters which result in a dynamic range in risk estimates and confidence intervals.

366 Using QMRA modeling, we find that susceptible workers (unvaccinated, no precautions) in frozen food
367 packaging facilities are at low risk of SARS-CoV-2 fomite-mediated transmission (exposure to large
368 droplets and small aerosol particles on plastic packaging) under cold-chain conditions. Strategies
369 demonstrated to further reduce fomite-mediated infection risk to workers include hourly handwashing and
370 universal mask use. Vaccination of workers should be prioritized as an effective intervention when
371 combined with these industry standard infection control measures.⁶⁴ When assessing the relative fomite
372 infection risk, our work suggests that extra decontamination procedures on food packaging of cold-chain
373 products make only negligible contributions beyond the standard infection control risk reductions. Hence,
374 they are difficult to justify based on risk reduction. Continued use of global^{84,85} and U.S. federal^{56,57} SARS
375 CoV-2 interventions (handwashing, mask use) and equitable distribution of vaccines will support the health
376 and safety of food workers and maintain global food supply chains and consumer food security.⁸²

377 378 **Contributors**

379 All authors contributed to the study conceptualization and methods. JSS conducted the analysis and wrote
380 and prepared the manuscript. All authors reviewed and revised the manuscript. JSS and DKC verified the
381 data. All authors read and approved the final version of the manuscript. All authors had full access to study
382 data and had final responsibility for the decision to submit for publication.

383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402

403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431

Data sharing

The code developed and used for this study will be made available through GitHub, with the DOI available upon publication.

Declaration of interests

We declare no competing interests.

Acknowledgments

This work was partially supported by the National Institutes of Health (NIH) T32 grant (J.S.S., grant 2T32ES012870-16), the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) (J.S.L. 2018-07410; J.S.S., grant 2020-67034-31728), the National Institute General Medical Sciences (B.A.L R01 GM124280), the National Science Foundation (B.A.L. 2032084), the NIH (E.T.S., T32AI138952), and Emory University's Infectious Disease Across Scales Training Program (E.T.S). The views expressed in this study are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent those of the NIH or USDA. The authors would like to thank Drs. Sanjay Gummalla and Lory Reveil (American Frozen Food Institute) for their valuable time and input as frozen food experts and for conducting surveys of facilities.

References

1. WHO. Transmission of SARS-CoV-2: implications for infection prevention precautions. Scientific Brief. 2020 July 9, 2020. Contract No.: WHO/2019-nCoV/Sci_Brief/Transmission_modes/2020.3.
2. CDC. Science brief: SARS-CoV-2 and surfaces (fomite) transmission for indoor community environments. In: Services DoHaH, editor. Washington, DC2021.
3. Mondelli MU, Colaneri M, Seminari EM, Baldanti F, Bruno R. Low risk of SARS-CoV-2 transmission by fomites in real-life conditions. *Lancet Infect Dis.* 2021;**21**(5):e112.
4. Editorial N. Coronavirus is in the air - there's too much focus on surfaces. *Nature.* 2021;**590**(7844):7.
5. Goldman E. SARS Wars: the Fomites Strike Back. *Appl Environ Microbiol.* 2021;**87**(13):e0065321.
6. Kanamori H. Rethinking environmental contamination and fomite transmission of SARS-CoV-2 in the healthcare. *J Infect.* 2021;**82**(1):e17-e8.
7. Lewis D. COVID-19 rarely spreads through surfaces. So why are we still deep cleaning? *Nature.* 2021;**590**(7844):26-8.
8. Kampf G, Bruggemann Y, Kaba HEJ, Steinmann J, Pfaender S, Scheithauer S, et al. Potential sources, modes of transmission and effectiveness of prevention measures against SARS-CoV-2. *J Hosp Infect.* 2020;**106**(4):678-97.
9. Meyerowitz EA, Richterman A, Gandhi RT, Sax PE. Transmission of SARS-CoV-2: A Review of Viral, Host, and Environmental Factors. *Ann Intern Med.* 2021;**174**(1):69-79.
10. Greenhalgh T, Jimenez JL, Prather KA, Tufekci Z, Fisman D, Schooley R. Ten scientific reasons in support of airborne transmission of SARS-CoV-2. *Lancet.* 2021;**397**(10285):1603-5.
11. Bueckert M, Gupta R, Gupta A, Garg M, Mazumder A. Infectivity of SARS-CoV-2 and Other Coronaviruses on Dry Surfaces: Potential for Indirect Transmission. *Materials.* 2020;**13**(22).
12. Bourouiba L. Turbulent Gas Clouds and Respiratory Pathogen Emissions: Potential Implications for Reducing Transmission of COVID-19. *JAMA.* 2020;**323**(18):1837-8.
13. Morawska L, Johnson GR, Ristovski ZD, Hargreaves M, Mengersen K, Corbett S, et al. Size distribution and sites of origin of droplets expelled from the human respiratory tract during expiratory activities. *J Aerosol Sci.* 2009;**40**(3):256-69.

