

1 **Bayesian Calibration of Using CO₂ Sensors to Assess Ventilation Conditions and Associated**
2 **COVID-19 Airborne Aerosol Transmission Risk in Schools**

3 Danlin Hou¹, Ali Katal¹, and Liangzhu (Leon) Wang^{*1}

4 ¹Concordia University, Montreal, Canada

5 *^{*}Liangzhu (Leon) Wang, Ph.D., P.Eng., Associate Professor

6 Centre for Zero Energy Building Studies

7 Department of Building, Civil and Environmental Engineering

8 Concordia University

9 1455 de Maisonneuve Blvd. West

10 Montreal, Quebec, Canada, H3G 1M8

11 Email: leon.wang@concordia.ca; lzwang@gmail.com

12 Phone: 514-848-2424 ext. 5766

13 Fax: 514-848-7965

14 **Abstract**

15 Ventilation rate plays a significant role in preventing the airborne transmission of diseases in
16 indoor spaces. Classrooms are a considerable challenge during the COVID-19 pandemic because
17 of large occupancy density and mainly poor ventilation conditions. The indoor CO₂ level may be
18 used as an index for estimating the ventilation rate and airborne infection risk. In this work, we

Bayesian Calibration of CO₂, Ventilation and COVID-19 Airborne Risk

1 analyzed a one-day measurement of CO₂ levels in three schools to estimate the ventilation rate and
2 airborne infection risk. Sensitivity analysis and Bayesian calibration methods were applied to
3 identify uncertainties and calibrate key parameters. The outdoor ventilation rate with a 95%
4 confidence was 1.96 ± 0.31 ACH for Room 1 with mechanical ventilation and fully open window,
5 0.40 ± 0.08 ACH for Rooms 2, and 0.79 ± 0.06 ACH for Room 3 with only windows open. A
6 time-averaged CO₂ level < 450 ppm is equivalent to a ventilation rate > 10 ACH in all three rooms.
7 We also defined the probability of the COVID-19 airborne infection risk associated with
8 ventilation uncertainties. The outdoor ventilation threshold to prevent classroom COVID-19
9 aerosol spreading is between 3 – 8 ACH, and the CO₂ threshold is around 500 ppm of a school day
10 (< 8 hr) for the three schools.

11 **Practical Implications**

12 The actual outdoor ventilation rate in a room cannot be easily measured, but it can be calculated
13 by measuring the transient indoor CO₂ level. Uncertainty in input parameters can result in
14 uncertainty in the calculated ventilation rate. Our three classrooms study shows that the estimated
15 ventilation rate considering various input parameters' uncertainties is between ± 8 -20 %. As a result,
16 the uncertainty of the ventilation rate contributes to the estimated COVID-19 airborne aerosol
17 infection risk's uncertainty up to ± 10 %. Other studies can apply the proposed Bayesian and
18 MCMC method to estimating building ventilation rates and airborne aerosol infection risks based
19 on actual measurement data such as CO₂ levels with uncertainties and sensitivity of input
20 parameters identified. The outdoor ventilation rate and CO₂ threshold values as functions of
21 exposure times could be used as the baseline models to develop correlations to be implemented by
22 cheap/portable sensors to be applied in similar situations to monitor ventilation conditions and
23 airborne risk levels.

Bayesian Calibration of CO₂, Ventilation and COVID-19 Airborne Risk

1 **Keywords**

2 Airborne infection; COVID-19; Bayesian calibration; Markov Chain Monte Carlo; Ventilation rate;
3 CO₂; Risk

4 **1. Introduction**

5 Airborne transmission of relatively small aerosol droplets plays a dominant role in spreading
6 SARS-CoV-2 (hereafter as COVID-19), especially in indoor spaces ^{1,2}. School classrooms pose a
7 considerable challenge because of the large occupants' density, mandatory presence of students,
8 and ventilation conditions of concern ³. For example, in Quebec province, Canada, a partial
9 lockdown was in effect for non-essential business, with many offices closed whereas primary and
10 secondary schools open. The weekly school-related COVID-19 cases in Quebec at the end of
11 August 2020 showed that schools accounted for 20% of the province's COVID-19 cases, while
12 students and staffs account for about 18% of Quebec's population ⁴. Statistical data shows that
13 1,781 schools had been observed with at least one positive case in Quebec since the beginning of
14 the pandemic⁵. Therefore, the rate of COVID-19 transmission in schools was higher than the
15 community transmission, and mitigation measures must be implemented in classrooms to reduce
16 the infection risk. Several studies revealed the significant impact of ventilation rate in reducing or
17 preventing the airborne transmission of diseases in indoor environments ⁶. There are different
18 recommendations for the minimum required ventilation rate in indoor spaces to achieve an
19 acceptable indoor air quality or preventing indoor airborne transmission. The United States Centers
20 for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) and World Health Organization (WHO) recommended
21 a minimum ventilation rate of 12 ACH to prevent airborne transmission in health-care facilities ^{7,8}.

Bayesian Calibration of CO₂, Ventilation and COVID-19 Airborne Risk

1 The Harvard-CU Boulder Portable Air Cleaner Calculator ⁹ suggests a total of five air changes per
2 hour as a good ventilation condition for reducing airborne transmission risk in classrooms.

3 While recommendations are mainly based on the ventilation rate, it has been a challenge to
4 quantify the outdoor air ventilation rate in a room. Indoor air CO₂ concentration is often considered
5 a surrogate/indicator for the ventilation rate. For example, the Montreal school board (Centre de
6 services scolaire de Montreal) stated in an open letter on December 14, 2020: "Establishments
7 without a mechanical ventilation system should apply the window opening guidelines to ensure
8 frequent air changes in our premises"; "Always in order to ensure good indoor air quality, we have
9 also started measuring carbon dioxide (CO₂) in our establishments since November. In addition to
10 this initiative, there are the CO₂ tests that must be carried out by all school service centers in
11 Quebec before December 16. The level of CO₂ is a good indicator of the supply of fresh air in a
12 room. Thus, following these tests, corrective measures will be put forward, if necessary." ¹³.

13 In the literature, several studies used a transient CO₂ mass balance method and measured CO₂
14 levels to calculate the ventilation rate in different indoor environments such as classrooms and
15 university libraries ¹⁰⁻¹². Batterman (2017) ¹² estimated the CO₂ generation rate based on the age
16 and assumed activity level for CO₂ calculation in mechanically ventilated classrooms, but the real
17 activity type was unknown, so the results were subject to uncertainties. They used the whole day
18 data to estimate ventilation rate, but they did not validate the model by calculating the CO₂ at a
19 different time or day. For the estimation of ventilation rate using the transient CO₂ sensor data, it
20 is essential to find dominant parameters that affect the final results, calibrate the model by
21 measurement data, quantify and report the ventilation rates and infection risks with uncertainties.
22 As a result, due to various factors affecting CO₂ levels, such as variable occupant numbers and
23 outdoor conditions, and the fact the unknown uncertainties of these factors, questions have been

Bayesian Calibration of CO₂, Ventilation and COVID-19 Airborne Risk

1 raised about using CO₂ sensors to assess COVID-19 transmission risk ¹⁴. In summary, therefore,
2 two questions are often raised: 1). The CO₂ for Ventilation Assessment Question: when
3 considering variable occupancy and dynamic surrounding environment, how can we relate CO₂
4 concentrations to ventilation rates with uncertainties taken into account? 2). The CO₂ for Risk
5 Assessment Question: If CO₂ is used as an indicator for the COVID-19 airborne aerosol
6 transmission risk associated with ventilation conditions, what are the CO₂ threshold levels to
7 prevent spreading for ventilation-related risks with uncertainties quantified?

