medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.12.17.21267987; this version posted December 19, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Carbon dioxide, COVID-19 and the importance of restaurant ventilation: a case study from Spain approaching Christmas 2021

Teresa Moreno[1], Wes Gibbons[2]

[1] Institute of Environmental Assessment and Water Research, IDAEA-CSIC, 08034 Barcelona, Spain
[2] Bimón Press, Sitges, 08870 Barcelona, Spain

*Corresponding author: teresa.moreno@idaea.csic.es

Abstract

Restaurants present an especial challenge in the prevention of the spread of COVID-19 via exhalatory bioaerosols because customers are unprotected by facemasks while eating, so that ventilation protocols in such establishments become particularly important. However, despite the fact that this pandemic airborne disease has been with us for two full years, many restaurants are still not successfully prioritising air renovation as a key tool for reducing infection risk. We demonstrate this in the run-up to the 2021 Christmas celebrations by reporting on CO_2 concentration data obtained from a hotel breakfast room and restaurants during the 5-day Spanish holiday period of 4th-8th December. In the case of the breakfast room, inadequate ventilation resulted in average CO_2 levels ranging from 868 to 1237ppm on five consecutive days, with the highest levels coinciding with highest occupancy numbers. Inside the five restaurants, three of these were well ventilated, maintaining stable average CO_2 concentrations below 700ppm. In contrast, two restaurants failed to keep average CO_2 levels below 1000ppm, despite sporadic, but ineffective, attempts by one of them to ventilate the establishment. More effort needs to be made to foster in both restaurant managers and the general public an improved awareness of the value of CO_2 concentrations as an infection risk proxy and the relevance of ventilation issues to the propagation of respiratory diseases.

Introduction

The concentration of CO_2 in each human exhalation is around 100 times higher than that in outside ambient air. Thus, in a working restaurant CO_2 levels will quickly rise unless the indoor air is renovated by introducing outdoor air. The concentration of CO_2 in a public eating area at any given time therefore provides an indication of how successfully the ventilation is managing to refresh the air, that is to say, how much a customer is likely to be breathing air that has passed through the lungs of other people sharing the same space. As such, the airborne infection risk of a given respiratory pathogen would be expected to increase with increasing concentrations of exhaled CO_2 in a given restaurant, as well as being influenced by the behaviour of the occupants.

COVID-19 is known to be capable of airborne transmission within indoor environments and this method of propagation is fuelling the ongoing pandemic (e.g. Bazant and Bush, 2021; Buonnano et al., 2020a; Greenhalgh et al., 2021; Miller et al., 2021; Morawska and Milton, 2020; Peng et al., 2021; Shen et al., 2020; Wang et al., 2021; Zhang et al., 2021). The dominant mechanism for such transmission is widely considered to involve infected individuals exhaling viable virus-bearing aerosols. These exhalatory "viraerosols" (Moreno and Gibbons, 2021) can be released in great numbers not only by coughing, sneezing and normal vocalisation, but also simply by passive tidal breathing (e.g. Almstrand et al., 2010; Bake et al., 2019; Haslbeck et al., 2010; Johnson and Morawska, 2009; Schwarz et al., 2010). Once released into the indoor atmosphere, the potentially infective respiratory pathogens will be carried away from the diseased individual in a buoyant turbulent cloud of gas and particles (Boubouiba, 2021; Jones and Bross, 2015; Lv et al., 2021; Randall et al., 2021). Thus, to minimise respiratory infection risk in public indoor spaces the obvious

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.12.17.21267987; this version posted December 19, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

recommendation is to wear a well-fitted, high quality facemask, and combine this with efficient ventilation that ensures the constant introduction of fresh air from outside.

The use of facemasks is however not practicable in restaurant settings, so that ventilation protocols in such establishments become especially important. It is fully two years since the emergence of SARS-CoV-2, and there has been a clear call from some in the scientific community that a revolution is needed in the way we think about indoor air quality (e.g. Melikov, 2020; Morawska et al., 2021). Nevertheless, the message that air renovation by ventilation is likely to be of vital importance to reduce the spread of COVID-19 has still not hit home in many public eating places. We demonstrate this by reporting on data collected during the busy nationwide early December Spanish double bank holiday (6th and 8th) which is celebrated throughout the country and presents the threat of boosting a viral superspreading event linked to Christmas celebrations during the rest of the month.

