

The impact of heating, ventilation, and air conditioning design features on the transmission of viruses, including the 2019 novel coronavirus: a systematic review of filtration

Authors:

Gail M. Thornton, PhD¹, Brian A. Fleck, PhD¹, Emily Kroeker, MLIS¹, Dhyey Dandnyak, BSc¹, Natalie Fleck, BA¹, Lexuan Zhong, PhD¹, Lisa Hartling, PhD²

Affiliations:

1 Department of Mechanical Engineering, Faculty of Engineering, University of Alberta

2 Department of Pediatrics, Faculty of Medicine & Dentistry, University of Alberta

Correspondence: Dr. Brian A. Fleck; Department of Mechanical Engineering, Faculty of Engineering, University of Alberta; 116 Street and 85 Avenue; Edmonton, Alberta, Canada T6G 2R3; Email: brian.fleck@ualberta.ca

Conflict of Interest: Dr. Fleck is an unpaid advisor for Pura Air Inc. in Vancouver.

Acknowledgements: We thank Tara Landry and Alison Henry for conducting the peer review of the search strategies. We thank Samuel Ducholke, Kristen Rumbold, Larry Zhong, and Stella Mathews for their involvement in screening studies for inclusion.

Funding: This work is funded by a Canadian Institutes of Health Research (CIHR) Operating Grant: Canadian 2019 Novel Coronavirus (COVID-19) Rapid Research Funding Opportunity [https://webapps.cihr-irsc.gc.ca/decisions/p/project_details.html?applId=422567&lang=en].

Dr. Hartling is supported by a Canada Research Chair in Knowledge Synthesis and Translation.

Drs. Fleck and Zhong are supported by NSERC Discovery program.

Filtration and Virus Transmission

Abstract

Historically, viruses have demonstrated airborne transmission. Emerging evidence suggests the novel coronavirus (SARS-CoV-2) that causes COVID-19 may also spread by airborne transmission. This is more likely in indoor environments, particularly with poor ventilation. In the context of potential airborne transmission, a vital mitigation strategy for the built environment is heating, ventilation, and air conditioning (HVAC) systems. HVAC features could modify virus transmission potential. A systematic review following international standards was conducted to comprehensively identify and synthesize research examining the effectiveness of filters within HVAC systems in reducing virus transmission. Twenty-three relevant studies showed that: filtration was associated with decreased transmission; filters removed viruses from the air; increasing filter efficiency (efficiency of particle removal) was associated with decreased transmission, decreased infection risk, and increased viral filtration efficiency (efficiency of virus removal); increasing filter efficiency above MERV 13 was associated with limited benefit in further reduction of virus concentration and infection risk; and filters with the same efficiency rating from different companies showed variable performance. Increasing filter efficiency may mitigate virus transmission; however, improvement may be limited above MERV 13. Adapting HVAC systems to mitigate virus transmission requires a multi-factorial approach and filtration is one factor offering demonstrated potential for decreased transmission.

Keywords: virus, transmission, coronavirus, COVID-19, aerosol, filtration

Filtration and Virus Transmission

Practical Implications

In order for filtration to be an effective means of virus removal and transmission control, proper installation is required. As well, professionals should be aware of the fact that similarly rated filters from different companies may offer different virus reduction results. While increasing filtration efficiency (i.e., increasing MERV rating or moving from MERV to HEPA) is associated with virus mitigation, there appears to be diminishing returns for filters rated MERV 13 or higher. Although costs increase with filtration efficiency, filtration costs are lower than the cost of ventilation options with the equivalent reduction in transmission.

Introduction

In March 2020, the World Health Organization (WHO) declared a global pandemic due to Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) which is attributed to Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2).¹ Worldwide, public health authorities have sought evidence regarding routes of virus transmission and corresponding public health measures to mitigate virus spread. Certain viruses can be transmitted via an aerosol route.² Aerosol transmission is facilitated by virus-laden aerosols expelled by humans, remaining airborne for extended periods of time. Recent evidence suggests that SARS-CoV-2 can spread via airborne transmission, particularly in indoor environments with poor ventilation.³⁻⁴ In April 2021, the American Society of Heating, Refrigerating, and Air-Conditioning Engineers (ASHRAE) released a statement declaring that “[a]irborne transmission of SARS-CoV-2 is significant and should be controlled. Changes to building operations, including the operation of heating, ventilating, and air-conditioning systems, can reduce airborne exposures.”⁵ Determining appropriate measures to protect occupants of indoor spaces based on informed, interdisciplinary research is critical to managing the spread of infectious disease.⁶

Heating, ventilation, and air conditioning (HVAC) systems can mitigate airborne transmission of viruses by removing or diluting contaminated air inside the building envelope where humans breathe.⁶⁻⁹ HVAC design features, such as, filtration, ventilation, ultraviolet radiation, and humidity can influence transmission. The first official air filter testing standard in the HVAC industry was published by ASHRAE in 1968: ASHRAE 52-68.¹⁰ In 1976, the updated ASHRAE 52-76 was published. In Europe, ASHRAE 52-76 was adapted as Eurovent 4/5 which classified filters from EU1 to EU9.¹⁰ In 1999, ASHRAE 52.2 introduced the classification Minimum Efficiency Reporting Value (MERV). ASHRAE 52.2 was modified in 2007, 2012, and 2017. By

Filtration and Virus Transmission

2016 in Europe, ISO 16890 replaced EN779 which classified filters as G1-G4; M5-M6; F7-F9.¹⁰ EN779 had replaced Eurovent 4/9 which superseded Eurovent 4/5.¹⁰ In ASHRAE Standard 52.2-2017, filter efficiency is based on particle size removal efficiency (PSE).¹¹ In other words, filter efficiency is the fraction of particles removed from air passing through the filter.¹² Particles fall into three size ranges: E₁ 0.30-1.0 µm; E₂ 1.0-3.0 µm; and E₃ 3.0-10.0 µm. The PSEs in these size ranges are used to determine the MERV rating, which ranges from MERV 1 to MERV 16. Another common filter is a High Efficiency Particulate Air (HEPA) filter; the filter efficiency of a HEPA filter is better than MERV 16.¹² Based on these dates, studies and recommendations may report a variety of filter efficiencies from EU, F, MERV, and HEPA.

In January 2021, ASHRAE⁵ made recommendations for reducing airborne infectious aerosol exposure, which included the use of MERV 13 or higher filters for air recirculated by HVAC systems. When accessed in April 2021, the ASHRAE website indicated that MERV 13 is recommended but MERV 14 or better is preferred.¹³ In March 2021, the WHO released a roadmap concerning indoor ventilation during COVID-19.¹⁴ Based on a scoping review that identified six studies specific to SARS-CoV-2 and review of technical guidance by leading international HVAC organizations, the roadmap presents standards for healthcare, non-residential and residential environments based on type of ventilation (natural vs. mechanical). In specific situations (e.g., depending on ventilation rate and airflow patterns, system designs with air recirculation modes or heat recovery), HEPA or MERV 14 filters are recommended.¹⁴

This systematic review considered whether virus transmission is affected by HVAC design features, particularly, filtration. In this review, an extensive and comprehensive search of the literature was conducted to identify and synthesize published research evaluating the effectiveness of filtration in reducing virus transmission. The insight drawn from this review could help answer

Filtration and Virus Transmission

questions of the utility of filtration to mitigate the transmission of SARS-CoV-2 in mechanically ventilated indoor environments. Further, understanding the association between filter efficiency and infection risk could inform control measures. Finally, a comprehensive synthesis of the existing scientific literature can identify gaps and guide priorities for future research.

Methods

This systematic review addressed the research question: is virus transmission affected by HVAC design features, particularly, filtration? The current review was part of a larger research program to review literature on HVAC design features (ventilation, filtration, ultraviolet radiation, and humidity) and virus transmission. Results for other HVAC design features of interest are reported separately due to the volume and heterogeneity of the research. The systematic review is registered.¹⁵ An *a priori* protocol was developed and is publicly available.¹⁶ The standards for the conduct of systematic reviews defined by the international Cochrane organization¹⁷ were followed with modifications for questions of etiology.¹⁸ The review is reported according to accepted reporting standards.¹⁹

Search Strategy. From inception to June 2020, three electronic databases (Ovid MEDLINE, Compendex, Web of Science Core) were searched by a research librarian (GMT) using concepts related to virus, transmission, and HVAC. The Ovid MEDLINE search strategy is detailed in Table 1. Prior to implementing the searches, the strategies were peer-reviewed by two librarians (TL, AH). In January 2021, the search was updated. Reference lists of all relevant papers were screened, in addition to relevant review articles. Conference abstracts were identified through Compendex and Web of Science and were not included, but literature was searched to see whether any potentially relevant abstracts had been published as complete papers. Limits by year or language of publication were not placed on the search; however, only English-language studies

It is made available under a [CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/) .

Filtration and Virus Transmission

were included due to the volume of available literature and resource constraints. EndNote was used to manage references with duplicate records removed prior to screening.

