Can cheap, rapid air filtration control the pandemic?

Devabhaktuni Srikrishna, Patient Knowhow, Inc.
sri.devabhaktuni@gmail.com, www.patientknowhow.com

Abstract: Public health departments such as CDC and California Department of Public Health (CA-DPH) advise HEPA-purifiers to limit transmission of SARS-CoV-2 in classrooms and community spaces. CA-DPH recommends 4-6 air exchanges per hour often necessitating multiple HEPA-purifiers per room, unaffordable in under-resourced community settings. Pressure to seek cheap, rapid air filtration resulted in proliferation of lower-cost, Do-It-Yourself (DIY) air purifiers whose performance is not well characterized compared to HEPA-purifiers. Primary metrics are clean air delivery rate (CADR), noise generated (dBA), and affordability ($$). CADR measurement often requires expensive, hard-to-replicate laboratory experiments. In this study, we use simplified, low-cost measurement tools enabling scalable evaluation of aerosol filtration efficiencies (0.3 to 10 microns), estimated CADR, and noise generation to compare a dozen HEPA-purifiers and DIY purifier designs. DIY purifiers consist of one or two box fans coupled to single MERV 13-16 filters (1”-5” thick) or quad filters in a cube. Accounting for reduced filtration efficiency of MERV 13-16 filters (versus HEPA) at the most penetrating particle size of 0.3 microns, estimated CADR of DIY purifiers using 2”, 4”, and 5” filters at lowest fan speed (for tolerable noise) was 257 cfm ($35), 322 cfm ($58), and 404 cfm ($120) comparable to best-in-class, HEPA-purifiers running at maximum speed with low noise generation at 282 cfm ($549). Quad filter designs, popularly known as Corsi-Rosenthal box, achieved gains in estimated CADR less than 80% over single filter designs (in contrast to 200-250% gains reported by UC-Davis), and less than the 100% gain by adding another DIY purifier. Replacing one of the quad filters with a second fan resulted in gains of 125%-150% in estimated CADR. DIY alternatives using single filters compare favorably to HEPA-purifiers in estimated CADR, noise generated but five to ten times lower cost, enabling cheap, rapid aerosol removal around the world.

Conflicts of Interest

I have no relevant interests to declare. I am not associated with any of the manufacturers mentioned in this research.

Introduction

Recent studies demonstrate live SARS-Cov-2 in micron[1 2] and submicron[3] aerosols from the exhaled breath of infected people. Pathogen-carrying aerosols have potential to accumulate in airspaces of poorly ventilated, indoor spaces such as classrooms, clinics, offices, homes,

restaurants, and bars and other community settings, and if inhaled may result in COVID-19 infections.[4] Separately, toxic aerosol pollution such as from wildfires, wood burning, and other sources can be encountered in these same locations with ventilation using unfiltered, outdoor air. Portable air filtration in the form of commercially available, high efficiency particulate air purifiers (HEPA-purifiers) is useful to remove both types of aerosols without relying on centralized air-handling systems designed to turn on / off to control temperature, not necessarily to run continuously to sanitize the air.

Unlike healthcare facilities where there are minimum specifications[54] for ventilation and air filtration in many cases exceeding 15 air exchange per hour (ACH), in community settings[55] and schools[56] the CDC (US) recommends increasing air filtration "as high as possible." Specific targets for ACH in community settings are needed.

Fundamentally, the rate of aerosol (particulate) removal by air filters (HEPA, DIY, etc.) in a room as measured by clean air delivery rate (CADR) must exceed the rate of introduction of these aerosols by a significant margin in order to avoid accumulation of aerosols and achieve rapid clearance (e.g. when introduced by an infected person or smoky source). Outdoor ventilation is generally additive to air filtration (in terms of ACH) except on days when the outdoor air is polluted with wildfire or smoky particulates (e.g. PM 2.5) in which case indoor air filtration is needed to clean the outdoor air too. Experts at Boston School of Public Health[57] and the California Department of Public Health[58] recommend 4 to 6 ACH in community settings to prevent COVID-19. Researchers measuring traces of the SARS-CoV2 coronavirus in the air of a COVID-19 ward of a UK hospital reported they were undetectable once air filtration machines filtered the air in each room every 6 to 12 minutes.[73] To achieve

these ACH targets, cost and noise generation concerns with portable air filtration or ventilation upgrades need to be addressed.[59 60]

For example, in a typical classroom (30'x30'x8'), a HEPA-purifier with clean air delivery rate (CADR) of 300 cubic feet per minute (cfm) needs 24 minutes to cycle the air once (2.5 air exchanges per hour or ACH) under ideal mixing conditions.[5 6] This classroom would require 2-3 air HEPA-purifiers with low-noise generation costing $400-$500 each (with periodic $40-$80 filter replacements) to achieve 4-6 ACH costing approximately $1000-$1500 per classroom, outside the budget of many schools. Getting 15 ACH as in hospitals and passenger aircraft would require proportionally more HEPA-purifiers putting it further out of reach.



Figure 1: Classroom dimensions (length x width x height)

Indoor ventilation upgrades, portable HEPA purifiers, and respirators (e.g. N95) can remove SARS-Cov-2 particles and its variants, other airborne viruses that cause natural or artificial pandemics (e.g. respiratory RNA viruses[76]), aerosolized bacteria such as anthrax[77], and

particulate pollution. However, these can be unaffordable to much of the US and world population.

Lower cost alternatives to HEPA-purifiers in use for a decade were investigated for both their air filtration properties and safety. A Minimum Efficiency Rating Value-13 (MERV-13) filter attached to a box fan (e.g. using duct tape, bungee cord, rubber band, clips) was demonstrated to effectively filter wildfire PM2.5 and submicron particles.[7] Ford Motor Company sponsored "Scrappy Filtration" which donated 20,000 box-fan and air filters held together with a cardboard structure for use in classrooms to underserved communities.[8 9] However, lower-cost box-fan-filter alternatives have not yet been directly compared using the same test methods to HEPA-purifiers along key metrics: filtration efficiency (%), air flow and clean air delivery rate (CADR), and noise generation (dBA).

Below, we compare cost-effectiveness of aerosol filtration by best-in-class, portable HEPA-purifiers and do-it-yourself (DIY) alternatives built from box fans and HVAC filters rated at MERV-13, 14, 15 and 16. Comparison is based on three metrics: estimated clean air delivery rate (CADR), the noise generated (dBA), and initial cost or affordability ($). Measurement devices include an ISO-certified, calibrated aerosol meter for input/output particle filtration of sizes ranging from 0.3 microns to 10 microns, airspeed meter to measure airflow, and NIOSH sound meter app to measure noise. Traditional methods that measure the effect of the air purifier (and its CADR) using the decay rate of aerosols generated or injected into an isolated, unoccupied room require greater investment of time, effort, and training/expertise compared to the much simpler DIY test methods described here.[78 79] We use ambient aerosols to rapidly compare different filters, fans, and configurations with low-cost, measurement

tools available online (e.g. Amazon) also making these results easy to replicate and verify with limited resources.

Leveraging these simpler test methods, we were able to evaluate and compare three HEPA-purifiers, 6 single-filter and three 3 (quad and triple filter) configurations with box fans without conducting twelve different aerosol-generating experiments. We also evaluate DIY configurations involving quad filter design in a cube formation, popularly known on social media as the Corsi-Rosenthal box, proposed to enhance airflow and CADR over a single filter design, and compare this to a cube design replacing one of the four filters with an additional fan.

Safety Notes: California Air Resource Board recommends never leaving box-fan air filters unattended while turned on, and to use box fans in the US those manufactured after 2012 because they have a fused plug to prevent electrical fires e.g. if the device is inadvertently knocked over.[10] Chemical Insights, a subsidiary of Underwriter Laboratories, recently tested five different electric box fan models (approximately 20” × 20” in size) with attached air filters and concluded that all measured temperatures fell below the maximum acceptable thresholds defined by the market safety standard for electric fans (UL 507).[11] The resources and information in this article (the “Content”) are for informational purposes only and should not be construed as professional advice. The Content is intended to complement, not substitute, the advice of your doctor. You should seek independent professional advice from a person who is licensed and/or qualified in the applicable area. No action should be taken based upon any information contained in this article. Use of the article is at your own risk. Patient Knowhow, Inc. takes no responsibility and assumes no liability for any Content made in this article.