- 432 14. Fernstrom A, Goldblatt M. Aerobiology and its role in the transmission of infectious diseases. *J*
433 *Pathog.* 2013;**2013**:493960.
- 434 15. Cai J, Sun W, Huang J, Gamber M, Wu J, He G. Indirect Virus Transmission in Cluster of
435 COVID-19 Cases, Wenzhou, China, 2020. *Emerg Infect Dis.* 2020;**26**(6):1343-5.
- 436 16. Xie C, Zhao H, Li K, Zhang Z, Lu X, Peng H, et al. The evidence of indirect transmission of
437 SARS-CoV-2 reported in Guangzhou, China. *BMC Public Health.* 2020;**20**(1):1202.
- 438 17. Bae SH, Shin H, Koo HY, Lee SW, Yang JM, Yon DK. Asymptomatic Transmission of SARS-
439 CoV-2 on Evacuation Flight. *Emerg Infect Dis.* 2020;**26**(11):2705-8.
- 440 18. Liu P, Yang M, Zhao X, Guo Y, Wang L, Zhang J, et al. Cold-chain transportation in the frozen
441 food industry may have caused a recurrence of COVID-19 cases in destination: Successful isolation of
442 SARS-CoV-2 virus from the imported frozen cod package surface. *Biosaf Health.* 2020;**2**(4):199-201.
- 443 19. Ji W, Li X, Chen S, Ren L. Transmission of SARS-CoV-2 via fomite, especially cold chain,
444 should not be ignored. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA.* 2021;**118**(11).
- 445 20. Riddell S, Goldie S, Hill A, Eagles D, Drew TW. The effect of temperature on persistence of
446 SARS-CoV-2 on common surfaces. *Virol J.* 2020;**17**(1):145.
- 447 21. Pastorino B, Touret F, Gilles M, de Lamballerie X, Charrel RN. Prolonged Infectivity of SARS-
448 CoV-2 in Fomites. *Emerg Infect Dis.* 2020;**26**(9).
- 449 22. van Doremalen N, Bushmaker T, Morris DH, Holbrook MG, Gamble A, Williamson BN, et al.
450 Aerosol and Surface Stability of SARS-CoV-2 as Compared with SARS-CoV-1. *N Engl J Med.*
451 2020;**382**(16):1564-7.
- 452 23. Paton S, Spencer A, Garratt I, Thompson KA, Dinesh I, Aranega-Bou P, et al. Persistence of
453 SARS-CoV-2 virus and viral RNA in relation to surface type and contamination concentration. *Appl*
454 *Environ Microbiol.* 2021.
- 455 24. Aboubakr HA, Sharafeldin TA, Goyal SM. Stability of SARS-CoV-2 and other coronaviruses in
456 the environment and on common touch surfaces and the influence of climatic conditions: A review.
457 *Transbound Emerg Dis.* 2021;**68**(2):296-312.