Study Selection. Study selection had two stages. First, two reviewers independently screened titles and abstracts of references identified by electronic database searches. Relevance of each record was classified as Yes, Maybe, or No. Any conflicts between Yes/Maybe and No were resolved by one reviewer. To ensure consistency among the review team, pilot testing was conducted with three sets of studies (n=199 each). The review team met to discuss discrepancies and develop decision rules after each set of pilot screenings. Second, two reviewers independently reviewed full text articles and applied inclusion and exclusion criteria. Reviewers classified studies as Include or Exclude. Any conflicts between Include and Exclude were resolved by consensus of the review team. One reviewer resolved conflicts between different exclusion reasons. The second stage of screening was pilot tested with three sets of studies (n=30 each). The review team met to resolve discrepancies after each pilot round. The review team conducted screening using Covidence software.

Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria. Inclusion and exclusion criteria are listed in Table 2. This systematic review was part of a larger effort to examine different HVAC design features and virus transmission. While all design features were included in the search and screening process at once, only studies evaluating filtration were synthesized here. A variety of agents were included in the search; however, studies of viruses or agents that simulated viruses were prioritized. Other agents (e.g., bacteria, fungi) would be included only if studies were not available that were specific to viruses. Studies using bacteriophages, which are viruses that infect bacterial cells,²⁰ were included. This review is interested in studies of the indoor built environment (e.g., office, public, residential buildings) which had mechanical ventilation. Primary research that provided quantitative results

Filtration and Virus Transmission

of the correlation or association between filtration and virus transmission was included. No restrictions were placed on year of publication and only English-language, peer-reviewed publications were included.

Risk of Bias Assessment. For experimental studies, risk of bias was assessed based on three key domains: selection bias, information bias and confounding.²¹⁻²² Reviewers assessed each domain as low, unclear, or high risk of bias using signalling questions¹⁷ from guidance documents for the different study types that were included; e.g., animal studies, laboratory experiments, epidemiological studies.²¹⁻²³ For modelling studies, risk of bias was assessed using the following three key domains: definition, assumption, and validation.²³⁻²⁴ The domain definition considers model complexity and data sources, assumption considers the description and explanation of model assumptions, and validation considered model validation and sensitivity analysis.²⁴ Reviewers assessed each domain as low, unclear, or high risk of bias based on signalling questions.²³⁻²⁵ Risk of bias items were pilot tested among three review authors. Then, two reviewers (GMT, BAF) applied the criteria independently to each relevant study and met to resolve discrepancies.

Data Extraction. Reviewers extracted general information about the study (authors, year of publication, country of corresponding author, study design) and methods (setting, population [as applicable], agent studied, intervention set-up). Details on filtration parameters (where available) were extracted, including any filter efficiency ratings or classifications (such as MERV and EU ratings or HEPA) or filter efficiencies expressed as percentages, where applicable. More recent filter efficiencies are based on ASHRAE Standard 52.2-2017 and represent particle size removal efficiencies (PSE) with particles falling into three size ranges: E₁ 0.30-1.0 µm; E₂ 1.0-3.0 µm; and E₃ 3.0-10.0 µm.¹¹ Efficiency of particle removal is usually represented by conventional filter

Filtration and Virus Transmission

efficiency ratings, such as MERV, EU, F, and HEPA. Quantitative data were extracted, as well as results of any tests of statistical significance related to filtration features. The primary outcome of interest was quantitative measures of the association between filtration and virus transmission. As such, data on actual transmission were extracted where available (i.e., infections), as well as information regarding viruses, filters, setting and experimental test set-up, and outcomes. The distinction between the efficiency of particle removal described above and the efficiency of virus removal is important. The efficiency of virus removal is calculated as the difference between the virus concentration upstream of the filter and the virus concentration downstream of the filter divided by the virus concentration upstream of the filter expressed as a percentage. Only one aerosolized virus study used terminology that referred explicitly to virus, viral filtration efficiency,²⁶ while the remaining studies on virus removal used a variety of terms typical for particle removal: removal efficiency,²⁷ filtrating efficiency,²⁸ filter efficiency,²⁹ and filter reduction efficiency.³⁰⁻³¹ European ratings were presented with MERV rating conversions.³² Using a data extraction form spreadsheet to ensure comprehensive and consistent capture of data, one reviewer extracted data and a second reviewer verified data for accuracy and completeness. Any discrepancies were discussed by the review team.

Data Synthesis. As anticipated, meta-analysis was not possible due to heterogeneity across studies in terms of study design, filtration features examined, outcomes assessed, and reporting of results. Evidence tables were developed to describe the studies and their results, as well as a narrative synthesis of the results. To allow for meaningful synthesis and comparison across studies, the studies are presented and discussed in three groups: animal studies (Table 3), aerosolized virus studies (Table 4), and modelling studies (Table 5).

Results

12,177 unique citations were identified following searches executed using the search protocol; 2,428 were identified as potentially relevant following title/abstract screening and 568 met the inclusion criteria following full-text review (Figure 1). Fifty-eight of the 568 were relevant to filtration; 23 studies met the inclusion criteria for filtration and viruses following full-text review (Figure 1). Studies were published between 1966 and 2021 (median year 2014). The majority (n=19) of studies were conducted in the United States. Funding sources for the studies included national research funding organizations and initiatives (n=8), industry (n=4), foundations (n=2), university grants (n=1), filtration associations (n=1), and research networks (n=1). Six studies reported no funding or did not list funding sources.

In this review, studies were examined in three categories: animal studies (n=7), aerosolized virus studies (n=7), and modelling studies (n=9). Within the 23 studies, seven viruses and three bacteriophages were studied, including SARS-CoV-2 (COVID-19) (n=2), porcine reproductive and respiratory syndrome virus (PRRSV) (n=8), influenza (n=3), measles (n=1), Newcastle Disease Virus (NDV) (n=1), adenovirus (n=1), and avian influenza (n=1). Details of individual studies are provided in Tables 3, 4, and 5.

Animal Studies (n=7). Six studies evaluated the influence of filtration on PRRSV in pigs³³⁻³⁸ and one study examined NDV in chickens.³⁹ Of the seven studies, three were performed using experimental test set-ups^{33-34,39} and four were performed in the field (i.e., pig barns).³⁵⁻³⁸

Five of the seven studies found that filtration was associated with decreased virus transmission (Table 3).^{33,35-37,39} Pitkin et al³⁵ also found that filtration was associated with decreased daily risk of infections for PRRSV. One study found the use of filtration was associated with decreased

It is made available under a [CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/) .

Filtration and Virus Transmission

presence of PRRSV downstream of the filter³⁴ and another³⁸ found the use of filtration was associated with decreased relative risk of PRRSV introductions.

Dee et al³³ and Hopkins and Drury³⁹ found that increased filter efficiency was associated with decreasing transmission. Hopkins and Drury³⁹ documented that improper installation of a high efficiency filter allowed transmission to happen. Additionally, Dee et al³⁶ found no difference in the transmission reduction between MERV 14 and MERV 16 with no transmission events in both situations. As well, two studies found that filter performance varied by manufacturer when testing similarly rated filters from different companies.^{34,39}

Aerosolized Virus Studies (n=7). Five of seven aerosolized virus studies found that filtration was associated with virus removal using PRRSV,³⁰ equine arteritis virus (EAV),³⁰ bovine enterovirus (BEV),³⁰ human adenovirus,²⁹ and the bacteriophages T7²⁷⁻²⁸ and MS2.³¹ One study found that increasing MERV rating was associated with decreasing virus concentration for bacteriophage T4⁴⁰ at different locations within an apartment unit, and another found that increasing MERV rating was associated with increasing viral filtration efficiency using bacteriophage MS2²⁶ in a test duct set-up (Table 4).

Like the animal studies conducted by Dee et al³³ and Hopkins and Drury,³⁹ two aerosolized studies found increasing MERV ratings to be associated with increased virus removal efficiencies.^{26,40} Zhang et al²⁶ noted that the filter efficiency associated with E₁ (i.e., 0.30-1.0 µm; the smallest particle size range for MERV classification) was a good approximation of the viral filtration efficiency. In addition, Washam et al,²⁷ prior to the use of MERV ratings as developed in 1999, identified cost differences between filters of similar efficiency.

Modelling Studies (n=9). Nine of the filtration studies were modelling, employing the following models: one-dimensional analytical model,⁴¹ Wells-Riley model,⁴²⁻⁴⁵ CONTAM multi-zone IAQ

It is made available under a [CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/) .

