Can 10x cheaper, rapid air filtration using a wide range of DIY options complement commercial HEPA purifiers to help 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 hard-to-replicate laboratory experiments with generated aerosols. In this study, we use simplified, low-cost measurement tools of ambient aerosols 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” (67%), 4” (66%), and 5” (85%) filters at lowest fan speed was 293 cfm ($35), 322 cfm ($58), and 405 cfm ($120) comparable to best-in-class, low-noise generating HEPA-purifier running at maximum speed with 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, less than the 100% gain by adding a second DIY purifier. Replacing one of the four 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 at 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.

Indoor ventilation upgrades, HEPA-purifiers, and respirators can reduce inhalation of SARS-CoV-2 and its variants, other airborne viruses, aerosolized bacteria[86] (e.g. anthrax), particulate pollution, allergens (pollen, dust, bacteria, fungi, etc.) but purifiers/ventilation can be expensive[71] and respirators can be difficult to wear for an extended period of time causing many organizations or households to hesitate. A design target is to meet or exceed 4 to 6 air exchanges per hour (ACH) recommended[58] by California Department of Public Health, or even exceed 15 ACH used in passenger aircraft where, as discussed below, several observers have noted that (published) super-spreading events are much more infrequent (fewer) than would be expected with such high occupant density. For both targets, high price-points for select HEPA-purifier models without incurring excessive noise generation make them unaffordable for many households and communities.

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.

Lower cost alternatives to HEPA-purifiers in use for a decade, were recently 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, the published literature regarding these lower-cost box-fan-filters is lacking key metrics such as filtration efficiency (%), air flow (CADR), and noise generation (dBA) and does not use lower-cost, rapid test methods (e.g. that do not require a potentially more expensive, sealed test chamber) which would more readily enable comparisons to a wider range of HEPA-purifiers.

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 μm to 10 μm, airspeed meter to measure airflow, and NIOSH sound meter app to measure noise. Leveraging these test methods, we were able to evaluate and compare three different HEPA-purifiers against common DIY fan-filter configurations.

Tested DIY configurations include 6 single-filter and three (quad and triple filter) configurations with box fans. 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. In order to examine how CADR is impacted by additional flow, the Corsi-Rosenthal DIY cube (4 filters and 1 fan) was compared to a cube design replacing one of the four filters with an additional fan (i.e., 3 filters 2 fans). A preview of these results showing estimated CADR versus cost is shown in Figure 1 with examination of the multidimensional tradeoffs between filtration efficiency at different particle sizes, airflow, estimated CADR, noise generated, number of fans and filters, and unit cost in the Methods, Results, Discssion, and Limitations sections. Finally, the Discussion concludes with a comparative analysis of indoor air exchange rates needed to control SARS-CoV-2 transmission (super spreading) using data from passenger airplanes.



Figure 1: comparison of est. CADR and cost of HEPA purifiers and DIY box fan-filters e.g., 3x2 means three filters were used with two box fans

Safety Notes: California Air Resource Board recommends never leaving box-fan air filters unattended while turned on, and to use box fans sold in the US manufactured after 2012 because it is likely they have a fused plug to prevent electrical fires e.g. if the device is inadvertently knocked over.[10] Chemical Insights, a subsidiary of Underwriters 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] In detail, in addition to assessing DIY fans with clean MERV 13s, DIYs were tested with filters loaded with two types of particles (ASHRAE dust and smoke from biomass burning to represent a loaded filter due to a wildfire), and test scenarios also included fully sealing the box fans in plastic and running fans for over 7 hours face-down on the floor. Even under those scenarios, the fans' surface components did not reach temperatures that would cause minor burn/injury, and all fan models were able to operate continuously throughout all test scenarios without reaching UL 507 thresholds. Commercially available HEPA-purifiers typically have “smart” settings. Based on the presence of particulate matter in the air, they use a built-in sensor to automatically adjust their fan speed. These built-in sensors are not typically triggered by the respiratory aerosols that carry SARS-Cov-2 viruses. Although this maybe acceptable if you’re concerned only about smoke, if the goal is to reduce covid-19 risk, fan speed settings for HEPA-purifiers need to be set to operate at a constant speed to continuously filter the air regardless of particular matter detected by the sensor, higher the better. A best practice for shared spaces such as classrooms and offices where viral transmission is a primary concern is to run the HEPA-purifier at its maximum fan speed or the highest fan speed tolerable to the occupants of the room. 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 available in this article.

Methods

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, risk of inhalation of the generated aerosols, 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.