- 458 25. Kozer E, Rinott E, Kozer G, Bar-Haim A, Benveniste-Levkovitz P, Klainer H, et al. Presence of
459 SARS-CoV-2 RNA on playground surfaces and water fountains. *Epidemiol Infect.* 2021;**149**:e67.
- 460 26. Harvey AP, Fuhrmeister ER, Cantrell ME, Pitol AK, Swarthout JM, Powers JE, et al.
461 Longitudinal Monitoring of SARS-CoV-2 RNA on High-Touch Surfaces in a Community Setting.
462 *Environ Sci Technol Lett.* 2021;**8**(2):168-75.
- 463 27. Jiang XL, Zhang XL, Zhao XN, Li CB, Lei J, Kou ZQ, et al. Transmission Potential of
464 Asymptomatic and Paucisymptomatic Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 Infections: A
465 3-Family Cluster Study in China. *J Infect Dis.* 2020;**221**(12):1948-52.
- 466 28. Binder RA, Alarja NA, Robie ER, Kochev KE, Xiu L, Rocha-Melogno L, et al. Environmental
467 and Aerosolized Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 Among Hospitalized Coronavirus
468 Disease 2019 Patients. *J Infect Dis.* 2020;**222**(11):1798-806.
- 469 29. Piana A, Colucci ME, Valeriani F, Marcolongo A, Sotgiu G, Pasquarella C, et al. Monitoring
470 COVID-19 Transmission Risks by Quantitative Real-Time PCR Tracing of Droplets in Hospital and
471 Living Environments. *mSphere.* 2021;**6**(1).
- 472 30. Zhou J, Otter JA, Price JR, Cimpeanu C, Garcia DM, Kinross J, et al. Investigating SARS-CoV-2
473 surface and air contamination in an acute healthcare setting during the peak of the COVID-19 pandemic
474 in London. *Clin Infect Dis.* 2020.
- 475 31. Moore G, Rickard H, Stevenson D, Aranega-Bou P, Pitman J, Crook A, et al. Detection of SARS-
476 CoV-2 within the healthcare environment: a multi-centre study conducted during the first wave of the
477 COVID-19 outbreak in England. *J Hosp Infect.* 2021;**108**:189-96.
- 478 32. Cheng VC, Wong SC, Chan VW, So SY, Chen JH, Yip CC, et al. Air and environmental
479 sampling for SARS-CoV-2 around hospitalized patients with coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19).
480 *Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol.* 2020;**41**(11):1258-65.
- 481 33. Li YH, Fan YZ, Jiang L, Wang HB. Aerosol and environmental surface monitoring for SARS-
482 CoV-2 RNA in a designated hospital for severe COVID-19 patients. *Epidemiol Infect.* 2020;**148**:e154.