Methods

HEPA-purifiers. Three models evaluated include the Coway Airmega 300 ($549, 285 cfm), Coway AP-1512HH ($229, 233 cfm), and Airthereal AHG550 ($233, 324 cfm). Unit prices are as listed on Amazon and "smoke" clean air delivery rate (CADR) in units of cubic feet per minute (cfm) is as listed on manufacturer website.

HVAC filters with box fan. For DIY configurations, the box fans used are 20" Lasko Fan ($20) along with 20" x 20" HVAC filters made by Nordic Pure of width and rating 1" MERV-14 ($11), 2" MERV-13 ($15), and 4" MERV-14 ($38), 4" MERV-15 ($42), by 3M of width and rating 1" MERV 14 ($26), and by Lennox of width and rating 5" MERV-16 ($99). MERV stands for minimum efficiency reporting values. The single and quad filter designs pictured in Figure 2 use one fan, and the triple filter design uses two fans with one fan replacing one of the filters. The square-shaped 20" box fans tend to pull in air from their front at their corners of the box, and a cardboard shroud of 14" diameter was attached to the output side (front) of each fan to concentrates and enhance airflow through the filter. For comparison, two methods of attaching the box fan to the air filters included vacuum (no attachment just relying on airflow), duct tape, and velcro. Unit prices are as listed on Home Depot, Amazon, or Walmart.

Figure 2: Do-It-Yourself Box Fan and Filters (single, quad filter designs with one fan and triple filter design with two fans)

Aerosol filtration efficiency. For each HEPA-purifier or box fan filter, counts at each particle size (0.3, 0.5, 0.7, 1.0, 2.5, 5, and 10 microns) were tested using an ISO-certified, particle counter (Temtop Particle Counter PMD 331 available on Amazon) with the filter turned ‘on’ and ‘off’ consecutively. The tests were conducted near an open window with fan blowing air through the window to allow for aerosols (particles) from outdoors to continuously enter the room. The particle counter is calibrated to within 10% at each particle size by the manufacturer. Five counts were recorded and averaged on the particle counter when its input was placed directly at the output of the air purifier/filter for 30 seconds. The filtration efficiency at each particle size was estimated by the formula, efficiency = 1 - on / off. To compare each fan-filter configuration in this study, the filtration efficiency depends only on the ratio of on to off, not on their absolute values.

Figure 3: Aerosol particle counter

Air flow. For each HEPA-purifier or DIY box fan filter, the airspeed was measured using an anemometer (BTMETER BT-100 Handheld Anemometer available on Amazon) held at the output perpendicular to the airflow. An average of three or more airspeed measurements (feet per minute) were multiplied by area of output to estimate the airflow (cubic feet per minute).

Figure 4: Anemometer

Noise. Noise measurements were taken for each air purifier/filter using an iPhone app maintained by National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH).[12] Three or

more noise measurements were taken at a 9” distance perpendicular to the direction of the output airflow and averaged.

Figure 5: NIOSH sound level meter (app)



Results

Note: Measurements in each table below are shown as averages (standard deviation in brackets).

HEPA-purifiers. As shown in Table 1, the results for the HEPA-purifiers show particle filtration efficiencies near or exceeding 95% at most particle sizes ranging from 0.3 to 10 microns and higher in many cases. At their maximum fan speed (3), the noise generated by the Coway Airmega 300 was lowest and most (subjectively) tolerable of the three models. To achieve similar subjective tolerability levels both the Coway AP-1512 and the Airthereal AGH550 had to be set at fan speed 2 which cut their estimated airflow (CADR) roughly in half. As a verification of the estimation methodology, the estimated airflow (cfm) using the

anemometer was reasonably close to the smoke CADR rating from the manufacturer's website.

Table 1: Performance of HEPA-purifiers

Setup		Noise and Airflow			Filtration Efficiency (%) avg of five measurements at each particle size (microns)						
	Price (est.)	Fan speed	Noise (dBA) avg. of three samples 9" away	Est. Airflow (output) cfm	0.3	0.5	0.7	1.0	2.5	5.0	10.0
Coway Airmega 300	$549	3	59.3 (2.1)	282 (61)	94.1 (0.9)	94.5 (1.1)	97.0 (0.96)	97.4 (0.92)	98.3 (1.5)	98.3 (1.8)	98.0 (1.6)
Coway AP-1512	$229	3	64.7 (0.57)	223 (3.7)	97.4 (0.3)	98.1 (0.4)	98.5 (0.6)	98.7 (0.8)	98.4 (1.7)	98.0 (3.0)	97.6 (5.5)
Coway AP-1512	$229	2	46.0 (3.5)	97 (5.7)							
Airthereal AGH550	$233	5	66.3 ± 0.6	410 (81)	86.5 (3.5)	89.5 (0.9)	90.6 (2.1)	92.7 (1.9)	93.9 (3.2)	96.0 (2.4)	98.6 (2.1)
Airthereal AGH550	$233	2	47.3 ± 1.5	206 (42)							

Single filter configurations with box fan. The noise generated by the box fan was (subjectively) tolerable only at fan speed #1 (out of three) with a measured noise level of 54 dBA comparable to the Coway Airmega 300 at 59 dBA. As shown in Table 2, the filtration efficiency of the MERV-13, 14, 15, or 16 filters at the most penetrating particle size of 0.3 microns varied by thickness from approximately 60% to 85% with highest observed for MERV-16 filter and lowest for the MERV 13 filter, well below the HEPA filters. Even though MERV-13 filters may remove less than 80% of particles in just one pass, if the air recirculates multiple times through filter the aerosol concentrations can be rapidly reduced.[7] The filtration efficiency exceeded 90% in some cases at particle sizes above 1 micron. Compared to 282 cfm for the Coway Airmega 300 ($375) at fan speed 3, the box fan at speed 1 has estimated CADR of:

- 404 cfm discounting the airflow of 476 cfm for 85% filtration efficiency (at 0.3 microns, fan speed 3) with the 5” MERV 16 filter ($120)
- 322 cfm discounting the airflow of 488 cfm for 66% filtration efficiency (at 0.3 microns, fan speed 3) with the 4” MERV-14 filter ($58)
- 293 cfm discounting the airflow of 437 cfm for 67% efficiency (at 0.3 microns, fan speed 1) with the 2” MERV-13 filter ($35).
- 244 cfm discounting the airflow of 381 cfm for 64% efficiency (at 0.3 microns, fan speed 1) with the 1” MERV-14 filter ($31).

At speed 3 the box fan had estimated CADR of:

- 645 cfm discounting the airflow of 759 cfm for 85% filtration efficiency (at 0.3 microns) with the 5” MERV 16 filter ($120)
- 488 cfm discounting the airflow of 740 cfm for 66% filtration efficiency (at 0.3 microns) with the 4” MERV-14 filter ($58)
- 391 cfm discounting the airflow of 664 cfm for 59% efficiency (at 0.3 microns) with the 2” MERV-13 filter ($35).
- 342 cfm discounting the airflow of 571 cfm for 60% efficiency (at 0.3 microns, fan speed 3) with the 1” MERV-14 filter ($31).

For all filters, filtration efficiencies were measured at fan speed #3, but also at fan speed #1 for the 2” MERV 13 and 1” MERV 14 filters at which the filtration efficiencies were higher. In general, that is expected to hold true with the other filters so the estimated CADR for each filter at fan speed #1 (above) would be commensurately higher as well.

