The World Is Completely Unprepared For Detecting Emerging Viruses/Bacteria In The Air

Devabhaktuni Srikrishna
Patient Knowhow, Inc.
www.patientknowhow.com
Email: sri@patientknowhow.com

Abstract: There is an immediate need for efficient networks to detect novel/emerging bioaerosol threats. In 2022, the Pentagon Force Protection Agency (PFPA) found detection of emerging bioaerosol threats (EBT) to be “not feasible for daily operations” due to cost of reagents used for metagenomics, cost of sequencing instruments, and time/cost for labor (subject matter expertise) to analyze bioinformatics. If the Pentagon experiences these operational difficulties, they may also extend to many of the 280,000 buildings (2.3 billion square feet) at 5000 secure US DoD military sites, 250 US Navy ships, and beyond in civilian buildings around the world. These economic barriers can still be addressed in a threat-agnostic manner by dynamically pooling samples from a network of dry filter units (DFUs) termed Spike Triggered Virtualization (STV). In STV, pooling and sequencing depth are automatically modulated in the next cycle in response to novel potential biothreats in the sequencing output of the previous sequencing cycle. By running at a high pooling factor and lower depth unless triggered by a potential pathogen spike, average daily and annual cost per DFU can be reduced by one to two orders of magnitude depending on chosen trigger thresholds. Artificial intelligence (AI) can further enhance sensitivity of STV triggers. Risk of infection during the 12-24 hour window between a bioaerosol incident and its detection remains, but can in some cases be reduced by 80% or potentially more with high-speed indoor air cleaning exceeding 10 air changes per hour (10 ACH) similar to passenger airplanes (Airbus A319, A321 and a Boeing 737-Max8/9) that were tested in flight. Costs of 4 ACH or higher are expected to rise non-linearly with ACH using central HVAC systems and be cost-prohibitive. Whereas 10 ACH or more can be achieved economically by recycling the air in rooms with portable air filtration systems tested for which costs scale linearly with ACH. For typical ceiling heights (< 10’), the cost per square foot cost for air filtration exceeding 10 ACH was found to be approximately $0.5 to $1 for Do-It-Yourself (DIY) and $2 to $5 for HEPA.

Introduction

The Pentagon Force Protection Agency (PFPA) has been at the forefront of innovations in threat-agnostic, bioaerosol security operations [72] such as use of barcoded DNA for mapping indoor aerosol transport between dry filter units (DFUs) in 2016 [1] [2]. In 2022, PFPA presented its experience with detection of emerging/novel bioaerosol threats (NBT) as being “not feasible for daily operations” [3]. These can include the universe of artificial-derived (synthetic) pathogens or natural pathogens for example those with pandemic potential such as most

recently SARS-CoV-2 or H5N1 [70] in the future. If the Pentagon experiences such operational difficulties, they may also extend to many of the 280,000 buildings (2.3 billion square feet) at 5000 secure DoD military sites [4], 250 active Navy ships at sea [5], and beyond in civilian buildings around the world. PFPA currently conducts biothreat testing for mail and environmental samples 24/7/365 at an onsite BSL 2/3 lab. PFPA surveils routinely from aerosol samples collected from a network infrastructure of DFUs located across the Pentagon reservation to track aerosolized biothreats such as one that might be released from an improvised bioaerosol device (e.g. a perfume bottle) or through aerosol contagion among people inside the Pentagon. PFPA is using molecular PCR assays and immunoassays to detect the presence of Biological Select Agents and Toxin (BSAT) known in advance, which are sensitive, specific, timely and within budget. However the Pentagon lacks a similar capability for NBT due to the tough economics of gene sequencing technologies necessary for real-time, accurate detection of aerosolized pathogen species, variants, and single nucleotide polymorphisms (SNPs). Below we discuss a path to make metagenomic sequencing feasible for daily detection of novel bioaerosols using virtualization and artificial intelligence (AI), and we identify cost-effective, 24x7x365 air cleaning options to bridge the gap between the bioaerosol release and its initial detection up to 24 hours later.