In 2021 the early December holiday period in Spain centred on a Monday (6th) and Wednesday (8th), so many people chose to take a longer break that included the previous weekend. Hotels and restaurants were exceptionally busy, despite concerns relating to the ongoing spread of the highly infectious omicron SARS-CoV-2 viral variant. In this study we collected CO_2 data during the 5-day holiday period (Saturday 4th to Wednesday 8th) from (1) a hotel breakfast room, and (2) whilst eating meals at five different restaurants. In order to ensure we were recording real-life conditions, we did not ask permission to measure CO_2 in any of these establishments and therefore provide no location details. CO_2, RH, temperature and $PM_{2.5}$ measurements were obtained at around 50cm above floor level using an IQAir (Air Visual Pro, https://www.iqair.com/en/air-quality-monitors/airvisual-pro) monitor, which measures CO_2 concentrations between 400-10,000ppm every 10 seconds. The system operates portably for 4 hours using a lithium battery. The person responsible for collecting the CO_2 measurements in all establishments tested negative for COVID-19 on the 12th December.

The hotel breakfast room

Table 1 and Figure 1 summarise the data from the hotel breakfast room. This was a large room on the first floor, connected to the rest of the hotel by a door leading to a staircase down to the hotel ground floor (not directly to outside air). This door was kept fully open throughout the breakfast period, but all six windows were kept closed. There was no CO_2 meter in the breakfast room, although one was operating in the ground floor bar below. All CO_2 measurements for this study were taken during the same breakfast time-slot (10.00-10.45 am) and from a similar part of the restaurant and at a height around 50cm above the floor. Seating protocols ensured that tables were separated by >1m and they were required to wear masks when helping themselves to the food buffet. Most guests wore correctly fitted masks when standing at the buffet, although there were a few notable exceptions.

Table 1. Hotel breakfast room

	CO_2 (ppm)		**RH (%)**		**T (°C)**		**$PM_{2.5}$ (µg/m^3)**	
	Mean	Max	Mean	Max	Mean	Max	Mean	Max
Day 1	868	919	56	57	23,8	24,5	4	7
Day 2	1237	1342	54	56	23,5	24,1	15	65
Day 3	1140	1180	54	56	24,3	25,1	6	10
Day 4	948	1004	59	62	24,9	25,2	3	5
Day 5	955	997	48	48	24,1	24,2	10	13

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.12.17.21267987; this version posted December 19, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .



Figure 1: CO_2 concentration curves for hotel breakfast periods on the five days 4th-8th December 2021. The curves record initial hotel room conditions (600-650ppm) interrupted by a brief trough marking a short outdoor walk to the breakfast room inside which CO_2 levels rose steeply, especially on the 5th (Day 2 on Table 1) when the room was fully occupied. The pre-breakfast transient peak on the 6th records entry into the hotel bar area. See text for details.

The lowest CO_2 concentrations in the hotel breakfast room (average 868ppm: Table 1) were measured at the beginning of the holiday period (4th), before hotel occupancy numbers reached their peak. During this first breakfast CO_2 levels climbed slowly to a maximum value of 919ppm (Table 1). In contrast, the following day (5th), after high hotel occupancy levels during the Saturday night, the breakfast room was exceptionally busy (CO_2 average 1237ppm). Under these conditions CO_2 concentrations at 10.00 were already approaching 1200ppm and then climbed to a peak of 1342ppm in the fully occupied room before slowly declining as people began to finish their breakfast and leave the establishment (Figure 1). On the morning of the bank holiday on the 6th December CO_2 levels were again high (Day 3 average 1140ppm: Table 1), falling to around 950ppm average on the remaining two days (Days 4 and 5: Figure 1). The atmospheric stability of this indoor setting over the five mornings was reflected by minimal variation in both temperature and RH. Apart from the exceptionally busy Day 2 (marked by much customer and staff movement and occasional toast burning events), average $PM_{2.5}$ levels also showed little variation on a given morning (varying by only 2-4 $\mu g/m^3$: Table 1). With the windows closed and the internal entry door left open, the dominant control on CO_2 concentrations appears to have been the number of guests attending breakfast. On the morning of the second day (5th), the headwaiter was made aware of the fact that the ventilation could be better, and agreed with this observation. However, nothing obvious was changed on subsequent mornings: in particular all windows remained closed.