Table 2: Performance of single-filter configurations with a box fan

Setup	Noise and Airflow	Filtration Efficiency (%) avg of five measurements at each particle size (microns)

Filter Mfr.	Filter Type	Price (est.)	Seal	Fan speed	Noise (dBA) avg. of three samples 9" away	Est. Airflow (output) cfm	0.3	0.5	0.7	1.0	2.5	5.0	10.0
Lennox	5" MERV-16	$120	vacuum	3		759 (72)	85 (2.6)	86 (3.0)	85 (0.45)	86 (1.6)	86 (4.8)	86 (7.1)	82 (13)
Lennox	**5" MERV-16**	**$120**	**vacuum**	**1**		**476 (35)**							
Nordic Pure	4" MERV-15	$63	vacuum	3		782 (23)	66 (6.9)	70 (5.0)	81 (3.0)	85 (3.9)	87 (1.6)	90 (1.8)	90 (4.4)
Nordic Pure	**4" MERV-15**	**$63**	**vacuum**	**1**		**510 (44)**							
Nordic Pure	4" MERV-14	$58	vacuum	3	62.7 (0.6)	740 (50)	66 (6.8)	69 (6.3)	80 (3.6)	86 (2.4)	92 (2.2)	92 (4.2)	92 (5.3)
Nordic Pure	4" MERV-14	$58	vacuum	2	60.0 (0.0)								
Nordic Pure	**4" MERV-14**	**$58**	**vacuum**	**1**	**54.0 (0.0)**	**488 (48)**							
Nordic Pure	2" MERV-13	$35	vacuum	3	62.0 (0.0)	664 (57)	59 6.0)	60 (5.7)	68 (4.2)	69 (7.8)	70 (11)	71 (8.5)	70 (17)
Nordic Pure	2" MERV-13	$35	vacuum	2	58.3 (0.6)								
Nordic Pure	**2" MERV-13**	**$35**	**vacuum**	**1**	**52.3 (0.6)**	**437 (53)**	**67 (2.0)**	**69 (2.2)**	**74 (3.2)**	**77 (3.9)**	**78 (2.7)**	**78 (3.0)**	**79 (6.0)**
3M (Filtrete)	1" MERV-14	$46	vacuum	3		590 (60)	78 (1.4)	79 (1.3)	78 (0.9)	77 (1.4)	77 (4.0)	77 (6.2)	77 (6.7)
3M (Filtrete)	**1" MERV-14**	**$46**	**vacuum**	**1**		**381 (51)**							
Nordic Pure	1" MERV-14	$31	velcro	3	64 (2)	571 (36)	60 (1.1)	65 (1.3)	78 (1.5)	83 (1.6)	86 (1.7)	88 (1.4)	81 (6.0)
Nordic Pure	1" MERV-14	$31	velcro	2	60.3 (1.5)								
Nordic Pure	**1" MERV-14**	**$31**	**velcro**	**1**	**55.3 (3.2)**	**381 (47)**	64 (4.1)	67 (4.5)	74 (4.6)	77 (4.2)	78 (5.0)	81 (3.8)	77 (6.2)

Cube configurations with box fan(s). Using comparably rated filters and fan speeds, the quad filter design with one box fan (4x1), popularly known as the Corsi-Rosenthal box, showed significant improvement in airflow and filtration efficiency over single filters (Table 3). Whereas results from attaching the filters were similar with duct tape (to seal up any gaps) or velcro (leaving small airgaps), suggesting any leaks created by a loose fit may not make much difference. Notably, the filtration efficiency of the quad filter design was marginally better than the corresponding single filter design possibly due to lower pressure across the filters. At fan speed 1, the quad filter (4x1, CR box) configuration has an estimated has estimated CADR of:

- 471 cfm (with the quad 2” MERV-13 filters, 4x1, velcro) discounting the airflow of 645 cfm by 73% filtration efficiency (at 0.3 microns, fan speed 3). This is an improvement in estimated CADR of 61% versus with a single filter (1x1) with 293 cfm.
- 387 cfm (with the quad 1” MERV-14 filters, 4x1, velcro) discounting the airflow of 546 cfm by 71% filtration efficiency (at 0.3 microns, fan speed 3). This is an an improvement of 61% versus a single filter (1x1) with 241 cfm.

At fan speed 3, the quad filter (4x1, CR box) configuration has an estimated has estimated CADR of:

- 659 cfm (with the quad 2” MERV-13 filters, 4x1, velcro) discounting the airflow of 903 cfm by 73% filtration efficiency (at 0.3 microns, fan speed 3). This is an improvement of 69% versus with a single filter (1x1) with 391 cfm.
- 604 cfm (with the quad 1” MERV-14 filters, 4x1, velcro) discounting the airflow of 851 cfm by 71% filtration efficiency (at 0.3 microns, fan speed 3). This is an an improvement of 77% versus a single filter (1x1) with 342 cfm.

However, use of a second fan to replace one of the filters on the face of the cube opposite to the fan (3x2) demonstrated much greater improvement in estimated CADR:

- 660 cfm (at fan speed 1 with three 2” MERV-13 filters and two fans) discounting the airflow of 1000 cfm by 66% filtration efficiency (0.3 microns, fan speed 3) versus estimated CADR of 293 cfm with a single filter (1x1) for an improvement of 125%.
- 1010 cfm (at fan speed 3 with three 2” MERV-13 filters and two fans) discounting the airflow of 1530 cfm by 66% filtration efficiency (0.3 microns, fan speed 3) versus estimated CADR of 391 cfm with a single filter (1x1) for an improvement of 158%.

The three extra filters in the CR box (4x1) increased airflow by less than 50% over equivalently rated single filter configuration (1x1), whereas it took adding an extra fan and two extra filters in the cube formation (3x2) to double the airflow and estimated CADR.

Table 3: Performance of cube configurations (filters x fans: 4x1 and 3x2)

Setup						Noise and Airflow		Filtration Efficiency (%) avg of five measurements at each particle size (microns)						
Filter Mfr.	Filter Type	filters x fans	Price (est.)	Seal	Fan speed	Noise (dBA) avg. of three samples 9" away	Est. Airflow (output) cfm	0.3	0.5	0.7	1.0	2.5	5.0	10.0
n/a	No filter	0x1	$20	n/a	3		965 (30)							
n/a	No filter	0x1	$20	n/a	1		664 (24)							
Nordic Pure	2" MERV-13	4x1	$80	velcro	3		903 (36)	73 (2.0)	74 (2.1)	76 (4.0)	79 (4.5)	78 (5.1)	74 (8.4)	65 (17)
Nordic Pure	**2" MERV-13**	**4x1**	**$80**	**velcro**	**1**		**645 (27)**							
Nordic Pure	2" MERV-13	4x1	$80	tape	3		851 (66)	67 (3.4)	67 (3.3)	74 (3.5)	79 (3.4)	80 (6.8)	87 (2.5)	86 (6.4)
Nordic Pure	**2" MERV-13**	**4x1**	**$80**	**tape**	**1**		**543 (42)**							
Nordic Pure	2" MERV-13	3x2	$85	velcro	3		Fan #1: 748 (27)	66 (3.0)	68 (2.8)	75 (2.6)	78 (2.4)	78 (5.3)	78 (7.3)	74 (10)
							Fan #2: 792 (35)							
Nordic Pure	**2" MERV-13**	**3x2**	**$85**	**velcro**	**1**		**Fan #1: 524 (34) Fan #2: 476 (29)**							
Nordic Pure	1" MERV-14	4x1	$64	tape	3		851 (66)	67 (3.4)	67 (3.3)	74 (3.5)	79 (3.4)	80 (6.8)	87 (2.5)	86 (6.4)
Nordic Pure	**1" MERV-14**	**4x1**	**$64**	**tape**	**1**		**542 (42)**							
Nordic Pure	1" MERV-14	4x1	$64	velcro	3		858 (44)	71 (1.5)	75 (1.1)	86 (1.2)	89 (1.3)	89 (1.5)	90 (1.7)	86 (8.3)
Nordic Pure	**1" MERV-14**	**4x1**	**$64**	**velcro**	**1**		**546 (24)**							

Discussion

Accounting for reduced filtration efficiency (60%-85%) of MERV-13,14 filters compared to HEPA, the estimated clean air delivery rate (CADR) of a do-it-yourself (DIY) setup using 2" MERV-13 or 4" MERV-14 filters with a box fan running at fan speed 1 for tolerable noise was 257 cfm to 322 cfm, comparable or better than a best-in-class, HEPA-purifier running at maximum speed with low noise generation at 282 cfm. Yet the upfront cost of the components of the DIY setup were approximately 10 times less ($35-$58) than best-in-class HEPA-purifiers ($549).