Filtration and Virus Transmission

model,⁴⁶ Susceptible-Exposed-Infectious-Recovered (SEIR) model,⁴³ an indoor contact model,⁴³ a control volume conservation model,⁴⁷ Hybrid Single Particle Lagrangian Integrated Trajectory (HYSPLIT) model,⁴⁸ School Building Archetype (SBA) model using both the Wells-Riley and Monte-Carlo approaches,⁴⁴ the multi-region FATE model of Fauske & Associates,⁴⁵ and dose-response model.⁴⁹ Viruses investigated include SARS-CoV-2,^{45,49} measles with influenza size distributions,⁴⁴ influenza,^{42-43,46} rhinovirus,⁴⁶ PRRSV,⁴⁷ avian influenza,⁴⁸ and virus modelled as gas.⁴¹ Augenbraun et al⁴⁹ sought to examine SARS-CoV-2 but the relevant infectivity parameters were set to that of influenza. A wide variety of settings were analyzed including a twin aisle airliner cabin,⁴¹ an office building,⁴² a cruise ship,⁴³ a school building,⁴⁴ a detached home,⁴⁶ sow barn,⁴⁷ a farm,⁴⁸ and a quantum physics lab.⁴⁹

From the nine modelling studies, five studies found that increasing filter efficiency associated with decreased virus concentration^{41,46} and decreased risk, including absolute risk and relative risk of infection,⁴² transmission risk,⁴⁴ and infection risk⁴⁸ (see Table 5). One study found that the use of filtration was associated with decreased attack rate.⁴³ Two studies found HEPA filtration was associated with decreased risk of SARS-CoV-2 infection⁴⁵ and decreased probability of SARS-CoV-2 infection.⁴⁹ Finally, Janni et al⁴⁷ found that a combination of MERV 8 prefilter and MERV 16 was associated with a lower concentration of PRRSV compared to a combination of MERV 8 prefilter and MERV 14.

Of the nine modelling studies, four evaluated the use of a single filter^{43,45,48-49}; all agreed that installing a filter is more beneficial than not installing a filter. Like the experimental studies of Dee et al³⁶ and Spronk et al,³⁷ and three modelling studies comparing single filters^{41-42,46} agreed that there is a threshold beyond which increasing filter efficiency may not affect the probability of infection. One study using a MERV 8 prefilter was able to model a difference in virus

Filtration and Virus Transmission

concentration comparing MERV 14 and MERV 16.⁴⁷ Mazumdar and Chen⁴¹ compared HEPA filters of different efficiencies and determined that improvement was not evident when increasing filter efficiencies past 99.90%. Azimi and Stephens⁴² and Brown et al⁴⁶ specifically found that there were diminishing returns for MERV 13 or higher filters when using influenza, while Dee et al³⁶ and Spronk et al³⁷ found no difference between MERV 14 and MERV 16 filters for PRRSV. Azimi and Stephens,⁴² using influenza, compared varying MERV filters and a HEPA filter and found that, for filters MERV 13 or greater, the risk reduction was not limited by the filter efficiency; instead by the amount of recirculating air through the HVAC system. Similar to Washam et al,²⁷ Azimi and Stephens⁴² considered the cost of filtration. Compared with the cost of an equivalent amount of outdoor air ventilation, Azimi and Stephens⁴² found filtration was the less expensive option for all MERV ratings except MERV 4.

Risk of Bias. Twelve of the 14 experimental studies had low risk of bias for all three domains: selection bias, information bias, confounding (Table 6). Two experimental studies had low risk of bias for selection bias and confounding but had unclear risk of bias for information bias because of a lack of clarity in the methodological details.²⁸⁻²⁹ Seven of the nine modelling studies had low risk of bias for all three domains: definition, assumption, validation (Table 7). Two modelling studies had low risk of bias for assumption and validation but had unclear risk of bias for definition because of a lack of clarity about the HEPA filter efficiency⁴⁵ and contribution of fresh air.⁴⁹

Discussion

While there is substantial literature on the use of filters to remove particles, this review was designed to consider the use of filters to remove viruses. The 23 articles that satisfied our strict criteria revealed several important findings. First, filtration was associated with decreased virus transmission. Second, filters removed viruses from the air. Third, increasing filter efficiency

Filtration and Virus Transmission

(efficiency of particle removal) was associated with decreased transmission, decreased infection risk, and increased viral filtration efficiency (efficiency of virus removal). Fourth, increasing filter efficiency above MERV 13 was associated with limited benefit in further reduction of virus concentration and infection risk. Fifth, filters with the same filter efficiency rating from different companies had varied performance regarding transmission in animal studies.

Implications for Research. The modelling studies spanned from 2009 to 2020 and the aerosolized virus studies spanned from 1966 to 2021; some of the more recent studies were motivated by the COVID-19 pandemic. Many viruses were examined; however, it is particularly interesting that there were only two coronavirus studies (both SARS-CoV-2) for filtration, both modelling, and only one aerosolized study that used MS2 as a potential surrogate for SARS-CoV-2 based on size.²⁶ Additionally, one of the studies⁴⁹ discussed the implications of filtration in relation to SARS-CoV-2 but used influenza to set relevant infectivity parameters. The limited number of coronavirus (and specifically SARS-CoV-2) studies suggests a potential research gap to be addressed in the future. There is a very rich body of literature of engineering or laboratory studies which focuses on collecting physical metrics expected to affect transmission; these were not considered in this search as our focus was on connecting transmission itself with installed equipment. The trade-off between isolating specific parameters related to filtration physics or analysing more combined links in the chain of transmission is an important consideration and we stress that the literature gaps tend to be in studies which consider systems holistically. This points to a need for interdisciplinary studies which combine knowledge of well controlled filter experiments with less well controlled “real world” situations which inherently capture combined synergies in the transmission chain as well as possible “unknown unknowns” in that chain.

Filtration and Virus Transmission

Interestingly, the animal studies only spanned from 1971 to 2013. Furthermore, no field studies examining potential mitigation of virus transmission in humans using filtration were found. This suggests a research opportunity to investigate the use of filtration on mitigating virus transmission in “real-world” built environments occupied by humans, as well as epidemiological studies during disease outbreaks. Taken together, these findings identify an opportunity for more research that investigates HVAC filtration mitigation of human viruses and, specifically, human coronaviruses. More recent aerosolized virus studies use the ASHRAE Standard 52.2 test duct.^{26,31} This establishes an important level of consistency for future research. The aerosolized virus studies that state an explicit interest in SARS-CoV-2 used the bacteriophage MS2, which has a smaller size than SARS-CoV-2. Future research could explore the ramifications, if any, of this size differential on virus transmission given the size of droplet or droplet nuclei in which the virus itself is suspended.

Implications for Practice. Some findings are straightforward to address in practice. For example, proper installation is required for a filter to be effective in removing virus and preventing transmission.³⁹ Other findings are challenging to address in practice. Two studies documented variations in the performance of similarly rated filters that were purchased from different manufacturers.^{36,39} Variations in performance can occur in filters with the same MERV rating from the same manufacturers, not just different manufacturers. This alone implies that within the broad criteria of MERV ratings, there is enough variation in performance to point to a need for more filter sub-ranges or more stringent testing methods of MERV value.

A practical benchmark emerging from this review was, from the findings of Zhang et al,²⁶ that a conservative estimate of the viral filtration efficiency could be approximated by the E_1 efficiency used to determine MERV rating in ASHRAE Standard 52.2-2017.

Filtration and Virus Transmission

Not surprisingly, increasing filter efficiency, whether based on increasing filter efficiency before MERV ratings were established,³⁹ increasing MERV rating,⁴² or increasing from MERV to HEPA,³⁴ was associated with mitigation of virus transmission. An important practical consideration is that the improvement is limited above the filter efficiency MERV 13. This concept of diminishing returns was documented in both animal studies³⁶⁻³⁷ and modelling studies.^{41-42,46} Spronk et al³⁷ and Dee et al³⁶ found that both MERV 14 and MERV 16 were associated with no transmission, while Azimi and Stephens⁴² and Brown et al⁴⁶ showed that filters rated MERV 13 or better were associated with limited improvement. One model demonstrated decreased virus concentration with MERV 14 versus MERV 16 but both had MERV 8 prefilters.⁴⁷ While this could suggest an important role of prefilters at higher MERV ratings, the results are difficult to generalize across MERV ratings because only two were modelled. Although one study investigated prefilters, no studies examined filter replacement frequency within the context of viral filtration efficiency.

Diminishing returns are not limited to MERV ratings as Washam et al,²⁷ prior to the use of MERV ratings, found that similar efficiency can be achieved using a lower cost option. In addition, the cost increases with increasing MERV rating and HEPA filtration relative to the cost for MERV 13; however, the cost of filtration for these filters remains less than the cost of outdoor air ventilation with the equivalent transmission reduction.⁴² This finding is consistent with current ASHRAE recommendations for reducing airborne infectious aerosol exposure.¹² Interestingly, ASHRAE indicates that MERV 13 is recommended but MERV 14 is preferred.¹³ The use of MERV 14 is supported by WHO in the context of COVID-19.¹⁴

Installing or upgrading an air filtration system can sometimes be an expensive intervention. However, illness costs money as well and there is considerable research available showing simply how improved indoor air quality (IAQ) infrastructure investment is profitable when building

It is made available under a [CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license](#) .

Filtration and Virus Transmission

owners and users interests are aligned⁵⁰. Installing air filtration on large sow farms is estimated to cost \$150-200 per sow⁵¹. Alonso et al³⁸ postulates that air filtration like this is quite common now due to the major economic impact of PRRSV on swine production. When considering poultry, Hopkins and Drury³⁹ agreed that the additional cost of high efficiency filters would be justified by the investment return of the flock. A single influenza case results in an approximate economic loss of \$375 in the United States⁵². Azimi and Stephens⁴² found that upgrading a MERV 7 filter to MERV 13 would only be \$17 in labour cost annually in a typical office environment while reducing the number of infections by 1. Not only does air filtration reduce the number of viral infections, it improves the overall air quality by reducing the amount of allergens and asthma triggers in the air. An extra \$50 per year for high efficiency air filters in a family residence is seen as a small additional cost against the enormous financial and health burden of asthma⁴⁶.