The restaurants

Five restaurants were chosen to sample contrasting atmospheric scenarios (Table 2 and Figure 2). The data collected indicate that three of these restaurants (A, B, C: Figure 2) were well ventilated, maintaining stable CO_2 concentrations which averaged below 700ppm and never reached maxima of 1000ppm (Table 2), despite the fact that each establishment was different in character. Restaurant A was small, with few (<20) customers and with the front door continuously held slightly open it registered CO_2 average levels of 665ppm, although combined with relatively high $PM_{2.5}$ concentrations attributed to cooking emissions. Restaurant B was a narrow bar restaurant (<20

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.12.17.21267987; this version posted December 19, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

clients indoors), with tables separated by screens, the front door fully open, and showed similar air quality conditions to Restaurant A (Table 2). Restaurant C was a large, busy open-plan converted market building with multiple food outlets and two floors (the monitor recorded on the upper floor) and a prominent new ceiling HVAC system. Despite a multitude of customers and staff housed in this establishment, its large size combined with the HVAC system successfully kept average CO_2 levels at 684ppm and average $PM_{2.5}$ concentrations at 9µg/m^3 (Table 2). Despite the considerable differences between these three establishments, all of them thus managed to maintain stable, relatively low CO_2 levels, punctuated only occasionally by transient peaks due to people clustering near the monitor.

Table 2. Restaurants

	CO_2 (ppm)		RH (%)		T (°C)		$PM_{2.5}$ (µg/m^3)	
	Mean	Max	Mean	Max	Mean	Max	Mean	Max
A	665	860	55	57	20,0	20,8	25	59
B	651	924	60	71	20,7	21,7	11	38
C	684	754	47	55	23,6	24,0	9	26
D	1029	1310	56	58	21,9	22,4	45	94
E	1014	1116	60	62	21,3	21,6	16	25



Figure 2: CO_2 concentration curves for the five restaurants sampled during the study. A, B and C record good, generally stable ventilation conditions, with average CO_2 <700ppm, in contrast to Restaurants D and E. Whereas Restaurant D made sporadic efforts to ventilate the establishment by opening the front door (marked by two precipitate falls towards 600ppm), Restaurant E kept doors and windows closed. See text for details.

In contrast, two of the restaurants failed to maintain average CO_2 concentrations below 1000ppm during the meal (D and E: Table 2). In the case of Restaurant D, this was a medium-sized establishment which was fully occupied for much of the time, although maintaining correct adherence to table separation rules. The restaurant owner was aware of the need for ventilation, which she attempted to achieve by fully opening the front door from time to time, allowing a blast of cold air into the room that was not appreciated by some guests. Carbon dioxide concentration data for Restaurant D are shown on Figure 2 and show levels of around 1050ppm on entry into the establishment, with slight declines in the curve recording the arrival of guests briefly opening the

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.12.17.21267987; this version posted December 19, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

front door. Ventilating the restaurant suddenly by fully opening the front door caused CO_2 levels to drop immediately to 600ppm (Figure 2), but after this levels rose rapidly, interrupted by further guest arrivals, to peak at 1310ppm. A repeated brief ventilation episode suddenly reduced CO_2 concentrations once again to 600ppm before beginning another cycle of rising levels (Figure 2). Another notable characteristic of this restaurant was its high levels of average and maximum $PM_{2.5}$ (Table 2).

The other establishment failing to ensure minimum levels of CO_2 was smaller (Restaurant E) and, although much less busy (<20 clients), had chosen to keep the front door firmly closed. This scenario generated stable but high levels of CO_2 which were nearly 1000ppm upon entry and subsequently rose gradually to peak at 1116ppm (Figure 2; Table 2).

Discussion and conclusion

The risk of COVID-19 infection in an indoor space will depend on several factors, and modelling calculations based on the mid-20th century works by William Wells, Richard Riley and their colleagues have been applied to the problem by several authors (e.g. Buonanno et al., 2020b; Buonanno and Stabile in Moreno et al., 2021; Bazant and Bush, 2021; Peng and Jimenez, 2021; Peng et al., 2021). Key influencing factors include the number, infectiousness and behaviour of diseased occupants, the room size and air renovation rates, the overall occupancy and duration of exposure, the temperature, relative humidity and the evaporation rate of viraerosols of different sizes (Kin and Marr, 2019). In this context, CO_2 concentrations offer a proxy for the infection risk although, as emphasised by Peng and Jimenez (2021), this risk varies greatly depending on the exact nature of the indoor setting.