8 Both questions center around the uncertainties and associated sensitivity analysis of parameters.
9 Sensitivity Analysis (SA) and calibration methods such as Bayesian Markov Chain Monte Carlo
10 (MCMC) method ¹⁵ can be used along with measured indoor CO₂ concentrations to find the
11 dominant parameters for the CO₂ levels such as ventilation rate and calibrate them. Bayesian
12 MCMC is a calibration technique proposed in the twentieth century owing to the development of
13 MCMC and modern computer. Its application to the computer models' calibration was
14 systematically illustrated by Kennedy and O'Hagan (2001) ¹⁶. From then on, the boom of Bayesian
15 inference and calibration was signified. Now, Bayesian inference calibration has been utilized in
16 various topics, such as environment ¹⁷⁻²⁰, hydrology ²¹⁻²³, transportation ²⁴, and medicine research
17 ²⁵. In the field of heating, ventilation, and air conditioning (HVAC), one of the early applications
18 was conducted by Heo et al. ²⁶. Building energy models were calibrated using Bayesian inference
19 and further analyzed considering the uncertainties for retrofit decision making. By propagating
20 parameters using probabilistic analysis, Bayesian inference incorporates uncertainties into real
21 systems' approximations by computer models. Combining multiple sources of information at
22 different scales and with different reliabilities, the inadequacy of a model, revealed by the
23 discrepancy between the predictions and observed data, can be corrected. Compared with

Bayesian Calibration of CO₂, Ventilation and COVID-19 Airborne Risk

1 conventional deterministic calibration methods, the advantages of Bayesian inference calibration
2 are: 1) When the calibration measurements are qualitatively/quantitatively insufficient, for
3 traditional methods, the estimated model parameters can be far off from their original values;
4 however, for Bayesian calibration, since the uncertainties are considered, the calibration results
5 are more stable and reasonable; 2) For the traditional calibration method, the results are often
6 deterministic. In comparison, for the Bayesian inference calibration method, the results are derived
7 from quantitative stochastic analysis and with possibilities that can be regarded as a degree of
8 belief.

9 Therefore, to answer the "CO₂ for Ventilation Assessment" question, in this work, we investigated
10 three classrooms from three schools in Montreal, Canada, to analyze CO₂ and ventilation rate, and
11 estimate COVID-19 airborne aerosol infection risk. To estimate ventilation rate using the transient
12 CO₂ mass balance model, we obtained the measurement data of transient CO₂ concentrations. We
13 conducted a sensitivity analysis to find the dominant parameters for indoor air CO₂ concentration.
14 The Bayesian MCMC method was then used with the three classrooms' measured CO₂ data to
15 calibrate the dominant parameters and quantify the uncertainties. Calibrated ventilation rate helps
16 teachers to compare it with the officially recommended value for preventing indoor airborne
17 transmission. Then we used the calibrated model and tried different ventilation rates to estimate
18 CO₂ level for different exposure times. The results help occupants to estimate the ventilation rate
19 from the measured CO₂ data at each time.

20 On the other hand, calculation and adjusting the ventilation rate may not be enough for mitigating
21 the airborne transmission of COVID-19 in classrooms because no definite ventilation and CO₂
22 thresholds have been agreed upon for COVID-19. Recommended ventilation rate or indoor air
23 CO₂ level by some standards and agencies for indoor air quality condition may not be enough to

Bayesian Calibration of CO₂, Ventilation and COVID-19 Airborne Risk

1 prevent the indoor airborne transmission. For example, ASHRAE Standard 62-2001 (ASHRAE,
2 2004) recommended a maximum CO₂ level of 1000 ppm in classrooms for acceptable indoor air
3 quality, which may still not be enough for preventing airborne transmission of diseases. The
4 National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH) recommended a CO₂ level of 600-
5 1500 ppm for schools and workplaces but only considered comfort and working efficiency ²⁷. An
6 unofficial study by some scientists and teachers in 25 classrooms in Montreal revealed that in 75%
7 of the classrooms, the level of CO₂ exceeded 800 ppm because of poor ventilation conditions ²⁸.
8 However, they have been confused about the relations between monitored CO₂ levels, ventilation
9 conditions, and COVID-19 airborne transmission risks in the classrooms. The Wells-Riley model
10 ²⁹ can be used to calculate the indoor infection risk using calibrated ventilation rate. The effective
11 reproductive ratio, R_0 (ratio between secondary infectious cases and source cases), is often applied
12 and should be less than one to prevent spreading. Du et al. (2020) studied the impact of ventilation
13 improvement on a real tuberculosis (TB) outbreak in underventilated university buildings. Their
14 result showed that improving indoor ventilation to levels correspond with CO₂ < 1000 ppm
15 reduced 97% of TB infection risk. Before improving the ventilation, the initial CO₂ concentration
16 was 3,204 ppm in one classroom where the index cases attended. They concluded that enhancing
17 the ventilation rate to 14-15 ACH could effectively control the TB outbreak. However, there is no
18 information given for the COVID-19 regarding the CO₂ concentration for monitoring to prevent
19 airborne aerosol spread.

20 Rudnick and Milton (2003) derived an equation to estimate the indoor airborne infection
21 transmission using indoor air CO₂ concentration. They calculated the critical rebreathed fraction
22 of indoor air below which airborne propagation of typical respiratory infections will not occur.
23 They modeled several hypothetical cases in their work without measurement data. Peng and

Bayesian Calibration of CO₂, Ventilation and COVID-19 Airborne Risk

1 Jimenez (2020) ³¹ derived an analytical expression of CO₂-based risk proxies for COVID-19 and
2 used it to estimate CO₂ level corresponding to an acceptable airborne risk level in different indoor
3 environments. They showed that acceptable CO₂ level varies by over two orders of magnitude for
4 various rooms and activities. It also depends on other factors, such as wearing face masks. No
5 measurements and uncertainties were reported. Eykelbosh (2021) ¹⁴ reviewed several studies that
6 used indoor CO₂ level in assessing the transmission risk and concluded that indoor air CO₂ level
7 could only represent the ventilation condition. The infection risk does not depend only on the
8 ventilation rate, and other factors such as wearing a face mask, using portable air cleaner, and
9 exposure time can also affect the infection risk. Therefore, to estimate the required ventilation rate
10 and critical CO₂ level to prevent the transmission of COVID-19 aerosols in a classroom, it is
11 crucial to know the actual room condition such as occupancy profile, activity type, and other
12 parameters that affect the estimation of infection risk.

13 Therefore, to answer the "CO₂ for Risk Assessment" question, in this work, we used the calibrated
14 ventilation rate and actual room parameters to calculate the COVID-19 airborne transmission in
15 the three classrooms using the modified Wells-Riley equation. We compared the results with
16 infection risk corresponding to the Reproductive number to be one ($R_0 = 1$), and different
17 ventilation rates, and CO₂ threshold levels at various exposure durations.

18 **2. Methodology**

19 This section presents the models of CO₂ concentration, airborne infection risk, and sensitivity
20 analysis, and finally, the Bayesian calibration methods. Two fully-mixed transient mass balance
21 equations are solved to calculate indoor air CO₂ and COVID-19 quanta concentration. The
22 schematic of the models is plotted in Figure 1.

Bayesian Calibration of CO₂, Ventilation and COVID-19 Airborne Risk




Fig. 1 Schematic of the indoor air CO₂ and quanta concentration models

2.1 Indoor CO₂ concentration model

A fully-mixed transient mass balance model is solved for the calculation of CO₂ concentration in the room.

$$V \frac{dC_{CO_2}}{dt} = G_s + \lambda_1 C_{oa} - \lambda_1 C_{CO_2} \quad (1)$$

where V is the room volume (m^3); C_{CO_2} is the indoor air CO₂ concentration (mg/m^3); t is the time duration (s); G_s is the CO₂ generation rate by all occupants (mg/s), which depends on the age and activity level; λ_1 is the total outdoor air ventilation rate (m^3/s); and C_{oa} is the outdoor air CO₂ concentration (mg/m^3).