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. The HEPA air purifiers were chosen to be a selection of models known to be most quiet or well-reviewed. Note: "smoke" in this context of manufacturer-reported CADR typically refers to tobacco smoke not wildfire smoke. The tests for the HEPA air purifiers were conducted on November 11, 2021.

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), 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[80 81], and a cardboard shroud of 14" diameter was attached to the

output side (front) of each fan to enhance airflow through the filter by reducing flow recirculation (via the corners of the front of the box fan) and eddies at the fan blade tips. For comparison, three methods of attaching the box fan to the air filters included vacuum (i.e. no attachment just relying on airflow), duct tape, and velcro. Unit prices are as listed on Home Depot, Amazon, or Walmart. The tests for the HVAC filters with box fans (DIY air purifiers) were conducted in a January 10 to 13, 2022.

Figure 2: Do-It-Yourself Box Fan and Filters (single, quad filter designs with one fan and triple filter design with two fans). Blue arrows indicate direction of airflow

Aerosol filtration efficiency. For each HEPA-purifier or box fan filter, counts at each particle size bin (0.3, 0.5, 0.7, 1.0, 2.5, 5, and 10 μm) were tested using an ISO-certified, particle counter (Temtop Particle Counter PMD 331 available on Amazon) with the each device (its fan) turned ‘on’ and ‘off’ consecutively. The tests were conducted in a house near an open window with fan blowing air through the window to allow for aerosols (particles) from outdoors to continuously enter the room. 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. The five counts

were recorded individually over no more than 15 minutes, however the filtration efficiencies were computed using consecutively recorded counts no more than 2 minutes apart.

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).

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.

CADR (estimated). For each HEPA-purifier or DIY box fan filter, the Clean Air Delivery Rate (CADR) was estimated as the product of the measured air flow (cfm) and aerosol filtration efficiency (%) at 0.3 microns.

Results

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

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 μm and higher in many cases. At their maximum fan speed (3), the noise generated by the Coway Airmega 300 was lowest and most tolerable (subjectively to the author, without it feeling

stressful) 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 CADR using airflow (cfm) and filtration efficiency at 0.3 microns was within 10% of the the smoke CADR rating from the manufacturer's website. Based on this data it appears some HEPA air purifiers may have higher or lower rate of filtration at 0.3 microns than others (well below the 99.97% typically assumed) but still very effective at filtering these particles.

Table 1: Performance of HEPA-purifiers

Setup		**Noise and Airflow**			**CADR (cfm)**	**Filtration Efficiency (%) avg of five measurements at each particle size bin (μm)**						
	Price (est.)	Fan speed	Noise (dBA) avg. of three samples 9" away	Est. Airflow (output) cfm	**Est. using airflow x filtration eff. @ 0.3 μm**	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)	265	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)	216	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)	94							
Airthereal AGH550	$233	5	66.3 ± 0.6	410 (81)	354	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)	178							

Single filter configurations with box fan. The noise generated by the box fan was tolerable (subjectively to the author, without it feeling stressful) 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 μm 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 μm.

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**		**CADR (cfm)**	**Filtration Efficiency (%) avg of five measurements at each particle size bin (μm)**						
Filter Mfr.	Filter Type	Price (est.)	Seal	Fan speed	Noise (dBA) avg. of three samples 9" away	Est. Airflow (output) cfm	**Est. using airflow x filtration eff. @ 0.3 μm**	0.3	0.5	0.7	1.0	2.5	5.0	10.0
Lennox	5" MERV-16	$120	vacuum	3		759 (72)	645	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)**	**405**							
Nordic Pure	4" MERV-15	$63	vacuum	3		782 (23)	516	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)**	**336**							
Nordic Pure	4" MERV-14	$58	vacuum	3	62.7 (0.6)	740 (50)	488	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)**	**322**							
Nordic Pure	2" MERV-13	$35	vacuum	3	62.0 (0.0)	664 (57)	392	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)**	**293**	**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)	460	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)**	**298**							
Nordic Pure	1" MERV-14	$31	velcro	3	64 (2)	571 (36)	342	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)**	244	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. 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**		**CADR (cfm)**	**Filtration Efficiency (%) avg of five measurements at each particle size bin (μm)**						
Filter Mfr.	Filter Type	filters x fans	Price (est.)	Seal	Fan speed	Noise (dBA) avg. of three samples 9" away	Est. Airflow (output) cfm	**Est. using airflow x filtration eff. @ 0.3 μm**	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	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