With respect to restaurants, each establishment has its own transiently varying atmospheric microenvironment that needs to be managed, and this dynamic adds local complexity to the problem of ventilation control. To this challenge may be added the vagaries of customer behaviour (including complaints regarding the entry of cold air), concern for increased heating costs and, as we observed in one establishment, the possibility of grossly inaccurate CO_2 monitors on display. Despite these difficulties, however, it is clear that some establishments are being much more successful than others at maintaining low CO_2 concentrations, and this is likely to impact on health effects. To take a hypothetical example from our study locations, an asymptomatic but virally loaded COVID-19-positive family conversing enthusiastically over an early breakfast on the 5th December could have left a turbulent cloud of SARS-CoV-2-bearing aerosols dispersing slowly through the poorly ventilated room. Successive waves of breakfast guests arriving according to their pre-planned 45-minute timeslot that morning, as CO_2 levels rose above 1200ppm, could have been exposed to airborne viruses previously exhaled by the family and thus been potentially vulnerable to infection. If the same family had later dined at Restaurant C, their exhalatory pathogens would have been more quickly dispersed and diluted within a better ventilated atmosphere averaging 684ppm CO_2, and they would thus have presented less of a potential threat to other customers sharing the same space.

The short and straightforward nature of this study was designed to be equal to the simplicity of the message it contains: in the run-up to our third COVID-19 Christmas some restaurant managers are still not successfully prioritising the need for air renovation within their establishments, and they are therefore failing to minimise the risk of airborne viral transmission between their customers.

Acknowledgements

IDAEA-CSIC is a Centre of Excellence Severo Ochoa (Spanish Ministry of Science and Innovation, Project CEX2018-000794-S).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.12.17.21267987; this version posted December 19, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

References

Almstrand AC, Bake B, Ljungstrom E, Larsson P, Bredberg A, Mirgorodskaya E, Olin, AC. Effect of airway opening on production of exhaled particles. J Appl Physiol 2010;108:584-588

Bake B, Larsson P, Ljungkvist G, Ljungström E, Olin AC. Exhaled particles and small airways. Resp Res 2019;8.10.1186/s12931-019-0970-9

Bazant MZ, Bush JWM. A guideline to limit indoor airborne transmission of COVID-19. Proc Nat Ac Sci 2021;118 (17)

Bourouiba L. The fluid dynamics of disease transmission. Annual Review of Fluid Mechanics 2021; 53:473-508, 10.1146/annurev-fluid-060220-113712

Buonanno G, Morawska L, Stabile L. Quantitative assessment of the risk of airborne transmission of SARS-CoV-2 infection. Environ Int 2020;145, 106112.

Buonanno G, Stabile L, Morawska L. Estimation of airborne viral emission: Quanta emission rate of SARS-CoV-2 for infection risk assessment. Environ Int 2020;141, 105794.

Greenhalgh T, Jimenez J, Prather K, Tufekci Z, Fisman D, Schooley T. Ten scientific reasons in support of airborne transmission of SARS-CoV-2. The Lancet 2021, 10.1016/S0140-6736(21)00869-2

Haslbeck K, Schwarz K, Hohlfeld JM, Seume J, Koch W. Submicron droplet formation in the human lung. Aerosol Sci 2010; 41:429-438

Johnson GR, Morawska L. The Mechanism of Breath Aerosol Formation. J Aerosol Med Pulm D 2009;22(3):229-237, 10.1089/jamp.2008.0720.

Jones RM, Brosseau LM. Aerosol Transmission of Infectious Disease. J Occup Environ Med / American College of Occup Environ Med 2015;57(5), 10.1097/JOM.0000000000000448.

Lin K, Marr LC. Humidity-dependent decay of viruses, but not bacteria, in aerosols and droplets follows disinfection kinetics. Environ Sci Technol 2019;54:1024–1032.