The transient mass balance, Eq. 1, is useful for solving arbitrary occupancy patterns and generation rates such as classrooms because students leave the classroom for break and launch. The solution of Eq. 1 is:

$$C_{CO_2} = \frac{G_s}{\lambda_1} \left(1 - e^{-\frac{\lambda_1}{V}t}\right) + (C_{CO_2,0} - C_{oa})e^{-\frac{\lambda_1}{V}t} + C_{oa} \quad (2)$$

where $C_{CO_2,0}$ is the observed initial CO₂ concentration at each occupancy phase.

1 2.2 Airborne aerosol infection risk model

2 The probability of infection (PI) of a susceptible person in the room is calculated using the Wells-
3 Riley formulation³². The method was first used by Jimenez et al.³³ for calculating infection risk
4 in different indoor environments and is recently applied to the City Reduced Probability of
5 Infection (CityRPI) model and used for city-scale infection risk analysis^{34,35}. PI is a function of
6 the number of quanta μ inhaled by the susceptible person (Eq. 3). We assumed that social
7 distancing is maintained between all occupants, and the current study focuses on airborne aerosol
8 transmission only. We used five assumptions for applying this model: i) there is only one infected
9 person in the room who emits SARS-CoV-2 quanta with a constant rate, ii) the initial quanta
10 concentration is zero, iii) the latent period of the disease is longer than the duration students stay
11 in the classroom. Therefore the quanta emission rate remains constant during the day, iv) the indoor
12 environment is well-mixed, and v) the infectious quanta is removed as a first-order process by the
13 ventilation, filtration, deposition on surfaces, and airborne inactivation. The PI in Eq. 1 is based
14 on the attendance of one infected person in the room, so it calculates the probability that COVID-
15 19 aerosols are transmitted from the infected person to a susceptible person in the room; therefore,
16 it is a conditional probability of infection (PI_{cond}).

$$PI_{cond} = 1 - e^{-\mu} \quad (3)$$

17 The number of quanta inhaled by the susceptible person at the exposure time T is calculated by
18 time-averaged quanta concentration.

$$\mu = C_{q,avg} \times B \times T \times (1 - f_m \times M_{in}) \quad (4)$$

Bayesian Calibration of CO₂, Ventilation and COVID-19 Airborne Risk

1 B is the inhalation rate (m^3/h); $C_{q,avg}$ is the time-average quanta concentration (q/m^3); T is the
2 exposure time (h); f_m is the fraction of people in the room who wears the mask, and M_{in} is the
3 inhalation mask efficiency. A well-mixed transient mass balance equation similar to Eq. 1 is solved
4 to calculate the room's transient quanta concentration.

$$\frac{dC_q}{dt} = \frac{E}{V} - \lambda C_q \quad (5)$$

5 where C_q is the indoor quanta concentration (q/m^3); E is the net quanta emission rate (h^{-1}); and
6 λ is the first-order loss rate coefficient for quanta (h^{-1}). Assuming that the initial quanta
7 concentration is zero at the beginning of the day, Eq. 5 is solved as follows:

$$C_q = \frac{E}{\lambda V} (1 - e^{-\lambda t}) \quad (6)$$

8 Because of the change in the occupancy pattern during the day, the time-averaged quanta
9 concentration is calculated using the Trapezoidal integration. E is calculated based on the number
10 of infected people in the room N_{inf} , the fraction of people in the room with the mask f_m , exhalation
11 mask efficiency M_{ex} , and quanta emission rate by one infected individual ER_q .

$$E = ER_q (1 - f_m \times M_{ex}) \times N_{inf} \quad (7)$$

12 The first-order loss rate coefficient λ reflects several mechanisms: outdoor air ventilation λ_1 ,
13 filtration λ_2 , deposition on surfaces λ_3 , and airborne inactivation λ_4 .

$$\lambda = \lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + \lambda_3 + \lambda_4 \quad (8)$$

Bayesian Calibration of CO₂, Ventilation and COVID-19 Airborne Risk

1 λ_1 is the air change rate of outdoor air per hour (h^{-1}) by the HVAC system or opening windows.
2 λ_2 is the in-room air filtration using portable air purifiers and/or duct filters in HVAC systems. λ_3
3 is the removal by gravitational settling. Finally, λ_4 is the inactivation/decay rate.

4 As already mentioned, the PI_{cond} is the conditional probability of infection, assuming that there is
5 one infected person in the room. The prevalence rate of the disease in the city P_{prev} can be used to
6 estimate the number of possible infected individuals in the room. Therefore, the absolute
7 probability of infection PI_{abs} is calculated using the PI_{cond} , P_{prev} , and number of susceptible
8 people in the room N_{sus} ³³:

$$PI_{abs} = 1 - (1 - PI_{cond} \times P_{prev})^{N_{sus}} \quad (9)$$

9 N_{sus} is calculated using the total number of people in the room N_{tot} , number of infected persons,
10 and the fraction of immune people in the community F_{immune} . It can be estimated using the total
11 recovered cases in the study region^{36,37}.

$$N_{sus} = (N_{tot} - N_{inf}) \times (1 - F_{immune}) \quad (10)$$

12 The prevalence rate of the disease is estimated using the daily COVID-19 statistics reported by
13 official sources:

$$P_{prev} = \frac{N_{new}}{P(1 - f_{unrep})} \times D \quad (11)$$

14 where N_{new} is the daily new cases, P is the population, f_{unrep} is the fraction of unreported cases.
15 A study on ten diverse geographical sites in the US shows that the estimated number of infections
16 was much greater than the number of reported cases in all sites³⁶. By doing more daily tests, the

Bayesian Calibration of CO₂, Ventilation and COVID-19 Airborne Risk

1 current unreported fraction is around 0.8. D is the duration of the infectious period of SARS-CoV-
2 of 10 days in this work ³⁸.

3 **2.3 Sensitivity analysis model**

4 Both CO₂ and infection risk models include uncertain parameters such as ventilation rates and
5 emission rates. Some of the uncertain parameters may impact the result's accuracy and should be
6 calibrated by measurement data. Ideally, with sufficient measurements and computer resources,
7 all the uncertain parameters should be included in the calibration parameters. In reality, limited by
8 data quality/quantity or computer resources, only a few parameters could be included. Many
9 parameters and inputs could also manifest different levels of uncertainties and significances on
10 simulation outputs. So it is impracticable and unnecessary to calibrate all parameters, but for
11 dominant parameters only. Identifying these dominant parameters cannot merely rely on arbitrary
12 parameter selections from modelers' knowledge but should be based on a scientific process, i.e., a
13 sensitivity analysis.

14 To conduct a sensitivity analysis process, prior distributions and ranges of selected unknown
15 parameters should be determined. Then Monte Carlo (MC) simulation is employed to propagate
16 simulations whose model parameters' values are randomly chosen from the predefined ranges
17 using a specific sampling method to perform simulation runs iteratively. Here, the Latin Hypercube
18 Sampling (LHS) method ³⁹ is applied since it provides good convergence of parameter space with
19 relatively fewer samples. The obtained input-output dataset is then employed to identify the
20 dominant model parameters that strongly affect the outputs. In this study, 440 parametric
21 simulations were conducted for the sensitivity analysis of the CO₂ concentration model ⁴⁰.