At least two studies have measured the CADR of cube configurations (popularly known as the Corsi-Rosenthal box or CR box) by observing the decay rates of generated aerosols. The first study is by UC-Davis[78] measured 600 cfm at lowest fan speed to 850 cfm at highest fan speed. The second study is by Illinois Institute of Technology[79] (IIT), measured below 300 cfm in the range of 0.5 to 3 microns (dust) at the highest fan speed but above 450 cfm in the range of 5-11 microns (pollen). Both used five 2" MERV-13 filters (instead of four in our study) of similar dimensions so it is unclear why they differ by a factor of two. The estimated CADR of cube configurations using in our results with 2" MERV 13 filters of 471 cfm at lowest fan speed 1 and 659 cfm at the highest fan speed 3 are in between these two studies but more consistent with the UC-Davis study. The filtration efficiency at 0.3 microns used in our estimation of CADR is the among the particle sizes (most penetrating particle size), so it is possible that greater filtration efficiencies at larger particle sizes may account for this difference with UC-Davis results which is based on generated aerosols. It is also possible differences may be accounted for by differences in the filters, number of filters (4 vs 5), fans, and other differences in estimation methodology but further investigation would be required to fully understand why there is such a range.

However the quad filter design, CR box, did not achieve gains in CADR of more than 80% over a single filter design which is in contrast to the 200-250% gains reported by UC-Davis (also with shroud and 20” Lasko box fan),[13] separate from the UC-Davis study in the prior paragraph. Quad filter designs are unlikely to exceed the airflow with no filters. At fan speed 1, the airflow of quad 1” MERV 14 filter design (546 cfm) was within 25% of that with no filters (646 cfm), and the airflow of the single 1” MERV 14 (381 cfm) was within 50% of no filters. This suggests the quad 1” design is close to optimal but cannot be improved by a factor of 200% over the single 1” filter. At fan speed 1, the airflow with no filter (646 cfm) was measured to be 70% more than the airflow with a single 1” filter (381 cfm), 47% more than 2” MERV-13 filter (437 cfm), and only 32% more than the 4” MERV-14 filter (488 cfm). The cost and extra setup effort from the quad filters can be alternatively expended on more simply replicating a new box fan filter (+ 100% gain) so that the airflow is then distributed to different locations in the room or classroom. To illustrate this, replacing one of the 2” MERV-13 filters in the quad filter configuration with a second fan resulted in gains of approximately 125%-150% in estimated CADR (at fan speeds 1 and 3) which is notably better than 100% presumably in part due to improved filtration efficiency.

Regardless, our results suggest a sweet spot between speed of setup, simplicity, size, and cost is a single 20” box fan with 2” MERV-13 ($35) or 4” MERV-14 filter ($58) of 20” length and width. Single filter is easier and simpler to setup than multi-filter designs which is an advantage for scaling up DIY approaches. Alternatively, if higher filtration efficiency is desired a 5” MERV-16 filter can be used ($120). Given the simplicity and low-cost of the box-fan design using single 2” or 4” MERV-13/14 filters, form-factor improvements at a marginal cost may include a more stable, cardboard box frame so it is not so easy to knock

over with printed designs to make it aesthetically pleasing. A mosquito screen in front of the fan can help keep small objects (e.g. fingers or pencils) from contacting the fan blade which may be especially important for classroom[70] and home applications when young children are present.

Limitations

The filtration and airflow results for box fan used a certain set of filters and fans made by certain manufacturers, and results may vary with different manufacturers. There may also be variability in filter performance due to manufacturing defects or variations among fans and filters from the same manufacturer. The durability of filtration efficiency and airflow of these filters after extended use with box fans is also uncharacterized unlike HEPA-purifiers which have well-understood operational history.

If aerosol transmission is largely eliminated would it bring the pandemic under control?

Table 4 summarizes divergent views of public health agencies and academics on the transmission modes of SARS-Cov-2. Large-scale, real-world evidence of transmission events aboard passenger airplanes (inflight) may help settle this debate in favor aerosols playing a potentially more important role in inter-household, superspreading of SARS-Cov-2 than other transmission modes. Prior to mandatory mask usage on passenger flights, inflight transmission was observationally confirmed with genomic sequencing[27 28 29] and some have credited institution of mandatory masking for reduction in mass transmission (superspreading) aboard flights[30 31] which appears to validate the utility of droplet precautions[32] to reduce transmission within a short distance (e.g. 6 feet). However, even prior to mandatory masking aboard aircraft expert opinion has been that there were relatively few published documented superspreading (mass-transmission) events.[31 33 34 35]

Table 4: Divergent Views on Transmission Modes of SARS-Cov-2.

The Aerosol-Droplet-Fomite Debate	Observational studies and expert opinion observe superspreading events are responsible for most SARS-Cov-2 transmission, and approximately 80% of cases are transmitted by 10% to 20% of the infected (super spreaders)[1 14 15] and if so controlling superspreading can potentially control the pandemic. Numerous superspreading events in community settings have been attributed to aerosol inhalation[9] although, conversely, confusion persists about what is the most important transmission mode (for superspreading): aerosol (airborne), droplet, or surface (fomite). Theoretically at least, superspreading of SARS-Cov-2 without aerosols (e.g. droplet deposition onto mucous membranes, direct contact with an infected person or indirectly via surfaces or fomites) cannot be ruled out because superspreading is also observed with viruses thought to be spread primarily by direct physical contact such as ebola. During the West African Ebola epidemic superspreading was observed in hospitals (nosocomial), funerals (gatherings), and even taxis (transportation). Conversely, aerosol spread of Ebola has also not been completely ruled out either and continues to be debated decades after its discovery.[16]
WHO	In August, 2020 the WHO Infection Prevention and Control Research and Development Expert Group for COVID-19 wrote that the predominant route of transmission of SARS-CoV-2 is consistent with the droplet/contact route. As recently as December 21, 2021 Dr. Mike Ryan, Executive Director, WHO Health Emergencies Programme, emphasized[17] the role of multiple modes of transmission[18] including aerosols, droplets, and surfaces (fomites). In

	environments with extended, close-contacts such as households (or social bubbles), aerosols, droplets, and fomites may all have ample opportunity for transmission but the pandemic cannot be sustained without inter-household spread which maybe have a different mix of transmission routes than in households.[19]
CDC	US-CDC opinion is that fomite transmission of SARS-Cov-2 is unlikely[24] and people are primarily infected through exposure to respiratory fluids carrying the SARS-Cov-2, but these could be droplets or aerosols.[4]
California	On June 17, 2021, California (Cal-OSHA) declared COVID-19 an airborne disease and required employers to provide respirators (e.g. N95) upon request to unvaccinated employees[25] but the US (federal OSHA) only requires face coverings.[26]
Academics	Academics[20 21] have countered the WHO's position stating that SARS-CoV-2 is primarily airborne. In 2021, others have in turn characterized the position that airborne is the primary transmission route as exaggerated[22] and instead it primarily transmits respiratory droplets and, to a lesser extent, via aerosols.[23]

Spread of SARS-Cov-2 aboard flights will be limited by how many infected passengers board flights, of which 10%-20% are estimated to be potential super spreaders[14 43] based on expert opinion and observational studies. Unlike many other parts of the world, Hong Kong,[44 45] Australia and New Zealand conduct testing, tracing, and isolation of arriving passengers from abroad and publish observational studies of inflight superspreading. An airline Vistara reported that of 29 flights arriving in Hong Kong potentially up to 1% of their passengers tested positive.[72] Between December, 2020 and March, 2021 in Australia, wastewater from 24 (64.9%) of the 37 repatriation flights tested positive.[46] Among 6,570 arriving passengers

on these Australia-bound flights, 112 tested positive from which there would be expected 11 super spreaders (112 x 10%). As of October 20, 2020, out of 62,698 arriving passengers, New Zealand identified 215 who tested positive[27] from which there would be expected 21 super spreaders (215 x 10%). Indeed, based on testing of arriving passengers, infrequent reporting or publications aside from exceptional case studies also suggests lower incidence of superspreading than expected from the number of super spreaders who would be expected to be aboard these flights.