Lv J, Gao J, Wu B, Yao M, Yang Y, Chai T, Li N. Aerosol Transmission of Coronavirus and Influenza Virus of Animal Origin. Front Veterinary Sci 2021;8:109, 10.3389/fvets.2021.572012

Melikov AK. COVID-19: Reduction of airborne transmission needs paradigm shift in ventilation. Build Environ 2020;186: 107336. doi: 10.1016/j.buildenv.2020.107336

Miller SL, Nazaroff WW, Jimenez JL, Boerstra A, Buonanno G, Dancer SJ, Kurnitski J, Marr LC, Morawska L, Noakes C. Transmission of SARS-CoV-2 by inhalation of respiratory aerosol in the Skagit Valley Chorale superspreading event. Indoor Air 2021 Mar;31(2):314-323. doi: 10.1111/ina.12751

Morawska L, Milton DK. It Is Time to Address Airborne Transmission of Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19). Clin Infect Dis 2020;71 (9):2311-2313

Morawska L, Allen J, Bahnfleth W, Bluyssen PM, Boerstra A, Buonanno G, Cao J, Dancer SJ, Floto A, Franchimon F, Greenhalgh T, Haworth C, Hogeling J, Isaxon C, Jimenez JL, Kurnitski J, Li Y, Loomans M, Marks G, Marr LC, Mazzarella L, Melikov AK, Miller S, Milton DK, Nazaroff W, Nielsen PV, Noakes C, Peccia J, Prather K, Querol X, Sekhar C, Seppänen O, Tanabe SI, Tang JW, Tellier R, Tham KW, Wargocki P, Wierzbicka A, Yao M. A paradigm shift to combat indoor respiratory infection. Science 2021 May 14;372(6543):689-691. DOI: 10.1126/science.abg2025. PMID: 33986171.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.12.17.21267987; this version posted December 19, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Moreno, T., Gibbons, W. Aerosol transmission of human pathogens: From miasmata to modern viral pandemics and their preservation potential in the Anthropocene record. Geoscience Frontiers 2021, DOI:10.1016/j.gsf.2021.101282.

Moreno T, Pintó RM, Bosch A, Moreno N, Alastuey A, Minguillón MC, Anfruns-Estrada E, Guix S, Fuentes C, Buonanno G, Stabile L, Morawska L, Querol X. Tracing surface and airborne SARS-CoV-2 RNA inside public buses and subway trains. Environ Int 2021;147, 106326, 10.1016/j.envint.2020.106326

Peng Z, Bahnfleth W, Buonanno G, Dancer SJ, Kurnitski J, Li Y, Loomans MGLC, Marr LC, Morawska L, Nazaroff W, Noakes C, Querol X, Sekhar C, Tellier R, Greenhalgh T, Bourouiba L, Boerstra, A, Tang J, Miller S, Jimenez, J.L. Indicators for Risk of Airborne Transmission in Shared Indoor Environments and their application to COVID-19 Outbreaks. Medrxiv 2021; DOI: 10.1101/2021.04.21.21255898

Peng Z, Jimenez JL. Exhaled CO2 as COVID-19 infection risk proxy for different indoor environments and activities. Environ Sci Technol Lett 2021;8(5):392–397.

Randall K, Ewing ET, Marr LC, Jimenez JL, Bourouiba L. How did we get here: what are droplets and aerosols and how far do they go? A historical perspective on the transmission of respiratory infectious diseases. J of the The Royal Society 2021;11(6). DOI:10.1098/rsfs.2021.0049

Shen Y, Li C, Dong H, Wang Z, Martinez L, Sun Z, Handel A, Chen Z, Chen E, Ebell MH, Wang F, Yi B, Wang H, Wang X, Wang A, Chen B, Qi Y, Liang L, Li Y, Ling F, Chen J, Xu G. Community Outbreak Investigation of SARS-CoV-2 Transmission Among Bus Riders in Eastern China. JAMA Intern Med 2020;180(12):1665-1671.

Schwarz K, Biller H, Windt H, Koch W, Hohlfeld JM. Characterization of exhaled particles from the healthy human lung–a systematic analysis in relation to pulmonary function variables. J. Aerosol Med Pulm Drug Deliv 2010;23:371-379

Wang CC, Prather KA, Sznitman J, Jimenez JI, Lakdawala SS, Tufekci Z, Marr LC. Airborne transmission of respiratory viruses. Science 2021;373:6558. DOI: 10.1126/science.abd9149

Zhang R, Li Y, Zhang AL, Wang Y, Molina MJ. Identifying airborne transmission as the dominant route for the spread of COVID-19. Proc Natl Acad Sci USA 2020;117(26):14857-14863,