Bayesian Calibration of CO₂, Ventilation and COVID-19 Airborne Risk

1 The importance ranking results may vary with different combinations of sensitivity methods and
2 outputs depending on the variety of fundamental algorithms and conditions of each sensitivity
3 analysis method⁴¹. To avoid the potential inconsistency, Lim and Zhai proposed a new sensitivity
4 analysis method, sensitivity value index (SVI), to account for the differences in sensitivity analysis
5 methods and target outputs⁴². Eq. 12 shows how SVI is applied to recognizing and comparing the
6 importance rankings from different sensitivity analysis methods through the normalization and
7 aggregation process.

$$\sum_{l=1}^m \frac{\sum_{j=1}^k \left(\frac{V_{i,j}}{\sum_{i=1}^n |V_{i,j}|} \right)}{m \cdot k} \times 100 = \text{Sensitivity Value Index (SVI) (\%)} \quad (12)$$

8 where $V_{i,j}$ is the value of a sensitivity analysis method, i is a parameter, n is the total number of
9 the parameters, j is a sensitivity method, k is the total number of sensitivity methods, l is the target
10 output, and m is the total number of target outputs.

11 **2.4 Bayesian calibration and Markov Chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) models**

12 As the footstone of all Bayesian statistics, Bayes' theorem was first proposed by Reverend Thomas
13 Bayes in his doctoral dissertation⁴³ and can be described as:

$$\text{Posterior} = \frac{\text{Probability of the data} \times \text{Prior}}{\text{Average probability of the data}} \quad (13)$$

14 The probability of an event is inferred based on the prior knowledge of conditions related to the
15 event. Bayesian inference is one application of Bayes' theorem and can be written as:

Bayesian Calibration of CO₂, Ventilation and COVID-19 Airborne Risk

$$p(\theta|y) = \frac{p(y|\theta) \cdot p(\theta)}{p(y)} \propto p(y|\theta) \cdot p(\theta) \quad (14)$$

1 where $p(\theta|y)$ is the posterior distribution of the unknown parameter θ based on known
2 observation y . $p(y|\theta)$ is the likelihood function of observation conditional on the unknown
3 parameter. $p(\theta)$ is the prior distribution of the unknown parameter which is the marginal
4 probability that means it is irrespective of the outcome of another variable, and $p(y)$ is the
5 probability of the observation that is marginal as well to normalize $p(y|\theta)$. Therefore, the posterior
6 probability is proportional to the product of the prior probability and the likelihood.

7 In reality, it is impractical to apply the Bayesian inference for analytical solutions to all problems
8 because the likelihood's integrals can be computationally expensive or sometimes impossible to
9 be calculated. MCMC is a versatile approach to solve the parameter estimation problem with two
10 components. One is the well-known Monte Carlo method. It is a computational algorithm to solve
11 statistically challenging problems relying on repeated random samplings and approximate the
12 target value (e.g., mean value) using the independent samples' results. The other is the Markov
13 Chain method for solving a sequence of possible events. The probability of each event depends
14 only on the state attained in the previous event. By combining MCMC and Bayesian inference,
15 posterior distribution can be estimated efficiently.

16 Different MCMC algorithms can be classified into either a "random walking" group or a gradient-
17 based group according to the acceptance-rejection criterion's adoption. In this study, Hamiltonian
18 Monte Carlo (HMC) sampling method⁴⁴ was used for the MCMC. Five thousand steps of the
19 HMC algorithms on each of four separate chains were explored in this study to make a total of
20 20,000 samplers. We used one thousand samples during the "warming-up" stage to move chains

Bayesian Calibration of CO₂, Ventilation and COVID-19 Airborne Risk

1 toward the highest density area and tune sampler hyperparameters. For each room, the first 2/3 of
2 measurements are used for the calibration, with the remaining for the validation.

3 In this study, the Coefficient of Variance of Root Mean Squared Error (CVRMSE) (Eq. 15) and
4 Normalized Mean Bias Error (NMBE) were used as indicators to estimate the calibration and
5 validation performance.

$$CVRMSE (\%) = \frac{1}{\bar{y}} \sqrt{\frac{\sum_{i=1}^n (y_i - \hat{y}_i)^2}{n}} \times 100 \quad (15)$$

6 where \hat{y}_i is a predicted variable value for period i , y_i is an observed value for period i , \bar{y} is the
7 mean of the observed value, and n is the sample size.

$$NMBE (\%) = \frac{1}{\bar{y}} \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n (y_i - \hat{y}_i)}{n} \times 100 \quad (16)$$

8 **3. Case study**

9 In this study, three typical classrooms of three different schools in Montreal, Canada, were selected
10 for calibration and infection risk analysis. Each classroom was monitored during a typical
11 pandemic day, and occupants' information (students' age and number), ventilation system status,
12 window status, and transient indoor CO₂ concentration are recorded. The summary information is
13 shown in Table 1 and Figure 2.

14

15


Bayesian Calibration of CO₂, Ventilation and COVID-19 Airborne Risk

1 Table 1 Basic information about the measured classrooms


Room NO.	Date	Volume (m ³)	MV	NV	Occupancy Number (student + adult)	Student age
1	Nov. 10, 2020	165	Y	Y	19 + 1	7
2	Nov. 6, 2020	236	N	Y	20 + 1	11
3	Nov. 9, 2020	236	N	Y	18 + 1	7

2 Notes: MV means mechanical ventilation; NV means natural ventilation.

3 Room 1 is equipped with a mechanical ventilation system, and CO₂ is between 500 ~ 1000 ppm,
 4 while for Room 2 and Room 3, with no access to a mechanical ventilation system, the CO₂ reaches
 5 up to 1800 ppm. The CO₂ in Room 1 seems to indicate an acceptable level of air quality (<1000
 6 ppm), and for Rooms 2 and 3, it is higher than the acceptable level of air quality requirements. The
 7 occupancy pattern of Room 1 and Room 2 was measured, but for Room 3, no occupancy pattern
 8 was recorded, so we assumed that number of students is constant as recorded in the morning during
 9 the day. The outdoor air temperature and pressure data are provided by Environment and Climate
 10 Change Canada ⁴⁵. Other parameters required for the CO₂ calculation, such as outdoor air CO₂,
 11 generation rate, and outdoor air ventilation rate, are not available; therefore, we calibrate them
 12 using the CO₂ measurements.



Bayesian Calibration of CO₂, Ventilation and COVID-19 Airborne Risk



1 Fig. 2 CO₂ concentration measurements, occupancy number profile, outdoor air temperature, and
 2 outdoor air pressure of a) Room 1, b) Room 2, c) Room 3.

3 4. Results

4 In this section, the sensitivity analysis finds the dominant parameters for the calculation of CO₂
 5 concentrations. Then we use the Bayesian MCMC calibration to estimate the daily average
 6 ventilation rate using the CO₂ measurement data and occupancy patterns. With the calibrated
 7 model, we calculate the CO₂ concentrations in the three rooms under different ventilation rates.
 8 Finally, we used the calibrated ventilation rate to estimate the infection risk in each classroom. We

Bayesian Calibration of CO₂, Ventilation and COVID-19 Airborne Risk

1 also find the ventilation rate and CO₂ level thresholds to avoid the airborne COVID-19 aerosol
 2 spread for different exposure times.

3 **4.1 CO₂ model sensitivity analysis**

4 Outdoor/indoor pressure, outdoor/indoor air temperature, occupancy number, room volume,
 5 outdoor air ventilation rate, and CO₂ exhale rate are input parameters to predict CO₂ concentration.
 6 For the sensitivity analysis, the range of selected model inputs/parameters were defined according
 7 to the references, codes, and standards available. Table 2 shows the parameters with their
 8 sensitivity importance rankings: a smaller number indicates a more important/sensitive parameter.