Some studies have shown that there can be a plateau in effectiveness for filters past MERV 13 in typical situations^{42,46}. Mazumdar and Chen⁴¹ found that a 94% efficiency filter would not be able to protect passengers sitting far away from the infectious source in an airliner cabin and that a 99.9% filter was needed for their application. They go on to state that further increase in filter efficiency might be difficult and its effectiveness not clear. All filters with the same rating are not equal either. Differences in the filter media or frame design across companies and inconsistency in the filter rating systems across countries can contribute to discrepancies in filter efficiency³⁴. The source of the raw material of the filter media can also impact filter quality³⁵. Zhang et al²⁶ found that the viral filtration efficiency (VFE) is generally correlated with the MERV rating but they are not the same. They found that the VFE is always higher than E1, but lower than E2 or E3 efficiencies. This is all to say that choosing the right filter for the right application is important.

Filtration and Virus Transmission

The location, use case, existing system, budget, and acceptable level of risk should be taken into account when considering air filtration systems^{33,36,37}.

When considering scientific testing of filters, the size of the aerosol challenge should be considered very carefully. Many studies have stated that the level of contamination in their experiments was probably much larger than what would be expected in their respective typical situations^{27,34,39,40}. This could lead to certain interventions being wrongfully deemed inadequate.

Filtration should not be seen as the only approach to infection mitigation. Filtration should be paired with other infection mitigation strategies such as vaccination⁴⁴, distancing shared space users, and implementing a wait time before different users access the space⁴⁹, and other strict biosecurity measures³⁰. Installation of a high efficiency filter increases the pressure drop which can lead to greater energy use if the system has to run more often to service the same volume of air. If installing or upgrading the air filtration system is not possible, Bandaly et al²⁹ suggests switching to 100% outdoor air because some viral particles that pass through an inferior filter will still be infectious.

From our review of the literature, it is clear that upgrading or installing high efficiency air filtration is cost effective in the long run and reduces virus transmission. It is recognized that not all spaces are the same and it might not be feasible to implement high efficiency air filtration. If this is the case, then other infection mitigation measures such as UVGI, increasing ventilation rate, or controlling the relative humidity should be considered.

Conclusion

Evidence clearly demonstrates that filters are effective in removing viruses from the air and reducing the potential for virus transmission and risk of infection. However, experimental and

It is made available under a [CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license](#) .

Filtration and Virus Transmission

modelling studies indicate diminishing returns above MERV 13, with associated cost implications. Further, above MERV 13, other HVAC features (e.g., amount of recirculating air) may impact risk reduction beyond filtration efficiency. This systematic review identified no field studies or epidemiological investigations of the “real-world” effectiveness of filters in mitigating virus transmission in humans, representing an important gap and priority for future research. Only two modelling studies of SARS-CoV-2 and two experimental studies of MS2 were directly relevant to the current COVID-19 pandemic and recent coronavirus outbreaks.

References

1. World Health Organization (WHO). WHO Director-General's opening remarks at the media briefing on COVID-19 - 11 March 2020. <https://www.who.int/director-general/speeches/detail/who-director-general-s-opening-remarks-at-the-media-briefing-on-covid-19---11-march-2020>. Accessed 4 April 2021.
2. Leung NHL. Transmissibility and transmission of respiratory viruses. *Nat Rev Microbiol*. 2021. doi:10.1038/s41579-021-00535-6
3. Noorimotlagh Z, Jaafarzadeh N, Martinez SS, Mirzaee SA. A systematic review of possible airborne transmission of the COVID-19 virus (SARS-CoV-2) in the indoor air environment. *Environ Res*. 2021;193:110612. doi:10.1016/j.envres.2020.110612
4. Rahimi NR, Fouladi-Fard R, Aali R, Shahryari A, Rezaali M, Ghafouri Y, Ghalhari MR, Asaadi-Ghalhari M, Farzinnia B, Gea OC, Fiore M. Bidirectional association between COVID-19 and the environment: a systematic review. *Environ Res*. 2021;194:110692. doi:10.1016/j.envres.2020.110692
5. ASHRAE. ASHRAE epidemic task force releases updated airborne transmission guidance. 5 April 2021. American Society of Heating, Refrigerating, and Air-Conditioning Engineers (ASHRAE). <https://www.ashrae.org/about/news/2021/ashrae-epidemic-task-force-releases-updated-airborne-transmission-guidance>. Accessed April 22, 2021.
6. Luongo JC, Fennelly KP, Keen JA, Zhai ZJ, Jones BW, Miller SL. Role of mechanical ventilation in the airborne transmission of infectious agents in buildings. *Indoor Air*. 2016;26:666-678. doi:10.1111/ina.12267
7. Li Y, Leung GM, Tang JW, Yang X, Chao CYH, Lin JZ, Lu JW, Nielsen PV, Niu J, Qian H, Sleigh AC, Su H-JJ, Sundell J, Wong TW, Yuen PL. Role of ventilation in airborne transmission of infectious agents in the build environment – a multidisciplinary systematic review. *Indoor Air*. 2007;17:2-18. doi:10.1111/j.1600-0668.2006.00445.x
8. Bing-Yuan, Zhang Y-H, Leung NHL, Cowling BJ, Yang Z-F. Role of viral bioaerosols in nosocomial infections and measures for prevention and control. *J Aerosol Sci*. 2018;117:200-211. doi:10.1016/j.jaerosci.2017.11.011
9. Tang JW, Marr LC, Li Y, Dancer SJ. Covid-19 has redefined airborne transmission. *BMJ*. 2021;373:n913. doi:10.1136/bmj.n913
10. Yit JE, Chew BT, Yau YH. A review of air filter test standards for particulate matter of general ventilation. *Build Serv Eng Res Technol*. 2020;41(6):758-771. doi:10.1177/0143624420915626
11. ASHRAE. *ANSI/ASHRAE Standard 52.2-2017 Method of Testing General Ventilation Air-Cleaning Devices for Removal Efficiency by Particle Size*. Atlanta, GA: American Society of Heating, Refrigerating, and Air-Conditioning Engineers; 2017.
12. ASHRAE. Core Recommendations for Reducing Airborne Infectious Aerosol Exposure. 6 January 2021. American Society of Heating, Refrigerating, and Air-Conditioning Engineers (ASHRAE). <https://www.ashrae.org/file%20library/technical%20resources/covid-19/core-recommendations-for-reducing-airborne-infectious-aerosol-exposure.pdf> Accessed April 16, 2021.

Filtration and Virus Transmission

13. ASHRAE. Filtration/Disinfection. American Society of Heating, Refrigerating, and Air-Conditioning Engineers (ASHRAE). <https://www.ashrae.org/technical-resources/filtration-disinfection> Accessed April 16, 2021.
14. WHO. *Roadmap to Improve and Ensure Good Indoor Ventilation in the Context of COVID-19*. Geneva: World Health Organization; 2021.
15. Thornton G, Zhong L, Fleck B, Hartling L. The impact of heating, ventilation and air conditioning (HVAC) design features on the transmission of viruses, including the 2019 novel coronavirus (COVID-19): a systematic review. PROSPERO. 08 July 2020. https://www.crd.york.ac.uk/prospero/display_record.php?ID=CRD42020193968 Accessed July 8, 2020
16. Thornton GM, Fleck BA, Zhong L, Hartling L. The impact of heating, ventilation and air conditioning (HVAC) design features on the transmission of viruses, including the 2019 novel coronavirus (COVID-19): protocol for a systematic review and environmental scan. *Open Science Framework*. 2020. <https://doi.org/10.17605/OSF.IO/Y62V7>
17. Higgins JPT, Thomas J, Chandler J, Cumpston M, Li T, Page MJ, Welch VA. *Cochrane handbook for systematic reviews of interventions version 6.0*. Updated July 2019. Cochrane. Available from www.training.cochrane.org/handbook.
18. Moola S, Munn Z, Sears K, et al. Conducting systematic reviews of association (etiology): The Joanna Briggs Institute's approach. *Int J Evid Based Healthc*. 2015;13(3):163-169. doi:10.1097/XEB.0000000000000064
19. Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, Altman D G. Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses: the PRISMA statement. *BMJ*. 2009;339:b2535. doi:10.1136/bmj.b2535
20. Kowalski, WJ. *Ultraviolet germicidal irradiation handbook : UVGI for air and surface disinfection*. Heidelberg: Springer-Verlag; 2009.
21. Williams-Nguyen J, Bueno I, Sargeant JM, Nault AJ, Singer RS. What is the evidence that point sources of anthropogenic effluent increase antibiotic resistance in the environment? Protocol for a systematic review. *Anim Health Res Rev*. 2016;17(1):9-15. doi:10.1017/S1466252316000037
22. Office of Health Assessment and Translation (OHAT), Division of the National Toxicology Program, National Institute of Environment Health Sciences. *Handbook for conducting a literature-based health assessment using OHAT approach for systematic review and evidence integration*. National Toxicology Program, US Department of Health and Human Services, 4 March 2019. https://ntp.niehs.nih.gov/ntp/ohat/pubs/handbookmarch2019_508.pdf Accessed November 28, 2020.
23. Samuel GO, Hoffmann S, Wright RA, et al. Guidance on assessing the methodological and reporting quality of toxicologically relevant studies: A scoping review. *Environ Int*. 2016;92-93:630-646. doi:10.1016/j.envint.2016.03.010
24. Mateus ALP, Otete HE, Beck CR, Dolan GP, Nguyen-Van-Tam JS. Effectiveness of travel restrictions in the rapid containment of human influenza: a systematic review. *Bull World Health Organ*. 2014;92(12):868-880D. doi:10.2471/BLT.14.135590
25. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). *Guidance Document on the Validation of (Quantitative) Structure-Activity Relationship [(Q)SAR]*