- 483 34. Ben-Shmuel A, Brosh-Nissimov T, Glinert I, Bar-David E, Sittner A, Poni R, et al. Detection and
484 infectivity potential of severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) environmental
485 contamination in isolation units and quarantine facilities. *Clin Microbiol Infect.* 2020;**26**(12):1658-62.
- 486 35. Ong SWX, Tan YK, Chia PY, Lee TH, Ng OT, Wong MSY, et al. Air, Surface Environmental,
487 and Personal Protective Equipment Contamination by Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2
488 (SARS-CoV-2) From a Symptomatic Patient. *JAMA.* 2020;**323**(16):1610-2.
- 489 36. Jiang FC, Jiang XL, Wang ZG, Meng ZH, Shao SF, Anderson BD, et al. Detection of Severe
490 Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 RNA on Surfaces in Quarantine Rooms. *Emerg Infect Dis.*
491 2020;**26**(9).
- 492 37. La Scola B, Le Bideau M, Andreani J, Hoang VT, Grimaldier C, Colson P, et al. Viral RNA load
493 as determined by cell culture as a management tool for discharge of SARS-CoV-2 patients from
494 infectious disease wards. *Eur J Clin Microbiol Infect Dis.* 2020;**39**(6):1059-61.
- 495 38. Marcenac P, Park GW, Duca LM, Lewis NM, Dietrich EA, Barclay L, et al. Detection of SARS-
496 CoV-2 on Surfaces in Households of Persons with COVID-19. *Int J Environ Res Public Health.*
497 2021;**18**(15):8184.
- 498 39. Ahn JY, An S, Sohn Y, Cho Y, Hyun JH, Baek YJ, et al. Environmental contamination in the
499 isolation rooms of COVID-19 patients with severe pneumonia requiring mechanical ventilation or high-
500 flow oxygen therapy. *J Hosp Infect.* 2020;**106**(3):570-6.
- 501 40. Santarpia JL, Rivera DN, Herrera VL, Morwitzer MJ, Creager HM, Santarpia GW, et al. Aerosol
502 and surface contamination of SARS-CoV-2 observed in quarantine and isolation care. *Sci Rep.*
503 2020;**10**(1):12732.
- 504 41. Pitol AK, Julian TR. Community Transmission of SARS-CoV-2 by Surfaces: Risks and Risk
505 Reduction Strategies. *Environ Sci Technol Lett.* 2021.
- 506 42. Wilson AM, Weir MH, Bloomfield SF, Scott EA, Reynolds KA. Modeling COVID-19 infection
507 risks for a single hand-to-fomite scenario and potential risk reductions offered by surface disinfection. *Am*
508 *J Infect Control.* 2020.
- 509 43. Kraay ANM, Hayashi MAL, Berendes DM, Sobolik JS, Leon JS, Lopman BA. Risk for Fomite-
510 Mediated Transmission of SARS-CoV-2 in Child Daycares, Schools, Nursing Homes, and Offices.
511 *Emerg Infect Dis.* 2021;**27**(4):1229-31.
- 512 44. Jones RM. Relative contributions of transmission routes for COVID-19 among healthcare
513 personnel providing patient care. *J Occup Environ Hyg.* 2020;**17**(9):408-15.
- 514 45. Mizukoshi A, Nakama C, Okumura J, Azuma K. Assessing the risk of COVID-19 from multiple
515 pathways of exposure to SARS-CoV-2: Modeling in health-care settings and effectiveness of
516 nonpharmaceutical interventions. *Environ Int.* 2021;**147**:106338.
- 517 46. Sobolik JS, Sajewski ET, Jaykus L-A, Cooper DK, Lopman BA, Kraay ANM, et al. Controlling
518 risk of SARS-CoV-2 infection in essential workers of enclosed food manufacturing facilities. *medRxiv.*
519 2021:2021.05.14.21257244.
- 520 47. Azimi P, Keshavarz Z, Cedeno Laurent JG, Stephens B, Allen JG. Mechanistic transmission
521 modeling of COVID-19 on the Diamond Princess cruise ship demonstrates the importance of aerosol
522 transmission. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA.* 2021;**118**(8).
- 523 48. Malenovska H. Coronavirus Persistence on a Plastic Carrier Under Refrigeration Conditions and
524 Its Reduction Using Wet Wiping Technique, with Respect to Food Safety. *Food Environ Virol.*
525 2020;**12**(4):361-6.
- 526 49. Goldman E. Exaggerated risk of transmission of COVID-19 by fomites. *Lancet Infect Dis.*
527 2020;**20**(8):892-3.
- 528 50. Pouillot R, Delignette-Muller ML. Evaluating variability and uncertainty separately in microbial
529 quantitative risk assessment using two R packages. *International journal of food microbiology.*
530 2010;**142**(3):330-40.
- 531 51. Ozkaynak H, Frey HC, Burke J, Pinder RW. Analysis of coupled model uncertainties in source-
532 to-dose modeling of human exposures to ambient air pollution: A PM(2.5) case study. *Atmos Environ*
533 *(1994).* 2009;**43**(9):1641-9.