9 **Table 2 Sensitivity analysis with importance ranking for indoor CO₂ concentration.**

Parameters	Symbol	Range	Reference	Sensitivity Analysis Method			Sensitivity Value Index	Importance Rank
				SRC	Random Forest	T-value		
Outdoor air ventilation rate (ACH)	λ_1	0.01~2 (non-mechanical); 1~5 (mechanical)	46	0.32	27.8	7.3	42.1	1
CO ₂ generation rate per person (L/s·person)	G_1	0.002~0.01	12,47	0.18	10.1	4.1	20.2	2
Number of occupants (#)	N_{tot}	10~30	measured	0.06	4.6	1.4	7.5	3
Outdoor CO ₂ (ppm)	C_{oa}	396~416	12,48	0.08	2.3	1.7	7.4	4
Outdoor pressure (kPa)	P_{oa}	100.5~102.5	45	0.05	0.7	1.2	4.6	5
Indoor pressure (kPa)	P_{in}	100.5~102.5	45	0.02	4.3	0.4	4.2	6
Indoor air temperature (°C)	T_{in}	18~25	45	0.04	1.9	0.8	4.0	7
Outdoor air temperature (°C)	T_{oa}	10~20	45	0.01	1.82	0.2	1.6	8


10

Bayesian Calibration of CO₂, Ventilation and COVID-19 Airborne Risk


1 It is concluded that, for the classroom CO₂ levels, the most dominant parameters are outdoor air
2 ventilation rate, CO₂ generation rate per person, number of occupants, and outdoor CO₂
3 concentration. Specifically, the outdoor air ventilation rate's SVI is two times the second important
4 parameter. Some sensitive parameters are often known, such as occupant number, outdoor
5 temperature, and pressure. So they may not need to be calibrated. Therefore, we selected the
6 outdoor air ventilation rate, CO₂ generation rate, outdoor CO₂ concentration, and indoor air
7 temperature for the next step's model calibration. Indoor pressure was assumed to be identical to
8 the outdoor pressure.

9 4.3 Calibration and validation performance

10 For the calibration of the CO₂ model, the Bayesian inference method was applied. For each
11 occupancy phase (e.g., between every two measurements), we use the new measured CO₂ data as
12 the initial condition for Eq. 2. The posterior distributions are shown in Figure 3 and Table 3. In
13 each subplot, the red dash line represents the parameter's prior distribution in Table 2.



Bayesian Calibration of CO₂, Ventilation and COVID-19 Airborne Risk



1 Fig. 3 Distribution of calibrated parameters of the indoor CO₂ model.

2 The posterior distributions with the Bayesian calibration are indicated by blue, green, and orange

3 for Rooms 1, 2, and 3, respectively. The calibrated outdoor ventilation rate is 1.96 ± 0.31 ACH

4 for Room 1, 0.40 ± 0.08 ACH for Room 2, and 0.79 ± 0.06 ACH for Room 3. Here, the

5 ventilation rate is expressed by the calibrated mean value followed by the uncertainty for a 95%

6 confidence interval. Room 1 is mechanically and naturally ventilated (i.e., open windows), so its

7 ventilation rate is significantly higher than Rooms 2 and 3, with the outdoor air only from open

8 windows. The results of Room 2 and Room 3 are closer since both are naturally ventilated with

9 the same room volumes. The span of the posterior distribution of Room 1 is larger because of its

10 wider prior distribution. For Room 3, a constant occupancy was used, so it is relatively easier for

11 the MCMC iteration to find a posterior distribution. For the outdoor CO₂ level and indoor air

12 temperature, Room 2 and Room 3 are closer than Room 1 due to different ventilation modes.

13

14

15

Bayesian Calibration of CO₂, Ventilation and COVID-19 Airborne Risk

1 Table 3 Calibrated parameters of the CO₂ model

Room NO.	Prior Distribution	Posterior Distribution						
	Uniform Distribution Range	Mean Value	Standard Deviation	Quantiles (%)				
				2.5	25	50	75	97.5
Outdoor Air Ventilation Rate (ACH)								
Room 1	(1, 5)	1.96	0.16	1.67	1.85	1.96	2.07	2.29
Room 2	(0.01, 2)	0.40	0.04	0.33	0.38	0.40	0.43	0.48
Room 3		0.79	0.03	0.73	0.77	0.79	0.81	0.86
CO ₂ Generation Rate [$\times 10^{-3}$ L/s/person]								
Room 1	(0.002, 0.01)	2.42	0.16	2.12	2.30	2.41	2.52	2.75
Room 2		2.14	0.08	2.01	2.07	2.13	2.19	2.32
Room 3		2.02	0.02	2.00	2.01	2.01	2.03	2.07
Outdoor CO ₂ Concentration (ppm)								
Room 1	(396, 416)	414.4	1.62	410.1	413.8	414.9	415.6	416.0
Room 2		406.5	5.72	396.6	401.7	406.9	411.6	415.5
Room 3		401.8	4.89	396.2	397.9	400.4	404.7	414.1
Indoor Air Temperature (K)								
Room 1	(18, 25)	297.0	1.13	293.8	296.6	297.4	297.9	298.1
Room 2		294.7	2.03	291.4	293.0	294.8	296.6	298.0
Room 3		293.9	1.92	291.2	292.2	293.6	295.4	297.7

2

3 Using the mean value of the calibration parameters, we compared the simulation results and

4 measurements of CO₂ in Figure 4. The simulation results show similar trends well as the

5 measurements. According to the American Society of Heating, Refrigerating, and Air-


6 conditioning Engineers (ASHRAE) guideline 14⁴⁹ and FEMP⁵⁰, when the CVRMSE and NMBE

7 values are less than 30% and $\pm 10\%$ for transient data, the calibrated accuracy meet the


8 requirements. The (CVRMSE, NMBE) of validation of Rooms 1-3 are (15.3, 7.6), (10.5, 6.1), and

9 (12.5, 12.3), respectively, which shows that the validated accuracy is satisfied.


Bayesian Calibration of CO₂, Ventilation and COVID-19 Airborne Risk



(a) Room 1



(b) Room 2



(c) Room 3

Bayesian Calibration of CO₂, Ventilation and COVID-19 Airborne Risk



1 Fig. 4 Comparison of simulated and measured CO₂ levels in three schools.

2 **4.4 CO₂ level and ventilation rate evaluations**


3 The calibrated ventilation rates in all three classrooms are all less than 2 ACH. The recommended
4 ventilation rate for a safe indoor environment by Harvard-CU Boulder Portable Air Cleaner
5 Calculator for Schools is at least 5 ACH. Therefore, the ventilation rate of all three classrooms
6 seems inadequate. To relate the CO₂ levels, e.g., measured from a CO₂ sensor, and the ventilation
7 rates, by using the calibrated CO₂ model, we calculate the outdoor air ventilation rate in ACH and
8 CFM/person as a function of CO₂ levels at different exposure times in Figure 5. It helps teachers
9 find the room ventilation rate directly based on the CO₂ sensors at different school hours. For
10 example, for Room 1, when CO₂ > 600 ppm, OA (outdoor air) < 5 ACH (24 CFM/person); CO₂ >
11 800 ppm, OA < 2 ACH (9 CFM/person) at any time of the day. A CO₂ level less than 480 ppm
12 indicates a ventilation rate greater than 10 ACH (48 CFM/person) at all times. For Room 2, the
13 same CO₂ levels correspond to a lower ventilation rate than Room 1. For example, when CO₂ >
14 600 ppm, OA < 2 ACH (13 CFM/person); CO₂ < 440 ppm indicates that OA > 10 ACH (66
15 CFM/person). This shows that Room 1 shows a higher ventilation rate (ACH) for the same CO₂
16 level because of its smaller size. The ventilation rate of Room 3 at a specific CO₂ level is higher
17 than Room 2 because of its constant occupancy compared to the variable occupancy of Room 2. It
18 seems lunch breaks indeed lower CO₂ levels significantly (thus infectious risk in schools). For
19 Room 3, CO₂ > 600 ppm indicates OA < 3 ACH (22 CFM/person). These results show that the
20 indoor CO₂ could vary significantly in different classrooms even with the same ventilation rate
21 because of different room sizes, occupants number, and occupancy schedule. All three classrooms
22 show that an indoor CO₂ lower than 450 ppm indicates a ventilation rate greater than 10 ACH,

Bayesian Calibration of CO₂, Ventilation and COVID-19 Airborne Risk

- 1 close to the recommended 12 ACH value to prevent airborne transmission in health-care
- 2 facilities^{7,8}. Note that here CO₂ is the exposure-time-averaged instead of the instantaneous level.