Pentagon Pilot Study of Metagenomics (2022)

From March 2021 to March 2022 the Pentagon piloted metagenomic sequencing technologies to characterize the environmental background, and additionally to evaluate it as a potential threat-agnostic method to detect emerging and advanced biological threats [3]. A total of N=105 DFUs located indoors and outdoors were sampled once a month. The metagenomics revealed the “microbial background community is large and complex: it contains many different species of naturally-occurring and human-associated bacteria and viruses.” In some instances, samples contained high levels of fungi and human DNA which complicated analysis. In conclusion, PFPA found the metagenomic method was “not feasible for daily operations” due to its excessive cost, time consumed, large quantities of genetic data requiring high computational capability, and subject matter expertise (SME) to analyze the data. Furthermore, the Pentagon highlighted several other operational challenges including bioinformatic biases, microbial background in sampling devices, and high abundance organisms inhibiting detection of low abundance organisms. The Pentagon found bioaerosol metagenomics of the environment can be useful to improve its PCR assay design, but further technological advances are needed to reduce both the cost of resources and ambiguity of results in order to make metagenomics feasible as a threat-agnostic method to identify emerging threats. When I asked what are the costliest and most time consuming elements of the solution, the Pentagon specifically identified the reagents used for metagenomics are two orders of magnitude more costly than PCR, in addition to the cost of sequencing instruments (machines) and the labor (expertise) to analyze the bioinformatics.

For environmental background sampling applications seeking to examine the microbes captured in each DFU, emerging pathogen detection turned out to be cost-prohibitive in the Pentagon

pilot. Although the density of novel pathogens in the air may be fewer than 1000 per cubic meter [6] it may also contain 10 million other microbes or more [7]. As many as 10,000 microorganisms may need to be sequenced to find one novel human pathogen. A DFU collecting air typically at the rate of 1 cubic meter per minute can easily result in several hundreds of millions of microbes in each sample. Depending on the desired breadth and depth of the sequencing (quality), the cost of a single run of short-read sequencing can easily exceed $1000 [8] generating hundreds of gigabytes of data to be analyzed [9].

Spike Triggered Virtualization (STV)

Detection of the smallest quantities of a pathogen may be needed for environmental background sampling. If that stringent requirement is relaxed, aggregation or “pooling” of a larger number of DFUs in the network across fewer sequencing machines can slash the average daily cost and time within a budget targeted (by PFPA). As explained in the Air Force tactics for bioaerosol collection and identification [10], the operational benefits of pooling a large number of DFUs to be analyzed at once include a substantial reduction in expenditures on consumable materials, increased sample throughput, and lower total analysis times. However, pooling also theoretically increases the risk of a false negative due to sample dilution. If gene sequencing all samples to retain full sensitivity is cost-prohibitive, how much pooling can still reduce risk by enabling daily operations without excessive loss of sensitivity?

A “spike” in concentrations across the DFU network can be a cost-effective signal for a potentially novel pathogen. The Air Force tactical doctrine [10] points out that although it is unlikely, a covert aerosol release of a biological agent would only be captured by a single DFU, the possibility exists. The risk of this possibility can be mitigated with deployment of more DFUs in the network. In case of contagious pathogens exhaled by infected people such as SARS-CoV-2, such “spikes” of bioaerosol can be observed not only as a result of a rising number of infected people (“waves”) but are likely because bioaerosol emissions can vary by one or two orders of magnitude due to physiological differences among infected people [6] [11].

Unlike PCR, the gene sequencing process introduces errors into the reads of a pathogen’s sequence but the error rate can be overcome by increasing the “depth”: the number of times a given nucleotide in the pathogen’s genome has been sequenced (from repeated instances) in the sample. At a lower depth it may be possible to confidently recognize the species of an emerging pathogen but not individual mutations within that species. At higher depth the confidence in the characterization of the novel pathogen can be increased by more accurately recognizing features of that pathogen’s genome including as single-nucleotide polymorphisms (SNPs) which have been implicated in increased pathogenicity or transmissibility of viruses [12] [13] [14]. Once a “spike” at a chosen threshold concentration in the air indicates the presence of a potentially novel bioaerosol, to increase confidence it becomes necessary to confirm the presence of the novel pathogen at higher depth (and potentially also narrow its specific filter location) by reducing the pooling factor in subsequent sequencing of DFU samples. This increases the cost per sequencing run in response to the detection of the spike.