- 534 52. Bourouiba L, Dehandschoewercker E, Bush JWM. Violent expiratory events: On coughing and
535 sneezing. *J Fluid Mech.* 2014;**745**:537-63.
- 536 53. Nicas M, Best D. A study quantifying the hand-to-face contact rate and its potential application to
537 predicting respiratory tract infection. *J Occup Environ Hyg.* 2008;**5**(6):347-52.
- 538 54. De Albuquerque N, Baig E, Ma X, Zhang J, He W, Rowe A, et al. Murine hepatitis virus strain 1
539 produces a clinically relevant model of severe acute respiratory syndrome in A/J mice. *J Virol.*
540 2006;**80**(21):10382-94.
- 541 55. Dediego ML, Pewe L, Alvarez E, Rejas MT, Perlman S, Enjuanes L. Pathogenicity of severe
542 acute respiratory coronavirus deletion mutants in hACE-2 transgenic mice. *Virology.* 2008;**376**(2):379-89.
- 543 56. Food Safety Modernization Act Proposed Rule for Produce Safety, Standards for the Growing,
544 Harvesting, Packing, and Holding of Produce for Human Consumption, (Corrected version), FDA-2011-
545 N-0921 (2013).
- 546 57. FDA, OSHA. Employee Health and Food Safety Checklist for Human and Animal Food
547 Operations During the COVID-19 Pandemic. In: Administration USFaDAaOSaH, editor. [fda.gov](https://www.fda.gov): FDA;
548 2020.
- 549 58. Grove SF, Suriyanarayanan A, Puli B, Zhao H, Li M, Li D, et al. Norovirus cross-contamination
550 during preparation of fresh produce. *International Journal of Food Microbiology.* 2015;**198**:43-9.
- 551 59. United States Environmental Protection A. List N: Disinfectants for Coronavirus (COVID-19).
552 Pesticide Registration2020. p. 2020-.
- 553 60. WHO. Guidelines for Drinking-Water Quality. 2017. Contract No.: 978-92-4-154995-0.
- 554 61. Boehm AB. Risk-based water quality thresholds for coliphages in surface waters: effect of
555 temperature and contamination aging. *Environ Sci Process Impacts.* 2019;**21**(12):2031-41.
- 556 62. Prunas O, Warren JL, Crawford FW, Gazit S, Patalon T, Weinberger DM, et al. Vaccination with
557 BNT162b2 reduces transmission of SARS-CoV-2 to household contacts in Israel. *medRxiv.*
558 2021:2021.07.13.21260393.
- 559 63. Callaway E. Delta coronavirus variant: scientists brace for impact. *Nature.* 2021.
- 560 64. ASM. How Dangerous Is the Delta Variant (B.1.617.2)?2021 August 17, 2021. Available from:
561 <https://asm.org/Articles/2021/July/How-Dangerous-is-the-Delta-Variant-B-1-617-2>.
- 562 65. Levine-Tiefenbrun M, Yelin I, Katz R, Herzel E, Golan Z, Schreiber L, et al. Initial report of
563 decreased SARS-CoV-2 viral load after inoculation with the BNT162b2 vaccine. *Nat Med.*
564 2021;**27**(5):790-2.
- 565 66. Marks M, Millat-Martinez P, Ouchi D, Roberts CH, Alemany A, Corbacho-Monne M, et al.
566 Transmission of COVID-19 in 282 clusters in Catalonia, Spain: a cohort study. *Lancet Infect Dis.*
567 2021;**21**(5):629-36.
- 568 67. V Shah AS, Gribben C, Bishop J, Hanlon P, Caldwell D, Wood R, et al. Effect of vaccination on
569 transmission of COVID-19: an observational study in healthcare workers and their households. *medRxiv.*
570 2021:2021.03.11.21253275.
- 571 68. Chia PY, Xiang Ong SW, Chiew CJ, Ang LW, Chavatte J-M, Mak T-M, et al. Virological and
572 serological kinetics of SARS-CoV-2 Delta variant vaccine-breakthrough infections: a multi-center cohort
573 study. *medRxiv.* 2021:2021.07.28.21261295.
- 574 69. McCormick W, Mermel LA. The basic reproductive number and particle-to-plaque ratio:
575 comparison of these two parameters of viral infectivity. *Virol J.* 2021;**18**(1):92.
- 576 70. Klimstra WB, Tilston-Lunel NL, Nambulli S, Boslett J, McMillen CM, Gilliland T, et al. SARS-
577 CoV-2 growth, furin-cleavage-site adaptation and neutralization using serum from acutely infected
578 hospitalized COVID-19 patients. *J Gen Virol.* 2020;**101**(11):1156-69.
- 579 71. Ghezzi S, Pagani I, Poli G, Perboni S, Vicenzi E. Rapid Inactivation of Severe Acute Respiratory
580 Syndrome Coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) by Tungsten Trioxide-Based (WO₃)-Based Photocatalysis. *bioRxiv.* 2020:2020.08.01.232199.
- 581
582 72. Wang Z, Muecksch F, Schaefer-Babajew D, Finkin S, Viant C, Gaebler C, et al. Naturally
583 enhanced neutralizing breadth against SARS-CoV-2 one year after infection. *Nature.* 2021.