Bayesian Calibration of CO₂, Ventilation and COVID-19 Airborne Risk



1 Fig. 5 Relation of indoor CO₂ levels and ventilation rates for classrooms.

2 4.5 CO₂ level and infection risk evaluations

3 To study CO₂ and airborne aerosol infectious risk relation, we first calculate the probability of
4 infection risk with the posterior distribution of the ventilation rate obtained in Section 4.3. Note,
5 Here, the Bayesian and MCMC analysis allow us to quantify the uncertainties of the ventilation
6 rates to estimate airborne infectious risk by defining the probability of the infection risk: the
7 probable range of the infection risk estimated in classrooms. Then, we evaluate different
8 ventilation rates to identify the corresponding CO₂ threshold level, at which the reproductive
9 number, $R_0 < 1$, at all exposure times. We estimate the infection risk and indoor air CO₂ threshold
10 based on the actual room conditions in this work. The recommended threshold could be used for
11 other rooms under a similar condition.

12 Table 4 shows the input parameters for Eqs. 3-11 to calculate the COVID-19 airborne infection
13 risk in classrooms. Actual room conditions with age and activity levels were used to determine

Bayesian Calibration of CO₂, Ventilation and COVID-19 Airborne Risk

1 breathing and quanta emission rates^{51,52}. All students wore a face mask in the classroom, and mask
 2 efficiency was selected based on students' typical mask type. The prevalence rate and immunity
 3 fraction were calculated based on the official reported data⁵³.

4 Table 4 Input parameters for calculation of infection risk in three classrooms

Parameter	Symbol (unit)	Room number		
		Room 1	Room 2	Room 3
Breath rate	$B (m^3/h)$	0.67	0.67	0.67
Mask fraction	f_m	1	1	1
Mask inhalation efficiency	M_{in}	30%	30%	30%
Mask exhalation efficiency	M_{ex}	50%	50%	50%
Quanta emission rate	$ER_q (q/h)$	27.55	27.55	27.55
Number of infected people	N_{inf}	1	1	1
Indoor air filtration rate	$\lambda_2(1/h)$	0	0	0
Deposition rate	$\lambda_3(1/h)$	0.3	0.3	0.3
Decay rate	$\lambda_4(1/h)$	0.62	0.62	0.62
Number of susceptible	N_{sus}	19	20	18
Recovered cases	–	38891	38014	38646
Daily new cases	N_{new}	253	287	285
Unreported cases	f_{unrep}	80%	80%	80%
Duration of disease	D	10	10	10
Prevalence rate	P_{prev}	0.62%	0.70%	0.69%

5
 6 Figure 6 plots the transient PI_{cond} and PI_{abs} in three classrooms with the calibrated ventilation rates'
 7 posterior distribution. The orange/green line is the baseline of PI_{cond}/PI_{abs} calculated using the mean
 8 value of the posterior distribution of ventilation rate. The orange/green area is the estimated
 9 infection risk probability with a 95% confidence interval. For Rooms 1, 2, and 3, the mean PI_{cond}
 10 at the end of the day is around 14%, 14%, and 20%, respectively. Rooms 1 and 2 show lower PI_{cond}
 11 because no students were present during the break, so the quanta generation was zero. The
 12 uncertain band of PI_{cond} in Room 1 is wider than other rooms because of the larger posterior range
 13 of ventilation rate due to its mechanical ventilation system. In Rooms 1 and 2, when students leave
 14 the classroom, the PI_{abs} are zero because there is no susceptible persons in the room. Room 1 shows


Bayesian Calibration of CO₂, Ventilation and COVID-19 Airborne Risk

1 the lowest PI_{abs} because of the lower PI_{cond} and prevalence rate: all three measurements were
2 conducted on different days. There are more students in Room 2 than Room 3; however, because
3 of the lower PI_{cond} , the absolute PI of Room 2 is thus lower.


4 It also shows that after three hours, PI_{cond} of Room 1 is always smaller than two other rooms due
5 to a higher ventilation rate. More frequent leaves of students (three breaks in a day) also contribute:
6 the quanta level is generally lower than the two other rooms. PI_{cond} of Room 3 continues to rise
7 with the exposure time, unlike other classrooms, again due to the constant occupancy assumed.
8 Therefore, to reduce infection risk, more frequent breaks and leaves could be beneficial when
9 increasing the classroom's ventilation rate is relatively harder to achieve.

10 The conditional PI is the ratio of the number of infections to susceptibles $PI_{cond} = D/S$. The
11 reproductive number (R_0), defined by Rudnick and Milton (2003), is the number of secondary
12 infections when a single infected person is introduced in the room, and everyone in the room is
13 susceptible. If $R_0 < 1$, then the infectious agent cannot spread in the population. For these three
14 classrooms if PI_{cond} is smaller than 5.3%, 5%, and 5.5%, it is expected that the community spread
15 in the classrooms could be stopped. Figure 6 shows that, for Rooms 1, 2, and 3, the conditional PI
16 exceeds the level of $R_0 = 1$ at around two ~ three hours, after which mitigation measures should
17 be taken.

Bayesian Calibration of CO₂, Ventilation and COVID-19 Airborne Risk




a) Room 1




b) Room 2

Bayesian Calibration of CO₂, Ventilation and COVID-19 Airborne Risk




(a) Room 1



(b) Room 2

Bayesian Calibration of CO₂, Ventilation and COVID-19 Airborne Risk



(c) Room 3

1 Fig. 7 PI_{cond} and time-averaged CO₂ for different exposure times and ventilation rates.

2 According to Figure 7, each classroom needs a different ventilation rate at different exposure times

3 to reach the level of $R_0 = 1$. On the other hand, we can find the indoor CO₂ threshold for each

4 exposure time corresponding $R_0 = 1$, as shown in Figure 8. The CO₂ threshold level decreases with

5 exposure time for all three rooms. For Room 1 at the second hour, the acceptable level is around

6 1000 ppm and later has to be 520 ppm at the end of the day to avoid spreading. For Rooms 2 and

7 3, it decreases from 660 ppm to 505 ppm and 750 ppm to 500 ppm, respectively. Meanwhile, the


8 threshold levels for 3-7 hours exposure times are close for all three classrooms. In comparison,

9 Figures 8b and 8c illustrate that the ventilation rate threshold (to prevent the spreading) increases


10 with exposure time and is not a constant number because of the three rooms' different sizes and

11 schedules.


Bayesian Calibration of CO₂, Ventilation and COVID-19 Airborne Risk



(a)



(b)



Bayesian Calibration of CO₂, Ventilation and COVID-19 Airborne Risk

1 Fig. 9 a) Time-averaged indoor CO₂ concentration thresholds, and b, c) outdoor ventilation rate
2 thresholds with exposure times to prevent spreading.

3 In summary, the results of all three classrooms show that the ventilation rate threshold to prevent
4 the airborne transmission of COVID-19 depends on several parameters such as room size, student
5 schedules, and exposure time. The indoor CO₂ threshold seems to depend on exposure time mostly,
6 and the time-averaged level of 500 ppm seems acceptable for all three classrooms.