n/a	No filter	0x1	$20	n/a	1		664 (24)	n/a							
Nordic Pure	2" MERV-13	4x1	$80	velcro	3		903 (36)	659	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)**	**471**							
Nordic Pure	2" MERV-13	4x1	$80	tape	3		851 (66)	570	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)**	**364**							
Nordic Pure	2" MERV-13	3x2	$85	velcro	3		Fan #1: 748 (27)	494	66 (3.0)	68 (2.8)	75 (2.6)	78 (2.4)	78 (5.3)	78 (7.3)	74 (10)
							Fan #2: 792 (35)	523							
Nordic Pure	**2" MERV-13**	**3x2**	**$85**	**velcro**	**1**		**Fan #1: 524 (34)**	346							
							Fan #2: 476 (29)	314							
Nordic Pure	1" MERV-14	4x1	$64	tape	3		851 (66)	570	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)**	**363**							
Nordic Pure	1" MERV-14	4x1	$64	velcro	3		858 (44)	609	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)**	**388**							

Discussion

Accounting for reduced filtration efficiency of MERV-13,14,16 filters at the most penetrating particle size of 0.3 μm compared to HEPA, the estimated clean air delivery rate (CADR) of a

do-it-yourself (DIY) setup using 2” MERV-13 (67%), 4” MERV-14 (66%), 5” MERV 16 (85%) filters with a box fan running at fan speed 1 for tolerable noise was 293 cfm, 322 cfm, 405 cfm. This is comparable or better than a best-in-class, low-noise generating HEPA-purifier running at maximum speed with at 282 cfm. Yet the upfront cost of the components of the DIY setup were approximately 5 to 10 times less ($35-$58-$120) than best-in-class HEPA-purifiers ($549).

Figure 3: Estimated CADR (cfm) for DIY Air Purifiers (filters x fans) @ speed #1 e.g., 3x2 means three filters were used with 2 box fans



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 µm (dust) at the highest fan speed but above 450 cfm in the range

of 5-11 μm (pollen). Both used five 2” MERV-13 filters (instead of four in our study) of similar dimensions so it is unclear why the studies by UC-Davis and IIT differ by a factor of two. Our results were in between these two studies but more consistent with the UC-Davis study. The estimated CADR of cube configurations with four 2” MERV 13 filters was 471 cfm at lowest fan speed 1 and 659 cfm at the highest fan speed 3 using 73% filtration efficiency at 0.3 μm (most penetrating particle size). 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 salt aerosols. Other differences that may account for it are the number of filters (4 vs 5), fans, differences in estimation methodology, box fans from different manufacturers may differ substantially in terms of their flowrate at "free flow" (i.e. without any pressure drops from filters) and when installed in DIY air cleaners with filters, and differences in particles generated and measured at different aerodynamic particle sizes. Further investigation would be required to fully understand why there is such a range.

However at all fan speeds 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 also reported by UC-Davis (also with shroud and 20” Lasko box fan),[13] separate from the UC-Davis study in the prior paragraph. CR boxes 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 (CR box) 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% possibly 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), 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. A second box fan and single filter provide more air cleaning than one CR box with the possibility of benefits for air cleaner placement. 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. An aluminum mosquito screen fixed to the shroud 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 research on which are the most common COVID transmission modes (aerosol, droplet, or surfaces) what is the most common aerosol particle sizes by which it is transmitted continues to evolve as new variants emerge. However, multiple studies demonstrate SARS-

CoV-2 in micron and submicron aerosols from the exhaled breath of infected people[1 2 3] in one study, most of the live virus from human subjects was observed in submicron respiratory aerosols.[3]

The filtration efficiencies and airflow results for box fan used a certain set of filters and fans made by certain manufacturers, but they vary widely among different manufacturers of comparably rated MERV 13, 14, 15, 16 filters. Hence filter selection is critical to achieving the results desired. There may also be variability in filter performance due to manufacturing defects or variations among fans and filters from the same manufacturer. The long-term 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.

Since measurements of particle concentration were made by placing the inlet of the particle counter towards the outlet of the air purifier, there could be some re-entrainment in the shearing flow leaving the air cleaners that differs as a function of the design of each air cleaner which may impact the measurements.