- 584 73. Liu J, Liu Y, Xia H, Zou J, Weaver SC, Swanson KA, et al. BNT162b2-elicited neutralization of
585 B.1.617 and other SARS-CoV-2 variants. *Nature*. 2021.
- 586 74. Sheikh A, McMenamin J, Taylor B, Robertson C, Public Health S, the EIIC. SARS-CoV-2 Delta
587 VOC in Scotland: demographics, risk of hospital admission, and vaccine effectiveness. *Lancet*.
588 2021;**397**(10293):2461-2.
- 589 75. Monin L, Laing AG, Munoz-Ruiz M, McKenzie DR, Del Molino Del Barrio I, Alaguthurai T, et
590 al. Safety and immunogenicity of one versus two doses of the COVID-19 vaccine BNT162b2 for patients
591 with cancer: interim analysis of a prospective observational study. *Lancet Oncol*. 2021;**22**(6):765-78.
- 592 76. Dumas O, Wiley AS, Quinot C, Varraso R, Zock JP, Henneberger PK, et al. Occupational
593 exposure to disinfectants and asthma control in US nurses. *Eur Respir J*. 2017;**50**(4).
- 594 77. Dumas O, Varraso R, Boggs KM, Quinot C, Zock JP, Henneberger PK, et al. Association of
595 Occupational Exposure to Disinfectants With Incidence of Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease
596 Among US Female Nurses. *JAMA Netw Open*. 2019;**2**(10):e1913563.
- 597 78. Li D, Sangion A, Li L. Evaluating consumer exposure to disinfecting chemicals against
598 coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) and associated health risks. *Environ Int*. 2020;**145**:106108.
- 599 79. Kuehn BM. More Than 1 in 3 US Adults Use Disinfectants Unsafely. *JAMA*. 2020;**324**(4):328.
- 600 80. Chang A, Schnall AH, Law R, Bronstein AC, Marraffa JM, Spiller HA, et al. Cleaning and
601 Disinfectant Chemical Exposures and Temporal Associations with COVID-19 - National Poison Data
602 System, United States, January 1, 2020-March 31, 2020. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep*.
603 2020;**69**(16):496-8.
- 604 81. Han J, Zhang X, He S, Jia P. Can the coronavirus disease be transmitted from food? A review of
605 evidence, risks, policies and knowledge gaps. *Environ Chem Lett*. 2021;**19**(1):5-16.
- 606 82. Cable J, Jaykus LA, Hoelzer K, Newton J, Torero M. The impact of COVID-19 on food systems,
607 safety, and security-a symposium report. *Ann N Y Acad Sci*. 2021;**1484**(1):3-8.
- 608 83. Li B, Deng A, Li K, Hu Y, Li Z, Xiong Q, et al. Viral infection and transmission in a large, well-
609 traced outbreak caused by the SARS-CoV-2 Delta variant. *medRxiv*. 2021:2021.07.07.21260122.
- 610 84. WHO, FAO. COVID-19 and Food Safety: Guidance for competent authorities responsible for
611 national food safety control systems: Interim guidance.; 2020.
- 612 85. Cockburn W. COVID-19: Back to the workplace, adapting workplaces and protecting workers.
613 In: (EU-OSHA) EAFSaHaW, editor. 2020. p. 1-8.
- 614 86. Moustsen-Helms IR, Emborg H-D, Nielsen J, Nielsen KF, Krause TG, Mølbak K, et al. Vaccine
615 effectiveness after 1st and 2nd dose of the BNT162b2 mRNA Covid-19 Vaccine in long-term care facility
616 residents and healthcare workers – a Danish cohort study *medRxiv*. 2021:2021.03.08.21252200.
- 617 87. Khan N, Mahmud N. Effectiveness of SARS-CoV-2 Vaccination in a Veterans Affairs Cohort of
618 Patients With Inflammatory Bowel Disease With Diverse Exposure to Immunosuppressive Medications.
619 *Gastroenterology*. 2021.
- 620 88. Andrejko KL, Pry J, Myers JF, Jewell NP, Openshaw J, Watt J, et al. Prevention of COVID-19
621 by mRNA-based vaccines within the general population of California. *medRxiv*.
622 2021:2021.04.08.21255135.
- 623 89. Pawlowski C, Lenehan P, Puranik A, Agarwal V, Venkatakrishnan AJ, Niesen MJM, et al. FDA-
624 authorized mRNA COVID-19 vaccines are effective per real-world evidence synthesized across a multi-
625 state health system. *Med (N Y)*. 2021.
- 626 90. Swift MD, Breeher LE, Tande AJ, Tommaso CP, Hainy CM, Chu H, et al. Effectiveness of
627 mRNA COVID-19 vaccines against SARS-CoV-2 infection in a cohort of healthcare personnel. *Clin*
628 *Infect Dis*. 2021.