Filtration and Virus Transmission

- Models*. OECD Series on Testing and Assessment No. 69, OECD Publishing, 3 September 2014. <https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264085442-en>. Accessed January 4, 2021.
26. Zhang J, Huntley D, Fox A, Gerhardt B, Vatine A, Cherne J. Study of viral filtration performance of residential HVAC filters. *ASHRAE J*. 2020;1-6.
 27. Washam CJ, Black CH, Sandine WE, Elliker PR. Evaluation of filters for removal of bacteriophages from air. *Appl Microbiol*. 1966;14(4):497-505. doi:10.1128/aem.14.4.497-505.1966.
 28. Malaithao K, Kalambaheti T, Worakhunpiset S, Ramasoota P. Evaluation of an electronic air filter for filtrating bacteria and viruses from indoor air. *Southeast Asian J Trop Med Public Health*. 2009;40(5):1113-1120.
 29. Bandaly V, Joubert A, Andres Y, Le Cann P. Adenovirus behavior in air handling unit fiberglass filters. *Aerobiologia* (Bologna). 2019;35:357-366. doi:10.1007/s10453-019-09565-3.
 30. Wenke C, Pospiech J, Reutter T, Truyen U, Speck S. Efficiency of different air filter types for pig facilities at laboratory scale. *PLoS One*. 2017;12(10):e0186558. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0186558.
 31. Vyskocil JM, Létourneau V, St-Germain MW, Turgeon JG, Duchaine C. Challenge of mechanical and antimicrobial filters against infectious phages artificially agglomerated with inorganic dust with a known particle-size distribution. *Aerosol Sci Technol*. 2021;55(2):194-204. doi:10.1080/02786826.2020.1834073.
 32. Filtercorp International Ltd. Global filter classification and particle size efficiency chart. 2016. <https://filtercorp.co.nz/secondary-filtration>. Accessed April 22, 2021.
 33. Dee SA, Batista L, Deen J, Pijoan C. Evaluation of systems for reducing the transmission of Porcine reproductive and respiratory syndrome virus by aerosol. *Can J Vet Res*. 2006;70:28-33.
 34. Dee S, Pitkin A, Deen J. Evaluation of alternative strategies to MERV 16-based air filtration systems for reduction of the risk of airborne spread of porcine reproductive and respiratory syndrome virus. *Vet Microbiol*. 2009;138:106-113. doi:10.1016/j.vetmic.2009.03.019.
 35. Pitkin A, Deen J, Dee S. Use of a production region model to assess the airborne spread of porcine reproductive and respiratory syndrome virus. *Vet Microbiol*. 2009;136:1-7. doi:10.1016/j.vetmic.2008.10.013.
 36. Dee S, Pitkin A, Otake S, Deen J. A four-year summary of air filtration system efficacy for preventing airborne spread of porcine reproductive and respiratory syndrome virus and *Mycoplasma hyopneumoniae*. *J Swine Heal Prod*. 2011;19(5):292-294.
 37. Spronk G, Otake S, Dee S. Prevention of PRRSV infection in large breeding herds using air filtration. *Vet Rec*. 2010;1-2. doi:10.1136/vr.b4848.
 38. Alonso C, Murtaugh MP, Dee SA, Davies PR. Epidemiological study of air filtration systems for preventing PRRSV infection in large sow herds. *Prev Vet Med*. 2013;112:109-117. doi:10.1016/j.prevetmed.2013.06.001.
 39. Hopkins SR, Drury LN. Efficacy of air filters in preventing transmission of Newcastle disease. *Avian Dis*. 1971;15(3):596-603. doi:10.2307/1588737.

Filtration and Virus Transmission

40. Kunkel SA, Azimi P, Zhao H, Stark BC, Stephens B. Quantifying the size-resolved dynamics of indoor bioaerosol transport and control. *Indoor Air*. 2017;27:977-987. doi:10.1111/ina.12374.
41. Mazumdar S, Chen Q. A one-dimensional analytical model for airborne contaminant transport in airliner cabins. *Indoor Air*. 2009;9:3-13. doi:10.1111/j.1600-0668.2008.00553.x.
42. Azimi P, Stephens B. HVAC filtration for controlling infectious airborne disease transmission in indoor environments: Predicting risk reductions and operational costs. *Build Environ*. 2013;70:150-160. doi:10.1016/j.buildenv.2013.08.025.
43. Zheng L, Chen Q, Xu J, Wu F. Evaluation of intervention measures for respiratory disease transmission on cruise ships. *Indoor Built Environ*. 2016;25(8):1267-1278. doi:10.1177/1420326X15600041.
44. Azimi P, Keshavarz Z, Cedeno Laurent JGC, Allen JG. Estimating the nationwide transmission risk of measles in US schools and impacts of vaccination and supplemental infection control strategies. *BMC Infect Dis*. 2020;20(497):1-22. doi:10.1186/s12879-020-05200-6.
45. Kennedy M, Lee SJ, Epstein M. Modeling aerosol transmission of SARS-CoV-2 in multi-room facility. *J Loss Prev Process Ind*. 2021;69:1-7. doi:10.1016/j.jlp.2020.104336.
46. Brown KW, Minegishi T, Allen JG, McCarthy JF, Spengler JD, Macintosh DL. Reducing patients' exposures to asthma and allergy triggers in their homes: An evaluation of effectiveness of grades of forced air ventilation filters. *J Asthma*. 2014;51(6):585-594. doi:10.3109/02770903.2014.895011
47. Janni KA, Torremorell M, Jacobson LD, Alonso C, Hetchler BP. Modeling airborne virus concentrations in filtered swine barns with negative-pressure ventilating systems. *Trans ASABE*. 2018;61(3):1089-1099. doi:10.13031/trans.12561.
48. Zhao Y, Richardson B, Takle E, Chai L, Schmitt D, Xin H. Airborne transmission may have played a role in the spread of 2015 highly pathogenic avian influenza outbreaks in the United States. *Sci Rep*. 2019;9:1-11. doi:10.1038/s41598-019-47788-z.
49. Augenbraun BL, Lasner ZD, Mitra D, et al. Assessment and mitigation of aerosol airborne SARS-CoV-2 transmission in laboratory and office environments. *J Occup Environ Hyg*. 2020;17(10):447-456. doi:10.1080/15459624.2020.1805117.
50. Kajander J-K, Sivunen M, Junnila S. Valuing Indoor Air Quality Benefits in a Healthcare Construction Project with Real Option Analysis. *Buildings*. 2014; 4(4):785-805. doi:10.3390/buildings4040785
51. Reicks, D, Polson, D. A financial evaluation of PRRSV introduction risk mitigation attributed to air filtration of pig production sites. *Allen D. Lemman Swine Conference Proceedings*. 2011:37-41.
52. Fisk WJ. Health and productivity gains from better indoor environments and their relationship with building energy efficiency. *Annual review of energy and the environment*. 2000;25:537-566.
53. Watanabe T, Bartrand TA, Weir MH, Omura T, Haas CN. Development of a dose-response model for SARS coronavirus. *Risk Anal*. 2010;30(7):1129-1138. doi:10.1111/j.1539-6924.2010.01427.x

It is made available under a [CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license](#) .