7 **5. Conclusion**

8 The airborne transmission of COVID-19 is a major infection route in indoor spaces, especially
9 with poor ventilation conditions, large occupancy density, and high exposure time, such as school
10 classrooms. There are some recommended ventilation rates for acceptable indoor air quality or
11 preventing airborne transmission in indoor spaces, but it is not easy to measure the actual room's
12 ventilation rate. Indoor air CO₂ level can be used as an indicator for the ventilation rate, whereas
13 it depends on several parameters that must be estimated. In this work, we used the sensitivity
14 analysis, MCMC Bayesian Calibration method, measured data of indoor CO₂ and occupancy
15 profile of three classrooms in Montreal, Canada, to find and calibrate the dominant parameters to
16 estimate CO₂ levels indoors. The results showed that the outdoor ventilation rate is the most
17 significant parameter. The calibrated ventilation rate with a 95% confidence level is 1.96 ± 0.31
18 ACH for Room 1 with mechanical ventilation, and 0.40 ± 0.08 ACH and 0.79 ± 0.06 ACH for
19 Rooms 2 and 3 with windows open only. Based on the calibrated model, we created the correlations
20 between the CO₂ levels and the ventilation rates, which help teachers to estimate the ventilation
21 rates from the CO₂ sensors at any time. A time-averaged CO₂ lower than 450 ppm is equivalent

Bayesian Calibration of CO₂, Ventilation and COVID-19 Airborne Risk

1 to a ventilation rate greater than 10 ACH in all three rooms, close to the recommended 12 ACH
2 value for a safe indoor environment against airborne transmission.

3 This study also proposed the approach to calculating the probability of the infection risk based on
4 the calibrated ventilation rate, which helps quantify the uncertainty of outdoor ventilation rates.
5 Moreover, this study estimated the required ventilation rate threshold and the CO₂ threshold values
6 to prevent the airborne aerosol spreading of COVID-19 as a function of exposure time in the
7 classrooms. The ventilation threshold at all hours is 8, 3, and 6 ACH for rooms 1, 2, and 3,
8 respectively, and the CO₂ threshold is around 500 ppm at all exposure times (< 8 hr) of a school
9 day for all three classrooms. This threshold is significantly different from the recommended value
10 of 1000 ppm for acceptable indoor air quality conditions. Therefore, it is recommended that the
11 ventilation rate and indoor CO₂ concentration thresholds be reconsidered in indoor spaces,
12 especially classrooms, in the current pandemic.

13 **Acknowledgment**

14 The research is supported by the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council (NSERC) of
15 Canada through the Discovery Grants Program [#RGPIN-2018-06734] and the Advancing Climate
16 Change Science in Canada Program [#ACCPJ 535986-18].

17 **References**

- 18 1. Asadi S, Bouvier N, Wexler AS, Ristenpart WD. The coronavirus pandemic and aerosols:
19 Does COVID-19 transmit via expiratory particles? *Aerosol Sci Technol*. 2020.
- 20 2. Prather KA, Wang CC, Schooley RT. Reducing transmission of SARS-CoV-2. *Science*
21 (80-). 2020.

Bayesian Calibration of CO₂, Ventilation and COVID-19 Airborne Risk

- 1 3. Zhang J. Integrating IAQ control strategies to reduce the risk of asymptomatic SARS CoV-
2 2 infections in classrooms and open plan offices. *Sci Technol Built Environ*. 2020.
- 3 4. REMIORZ R. School COVID-19 cases consistent with community transmission, but
4 Quebec could be in trouble, data show - The Globe and Mail. 2020.
5 [https://www.theglobeandmail.com/canada/article-school-covid-19-cases-consistent-with-](https://www.theglobeandmail.com/canada/article-school-covid-19-cases-consistent-with-community-transmission-but/)
6 [community-transmission-but/](https://www.theglobeandmail.com/canada/article-school-covid-19-cases-consistent-with-community-transmission-but/). Accessed January 13, 2021.
- 7 5. Number of schools - Covid Écoles Québec. 2020. [https://www.covidecolesquebec.org/liste-](https://www.covidecolesquebec.org/liste-alphabtique)
8 [alphabtique](https://www.covidecolesquebec.org/liste-alphabtique). Accessed January 13, 2021.
- 9 6. Du CR, Wang SC, Yu MC, et al. Effect of ventilation improvement during a tuberculosis
10 outbreak in underventilated university buildings. *Indoor Air*. 2020.
- 11 7. Sehulster L, Chinn RYW. Guidelines for environmental infection control in health-care
12 facilities. Recommendations of CDC and the Healthcare Infection Control Practices
13 Advisory Committee (HICPAC). *MMWR Recomm Rep*. 2003.
- 14 8. Atkinson J, Chartier Y, Lúcia Pessoa-Silva C, et al. Natural ventilation for infection control
15 in health-care settings. *World Heal Organ*. 2016.
- 16 9. Allen J, Cedeno-Laurent J, Miller S. Harvard-CU Boulder Portable Air Cleaner Calculator
17 for Schools.v1.3 - Google Sheets. 2020.
18 [https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1NEhk1IEdbEi_b3wa6gI_zNs8uBJjISS-](https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1NEhk1IEdbEi_b3wa6gI_zNs8uBJjISS-86d4b7bW098/edit#gid=1882881703)
19 [86d4b7bW098/edit#gid=1882881703](https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1NEhk1IEdbEi_b3wa6gI_zNs8uBJjISS-86d4b7bW098/edit#gid=1882881703). Accessed January 13, 2021.
- 20 10. Penman JM. An experimental determination of ventilation rate in occupied rooms using

Bayesian Calibration of CO₂, Ventilation and COVID-19 Airborne Risk

- 1 atmospheric carbon dioxide concentration. *Build Environ.* 1980.
- 2 11. Mumovic D, Palmer J, Davies M, et al. Winter indoor air quality, thermal comfort and
3 acoustic performance of newly built secondary schools in England. *Build Environ.* 2009.
- 4 12. Batterman S. Review and extension of CO₂-based methods to determine ventilation rates
5 with application to school classrooms. *Int J Environ Res Public Health.* 2017.
- 6 13. COVID-19: Measures in place as the holidays approach. 2020.
7 [http://app.dialoginsight.com/T/OFSYS/SM2/365/2/S/F/1936/16667709/5P9DnIIH/734118](http://app.dialoginsight.com/T/OFSYS/SM2/365/2/S/F/1936/16667709/5P9DnIIH/734118.html)
8 [.html](http://app.dialoginsight.com/T/OFSYS/SM2/365/2/S/F/1936/16667709/5P9DnIIH/734118.html). Accessed January 28, 2021.
- 9 14. Eykelbosh A. Can CO₂ Sensors be Used to Assess COVID-19 Transmission Risk? |
10 National Collaborating Centre for Environmental Health | NCCEH - CCSNE. 2021.
11 <https://ncceh.ca/content/blog/can-co2-sensors-be-used-assess-covid-19-transmission-risk>.
12 Accessed January 22, 2021.
- 13 15. Strawderman RL, Gamerman D. Markov Chain Monte Carlo: Stochastic Simulation for
14 Bayesian Inference. *J Am Stat Assoc.* 2000.
- 15 16. Kennedy MC, O'Hagan A. Bayesian calibration of computer models. *J R Stat Soc Ser B Stat*
16 *Methodol.* 2001.
- 17 17. Van Oijen M, Rougier J, Smith R. Bayesian calibration of process-based forest models:
18 Bridging the gap between models and data. In: *Tree Physiology.* ; 2005.
- 19 18. Steel D. Bayesian statistics in radiocarbon calibration. *Philos Sci.* 2001.
- 20 19. Lehuger S, Gabrielle B, Oijen M van, et al. Bayesian calibration of the nitrous oxide