Sharing a computer to concurrently run multiple tasks (in this case also gene sequencing machines) and dynamically adjusting the resources up or down as needed by a task is known as “virtualization” in computer science. We term the dynamic adaptation (in software) of pooling to modulate the targeted sequencing depth (and costs) in response to detection of “spikes” as Spike Triggered Virtualization (STV). STV is illustrated in the model (Figure 1) showing how the maximum allowable pooling factor (per sequencing run or per machine), sequencing cost per filter, and annualized cost for the Pentagon pilot study would vary as a function of minimum pathogen concentration and minimum sequencing depth of the trigger. By running at a high enough average pooling factor, the daily and annual cost per DFU can be reduced by one to two orders of magnitude (Figure 1) depending on the trigger thresholds chosen.

Figure 1: Spike Triggered Virtualization (STV)



The pooling factor and costs are computed based on certain model assumptions (Table 1) with pathogen density and depth varying (Figure 1). Although model assumptions (Table 1) can vary, the shape of the curves (Figure 1) is similar.

Table 1: Model for pooling multiple filters

Quantity	Symbol	Formula	Value	Units
Genetic material density	V		1,000,000	per cubic foot
Air Flow rate	A		300.00	cubic feet per minute
Genetic material flow rate	F	V * A	300,000,000	per minute
Average genetic material length	L		20,000	bases

bases flow rate	Fb	F * L	6,000	Gigabases per minute
Bases per sequenced per run	B		1	Gigabases
Genetic material sequenced per run	S	B / L	50,000	Genetic material
Genetic material sequencing cost per run	Cr		1,000	$ per run
Target pathogen density	Vt_{1000}		1,000	per cubic foot
Total genetic material to pathogen ratio	H		1000	
Minimum detected # of copies to identify it (sequencing depth or coverage)	Id_{10}		10	
Bases sequenced to identify it	Bid_{10}	$V * Id_{10} * L / Vt_{1000}$	200	Megabases
Maximum permissible pooling factor to identify it	P_{10}	B / Bid_{10}	5	

As the desired depth increases further, pooling may not be feasible at all pathogen concentrations and instead, multiple sequencing runs (or machines) become necessary per each filter. This is depicted as a negative pooling factor in the first chart (Figure 1). As with Table 1, although model assumptions (Table 2) may vary the shape of curves (Figure 1) remains similar.

Table 2: Model for number of sequencing runs per filter

Quantity	Symbol	Formula	Value	Units
Genetic material density	V		1,000,000	per cubic foot
Air Flow rate	A		300.00	cubic feet per minute
Genetic material flow rate	F	V * A	300,000,000	per minute
Average genetic material length	L		20,000	bases

bases flow rate	Fb	F * L	6,000	Gigabases per minute
Bases per sequenced per run	B		1	Gigabases
Genetic material sequenced per run	S	B / L	50,000	Genetic material
Genetic material sequencing cost per run	Cr		1,000	$ per run
Target pathogen density	Vt_{1000}		1,000	per cubic foot
Total genetic material to pathogen ratio	H		1000	
Detected # of copies to identify it (sequencing depth / coverage)	Id_{100}		100	
Bases sequenced to identify it	Bid_{100}	$V * Id_{100} * L / Vt_{1000}$	2000	Megabases
Minimum # of runs to identify it	R_{100}	Bid_{100} / B	2	

Artificial Intelligence (AI)

The sensitivity of the trigger for detection of pathogenic novelty in STV depends on the chosen threshold concentration to detect the spike. Higher concentration relative to expected levels increase confidence in the detection of novelty (e.g. “reference normalized reads” used by the Pentagon). However to maintain efficiency and reduce daily cost these would need to be further filtered to exclude viruses that affect other kingdoms (e.g. plants) which in some studies comprised the bulk of sequenced microbes [7]. There are a few opportunities to enhance the sensitivity of the STV trigger with artificial intelligence (AI). First, some suggest AI can be trained to recognize mutants of cross-kingdom viruses that are more likely to affect humans such as influenza [17]. In the pilot study, the Pentagon’s contractors used pathogen databases such as BLAST, PanGIA, and Kraken to recognize novel pathogens and tell them apart from other pathogens that primarily affect plants and animals. However novel human pathogens may not be entirely captured in these databases and in some cases can be cross-kingdom (e.g. plant viruses that can infect humans) [18]. For example the AI may be trained to recognize sequences that potentially match human cell entry receptors [19]. Second, AI can be trained to more robustly recognize novel pathogens present with artifacts from the sequencing process such as multiple genome segments incompletely assembled with sequencing errors.