The aerosol measurements were conducted with a device which is an optical particle counter (OPC) called the PMD 311 manufactured by Temtop. The OPC counts particles in 7 bins (0.3, 0.5, 0.7, 1.0, 2.5, 5, and 10 microns). Possible sources of uncertainty in an OPC based are extremes of relative humidity and differences between optical properties of the aerosol particles measured in this study versus those particles used to calibrate the sensor by the manufacturer.[82] Extreme relative humidity appears unlikely to be a source uncertainty based on the environmental conditions under which this study was conducted. However, the

manufacturer used polystyrene aerosols to calibrate the sensor of the measurement device within 10% at each particle size. However, the choice of polystyrene material may have some systematic impact on the accuracy of the absolute counts when measuring aerosols made of other materials. The principle of operation of the OPC has a sensor which measures laser light scattered from each particle to estimate its size, with larger (smaller) particles having a greater (lower) scattering cross section which is used to differentiate the size of each particle counted. If some fraction of the particles that are part of the ambient aerosols measured in our study were much more or much less absorptive than polystyrene, such as black carbon, it is possible these particles could have a lower or higher scattering cross section than the calibration aerosol of same size, respectively. If so they could be counted as part of smaller or larger bins than their actual size. The measurements of the OPC in each bin will vary to some extent based on the distribution of absorptive and scattering properties of ambient aerosols relative to the polystyrene aerosol used to calibrate the OPC. However, any such systematic differences between the ambient aerosols and the calibration aerosols might be expected to apply uniformly to both the ‘in’ and ‘out’ measurements and therefore would not necessarily affect the computed filtration efficiency for the particles actually counted (measured) in each bin by the OPC, just that their size distribution might be shifted over by one or more bins based on how each particle’s individual optical properties differs from the calibration aerosol.

For each HEPA-purifier or DIY box fan filter, the Clean Air Delivery Rate (CADR) was estimated as the product of the measured air flow (cfm) and aerosol filtration efficiency (%) at 0.3 microns. Strictly speaking, the CADR estimate would apply to the particles that are counted by the measurement device in the 0.3 micron bin of the Temtop PMD 331 subject to the differences described between calibration and ambient aerosols in the prior paragraph, and therefore may not apply for other particle sizes.

Would the pandemic be under control if air in most rooms was filtered as rapidly as a passenger airplane cabin?

Best practices recommended by the state of California in the US are only 4 to 6 air exchanges per hour (ACH).[58] A recent study from Italy suggests infection rates were cut by over 80% in classrooms that implemented mechanical ventilation of 6 ACH. A UK study in a hospital setting found differences in viral load of indoor air in rooms with Covid positive subjects when air is filtered less than 4.5 ACH versus faster than 9 ACH.[85] Yet to date there is no large-scale, real-world data to validate a minimum threshold of ACH to control SARS-Cov-2 transmission in a room. The SARS-CoV-2 pandemic is sustained largely by superspreading events: approximately 80% of cases are transmitted by only 10% to 20% of the infected (super spreaders)[1 14 15] and if so controlling superspreading can potentially control the pandemic. As described in detail below, we find that documented super spreading events aboard passenger aircraft appear to be much fewer than would be expected from community prevalence estimates or preflight passenger testing. 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. Our analysis below of alterative hypotheses for the primary way the virus transmits (droplet, fomite, aerosol) does not prove, but suggests that the rapid air filtration often exceeding 15 air exchanges per hour in airplane cabins is perhaps the reason why.

Disclaimer: In general, there are many unknown factors that impact the transmission of SARS-CoV-2 and this section of the paper is conjectural, somewhat speculative. The resources and information in this section of the article (the “Section”) are for informational

purposes only and should not be construed as professional advice. The Section 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 Section. Use of the Section is at your own risk. Patient Knowhow, Inc. takes no responsibility and assumes no liability for any information made available in this Section and in the article.

A typical Boeing 737 carries 160 passengers in a cabin of approximately 7000 cubic feet (83' x 7' x 12'). With such dense occupancy, how much super spreading would we expect to occur aboard the thousands of such daily flights? Back-of-the-envelope estimates suggest often 1% or higher of those who could board an airplane are infected according to point-prevalence estimates (typically higher for symptomatic or unvaccinated individuals).[47 48] 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 to board every 5 flights for a 200 passenger flight (200 x 1% x 10% = 1/5) yet paradoxically this is well above the published rate of superspreading events aboard these aircraft.

Actual passenger data from preflight testing also points to a very low rate of super spreading aboard flights. 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, publish case studies of inflight super spreading, and approximately 10%-20% of the passengers who are positive on these flights would be estimated to be potential super spreaders[14 43]. 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%). Among 6,570 arriving passengers on Australia-bound flights, 112 tested positive from which there

would be expected 11 super spreaders (112 x 10%). Between December 2020 and March 2021 in Australia, wastewater from 24 (64.9%) of the 37 repatriation flights tested positive.[46] An airline Vistara reported that of 29 flights arriving in Hong Kong potentially up to 1% of their passengers tested positive.[72] 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.