Bayesian Calibration of CO₂, Ventilation and COVID-19 Airborne Risk

- 1 emission module of an agro-ecosystem model. *Agric Ecosyst Environ.* 2009.
- 2 20. Arhonditsis GB, Papantou D, Zhang W, Perhar G, Massos E, Shi M. Bayesian calibration
3 of mechanistic aquatic biogeochemical models and benefits for environmental management.
4 *J Mar Syst.* 2008.
- 5 21. Kuczera G, Kavetski D, Renard B, Thyer M. A limited-memory acceleration strategy for
6 MCMC sampling in hierarchical Bayesian calibration of hydrological models. *Water*
7 *Resour Res.* 2010.
- 8 22. Hall JW, Manning LJ, Hankin RKS. Bayesian calibration of a flood inundation model using
9 spatial data. *Water Resour Res.* 2011.
- 10 23. Xu T, Valocchi AJ. A Bayesian approach to improved calibration and prediction of
11 groundwater models with structural error. *Water Resour Res.* 2015.
- 12 24. Van Hinsbergen CPIJ, Van Lint HWC, Hoogendoorn SP, Van Zuylen HJ. Bayesian
13 calibration of car-following models. In: *IFAC Proceedings Volumes (IFAC-PapersOnline)*. ;
14 2009.
- 15 25. Whyte S, Walsh C, Chilcott J. Bayesian calibration of a natural history model with
16 application to a population model for colorectal cancer. *Med Decis Mak.* 2011.
- 17 26. Heo Y, Choudhary R, Augenbroe GA. Calibration of building energy models for retrofit
18 analysis under uncertainty. *Energy Build.* 2012.
- 19 27. NIOSH. CDC - The National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH). 2020.
20 <https://www.cdc.gov/niosh/>. Accessed January 21, 2021.

Bayesian Calibration of CO₂, Ventilation and COVID-19 Airborne Risk

- 1 28. Wilton K. 12 Montreal teachers secretly tested classroom ventilation. The results are
2 "problematic" | Montreal Gazette. 2020. [https://montrealgazette.com/news/local-news/12-](https://montrealgazette.com/news/local-news/12-montreal-teachers-secretly-tested-classroom-ventilation-the-results-are-problematic)
3 [montreal-teachers-secretly-tested-classroom-ventilation-the-results-are-problematic.](https://montrealgazette.com/news/local-news/12-montreal-teachers-secretly-tested-classroom-ventilation-the-results-are-problematic)
4 Accessed January 21, 2021.
- 5 29. Barnhart S, Sheppard L, Beaudet N, Stover B, Balmes J. Tuberculosis in health care settings
6 and the estimated benefits of engineering controls and respiratory protection. *J Occup*
7 *Environ Med.* 1997.
- 8 30. Rudnick SN, Milton DK. Risk of indoor airborne infection transmission estimated from
9 carbon dioxide concentration. *Indoor Air.* 2003.
- 10 31. Peng Z, Jimenez JL. Title: Exhaled CO₂ as COVID-19 infection risk proxy for different
11 indoor environments and activities. *medRxiv.* 2020.
- 12 32. Miller SL, Nazaroff WW, Jimenez JL, et al. Transmission of SARS-CoV-2 by inhalation of
13 respiratory aerosol in the Skagit Valley Chorale superspreading event. *Indoor Air.* 2020.
- 14 33. Jimenez JL. 2020_COVID-19_Aerosol_Transmission_Estimator - Google Sheets. 2020.
15 [https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/16K1OQkLD4BjgBdO8ePj6ytf-](https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/16K1OQkLD4BjgBdO8ePj6ytf-RpPMIJ6aXFg3PrIQBbQ/edit#gid=519189277)
16 [RpPMIJ6aXFg3PrIQBbQ/edit#gid=519189277.](https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/16K1OQkLD4BjgBdO8ePj6ytf-RpPMIJ6aXFg3PrIQBbQ/edit#gid=519189277) Accessed October 19, 2020.
- 17 34. Katal A, Albettar M, Wang L (Leon). City Reduced Probability of Infection (CityRPI) for
18 Indoor Airborne Transmission of SARS-CoV-2 and Urban Building Energy Impacts.
19 *medRxiv.* 2021. 2021.
20 [https://www.medrxiv.org/content/early/2021/01/20/2021.01.19.21250046.](https://www.medrxiv.org/content/early/2021/01/20/2021.01.19.21250046)

Bayesian Calibration of CO₂, Ventilation and COVID-19 Airborne Risk

- 1 35. Wang L (Leon), Katal A, Albettar M. CityRPI for Indoor Airborne Transmission. 2020.
2 <https://concordia-cityrpi.web.app/>. Accessed December 30, 2020.
- 3 36. Havers FP, Reed C, Lim T, et al. Seroprevalence of Antibodies to SARS-CoV-2 in 10 Sites
4 in the United States, March 23-May 12, 2020. *JAMA Intern Med.* 2020.
- 5 37. Gu Y. Estimating True Infections | COVID-19 Projections Using Machine Learning. 2020.
6 <https://covid19-projections.com/estimating-true-infections/>. Accessed October 12, 2020.
- 7 38. Byrne AW, McEvoy D, Collins AB, et al. Inferred duration of infectious period of SARS-
8 CoV-2: rapid scoping review and analysis of available evidence for asymptomatic and
9 symptomatic COVID-19 cases. *BMJ Open.* 2020.
- 10 39. Li Q, Augenbroe G, Brown J. Assessment of linear emulators in lightweight Bayesian
11 calibration of dynamic building energy models for parameter estimation and performance
12 prediction. *Energy Build.* 2016;124:194–202.
- 13 40. Matala A. Sample Size Requirement for Monte Carlo simulations using Latin Hypercube
14 Sampling. *Indep Res Proj Appl Math.* 2008:1–24.
- 15 41. Menberg K, Heo Y, Choudhary R. Sensitivity analysis methods for building energy models:
16 Comparing computational costs and extractable information. *Energy Build.* 2016.
- 17 42. Lim H, Zhai ZJ. Comprehensive evaluation of the influence of meta-models on Bayesian
18 calibration. *Energy Build.* 2017;155:66–75.
- 19 43. Bayes TR. An Essay Towards Solving a Problem in the Doctrine of Chances. *Philos Trans*
20 *R Soc London.* 1763;53:370–418.

Bayesian Calibration of CO₂, Ventilation and COVID-19 Airborne Risk

- 1 44. Betancourt M. A Conceptual Introduction to Hamiltonian Monte Carlo. *arXiv Prepr*
2 *arXiv170102434*. 2017.
- 3 45. ECCC. Historical Data - Climate - Environment and Climate Change Canada. 2020.
4 https://climate.weather.gc.ca/historical_data/search_historic_data_e.html. Accessed
5 October 5, 2020.
- 6 46. ANSI/ASHRAE. ANSI/ASHRAE Standard 62.1-2019, Ventilation for Acceptable Indoor
7 Air Quality. ASHRAE. 2019.
8 https://ashrae.iwrapper.com/ASHRAE_PREVIEW_ONLY_STANDARDS/STD_62.1_20
9 19. Accessed December 1, 2020.
- 10 47. Persily A, de Jonge L. Carbon dioxide generation rates for building occupants. *Indoor Air*.
11 2017.
- 12 48. Mike McGee. Daily CO₂. A Pro Oxygen. 2016. <https://www.co2.earth/daily-co2>. Accessed
13 December 27, 2016.
- 14 49. ANSI/ASHRAE. ASHRAE Guideline 14-2002 Measurement of Energy and Demand
15 Savings. *Ashrae*. 2002.
- 16 50. U.S. Department of Energy. M&V Guidelines: Measurement and Verification for
17 Performance-Based Contracts Version 4.0. 2015.
- 18 51. Buonanno G, Stabile L, Morawska L. Estimation of airborne viral emission: Quanta
19 emission rate of SARS-CoV-2 for infection risk assessment. *Environ Int*. 2020.
- 20 52. US Environmental Protection Agency. Exposure Factors Handbook: 2011 Edition. *US*

Bayesian Calibration of CO₂, Ventilation and COVID-19 Airborne Risk

- 1 *Environ Prot Agency*. 2011.

- 2 53. Esri Canada. COVID-19 Canada. 2020. <https://resources-covid19canada.hub.arcgis.com/>.
- 3 Accessed January 5, 2021.

- 4

- 5