Filtration and Virus Transmission

54. Watanabe T, Bartrand TA, Omura T, Haas CN. 2012. Dose-response assessment for influenza a virus based on data sets of infection with its live attenuated reassortants. *Risk Anal.* 2012;32(3):555–565. doi:10.1111/j.1539-6924.2011.01680.x

Filtration and Virus Transmission

Table 1: Search Strategy for Ovid MEDLINE¹⁶

Database: Ovid MEDLINE(R) ALL 1946 to Present

Search Strategy:

#	Searches
1	exp Aerosols/
2	Air Microbiology/
3	exp Viruses/
4	(aerosol or aerosols or bioaerosol or bioaerosols).mp.
5	droplet nuclei.mp.
6	infectio*.mp.
7	(pathogen or pathogens).mp.
8	(virus or viruses or viral or virome).mp.
9	or/1-8 [MeSH + Keywords – Virus concept]
10	Air Conditioning/
11	Air Filters/ or Filtration/
12	Humidity/
13	Ventilation/
14	Ultraviolet Rays/
15	air condition*.mp.
16	(air change rate or air change rates or air changes per hour or air exchange rate or air exchange rates or air exchanges per hour).mp.
17	(airflow or air flow).mp.
18	built environment.mp.
19	computational fluid dynamics.mp.
20	((distance adj6 index) or long distances).mp.
21	HVAC.mp.
22	(filter or filters or filtration).mp.
23	humidity.mp.
24	(ultraviolet or UV).mp.
25	ventilat*.mp.
26	or/10-25 [MeSH + Keywords – HVAC concept]
27	Air Pollution, Indoor/
28	exp Disease Transmission, Infectious/
29	(indoor adj1 (air quality or environment*)).mp.
30	transmission.mp.
31	or/27-30 [MeSH + Keywords – Transmission concept]
32	9 and 26 and 31
33	remove duplicates from 32

MeSH = Medical Subject Headings

Filtration and Virus Transmission

Table 2. Inclusion and exclusion criteria for systematic review¹⁶

Item	Inclusion criteria	Exclusion criteria
Agent	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Viruses • Aerosols • Bioaerosols • Droplet nuclei • Other pathogens (e.g., bacteria, fungi) <p><i>We planned a staged process: if we identified studies specific to viruses for each HVAC design feature, we would not include other pathogens; however, for design features where we did not find studies specific to viruses, we would expand to other pathogens.</i></p>	
HVAC	<p>Design features relating to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ventilation (ventilation rate, air changes per hour (ACH), air exchange, airflow pattern, pressurization) • Filtration (air filtration, filter type, MERV rating, filter age and/or use, pressure drop, holding capacity, replacement, change frequency) • Ultraviolet germicidal irradiation (UVGI; power, dose, uniformity of dose, flow rate, bioaerosol inactivation efficiency, location) • Humidity or relative humidity 	Examines HVAC / mechanical / or other ventilation mechanisms overall, but not by specific design features.
Setting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Office buildings • Public buildings (e.g., schools, day cares) • Residential buildings • Hospitals and other healthcare facilities (e.g., clinics) • Transport vehicles (e.g., aircraft) or hubs (e.g., airports) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outdoor settings • Indoor settings with natural ventilation
Outcomes	Quantitative data evaluating the correlation or association between virus transmission and above HVAC features	Qualitative data
Study design	<p>Primary research, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Epidemiological studies • Observational studies (e.g., cohort, case-control, cross-sectional) • Experimental studies (including human or animal) • Modelling studies, including CFD 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review articles • Commentaries, opinion pieces • Qualitative studies
Language	<p>English</p> <p><i>We planned a staged process where we would include studies in languages other than English if we do not identify English language studies for specific HVAC design features or if we identified clusters of potentially relevant studies in another language.</i></p>	
Year	No restrictions	
Publication status	Published, peer-reviewed	Unpublished, not peer-reviewed

CFD = computational fluid dynamics; HVAC = heating, ventilation, and air conditioning; MERV = minimum efficiency reporting value; UVGI = ultraviolet germicidal irradiation

Filtration and Virus Transmission

Table 3. Animal Studies (n=7; listed in chronological order)

First author Year Country	Infectious Agent	Filtration	Outcome Parameter	Data	Association
Hopkins (1971) ³⁹ USA	NDV [GB strain] in chickens	Experimental test set-up; Filter in AHU -4 Roughing filters (10-60% removal efficiency for particles 1-5µm) -1 Medium efficiency (ME) filter (60-90% removal efficiency) -3 High efficiency (HE) filters (90-99% removal efficiency) 3 manufacturers (A,B,C)	Transmission (Number of positive cabinets indicating transmission to 1 of 4 sentinel birds)	3 weeks -No filter: 37/44; -Roughing: 39/50; -ME: 6/12; -HE: 1/44*; *one positive likely the results of improper installation of the filter 6 weeks -Roughing: 6/6; -HE (total): 6/18; -HE (A): 4/6; -HE (B): 2/6; -HE (C): 0/6	-Increasing filter efficiency associated with decreasing transmission -HE filters from different manufacturers associated with varied performance.
Dee (2006) ³³ USA	PRRSV	2 experimental facilities; each with 2 chambers (donor and recipient) Low-Cost Filtration: - Mosquito netting pre-filter - Fiberglass furnace filter (MERV 4) - Electrostatic furnace filter (MERV 12) (EU3 rating) HEPA Filtration: - Pre-filter screen - Bag filter (EU8 rating) [MERV 14] ³² - HEPA filter (EU13 rating)	Transmission	- Transmission in 0/10 pigs in HEPA filtration group <i>significantly</i> lower than transmission in low-cost filtration group (4/10 pigs) and no filtration group (9/10 pigs). - Transmission in low-cost filtration group <i>significantly</i> lower than no filtration group.	-Filtration associated with decreased transmission. -Increasing filter efficiency associated with decreasing transmission.
Dee (2009) ³⁴ USA	PRRSV	2 experimental facilities; each with 2 chambers (donor and recipient) -4 MERV 16 (EU9) fiberglass filters from different	Presence of PRRSV in air samples post-treatment	MERV 16: -concentrations of 1×10^7 : -(A): 0/10 -(B): 10/10 -(C): 10/10 -(D): 10/10	-Filtration associated with decreased presence of PRRSV -Only MERV 16 (A) prevented the transfer of PRRSV to recipient chamber across all concentrations

It is made available under a [CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/) .

Filtration and Virus Transmission

		<p>companies in Sweden (A), US (B), China (C), Turkey (D) ($\geq 85\%$ and $< 95\%$ for 0.3 to 1.0 μm; $\geq 90\%$ for 1.0 to 10.0 μm)</p> <p>-1 MERV 14 (EU8) fiberglass filter from Sweden (A) ($\geq 75\%$ and $< 95\%$ for PM 0.3 to 1.0 μm; $\geq 90\%$ for PM 1.0 to 10.0 μm)</p>		<p>-concentrations of 1×10^6: -(A):0/10 -(B): 0/10 -(C): 0/10 -(D): 3/10</p> <p>MERV 14: -concentrations of 1×10^7: -(A): 10/10 -concentrations of 1×10^6: -(A):0/10</p> <p>Presence of PRRSV with MERV 16 (A) <i>significantly</i> lower than with all other filters.</p>	<p>-Increasing MERV rating from MERV 14 (A) to MERV 16 (A) associated with decreasing presence of PRRSV at PRRSV concentration 1×10^7</p> <p>-MERV 14 (A) filter was associated with decreased presence of PRRSV in comparison with MERV 16 (D) at concentration 1×10^6</p> <p>-MERV filters from different manufacturers associated with varied performance.</p>
Pitkin (2009) ³⁵ USA	PRRSV	<p>3 pig barns; 1 donor barn, 2 recipient barns (filtered and nonfiltered)</p> <p>Filtered barn: -stage 1: 6 MERV 4 fiberglass prefilters (20% efficiency for 3-10 μm) -stage 2: 6 pleat-in-pleat V-bank MERV 16 (EU9) fiberglass filters (95% efficiency for 0.3-1.0 μm)</p>	Transmission; Risk of Infection	<p>-0/26 (0%) positive aerosol transmission replicates in filtered barn was <i>significantly</i> lower than 8/26 (31%) positive replicates in non-filtered barn</p> <p>-Daily risk of infection in filtered building (0%) was <i>significantly</i> lower than unfiltered building (2.8%)</p>	<p>-Filtration associated with decreased transmission</p> <p>-Filtration associated with decreased risk of infection</p>
Dee (2011) ³⁶ USA	PRRSV	<p>4 pig buildings: donor, 2 filtered, and 1 unfiltered (control)</p> <p>“location, design, and methodologies employed in the model have been documented” in Pitkin (2009) (p.292)</p> <p>Four-year testing period</p>	Transmission	<p>-Transmission in 0/39 transmission events in buildings using MERV 16 was <i>significantly</i> lower than transmission in 28/65 events in buildings using no filtration</p> <p>-Transmission in 0/13 transmission events in buildings using MERV 14 was <i>significantly</i> lower than transmission</p>	<p>-Filtration associated with decreased transmission</p> <p>-Both MERV 14 and MERV 16 filters associated with no transmission</p>

It is made available under a [CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/).