Figures and Tables




Figure 1. Conceptual framework for fomite-mediated SARS-CoV-2 transmission involving exposure of a susceptible worker to individual plastic cartons, palletized cartons, and plastic wrap in a receiving warehouse under cold-chain conditions. This schematic depicts a representative frozen food packaging facility, initiating with two infected workers (left panel). Up to 10 contamination events per infected worker (0 to 10 coughs) can occur at three stages in the packaging pipeline: 1) contamination of the top-face of individual plastic cartons (144-216 individual cartons processed per hour) via respiratory droplet and aerosol fallout from the first infected worker while cartons are transported along a conveyor belt (orange in schematic); 2) contamination of cartons via respiratory particle spray (droplets and aerosols) as cartons are placed (manually or via automation) on a pallet by the second infected worker (yellow in schematic); and 3) contamination of the plastic-wrapped palletized cartons by respiratory particle spray (droplet and aerosol) from the second infected worker (yellow in schematic). Four pallets, each containing approximately 36-54 individual plastic cartons, are processed per hour. Because of current Good Manufacturing Practices (cGMP), the model did not account for indirect transfer of virus from the infected workers' hands to the plastic fomites along the packaging pipeline. Under cold-chain conditions assuming no viral decay, plastic wrapped pallets were transported to a receiving warehouse for unloading by a susceptible worker. Infection risks resulting exclusively from fomite transmission were simulated as contacts between the susceptible worker's fingers and palms (of both hands) and the fomite surface (accounting for the surface area of the hand relative to the fomite surface); virus transfer from fomite to hands; and virus transfer from fingertips to facial mucous membranes (accounting for the surface area of the fingers relative to the combined surface area of the eyes, nose, and mouth). Grey boxes indicate infection control measures implemented for the infected (mask use, vaccination) and susceptible (handwashing, mask use, vaccination) workers. In the

scenarios with additional plastic surface decontamination, this was simulated prior to the susceptible worker contacting the fomites.




Figure 2. Fomite-mediated SARS-CoV-2 infection risks associated with individual and combined standard infection control measures (hourly handwashing [2 log₁₀ virus removal efficiency],⁵⁸ surgical mask use). Vaccination was incorporated into the model representing two doses of mRNA vaccine (Moderna/Pfizer) and was applied with and without the standard infection control measures. Additional decontamination of plastic packaging [3 log₁₀ virus removal efficiency]⁵⁹ was applied in combination with the standard infection control measures. Ventilation (two air changes per hour [ACH]) was applied to all simulations. An infectious to non-infectious particle ratio of 1:100⁴¹ was applied to all viral shedding concentrations. Reductions in SARS-CoV-2 infection risk (%) to the susceptible worker relative to no interventions are reported below each panel. Panel A represents the impact of standard infection control measures with and without vaccination on fomite-mediated SARS-CoV-2 risk. For the first vaccination scenario, we assumed only the susceptible worker was vaccinated with two doses of mRNA vaccine (Moderna/Pfizer) and vaccine effectiveness (VE) against susceptibility to infection was simulated across three vaccination states. These included: 1) no vaccination/no prior immunity; 2) lower VE ranging from 64⁸⁶-80%⁸⁷ representative of reduced protection (variants of concern, waning immunity, immunocompromised and elderly or at-risk populations); and 3) optimal VE ranging from 86%^{88,89}-99⁹⁰% among healthy adults 14 days or more after second mRNA dose. Panel B: the second vaccine scenario represented vaccine effectiveness against transmission, where all workers are assumed to be vaccinated with two doses of mRNA vaccines and hence the model simulated rare breakthrough infections. Vaccine effectiveness against transmission (VET) was modeled by applying the combined effect of the reduction in risk of infection to the susceptible worker and the risk of transmissibility given a rare breakthrough infection among the vaccinated workers. We used the VET estimate (88.5% [95% CI: 82.3%, 94.8%]) derived from Prunas *et al.*,⁶² VET was modeled across a

range of three peak infectious viral shedding concentrations representative of possible increased transmissibility and/or infectiousness of variants of concern: 1) $8 \cdot 1 \cdot 9 \cdot 4 \log_{10}$ viral particles; 2) $7 \cdot 1 \cdot 8 \cdot 4 \log_{10}$ viral particles; and 3) $6 \cdot 4 \cdot 7 \cdot 7 \log_{10}$ viral particles. These viral shedding levels represent 100-, 10-, and 2-times, respectively, the increased viral shedding concentration simulated in the base model analysis. Dashed lines represent 1:10,000 (black) and 1:1,000,000 (grey) infection risk thresholds, derived from WHO and U.S. EPA guidelines for drinking water quality.^{60,61}