Subclinical Person-to-Person Contagion (P2P)

PFPA recommends masks for high community levels [20] in spite of available measures such as ventilation, filtration, and ultraviolet light disinfection [73] for long-range risk reduction. Even with good ventilation, outbreaks where people are socializing at close proximity (e.g. at lunch < 3 feet for 30 minutes) or fleeting contact in hallways are at risk for pathogen transmission [21]. Multiple case studies show person-to-person (P2P) spread can be subclinical or asymptomatic, which might be called “stealth” airborne pathogens because they may infect a substantial portion of the population before resulting in symptoms that cause a visit to a clinic. For example in 2020, of approximately 5000 sailors onboard the aircraft carrier USS Theodore Roosevelt, 55% or 229 of 416 sailors that tested positive for Covid-19 on were asymptomatic [22]. Also in 2021, 18% of high-school classrooms (N=72) in South Africa had Tuberculosis (TB) likely subclinical infection which was discovered only by bioaerosol sampling [23].

Same-day or next-day detection can provide early warning capability needed to break transmission chains of a subclinical, contagious novel bioaerosol cloud in the Pentagon (P2P + NBT). For instance, Gain of function (GOF) studies suggest a few gene edits (SNPs) can turn a virus that is ~50% fatal in dogs into a human virus [24] [25] [26]. If an emerging, airborne measles-relative lacks vaccines or treatments, then a two day delay in its detection results in most of the Pentagon being infected based on the Monte-Carlo simulation of contagion (Figure 2). Since the hypothesized human subvariant has only a small number of SNPs different from the more commonly occuring dog version, expanded sequencing depth in response to detection of a spike is necessary to know the difference.

Figure 2: Model of contagion for measles-like virus in the Pentagon



Modeling parameters: Average of 100 Monte-Carlo simulations with R0=10 over 14 infectious days or 71% average infection rate per day (Poissonian statistics: Per day, 48% chance of infecting zero, 35% chance of one, 12% chance of 2, 3% chance of 3….)
Initial conditions: N=27,000 employees at Pentagon, 1 employee infected on day 1.

Subvariants and Single Nucleotide Polymorphisms (SNPs)

An illustrative model is shown (Figure 3) how increased sequencing depth improves detection accuracy of single-SNP subvariants such as the example dog virus above. It is based on the binomial distribution assuming the fraction of subvariants with that SNP is 1:15 (also known as allelic fraction), and the error rate of the sequencing technology itself that could cause a false read of that SNP is 1:30. A receiver-operator (ROC) curve (Figure 3), true positives versus false positives at different detection thresholds for the SNP, includes different sequencing depths 100, 150, 300, and 1000. In general for true positives to exceed false positives, base error rate must not exceed the allelic fraction of the subvariant being detected. Otherwise the positives would mostly be caused by sequencing errors not actual SNPs.

Figure 3: Receiver-operator (ROC) curve for different sequencing depths, 1:30 error rate of sequencing technology and 1:15 ratio of mutated subvariants



Detect to Treat Vulnerability (D2T)

Supposing daily metagenomic surveillance were to become feasible for daily operations at the Pentagon (e.g. with STV), use of detection still requires sample collection and laboratory processing introducing a delay > 0. This delay necessarily creates a window of vulnerability, between when the incident occurred (“boom”) and when protective actions are taken, right of “boom.” This delay is typically no less than 12-24 hours according to Air Force tactics [10] during which people can still be infected. This residual risk remains with a contagious pathogen (P2P) especially at close contact (Figure 4). The model compares infectious particle concentration in the absence of detection to the reduction seen with 24 hour detection (daily) and immediate use of protection post-detection. This model is based on linear decay in infectious particle concentration with distance from the infectious source derived in [27]. Although assumptions for infectious particles can vary, this model mainly illustrates that daily metagenomic surveillance can substantially reduce risk a day after the initial incident, but cannot alter what transpires between right of “boom” before initial detection of NBT up to or more than 24 hours later.