More broadly, point prevalence of COVID-19 is highly dynamic and has been observed to be approximately 1% or higher at times in observational community testing of those who could board an airplane (typically higher for symptomatic or unvaccinated individuals).[47 48] During periods of high community prevalence, if only 1% of passengers who board airplanes are positive and at least 10% of them are super spreaders we expect approximately one super spreader on board every 5 flights for a 200 passenger flight (200 x 1% x 10% = 1/5) well above the published rate of multiple transmission events aboard these aircraft.

Table 5 lists three alternate hypotheses for why there have been relatively few published multiple-transmission (superspreading) events on flights is the rapid air filtration aboard passenger aircraft: mandatory masking, passenger mixing patterns, and rapid HEPA filtration. Appling Occam's Razor, perhaps the most plausible, explanation of the three is rapid, HEPA air filtration (often exceeding 15 air exchanges per hour) because it is the greatest differentiator between passenger airplanes and community settings. In a short time that Omicron variant has spread around the world, there have already been case studies published of large super spreading events[74] and cross hallway transmission in quarantine hotels in Hong Kong[75] suggesting aerosol transmission, yet it is remarkable that considering the densely

packed quarters aboard passenger airplanes there have thus far been no similar case studies published of mass-transmission of Omicron aboard passenger flights.

Table 5: Possible explanations for lower than expected inflight super spreading.

Mandatory masking	One possible explanation for lower than expected inflight superspreading is that passenger adherence to masking, once it became mandatory, was higher than in the community settings due to enforcement by airlines. Transmission aboard flights (and across rows) was also observed in three flights when masks were worn by most infected passengers[27 36 37] and in one flight when masks were worn by all passengers for the flight duration.[38] Transmission has also been observed and confirmed with genome sequencing in healthcare settings despite both parties being masked maintaining a distance of 3 feet.[39] This is remarkable[40 41] considering thousands of daily flights carried millions of passengers[42] in densely packed seating arrangements with non-uniform implementation and inconsistent or imperfect passenger adherence to control measures such as preflight testing and masking.
Passenger mixing patterns	Another possible explanation for low incidence of multiple transmission (superspreading) aboard flights maybe reduced passenger mixing patterns involving close-contact relative to community settings mixed because passengers are confined to their seats most of the time. Greater transmission is predicted[49] and observed retrospectively[35] for passengers who sit nearby aboard flights. Observational studies aboard ten transcontinental flights showed there are ample opportunities for mixed, close-contact aboard these aircraft (perhaps not as many as in a bar) because passengers not only share bathrooms but frequently walk around inflight (e.g. queuing at bathrooms for

	multiple minutes) especially by aisle-seated passengers on longer flights.[50] They appear to be higher in number and shorter in duration than community.[51 52]
Rapid, HEPA air filtration	The level of ventilation or air filtration is measured by the number of air exchanges per hour (ACH). Passenger aircraft typically use rapid HEPA air filtration as high as 15 air changes per hour (ACH)[53] which itself has been insufficient to completely stop all multiple transmission (superspreading), but still much higher than typical indoor community settings.

The combination of N95 masks with rapid HEPA filtration onboard the aircraft was utilized for a repatriation flight to South Korea.[61] Public health agencies should also consider recommending a broader range of masks options based on breathability, fit, cost, and reusability that provide minimum specifications for protection against aerosols carrying viruses such as CDC-NIOSH approved N95, N99, or P100 respirators and their equivalents. Breathability is often raised as a concern with respirators compared to ordinary face coverings or double masking. N95 respirators have been characterized by the directors of CDC and NIAID as difficult to breathe,[62 63] but there is a great deal of variation in breathability among N95 models (disposable and reusable). One laboratory study found N95 more breathable than two masks consisting of a surgical mask beneath a cloth mask.[64] Effective filtration depends on how well the respirator fits and seals to the face. Another concern with community use of respirators is fit-failure i.e. whether adequate fit is achieved without fit-testing. Further studies are needed to validate the fit of respirators worn by community participants without fit testing. A limited number of trials with small numbers of participants indicate high filtration using N95 respirators even with suboptimal fit or in the absence of fit testing and training.[65 66 67 68 69]

Conclusions

Indoor ventilation upgrades, HEPA-purifiers, and respirators that can remove SARS-Cov-2 particles and its variants, other airborne viruses causing natural or artificial pandemics, aerosolized bacteria such as anthrax, and particulate pollution can be expensive or difficult causing many organizations or households to hesitate.[71] To meet or exceed recommended 4 to 6 air exchanges per hour (ACH) or exceeding 15 ACH used in passenger aircraft, high price-points for select HEPA-purifier models without incurring excessive noise generation make them unaffordable for many households and communities. As we discovered in the test results, DIY air filtration by combining off-the-shelf components (box fans with heating, ventilation and cooling or HVAC filters) compares favorably in performance (clean air delivery rate, noise) to HEPA air purifiers but at approximately five to ten times lower cost, and can be an affordable option for rapid aerosol removal indoors in homes, clinics, schools, and offices.

References

1. Coleman KK, Tay DJW, Sen Tan K, Ong SWX, Son TT, Koh MH, Chin YQ, Nasir H, Mak TM, Chu JJH, Milton DK, Chow VTK, Tambyah PA, Chen M, Wai TK. Viral Load of SARS-CoV-2 in Respiratory Aerosols Emitted by COVID-19 Patients while Breathing, Talking, and Singing. Clin Infect Dis. 2021 Aug 6:ciab691. doi: 10.1093/cid/ciab691. Epub ahead of print. PMID: 34358292; PMCID: PMC8436389.

2. Adenaiye OO, Lai J, de Mesquita PJB, Hong F, Youssefi S, German J, Tai SS, Albert B, Schanz M, Weston S, Hang J, Fung C, Chung HK, Coleman KK, Sapoval N, Treangen T, Berry IM, Mullins K, Frieman M, Ma T, Milton DK; University of Maryland StopCOVID Research Group. Infectious SARS-CoV-2 in Exhaled Aerosols and Efficacy of Masks During Early Mild Infection. Clin Infect Dis. 2021 Sep 14:ciab797. doi: 10.1093/cid/ciab797. Epub ahead of print. PMID: 34519774; PMCID: PMC8522431.

3. Santarpia JL, Herrera VL, Rivera DN, Ratnesar-Shumate S, Reid SP, Ackerman DN, Denton PW, Martens JWS, Fang Y, Conoan N, Callahan MV, Lawler JV, Brett-Major DM, Lowe JJ. The size and culturability of patient-generated SARS-CoV-2 aerosol. J Expo Sci Environ Epidemiol. 2021 Aug 18:1–6. doi: 10.1038/s41370-021-00376-8. Epub ahead of print. PMID: 34408261; PMCID: PMC8372686.

4. Scientific Brief: SARS-CoV-2 Transmission. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. May 7, 2021. https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/science/science-briefs/sars-cov-2-transmission.html

5. Patient Knowhow, “AIR PURIFIERS (HEPA FILTERS) FOR YOUR CLASSROOM, OFFICE, OR HOME” https://www.patientknowhow.com/hepacalculator.html

6. https://www.hsph.harvard.edu/news/hsph-in-the-news/experts-offer-advice-on-air-purifiers-for-classrooms/

7. May, N.W., Dixon, C., Jaffe, D.A. (2021). Impact of Wildfire Smoke Events on Indoor Air Quality and Evaluation of a Low-cost Filtration Method. Aerosol Air Qual. Res. 21, 210046. https://doi.org/10.4209/aaqr.210046

8. Ford Media Center, May 12, 2021. “FORD DIY AIR FILTRATION KIT THAT REDUCES COVID-19 IN THE AIR VALIDATED BY PEER-REVIEWED SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH JOURNAL” https://media.ford.com/content/fordmedia/fna/us/en/news/2021/05/12/ford-diy-air-filtration-kit-covid-19-validated.html

9. Ruichen He, Wanjiao Liu, John Elson, Rainer Vogt, Clay Maranville, and Jiarong Hong, "Airborne transmission of COVID-19 and mitigation using box fan air cleaners in a poorly ventilated classroom", Physics of Fluids 33, 057107 (2021) https://doi.org/10.1063/5.0050058

10. California Air Resources Board. “Protecting Yourself from Wildfire Smoke” https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/protecting-yourself-wildfire-smoke

11. Aika Davis, Marilyn Black. Chemical Insights. An Evaluation of DIY Air Filtration. https://chemicalinsights.org/wp-content/uploads/DIY-Box-Fan-Report-2021.pdf

12. The National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH). "NIOSH Sound Level Meter App" https://www.cdc.gov/niosh/topics/noise/app.html

13. UC-Davis Western Cooling Eciency Center. August, 2021. "TESTING DIFFERENT CONFIGURATIONS OF DO-IT-YOURSELF PORTABLE AIR CLEANERS" https://energy.ucdavis.edu/wp-content/uploads/Case-Study_DIY-Portable-Air-Cleaners-083121.pdf

14. Chen PZ, Koopmans M, Fisman DN, Gu FX. Understanding why superspreading drives the COVID-19 pandemic but not the H1N1 pandemic. Lancet Infect Dis. 2021 Sep;21(9):1203-1204. doi: 10.1016/S1473-3099(21)00406-0. Epub 2021 Aug 2. PMID: 34352224; PMCID: PMC8328407.