Filtration and Virus Transmission

		Building 3: -MERV 16 (EU9) (95% efficiency for 0.3 to 1.0 µm) -MERV 14 (EU8) (75% efficiency for 0.3 to 1.0 µm)		in 28/65 events in buildings using no filtration	
Spronk (2010) ³⁷ USA	PRRSV	Pig barns: 2 filtered, 5 non- filtered barns Filtered barns were “air filtered using technology described” in Pitkin (2009) (p.1) -MERV 14 (75% removal efficiency) -MERV 16 (95% removal efficiency)	Transmission (presence of infection of PRRSV)	-0 transmissions detected in filtered barns was lower than unfiltered barns which experienced severe clinical episodes of PRRSV	-Filtration associated with decreased transmission -Both MERV 14 and MERV 16 filters associated with no transmission
Alonso (2013) ³⁸ USA	PRRSV	37 farms: 20 filtered, 17 non- filtered -Decision to use filtration made independently from the study by producers. Filters were at minimum: -MERV 14 (EU8) (75% efficiency) -MERV 16 (EU9) (95% efficiency)	Incidence rate of new PRRSV events per year; Relative risk of PRRSV introduction “we consider the most appropriate comparison for estimating the impact of filtration to be between the filtration period (period E) and the pre-filtration periods of the same farms (periods C plus D) . . . control.” (p.114)	5% cut-off Incidence rate: C (pre-filtered) 0.71 (0.53, 0.97) D (pre-filtered) 0.73 (0.47, 1.14) E (filtered) 0.13 (0.05, 0.34) Paired comparison of incidence rates indicated <i>significant</i> absolute risk reduction of 0.6 (p.114) Relative Risk for CD (pre-filtered) vs. E (filtered): 5.54 (2.06, 15.6) [RR=0.18 filtered vs. pre-filtered]	-Filtration associated with decreased PRRSV incidence rate -Filtration associated with decreased absolute risk -Filtration associated with decreased relative risk

Data reported as (95% confidence interval) or ± standard deviation.

AHU = Air Handling Unit; NDV = Newcastle Disease Virus; MERV = Minimum Efficiency Reporting Values; PRRSV = Porcine Reproductive and Respiratory Syndrome Virus

Filtration and Virus Transmission

Table 4. Aerosolized Virus Studies (n=7; listed in chronological order)

First author Year Country	Infectious Agent	Filtration	Outcome Parameter	Data	Association
Washam (1966) ²⁷ USA	T7	Glass wool filter material, Non-absorbent cotton filter material, Fiberglass filter material, and Commercial absolute filter (99.95% efficiency for 0.3 μm) Plenum chamber (low air flow) and flow in a duct (high air flow) Low air flow: 1 ft ³ /min High air flow: 10-25 ft ³ /min	Removal efficiency (%)	Low air flow: Glass wool = 98.543% to 99.837% Cotton > 99.900% Fiberglass > 99.999% Commercial > 99.999% High air flow: Fiberglass > 99.999% Commercial > 99.990%	-Filtration associated with virus removal -Different filter materials associated with different efficiencies -Fiberglass filter material (lower cost) associated with similar efficiency as commercial absolute filter (higher cost)
Malaithao (2009) ²⁸ Thailand	T7	HEPA Filter in middle of experimental chamber	Filtrating efficiency (%)	99.99%	-Filtration associated with virus removal
Wenke (2017) ³⁰ Germany	PRRSV EAV [strain Bucyrus] BEV [strain LCR-4]	Test chamber duct -Filter 1: MERV 6-8 (G4) prefilter and MERV 16 (F9) filter (>95% efficiency) -Filter 4: MERV 14-16 (approx. F8-9) filter	Filter reduction efficiency (%)	PRRSV: -Filter 1: 98.0 ± 1.05% -Filter 4: 92.1 ± 5.96% EAV: -Filter 1: 97.5 ± 1.19% -Filter 4: 98.7 ± 1.26% BEV: -Filter 1: 96.0 ± 2.90% -Filter 4: 98.7 ± 0.72%	-Filtration associated with virus removal
Kunkel (2017) ⁴⁰ USA	T4 model for norovirus and influenza virus (p.978)	MERV 8, MERV 11, MERV 16 Filters installed in recirculating	% reduction in total mass concentration (filter compared to no filter) at different	Near range (0.5 m): MERV 8 = ~26% reduction MERV 11 = ~22% reduction MERV 16 = ~32% reduction (from Figure 8 on p.985)	-Increasing MERV rating associated with decreasing virus concentration

It is made available under a [CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/) .

Filtration and Virus Transmission

		AHU in unoccupied apartment unit	locations from source: -near range (0.5 m) -short range (3 m) -medium range (5 m) -long range (7m)	Short range (3 m): MERV 8 = ~26% reduction MERV 11 = ~34% reduction MERV 16 = ~78% reduction (from Figure 8 on p.985) Medium range (5 m): MERV 8 = ~70% reduction MERV 11 = ~93% reduction MERV 16 = ~97% reduction (p.984) Long range (7 m): MERV 8 = ~12% reduction MERV 11 = ~81% reduction MERV 16 = ~92% reduction (p.984)	-MERV 8 was less effective at controlling long range bioaerosol transport
Bandaly (2019) ²⁹ France	Human adenovirus serotype 2 strain	F7 [MERV 13; EU7] ³² Airflow: 0.16 m s ⁻¹ Experimental set-up	Filter efficiency	91%-99%	-Filtration associated with virus removal
Zhang (2020) ²⁶ [USA]	MS2	MERV 5, MERV 12, MERV 13, MERV 14 Airflow: 1740 m ³ /h Test duct per ASHRAE Standard 52.2-2017	Viral filtration efficiency (VFE)	MERV 5: VFE = 32% ± 10.5% MERV 12: VFE = 78% ± 8.8% MERV 13: VFE = 89% ± 8.2% MERV 14: VFE = 97% ± 1.4% "In comparison to E1, E2 and E3 efficiencies measured per ASHRAE Standard 52.2-2017, VFE was found to be higher than initial E1 efficiency, but lower than initial E2 and E3 efficiencies." (p.5)	-Increasing MERV rating associated with increasing viral filtration efficiency
Vyskocil (2021) ³¹ Canada	MS2 Viral aerosol composed of test dust (0.3-10 µm) and lyophilized phages with cryoprotective agents	MERV 16 Airflow: 1250-1300 CFM Test duct per ASHRAE Standard 52.2-2012	Filter reduction efficiency (%) ¹¹	Dust particles = 96.4% Infectious MS2 (Culture) = 99.4% Total MS2 (qPCR) = 99.4%	-Filtration associated with virus removal

Data reported as (95% confidence interval) or ± standard deviation.

ASHRAE = American Society of Heating, Refrigerating and Air-Conditioning Engineers; BEV = Bovine Enterovirus 1; EAV = Equine Arteritis Virus; HEPA = High Efficiency Particulate Air; MERV = Minimum Efficiency Reporting Values; PRRSV = Porcine Reproductive and Respiratory Syndrome Virus; PCR = Polymerase chain reaction

Filtration and Virus Transmission

Table 5. Modelling Studies (n=9; listed in chronological order)

First author Year Country	Infectious Agent	Model	Outcome Parameter	Data	Association
Mazumdar (2009) ⁴¹ USA	Virus modelled as a gas with a release rate of 1×10^{-6} kg/s	HEPA filters with efficiencies of 94%, 99.90%, 99.97%, and 100% based on 0.3 μm particle size 50% of outside air and 50% of recirculated air One-dimensional analytical model Setting: 30 row twin-aisle airliner cabin	Concentration (in ppm) of the virus in the rows of the airliner cabin	- 94% efficient filter reduced concentration by three orders of magnitude from its peak. - 99.90% efficient filter reduced concentration by five orders of magnitude from its peak. - Improvement not evident with further increase to 99.97% efficient filter.	- Increasing filter efficiency up to 99.90% associated with decreased virus concentration - Further increase in filter efficiency to 99.97% associated with limited improvement
Azimi (2013) ⁴² USA	Influenza droplet nuclei	Mean efficiencies based on reported particle size distributions of influenza virus and reported MERV of filters. MERV 4: 10.5% MERV 7: 42.2% MERV 11: 68.2% MERV 13: 85.9% MERV 14: 88.0% MERV 15: 90.0% MERV 16: 95.0% HEPA: 99.9% 100 quanta/h generation rate. Virus size distribution is modified to fit in size bins of 0.3-1 μm , 1-3 μm , and 3-10 μm to match the size bins outlined in ASHRAE 52.2-2007 Outdoor air supply fraction of total airflow is 25% Wells-Riley model	Absolute risk (AR) of infection estimated using a modified particle-size-resolved version of the Wells-Riley model. Relative risk (RR) of infection estimated using "no-filter" condition as a baseline. RR is calculated as the probability of infection with a particular filter installed divided by the probability of infection without a filter installed.	Absolute risk (AR) No filter: 15% MERV 7: 12% \geq MERV 13: 10% or lower Relative Risk (RR) MERV 4: 0.93-0.94 MERV 7: 0.75-0.81 MERV 11: 0.65-0.72 \geq MERV 13: 0.53-0.69 (from Figure 2, p.156) MERV 13: \sim 0.57-0.69 MERV 14: \sim 0.56-0.69 MERV 15: \sim 0.55-0.69 MERV 16: \sim 0.54-0.67 HEPA: \sim 0.53-0.67 Annual cost per unit removal rate [\$ per 1/hour] Equivalent outdoor air ventilation: \$367-\$543 MERV 4: \$705 MERV 7: \$216 MERV 11: \$137 MERV 13: \$119 MERV 14: \$120 MERV 15: \$136 MERV 16: \$152 HEPA: \$232	-Increasing filter efficiency associated with decreased absolute risk of infection -Increasing filter efficiency associated with decreasing relative risk of infection -MERV 13 or better associated with limited improvement -For MERV 13 or better filters, risk reduction is limited by the amount of recirculating air through the HVAC system and filter, not the filtration efficiency

It is made available under a [CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/).