Figure 4: Model comparing infectious particle concentration (P2P) without detection to the reduction seen following 24 hour detection (daily) and immediate use of protection



To address this window of vulnerability, Air Force tactics describe the primary purpose of DFU network infrastructure deployment, sample collection, and screening of ambient air samples is to provide “Detect to treat” (D2T) notification of a biological attack. D2T is to give time for commanders to recognize the need for, and implement, effective medical treatment protocols. While there are existing treatments for many BSAT, novel treatments for novel threats are unknowable in advance. In 2023, the DoD announced programs using advances in supercomputing-based drug discovery like the discovery of Paxlovid [28], to model new threats and generate potential treatments by modulating the immune system through six metabolic routes [29]. Although Paxlovid for SARS-CoV-2 is a breakthrough, it took years to discover among many alternatives, verify its safety and efficacy in humans, then manufacture, and distribute at first in very limited quantities to the public. It is unclear that such breakthroughs are replicable in time for every emerging bioaerosol threat that comes along in the future. In spite of future biomedical advances, treatments are at high risk of being unavailable for bioaerosol threats for several reasons. For NBT, novel treatments may be unsafe, ineffective, or delayed. For BSAT, treatment-resistant variants of BSAT may emerge [71], or even if they work there simply may not be enough doses or treatment facilities in a surge especially at population-scale (e.g. as seen during the West African Ebola epidemic in 2014 and more recently with COVID-19 and Paxlovid early on after its release). Due to limited manufacturing facilities, treatments are also hard to manufacture on demand during a surge unless stocked in advance.

Indoor Air Cleaning to “close” the D2T window

Indoors, use of frequent air cleaning 24x7x365 to remove bioaerosols can help “defuse the boom” by cutting the risks during the D2T window of vulnerability since approximately 90% of

our time is spent indoors at home, school, work [30]. An 80% lower infection risk (P2P) was observed in Italian classrooms during the Delta/Omicron waves of COVID-19 that were ventilated at the rate of an estimated 5 to 6 air changes per hour (ACH) within the classroom [31] [32]. To use a nuclear analogy, if novel bioaerosols (NBT) are like radioactive air, then its "half-life" (= $\log_e(2) \div$ ACH) is inversely proportional to the ACH (Figure 5). The residual level of particle concentration remaining (Figure 5) depends directly on the rate of particle entry or emission into the room, and is also inversely proportional to the ACH [33].

Figure 5: Relationship of Air Changes Per Hour (ACH) to particle concentratio



n

12 Air Changes Per Hour (ACH)

Three data points suggest at least 12 ACH is needed for infection control.

First, CDC experts indicated more than 12 ACH (half life < 3.5 mins) is necessary to stop spread of SARS-CoV-2 in some situations although they were not aware of outbreaks in spaces ventilated at 5 to 6 ACH [34] [35]. The volumetric rate of clean air (CADR) needed in a room to meet 6 ACH is 100 cubic feet per minute (100 cfm = 60 x 100 cf per hour) for every 1000 cubic feet (1000 cf). 12 ACH therefore needs double the CADR equal to 200 cfm per 1000 cf.

Second, real-world evidence of the relation of infection risk with high-speed air filtration can be seen with infection (superspreading) rates aboard passenger aircraft. According to CDC, jet aircraft built after the late 1980s recirculate cabin air through filters, and through high-efficiency particulate air (HEPA) filters in most newer-model airplanes [36]. As described below, measurements of the ACH on 3 passenger jets inflight (Airbus A319, A321 and a Boeing 737-Max8/9) were in the range of 11-12 ACH much lower than the 20-30 ACH as reported on the CDC webpage [36], suggesting that perhaps 12 ACH can substantially reduce infection risk from aerosolized pathogens.

Multiple authors observed that superspreading aboard airplanes with high passenger density was less frequent than might be expected with so many passengers contained in such a small

space. Most flights are not contact traced, but Australia and New Zealand tracked infections in arriving international flights in early days of pandemic (repatriation) and required passengers to be tested during mandatory quarantine. As of October 20, 2020, out of 62,698 arriving passengers, New Zealand identified 215 who tested positive but published only one instance of inflight super spreading [37]. Australia published three flights with superspreading [38] [39]. If we expect approximately 10% of infected people to be super spreaders [40] about 20 out of 215 arriving in New Zealand and dozens in Australia, well above the published rate of superspreading events. Several researchers have hypothesized why we don't see more superspreading aboard these flights. Some initially credited the institution of mandatory masking for dramatically reduced super spreading aboard flights [41]. However, even prior to mandatory masking aboard aircraft there were relatively few published documented superspreading (mass-transmission) events [42]. Another possible explanation maybe low level of passenger mixing involving close-contact because passengers are confined to seats most of time, yet studies aboard ten transcontinental flights showed there are ample mixing opportunities [43]. If masking or mixing does not account for lower than expected superspreading on flights, a possible remaining explanation is air filtration.

