

To: 5.1.2e [5.1.2e @rivm.nl]; 5.1.2e [5.1.2e @rivm.nl]
Cc: 5.1.2e [5.1.2e @ggdgm.nl]; 5.1.2e [5.1.2e @rivm.nl]
From: 5.1.2e
Sent: Wed 10/21/2020 11:40:22 AM
Subject: RE: Nu mét bijlage!
Received: Wed 10/21/2020 11:40:23 AM

Oh, I see what you mean.

I copied this person by mistake to the list below of people that are likely secondary cases. I moved her up again. I think the mistake occurred as I thought I had 13 persons in Osiris with info that linked them to the choir. But it looks like one more tested positive than the info we got on the map from the choir contact person. 5.1.2e

5.1.2e So we have 14 out of 19 positive in the end.

Best,

5.1.2e

From: 5.1.2e <5.1.2e @rivm.nl>
Sent: woensdag 21 oktober 2020 12:59
To: 5.1.2e <5.1.2e @rivm.nl>; 5.1.2e <5.1.2e @rivm.nl>; 5.1.2e <5.1.2e @ggdgm.nl>; 5.1.2e <5.1.2e @rivm.nl>
Subject: RE: Nu mét bijlage!

Thanks 5.1.2e. I was comparing the information in both sources but when I put information for both in the epi-curve (see attached), I end up with 14 cases in the epi-curve.

There are 13 cases in the OSIRIS list but I could not identify one of the positive cases from the formdesk questionnaire in the OSIRIS list:

fd_id= 5.1.2e
geboortedatum= 5.1.2e
geslacht= 5.1.2e
position no= 5.1.2e

I was trying to figure out the discrepancy, if one case in the OSIRIS list is incorrectly placed? Would you know more?

Yes, I agree – we should remove the numbers for the signal (I have just kept it in for the moment for an accuracy check).

Thanks for sharing the paper & article – quite interesting.

5.1.2e

From: 5.1.2e <5.1.2e @rivm.nl>
Sent: 21 October 2020 12:16
To: 5.1.2e <5.1.2e @rivm.nl>; 5.1.2e <5.1.2e @rivm.nl>; 5.1.2e <5.1.2e @ggdgm.nl>; 5.1.2e <5.1.2e @rivm.nl>
Subject: RE: Nu mét bijlage!

Hi,

Thanks for updating the epicurves. For the signal it's better to leave the numbers out. But why do you think cases for who we only have info from Osiris cannot be added to the epicurve? I think we can combine both sources.

I read an article about a paper that came out as a preprint last week: <https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.10.13.20212233v1> would be good to add as a reference.

This is the newspaper article about it:

<https://www.nrc.nl/nieuws/2020/10/20/supershedder-kan-coronavirus-verspreiden-via-aerosol-a4016681>

5.1.2e

Van: 5.1.2e <5.1.2e@rivm.nl>

Datum: 21 oktober 2020 om 12:00:49 CEST

Aan: 5.1.2e <5.1.2e@rivm.nl>, 5.1.2e <5.1.2e@rivm.nl>, 5.1.2e <5.1.2e@ggdhm.nl>, 5.1.2e <5.1.2e@rivm.nl>

Onderwerp: RE: Nu mét bijlage!

Thanks 5.1.2e for checking the cases. I have updated the epi-curve for Heerde (see attached, bottom epi-curve).

I believe we can only add in two additional dates of onset from OSIRIS at the moment (16 & 19). Let me know if you agree or if anything should be changed.

Many thanks,

5.1.2e

From: 5.1.2e <5.1.2e@rivm.nl>

Sent: 20 October 2020 19:27

To: 5.1.2e <5.1.2e@rivm.nl>; 5.1.2e <5.1.2e@ggdhm.nl>; 5.1.2e <5.1.2e@rivm.nl>; 5.1.2e <5.1.2e@rivm.nl>


Subject: RE: Nu mét bijlage!

Hi I will look at the signal later.

But I have updated the Osiris file for Heerde and matched it with the questionnaires we have so far. I think you can also include the persons we do't have a questionnaire from yet in the epicurve as we do have an onset date for most of them from Osiris.

The file is in the folder (Cluster koor Heerde_Osiris_update) check the second last sheet

5.1.2e



3 - 5

Dubbel