15. Sun K, Wang W, Gao L, Wang Y, Luo K, Ren L, Zhan Z, Chen X, Zhao S, Huang Y, Sun Q, Liu Z, Litvinova M, Vespignani A, Ajelli M, Viboud C, Yu H. Transmission heterogeneities, kinetics, and controllability of SARS-CoV-2. Science. 2021 Jan 15;371(6526):eabe2424. doi: 10.1126/science.abe2424. Epub 2020 Nov 24. PMID: 33234698; PMCID: PMC7857413.

16. Osterholm MT, Moore KA, Kelley NS, Brosseau LM, Wong G, Murphy FA, Peters CJ, LeDuc JW, Russell PK, Van Herp M, Kapetshi J, Muyembe JJ, Ilunga BK, Strong JE, Grolla A, Wolz A, Kargbo B, Kargbo DK, Sanders DA, Kobinger GP. Transmission of Ebola

viruses: what we know and what we do not know. mBio. 2015 Feb 19;6(2):e00137. doi: 10.1128/mBio.00137-15. Erratum in: MBio. 2015;6(4):e01154. Formenty, Pierre [Deleted]. PMID: 25698835; PMCID: PMC4358015.

17. "How does #COVID19 spread? What are some modes of transmission? What can you do to protect yourself? @DrMikeRyan explains." https://twitter.com/WHO/status/1473387274159149063

18. "Coronavirus disease (COVID-19): How is it transmitted?" https://www.who.int/news-room/questions-and-answers/item/coronavirus-disease-covid-19-how-is-it-transmitted

19. Lee EC, Wada NI, Grabowski MK, Gurley ES, Lessler J. The engines of SARS-CoV-2 spread. Science. 2020 Oct 23;370(6515):406-407. doi: 10.1126/science.abd8755. PMID: 33093098.

20. Greenhalgh T, Jimenez JL, Prather KA, Tufekci Z, Fisman D, Schooley R. Ten scientific reasons in support of airborne transmission of SARS-CoV-2. Lancet. 2021 May 1;397(10285):1603-1605. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(21)00869-2. Epub 2021 Apr 15. Erratum in: Lancet. 2021 May 15;397(10287):1808. PMID: 33865497; PMCID: PMC8049599.

21. Robert T Schooley, Ferric C Fang, Reply to Meyerowitz and Richterman, Clinical Infectious Diseases, Volume 73, Issue 7, 1 October 2021, Pages 1319–1320, https://doi-org.eres.qnl.qa/10.1093/cid/ciab017

22. Escandón, K., Rasmussen, A.L., Bogoch, I.I. et al. COVID-19 false dichotomies and a comprehensive review of the evidence regarding public health, COVID-19 symptomatology, SARS-CoV-2 transmission, mask wearing, and reinfection. BMC Infect Dis 21, 710 (2021). https://doi.org/10.1186/s12879-021-06357-4

23. Zhou, L., Ayeh, S.K., Chidambaram, V. et al. Modes of transmission of SARS-CoV-2 and evidence for preventive behavioral interventions. BMC Infect Dis 21, 496 (2021). https://doi.org/10.1186/s12879-021-06222-4

24. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. SARS-CoV-2 and Surface (Fomite) Transmission for Indoor Community Environments. https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/more/science-and-research/surface-transmission.html

25. California Division of Occupational Safety and Health (Cal-OSHA). COVID-19 Prevention. https://www.dir.ca.gov/title8/3205.html

26. US Department of Labor Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA). COVID-19 Vaccination and Testing; Emergency Temporary Standard. https://www.osha.gov/coronavirus/ets2

27. Swadi T, Geoghegan JL, Devine T, McElnay C, Sherwood J, Shoemack P, Ren X, Storey M, Jefferies S, Smit E, Hadfield J, Kenny A, Jelley L, Sporle A, McNeill A, Reynolds GE, Mouldey K, Lowe L, Sonder G, Drummond AJ, Huang S, Welch D, Holmes EC, French N, Simpson CR, de Ligt J. Genomic Evidence of In-Flight Transmission of SARS-CoV-2

Despite Predeparture Testing. Emerg Infect Dis. 2021 Mar;27(3):687-693. doi: 10.3201/eid2703.204714. Epub 2021 Jan 5. PMID: 33400642; PMCID: PMC7920679.

28. Khanh NC, Thai PQ, Quach HL, Thi NH, Dinh PC, Duong TN, Mai LTQ, Nghia ND, Tu TA, Quang N, Quang TD, Nguyen TT, Vogt F, Anh DD. Transmission of SARS-CoV 2 During Long-Haul Flight. Emerg Infect Dis. 2020 Nov;26(11):2617-2624. doi: 10.3201/eid2611.203299. Epub 2020 Sep 18. PMID: 32946369; PMCID: PMC7588538.

29. Speake H, Phillips A, Chong T, Sikazwe C, Levy A, Lang J, Scalley B, Speers DJ, Smith DW, Effler P, McEvoy SP. Flight-Associated Transmission of Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 Corroborated by Whole-Genome Sequencing. Emerg Infect Dis. 2020 Dec;26(12):2872-2880. doi: 10.3201/eid2612.203910. Epub 2020 Sep 29. PMID: 32990563; PMCID: PMC7706937.

30. Nir-Paz R, Grotto I, Strolov I, Salmon A, Mandelboim M, Mendelson E, Regev-Yochay G. Absence of in-flight transmission of SARS-CoV-2 likely due to use of face masks on board. J Travel Med. 2020 Dec 23;27(8):taaa117. doi: 10.1093/jtm/taaa117. PMID: 32662832; PMCID: PMC7454758.

31. Freedman DO, Wilder-Smith A. In-flight transmission of SARS-CoV-2: a review of the attack rates and available data on the efficacy of face masks. J Travel Med. 2020 Dec 23;27(8):taaa178. doi: 10.1093/jtm/taaa178. PMID: 32975554; PMCID: PMC7543400.

32. Eric A Meyerowitz, Aaron Richterman, A Defense of the Classical Model of Transmission of Respiratory Pathogens, Clinical Infectious Diseases, Volume 73, Issue 7, 1 October 2021, Page 1318, https://doi.org/10.1093/cid/ciab016

33. Bielecki M, Patel D, Hinkelbein J, Komorowski M, Kester J, Ebrahim S, Rodriguez-Morales AJ, Memish ZA, Schlagenhauf P. Air travel and COVID-19 prevention in the pandemic and peri-pandemic period: A narrative review. Travel Med Infect Dis. 2021 Jan-Feb;39:101915. doi: 10.1016/j.tmaid.2020.101915. Epub 2020 Nov 10. PMID: 33186687; PMCID: PMC7655026.

34. Kelly D, Bambury N, Boland M. In-flight transmission of wild-type SARS-CoV-2 and the outbreak potential of imported clusters of COVID-19: a review of published evidence. Global Health. 2021 Aug 21;17(1):93. doi: 10.1186/s12992-021-00749-6. PMID: 34419084; PMCID: PMC8379567.