Indoor testing of ACH typically involves generating test aerosols (e.g. salt water, smoke, tracers) which may be unsafe or disallowed e.g. in occupied rooms or passenger aircraft. The procedure to verify ACH on the aircraft relied on ambient aerosols and is based on the model for ambient aerosol decay in the Appendix. At each point in time, the aerosol concentrations (count per liter) were measured using a 7-channel handheld optical particle counter (HOPC) called the Temtop Particle Counter PMD 331 (calibrated to meet ISO-2150). Each measurement was taken for 30 seconds at the most penetrating particle size (MPPS) of 0.3 μm. Since the airplane is an uncontrolled environment several transient aerosol fluctuations can also be observed in aerosol particle counts by the HOPC at MPPS (0.3 μm) after take-off for the three airplanes (Figure 6).

- **Airbus A319:** The best fit (shown) was 11.7 ACH with leak of 3800 particles per liter per hour (32% average percent error).
- **Airbus A321:** The best fit (shown) was 11.8 ACH with leak of 6300 particles per liter per hour (18% average percent error).
- **Boeing 737-Max8/9:** The best fit (shown) was 10.9 ACH with leak of 4100 particles per liter per hour (24% average percent error).

Figure 6: Best fit to estimate ACH after takeoff aboard the Airbus A319, Airbus A321, and Boeing 737-Max8/9







Third, in general it takes a reduction of aerosol concentrations by 20 times to get the equivalent of 95% filtration as nominally required for N95 respirators which need at least 12 ACH if not more. Miller et. al. [33] describes an approximation (Equation 3) for equilibrium viral particle concentration (C) with one or more infected persons emitting virus at rate (E per hour) in a well-mixed room of volume (V) with ACH (λ per hour): $C = E / (\lambda V)$. In an unventilated room (the absence of any indoor ventilation or air filtration), the particle removal still includes surface deposition with a contribution to λ estimated in a wide range of 0.3 to 1.5 [33]. In experiments described in the Appendix the ACH from surface deposition in a room was measured to be approximately 0.6. Assuming surface deposition contributes 0.6 to λ, 20 times reduction in

aerosol concentrations to achieve N95-equivalent filtration at far-field in a well-mixed environment requires ACH (λ) from air filtration to be 12.

One caveat is that indoor air cleaning in general is predicted to reduce near-field exposure to exhaled aerosols to some extent [44] dependent on aerodynamic factors [45]. However, a CDC laboratory experiment confirmed [46] that in-room air filtration does not reduce exhaled breath exposure to simulated participants sitting very close to an infected person (near-field e.g. less than 6 feet) to the same degree it can at a larger distance when air is well-mixed within the room (far-field). Respirators remain useful for reducing risk to both near-field and far-field exposures, whereas air filtration can only mitigate far-field exposure in a well-mixed environment, not near-field.

Retrospective analysis showed that use of KN95/N95 respirators by both community members [47] and in healthcare settings [48] resulted in lower COVID infection rates as compared to cloth and surgical masks. Across a variety of manufacturers the average filtration efficiency of N95 at 0.3 μm particle size was found to be much higher at 98% and more consistent than 81% for KN95 (Table 2 of [49]). This 98% is reassuringly higher than the 95% filtration efficiency nominally required for N95, although N95 fit [50] and filtration efficiency (Figure 2 of [51]) may degrade with reuse over several hours (and wearing an N95 with poor fit is like closing the windows of a car door but leaving a crack open). The N95 average of 98% requires a 50 times reduction in inhaled aerosols (ACH=30) and KN95 average of 80% requires 5 times (ACH=3) in an unventilated room assuming surface deposition contributes 0.6 to ACH (λ).

Portable Air Filtration

It is not possible to protect from NBT or BSAT using outside air for indoor ventilation if the source of the bioaerosol release is from outside, unless the outside air is nearly 100% disinfected or filtered when entering the building, which is often cost-prohibitive. With some exceptions, more than 4 ACH of filtered, recirculated air using centralized heating ventilation and air conditioning (HVAC) systems is also uneconomical because of the cost of energy needed to transport the air remotely to an HVAC rises approximately as the cube of ACH (ACH^3) [52]. This is not including the costs of conditioning the air temperature at these higher airflow rates.