Why is there such a low rate of published super spreading aboard passenger aircraft? Some initially credited institution of mandatory masking for reduction in super spreading aboard flights.[30 31] Prior to mandatory mask usage on passenger flights, inflight transmission was observationally confirmed with genomic sequencing[27 28 29] 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 there were relatively few published documented superspreading (mass-transmission) events.[31 33 34 35]

Table 4 lists three alternate hypotheses for why there have been relatively few published superspreading events on flights along with reasons for or against them: mandatory masking, passenger mixing patterns, and rapid HEPA filtration. Applying 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 which masking and mixing are not dissimilar to airplanes, but rapid HEPA air filtration is uncommon in 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 passenger density on airplanes there have been no similar case studies published of super spreading of Omicron aboard passenger airplanes inflight.

Table 4: 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]
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.

Table 5 summarizes differing views of public health agencies and academics on the transmission modes of SARS-CoV-2. Large-scale, real-world evidence of limited super spreading events aboard passenger airplanes (inflight) may help settle this debate in favor aerosols playing a primary important role in inter-household, superspreading of SARS-CoV-2 than other transmission modes as the White House[82] has recently concluded but other US-federal agencies such as CDC have yet to.[4]

Table 5: Differing Views on Transmission Modes of SARS-CoV-2. Although in general the views of each community/agency are not easily summarized, the table below aims to expose differences in their views for context.

The Aerosol-Droplet-Fomite Debate	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]
White House	In contrast to the CDC, on March 23, 2022 the White House Office of Science and Technology Policy declared the aerosol route to be the most common way the virus is transmitted, “The most common way COVID-19 is

	transmitted from one person to another is through tiny airborne particles of the virus hanging in indoor air for minutes or hours after an infected person has been there."[82]
Academics	Some academics[20 21] have countered the WHO's position stating that SARS-CoV-2 is primarily airborne. In 2021, other academics 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]

Besides rapid air filtration, what precautions can be implanted if aerosols are the primary route of SARS-CoV-2 transmission? 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

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 complementary or beneficial to indoor 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 outdoor air ventilation would introduce additional aerosol further increasing the need for indoor air filtration. 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]

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.

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.

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.

If rapid air filtration the main reason why super spreading is infrequent aboard passenger airplanes, then as the rate of indoor air filtration (in buildings) approaches the rapid rate of air filtration aboard aircraft cabins often exceeding 15 air exchanges per hour (ACH) it has potential to control the pandemic by drastically reducing the chances of super spreading.

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 Gouliouris, 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. Rachael Dal Porto, Monet N. Kunz, Theresa Pistochini, Richard L. Corsi & Christopher D. Cappa (2022) Characterizing the performance of a do-it-yourself (DIY) box fan air filter, Aerosol Science and Technology, DOI: 10.1080/02786826.2022.2054674

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

80. Elfstrom, D. "Effect of shroud size on outlet flow." https://twitter.com/DavidElfstrom/status/1457390757703208966

81. Rosenthal, J. "How to Improve the Efficiency of the "Box Fan and MERV 13 Filter" Air Cleaner" https://www.texairfilters.com/how-to-improve-the-efficiency-of-the-box-fan-and-merv-13-filter-air-cleaner/

82. Hagan DH, Kroll JH. Assessing the accuracy of low-cost optical particle sensors using a physics-based approach. Atmos Meas Tech. 2020;13(11):6343-6355. doi: 10.5194/amt-13-6343-2020. Epub 2020 Nov 26. PMID: 33777248; PMCID: PMC7995643.

83. Alondra Nelson, "Let's Clear The Air On COVID", White House Office of Science Technology and Policy, https://www.whitehouse.gov/ostp/news-updates/2022/03/23/lets-clear-the-air-on-covid/

84. "Italian study shows ventilation can cut school COVID cases by 82%" Reuters https://www.reuters.com/world/europe/italian-study-shows-ventilation-can-cut-school-covid-cases-by-82-2022-03-22/

85. Hooman Parhizkar, Leslie Dietz, Andreas Olsen-Martinez, Patrick F Horve, Liliana Barnatan, Dale Northcutt, Kevin G Van Den Wymelenberg, Quantifying Environmental Mitigation of Aerosol Viral Load in a Controlled Chamber With Participants Diagnosed With Coronavirus Disease 2019, Clinical Infectious Diseases, 2022;, ciac006, https://doi.org/10.1093/cid/ciac006

86. "The effectiveness of stand alone air cleaners for shelter-in-place" https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/15737155/