Filtration and Virus Transmission

		Setting: office building			
Brown (2014) ⁴⁶ USA	Respiratory virus: Influenza and rhinovirus	<p>Efficiencies based on reported particle size distribution of respiratory virus modelled as influenza and rhinovirus and reported MERV of filters.</p> <p>MERV 1: 10% MERV 7: 41% MERV 8 (A): 55% MERV 8 (B): 70% MERV 12: 80% MERV 13: 90% MERV 16: 100%</p> <p>67 and 5 q/h generation rate for influenza and rhinovirus, respectively. Virus particle size: 97% in the 1.0–3.0 µm diameter size range and 3% in the 3.0–9.0 µm diameter size range.</p> <p>CONTAM multi-zone IAQ model</p> <p>Setting: a detached home in Atlanta</p>	<p>Concentration of the virus (10² quanta/m³)</p> <p>% Effectiveness (reduction compared to MERV 1 filter)</p>	<p>Concentration</p> <p>MERV 1: 17.1 MERV 7: 9.5 MERV 8 (A): 7.7 MERV 8 (B): 6.3 MERV 12: 5.5 MERV 13: 4.8 MERV 16: 4.3</p> <p>% Effectiveness</p> <p>MERV 7: 44 MERV 8 (A): 55 MERV 8 (B): 63 MERV 12: 68 MERV 13: 72 MERV 16: 75</p>	<p>- Increasing filter efficiency (MERV rating) associated with decreased concentration of respiratory virus</p> <p>- MERV 13 or better associated with limited improvement</p>
Zheng (2016) ⁴³ USA	Influenza	<p>HEPA filter with 92.5% single-pass removal efficiency for infectious droplet nuclei</p> <p>66.91 quanta/h and 15 quanta/h</p> <p>SEIR, Wells-Riley, and Indoor contact model</p> <p>Setting: cruise ship</p>	<p>Attack rate = Number of new cases in population at risk divided by number of persons at risk in population</p>	<p>Attack rate decreased 84.9% with HEPA compared with baseline (no HEPA): 5.05% vs 33.42%</p>	<p>Filtration associated with decreased attack rate (related to number of cases)</p>

It is made available under a [CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/) .

Filtration and Virus Transmission

<p>Janni (2018)⁴⁷ USA</p>	<p>PRRSV</p>	<p>- MERV 8 prefilter and MERV 14 - MERV 8 prefilter and MERV 16</p> <p>MERV 8: >70% efficiency for 3.0-10.0 µm. MERV 14: 75%-85% efficiency for 0.3-1.0 µm; >90% efficiency for 1.0-3.0 µm, and 3.0-10.0 µm. MERV 16: >95% efficiency for 0.3-1.0 µm, 1.0-3.0 µm, and 3.0-10.0 µm .</p> <p>Virus distribution in copies per m³: 10 in 0.3-1.0 µm, 10 in 1.0-3.0 µm, 80 in 3.0-10.0 µm, to match the size bins in ASHRAE 52.2-2012.</p> <p>Control volume conservation model</p> <p>Setting: sow gestation barn</p>	<p>Virus concentration in barn (genome copies per m³)</p>	<p>MERV 8 prefilter and MERV 14 (cases 1-8): 7.7 - 13.0</p> <p>MERV 8 prefilter and MERV 16 (cases 1-8): 4.4 - 10.4</p>	<p>MERV 8 prefilter and MERV 16 associated with decreased virus concentration compared with MERV 8 prefilter and MERV 14</p>
<p>Zhao (2019)⁴⁸ USA</p>	<p>highly pathogenic avian influenza</p>	<p>75% efficient filter</p> <p>Virus carried by particles sized PM10 and PM2.5</p> <p>HYSPLIT model</p> <p>Setting: farm</p>	<p>Probability of infection was calculated by comparing the modeled virus concentrations with the minimal infective doses (MIDs)</p>	<p>Cases in each risk category</p> <p>75% efficient filter: High (>50%): 0 Medium (10-50%): 7 Low (1-10%): 45 Extremely low (<1%): 25</p> <p>Worst case scenario: High (>50%): 3 Medium (10-50%): 30 Low (1-10%): 33 Extremely low (<1%): 11</p>	<p>Filtration associated with decreased infection risk</p>
<p>Augenbraun (2020)⁴⁹ USA</p>	<p>SARS-CoV-2 but relevant infectivity parameters</p>	<p>HEPA filter with 99.97% efficiency based on 0.1-0.3 µm particle size (conservative</p>	<p>Probability of infection calculated using a dose-</p>	<p>Assuming sick and healthy persons wearing N95 masks are far enough apart that they sit in different</p>	<p>HEPA filtration associated with decreased probability of infection</p>

It is made available under a [CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/) .

Filtration and Virus Transmission

	set to those of influenza	estimate based on Dietz et al 2020) Sick person exhales ~35-70 viral particles/minute Dose-response model Setting: Quantum physics laboratory with HEPA filter and 12 ACH.	response model ⁵³⁻⁵⁴	airstreams in the lab only: HEPA filter: <1% likelihood of infection for 3 weeks of exposure No HEPA filter: >1% likelihood of infection for 3 weeks of exposure	
Azimi (2020) ⁴⁴ USA	Measles virus but assumed that the size distribution is similar to influenza viruses	MERV 8 with efficiency of 72% (range: 44-86%) MERV 13 filter with Infectious-particle-size-weighted filtration efficiency of 85.9% (range: 81.6-89.2%) HEPA filter with Infectious-particle-size-weighted filtration efficiency of 99.9% 6.4 ACH with 6.7 L/s-per person outdoor air ventilation rate Wells-Riley model, School Building Archetype (SBA) model, and a Monte-Carlo simulation Setting: School building	Transmission risk calculated using a modified Wells-Riley model. Relative effectiveness estimated by comparing the average number of infected cases among all students in the basic infection control designs with the same numbers after enhancing the removal rates of infectious bio-aerosols in the SBA model using different control scenarios.	Median transmission risk for unvaccinated students: MERV 8: 45% MERV 13: 32% HEPA: 29% Relative effectiveness: MERV 13: 28% HEPA: 33%	Increasing filter efficiency associated with decreasing transmission risk and increasing relative effectiveness
Kennedy (2020) ⁴⁵ USA	SARS-CoV-2	HEPA filter Virus size distribution: mean: 1.51 μ m with SD 2.01	Risk of infection calculated using the Wells-Riley Model.	Person 1 (inside the source room) Person 2 (different room in same building) Person 3 (enters source room after 8 hours)	HEPA filtration is associated with decreased risk of infection

It is made available under a [CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/) .

Filtration and Virus Transmission

		<p>Source rate: $7.09 \times 10^{-6} \text{ mL h}^{-1}$</p> <p>50% outdoor air fraction</p> <p>Multi-region model. Flow Aerosol Thermal and Explosion (FATE) software package. Wells-Riley equation with 50 viral particles assumed to cause disease in 63% of the population.</p>		<p>Risk of infection without HEPA: Person 1: 12.9% Person 2: 4.1 % Person 3: 0.5%</p> <p>Risk of infection with HEPA: Person 1: 9.5% Person 2: <0.1 % Person 3: 0.2%</p>	
--	--	---	--	---	--

HEPA = High Efficiency Particulate Air; HYSPLIT = Hybrid Single Particle Lagrangian Integrated Trajectory; MERV = Minimum Efficiency Reporting Values; PRRSV = Porcine Reproductive and Respiratory Syndrome Virus

It is made available under a [CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/) .

Filtration and Virus Transmission

Table 6. Risk of Bias for Experimental Studies

Study	Selection Bias	Information Bias	Confounding*
Washam (1966) ²⁷	low	low	low
Hopkins (1971) ³⁹	low	low	low
Dee (2006) ³³	low	low	low
Dee (2009) ³⁴	low	low	low
Pitkin (2009) ³⁵	low	low	low
Malaithao (2009) ²⁸	low	unclear	low
Spronk (2010) ³⁷	low	low	low
Dee (2011) ³⁶	low	low	low
Alonso (2013) ³⁸	low	low	low
Kunkel (2017) ⁴⁰	low	low	low
Wenke (2017) ³⁰	low	low	low
Bandaly (2019) ²⁹	low	unclear	low
Zhang (2020) ²⁶	low	low	low
Vyskocil (2021) ³¹	low	low	low

* Confounding assessed for our comparison of interest.

Table 7. Risk of Bias for Modelling Studies

Study	Definition	Assumption	Validation
Mazumdar (2009) ⁴¹	low	low	low
Azimi (2013) ⁴²	low	low	low
Brown (2014) ⁴⁶	low	low	low
Zheng (2016) ⁴³	low	low	low
Janni (2018) ⁴⁷	low	low	low
Zhao (2019) ⁴⁸	low	low	low
Augenbraun (2020) ⁴⁹	unclear	low	low
Azimi (2020) ⁴⁴	low	low	low
Kennedy (2020) ⁴⁵	unclear	low	low

Filtration and Virus Transmission




Figure 1. Flow of studies through the selection process (note: search was conducted for all HVAC design features but only studies of filtration are included in this manuscript)