35. Blomquist PB, Bolt H, Packer S, Schaefer U, Platt S, Dabrera G, Gobin M, Oliver I. Risk of symptomatic COVID-19 due to aircraft transmission: a retrospective cohort study of contact-traced flights during England's containment phase. Influenza Other Respir Viruses. 2021 May;15(3):336-344. doi: 10.1111/irv.12846. Epub 2021 Mar 1. PMID: 33650201; PMCID: PMC8013760.

36. Murphy N, Boland M, Bambury N, Fitzgerald M, Comerford L, Dever N, O'Sullivan MB, Petty-Saphon N, Kiernan R, Jensen M, O'Connor L. A large national outbreak of COVID-19 linked to air travel, Ireland, summer 2020. Euro Surveill. 2020 Oct;25(42):2001624. doi: 10.2807/1560-7917.ES.2020.25.42.2001624. PMID: 33094715; PMCID: PMC7651877.

37. Toyokawa T, Shimada T, Hayamizu T, Sekizuka T, Zukeyama Y, Yasuda M, Nakamura Y, Okano S, Kudaka J, Kakita T, Kuroda M, Nakasone T. Transmission of SARS-CoV-2 during a 2-h domestic flight to Okinawa, Japan, March 2020. Influenza Other Respir Viruses. 2021 Oct 3. doi: 10.1111/irv.12913. Epub ahead of print. PMID: 34605181.

38. Eichler N, Thornley C, Swadi T, Devine T, McElnay C, Sherwood J, Brunton C, Williamson F, Freeman J, Berger S, Ren X, Storey M, de Ligt J, Geoghegan JL. Transmission of Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 during Border Quarantine and Air Travel, New Zealand (Aotearoa). Emerg Infect Dis. 2021 May;27(5):1274-1278. doi: 10.3201/eid2705.210514. Epub 2021 Mar 18. PMID: 33734063; PMCID: PMC8084504.

39. Klompas M, Baker MA, Griesbach D, Tucker R, Gallagher GR, Lang AS, Fink T, Cumming M, Smole S, Madoff LC, Rhee C. Transmission of Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) From Asymptomatic and Presymptomatic Individuals in Healthcare Settings Despite Medical Masks and Eye Protection. Clin Infect Dis. 2021 Nov 2;73(9):1693-1695. doi: 10.1093/cid/ciab218. PMID: 33704451; PMCID: PMC7989527.

40. John Paul Tasker. COVID-19 transmission on flights 'extremely rare,' Dr. Tam says. CBC News. Nov 10, 2020. https://www.cbc.ca/news/politics/covid-transmission-flights-extremely-rare-1.5797065

41. Harvard University. Assessment of Risks of SARS-CoV-2 Transmission During Air Travel and Non-Pharmaceutical Interventions to Reduce Risk: Phase One Report: Gate-to-Gate Travel Onboard Aircraft. 2020-10-27. https://cdn1.sph.harvard.edu/wp-content/uploads/sites/2443/2020/10/HSPH-APHI-Phase-I-Report.pdf

42. Air Traffic By The Numbers. Federal Avaiation Administration. https://www.faa.gov/air_traffic/by_the_numbers/

43. Edwards DA, Ausiello D, Salzman J, Devlin T, Langer R, Beddingfield BJ, Fears AC, Doyle-Meyers LA, Redmann RK, Killeen SZ, Maness NJ, Roy CJ. Exhaled aerosol increases with COVID-19 infection, age, and obesity. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A. 2021 Feb 23;118(8):e2021830118. doi: 10.1073/pnas.2021830118. Erratum in: Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A. 2021 Jul 6;118(27): PMID: 33563754; PMCID: PMC7923364.

44. Choi EM, Chu DKW, Cheng PKC, Tsang DNC, Peiris M, Bausch DG, Poon LLM, Watson-Jones D. In-Flight Transmission of SARS-CoV-2. Emerg Infect Dis. 2020 Nov;26(11):2713-2716. doi: 10.3201/eid2611.203254. Epub 2020 Sep 18. PMID: 32946370; PMCID: PMC7588512.

45. Dhanasekaran V, Edwards KM, Xie R, Gu H, Adam DC, Chang LDJ, Cheuk SSY, Gurung S, Krishnan P, Ng DYM, Liu GYZ, Wan CKC, Cheng SSM, Tsang DNC, Cowling BJ, Peiris M, Poon LLM. Air travel-related outbreak of multiple SARS-CoV-2 variants. J Travel Med. 2021 Sep 20:taab149. doi: 10.1093/jtm/taab149. Epub ahead of print. PMID: 34542623.

46. Warish Ahmed, Aaron Bivins, Stuart L. Simpson, Paul M. Bertsch, John Ehret, Ian Hosegood, Suzanne Metcalfe, Wendy J.M. Smith, Kevin V. Thomas, Josh Tynan, Jochen F. Mueller, Wastewater surveillance demonstrates high predictive value for COVID-19 infection on board repatriation flights to Australia, Environment International, 2021, 106938, ISSN 0160-4120, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envint.2021.106938.

47. Elliott P, Haw D, Wang H, et al; COVID-19 Genomics UK (COG-UK) Consortium11. Exponential growth, high prevalence of SARS-CoV-2, and vaccine effectiveness associated with the Delta variant. Science. 2021;eabl9551. Published online November 2, 2021. doi:10.1126/science.abl9551

48. El Sahly HM, Baden LR, Essink B, et al; COVE Study Group. Efficacy of the mRNA-1273 SARS-CoV-2 vaccine at completion of blinded phase. N Engl J Med. Published online September 22, 2021. doi:10.1056/NEJMoa2113017

49. Dietrich WL, Bennett JS, Jones BW, Hosni MH. Laboratory Modeling of SARS-CoV-2 Exposure Reduction Through Physically Distanced Seating in Aircraft Cabins Using Bacteriophage Aerosol - November 2020. MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep. 2021 Apr 23;70(16):595-599. doi: 10.15585/mmwr.mm7016e1. PMID: 33886531; PMCID: PMC8061797.

50. Hertzberg VS, Weiss H, Elon L, Si W, Norris SL; FlyHealthy Research Team. Behaviors, movements, and transmission of droplet-mediated respiratory diseases during transcontinental airline flights. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A. 2018 Apr 3;115(14):3623-3627.

doi: 10.1073/pnas.1711611115. Epub 2018 Mar 19. PMID: 29555754; PMCID: PMC5889623.

51. Mossong J, Hens N, Jit M, Beutels P, Auranen K, Mikolajczyk R, Massari M, Salmaso S, Tomba GS, Wallinga J, Heijne J, Sadkowska-Todys M, Rosinska M, Edmunds WJ. Social contacts and mixing patterns relevant to the spread of infectious diseases. PLoS Med. 2008 Mar 25;5(3):e74. doi: 10.1371/journal.pmed.0050074. PMID: 18366252; PMCID: PMC2270306.

52. Leung K, Jit M, Lau EHY, Wu JT. Social contact patterns relevant to the spread of respiratory infectious diseases in Hong Kong. Sci Rep. 2017 Aug 11;7(1):7974. doi: 10.1038/s41598-017-08241-1. PMID: 28801623; PMCID: PMC5554254.

53. Bhuvan KC, Shrestha R, Leggat PA, Ravi Shankar P, Shrestha S. Safety of air travel during the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic. Travel Med Infect Dis. 2021 Sep-Oct;43:102103. doi: 10.1016/j.tmaid.2021.102103. Epub 2021 Jun 7. PMID: 34111566; PMCID: PMC8180446.

54. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Infection Control Guidelines for Environmental Infection Control in Health-Care Facilities (2003): Ventilation Specifications for Health-Care Facilities. https://www.cdc.gov/infectioncontrol/guidelines/environmental/appendix/air.html

55. Ventilation in Buildings. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. June 2, 2021. https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/community/ventilation.html

56. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. “Ventilation in Schools and Childcare Programs” https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/community/schools-childcare/ventilation.html

57. Allen JG, Ibrahim AM. Indoor Air Changes and Potential Implications for SARS-CoV-2 Transmission. JAMA. 2021;325(20):2112–2113. doi:10.1001/jama.2021.5053

58. Tomas Aragon, California Department of Public Health, “Interim Guidance for Ventilation, Filtration, and Air Quality in Indoor Environments” https://www.cdph.ca.gov/Programs/CID/DCDC/Pages/COVID-19/Interim-Guidance-for-Ventilation-Filtration-and-Air-Quality-in-Indoor-Environments.aspx

59. Duill FF, Schulz F, Jain A, Krieger L, van Wachem B, Beyrau F. The Impact of Large Mobile Air Purifiers on Aerosol Concentration in Classrooms and the Reduction of Airborne Transmission of SARS-CoV-2. Int J Environ Res Public Health. 2021 Nov 2;18(21):11523. doi: 10.3390/ijerph182111523. PMID: 34770037.

60. Bluyssen PM, Ortiz M, Zhang D. The effect of a mobile HEPA filter system on 'infectious' aerosols, sound and air velocity in the SenseLab. Build Environ. 2021 Jan 15;188:107475. doi: 10.1016/j.buildenv.2020.107475. Epub 2020 Dec 3. PMID: 33293755; PMCID: PMC7711180.

61. Bae SH, Shin H, Koo HY, Lee SW, Yang JM, Yon DK. Asymptomatic Transmission of SARS-CoV-2 on Evacuation Flight. Emerg Infect Dis. 2020 Nov;26(11):2705-2708. doi: 10.3201/eid2611.203353. Epub 2020 Aug 21. PMID: 32822289; PMCID: PMC7588520.

62. Abraar Karan, Ranu Dhillon and Devabhaktuni Srikrishna. America needs better masks to fight Covid-19. CNN Opinion. February 1, 2021. https://www.cnn.com/2021/01/29/opinions/covid-19-n95-masks-availability-karan-dhillon-srikrishna/index.html

63. David Ignatius. Transcript: Coronavirus: Leadership During Crisis with Anthony S. Fauci. Washington Post Live. February 2, 2021. https://www.washingtonpost.com/washington-post-live/2021/02/02/transcript-coronavirus-leadership-during-crisis-with-anthony-s-fauci/

64. Arumuru V, Samantaray SS, Pasa J. Double masking protection vs. comfort-A quantitative assessment. Phys Fluids (1994). 2021 Jul;33(7):077120. doi: 10.1063/5.0058571. Epub 2021 Jul 21. PMID: 34335010; PMCID: PMC8320463.

65. Sickbert-Bennett EE, Samet JM, Clapp PW, Chen H, Berntsen J, Zeman KL, Tong H, Weber DJ, Bennett WD. Filtration Efficiency of Hospital Face Mask Alternatives Available for Use During the COVID-19 Pandemic. JAMA Intern Med. 2020 Dec 1;180(12):1607-1612. doi: 10.1001/jamainternmed.2020.4221. PMID: 32780113; PMCID: PMC7420816.

66. Brosseau LM. Fit testing respirators for public health medical emergencies. J Occup Environ Hyg. 2010 Nov;7(11):628-32. doi: 10.1080/15459624.2010.514782. PMID: 20853203.

67. Steinle S, Sleeuwenhoek A, Mueller W, Horwell CJ, Apsley A, Davis A, Cherrie JW, Galea KS. The effectiveness of respiratory protection worn by communities to protect from volcanic ash inhalation. Part II: Total inward leakage tests. Int J Hyg Environ Health. 2018 Jul;221(6):977-984. doi: 10.1016/j.ijheh.2018.03.011. Epub 2018 Mar 28. PMID: 29861400.

68. McMahon K, Jeanmonod D, Check R, Rivard L, Balakrishnan V, Kelly B, Pester J, Jeanmonod R. The pragmatic use of industrial elastomeric facemasks in health care practice during the COVID-19 pandemic. Am J Emerg Med. 2021 Oct;48:273-275. doi: 10.1016/j.ajem.2021.05.025. Epub 2021 May 13. PMID: 34022633; PMCID: PMC8116120.

69. Prince SE, Chen H, Tong H, Berntsen J, Masood S, Zeman KL, Clapp PW, Bennett WD, Samet JM. Assessing the effect of beard hair lengths on face masks used as personal protective equipment during the COVID-19 pandemic. J Expo Sci Environ Epidemiol. 2021 Nov;31(6):953-960. doi: 10.1038/s41370-021-00337-1. Epub 2021 May 18. PMID: 34006963; PMCID: PMC8130778.

70. Lam-Hine T, McCurdy SA, Santora L, Duncan L, Corbett-Detig R, Kapusinszky B, Willis M. Outbreak Associated with SARS-CoV-2 B.1.617.2 (Delta) Variant in an Elementary School - Marin County, California, May-June 2021. MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep. 2021 Sep 3;70(35):1214-1219. doi: 10.15585/mmwr.mm7035e2. PMID: 34473683; PMCID: PMC8422870.

71. Dancer SJ, Bluyssen PM, Li Y, Tang JW. Why don't we just open the windows? BMJ. 2021 Nov 26;375:n2895. doi: 10.1136/bmj.n2895. PMID: 34836876.

72. Natasha Khan. Covid-19 Case Cluster Linked to One Flight Stirs Debate Among Health Experts. Wall Street Journal. April 24, 2021.

73. Andrew Conway Morris, Katherine Sharrocks, Rachel Bousfield, Leanne Kermack, Mailis Maes, Ellen Higginson, Sally Forrest, Joana Pereira-Dias, Claire Cormie, Tim Old, Sophie Brooks, Islam Hamed, Alicia Koenig, Andrew Turner, Paul White, R Andres Floto, Gordon Dougan, Effrossyni Gkrania-Klotsas, Theodore Goulliouris, Stephen Baker, Vilas Navapurkar, The Removal of Airborne Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) and Other Microbial Bioaerosols by Air Filtration on Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) Surge Units, Clinical Infectious Diseases, 2021;, ciab933, https://doi.org/10.1093/cid/ciab933

74. Brandal Lin T., MacDonald Emily, Veneti Lamprini, Ravlo Tine, Lange Heidi, Naseer Umaer, Feruglio Siri, Bragstad Karoline, Hungnes Olav, Ødeskaug Liz E., Hagen Frode, Hanch-Hansen Kristian E., Lind Andreas, Watle Sara Viksmoen, Taxt Arne M., Johansen Mia, Vold Line, Aavitsland Preben, Nygård Karin, Madslien Elisabeth H.. Outbreak caused by the SARS-CoV-2 Omicron variant in Norway, November to December 2021. Euro Surveill. 2021;26(50):pii=2101147. https://doi.org/10.2807/1560-7917.ES.2021.26.50.2101147

75. Gu H, Krishnan P, Ng DYM, Chang LDJ, Liu GYZ, Cheng SSM, Hui MMY, Fan MCY, Wan JHL, Lau LHK, Cowling BJ, Peiris M, Poon LLM. Probable Transmission of SARS-CoV-2 Omicron Variant in Quarantine Hotel, Hong Kong, China, November 2021. Emerg Infect Dis. 2021 Dec 3;28(2). doi: 10.3201/eid2802.212422. Epub ahead of print. PMID: 34860154.

76. Chapter 18, Gottlieb, S. Uncontrolled Spread: Why COVID-19 Crushed Us and How We Can Defeat the Next Pandemic. Harper. September 21, 2021.

77. Pile JC, Malone JD, Eitzen EM, Friedlander AM. Anthrax as a Potential Biological Warfare Agent. Arch Intern Med. 1998;158(5):429–434. doi:10.1001/archinte.158.5.429

78. Characterizing the performance of a DIY air filter
Rachael Dal Porto, Monet Kunz, Theresa Pisotchini, Richard L Corsi, Christopher D Cappa
https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2022.01.09.22268972v1

79. Yicheng Zeng, Mohammad Heidarinejad, PhD, and Brent Stephens, PhD, “Portable Air Cleaner Test Report ‘Corsi-Rosenthal’ Box Fan Air Cleaner w/ MERV 13 Filters”
https://www.built-envi.com/wp-content/uploads/IIT-CADR-Testing-C-R-Box-September-2021.pdf