To push above 4 ACH to 12 ACH and beyond, in-room air cleaning methods such as air filtration and germicidal ultraviolet (GUV) technology can be used economically. The costs of recycling the indoor air by locally cleaning air scales up linearly proportional to target ACH (ACH^1) and the room's volume. Public Health authorities including CDC [53], EPA [54], White House [55] [56], and California Department of Public Health (CDPH) [57] recommend installation of portable air filtration, HEPA or Do-It-Yourself (DIY), for use in all schools, homes, businesses. HEPA air purifiers are widely available in retail channels and in widespread use in US households to cut down ambient aerosol concentrations not only from infectious pathogens such as SARS-CoV-2, Influenza, RSV but also allergens, cooking pollution (frying, toasting, etc), wildfire particulates, wood-burning particulates, road pollution (diesel soot), and industrial

pollution. For example, In one instance (Figure 7) ambient particle counts at 0.3 µm (most penetrating particle size) in a room were reduced by almost 50x from outdoors to indoors within 40 minutes after closing the windows and running 9 ACH of DIY air filtration. GUV has been in use in many applications across DoD [73], in hospitals for infection control and to some extent for short-term or temporary exposure in public spaces. At this time a debate remains unresolved about long-term safety and appropriateness for extended, daily use of GUV [58] especially in regards to excessive generation of volatile organic compounds (VOC) and formation of secondary aerosols [59] [60] which may be carcinogenic [61].

Figure 7: With 9 ACH air filtration indoors, particle concentrations were reduced by almost 50x relative to outside



Combination of Detection and Air Cleaning

With continuous indoor air cleaning to reduce bioaerosol concentration, treatment is not the only option upon detection of a bioaerosol incident (NBT). Post-detection, exposure to bioaerosols can be further reduced by establishing emergency protocols for use for the duration of the detected disaster-incident. These temporary measures include well-fitting, comfortable respirators [62] not just cloth masks (e.g. N95, N99, P100, etc.) both outside and inside, and optionally with temporary indoor use of GUV and higher speed air filtration. The model of Figure

4 is used to estimate the combination effect on reduction of infectious particle concentration (P2P contagion) using both 24x7x365 detection with 12 ACH air filtration in the room (Figure 8). In the model, detection alone allows a window of infection (delay > 0) and filtration (or UV) alone still allows infection in “breathing zone,” but in combo they minimize risk (from P2P + D2T). At each distance from the bioaerosol source (infected person), the air filtration reduces exposure to the bioaerosol until detection of the incident (during the D2T window), and subsequently post-detection risk is minimized due to additional protections or treatment that maybe used.

Figure 8: Infectious particle concentration (P2P) without detection to reduction following 24 hour detection (daily), 12 ACH air filtration (24x7x365), and both in combination



High-Efficiency Particulate Absorbing (HEPA) and Do-It-Yourself (DIY) Air Cleaners

Do-It-Yourself (DIY) air filtration uses HVAC filters rated MERV 13 or higher in conjunction with box fans to achieve indoor air filtration results comparable to HEPA filtration but up to 10x lower cost [63]. To reach > 10 ACH in rooms with typical 8’-10’ ceiling heights, HEPA purifiers running at tolerable noise levels cost in the range of $2-$5 per square foot whereas Do-It-Yourself (DIY) air purifiers cost $0.5 to $1 per square foot, verified in tests described below. In 2022, CDC (NIOSH) conducted a “crash test” of DIY air purifiers using aerosols at the most penetrating particle size (0.3 µm to 0.6 µm), to verify whether they are capable of stopping viruses between test dummies [64]. In these tests, CDC found 12+ air changes per hour (12 ACH) was achievable in a realistic size classroom of 6000+ cubic feet but it took more than one DIY air purifier (parallelization). In 2021, EPA-sponsored testing of DIY by Underwriter Labs found popular box fan models remained safe after stress tests with loaded and blocked filters [65]. DIY

air purifiers not only filters reduce bioaerosol risk, improve air quality in general, but they may also double as low-cost bioaerosol collectors in lieu of DFUs [66].

Using similar methods as measurements of ACH in the passenger airplanes above, the ACH derived CADR is estimated below (Table 3) for a variety of HEPA and DIY models tested using a uniform methodology relying on ambient aerosols. DIY models were assembled using the instructions provided in [67]. As a general trend, the cost of 1000 cfm is significantly lower for the DIY configurations ($279-$699) than the HEPA ($334-$1300). Noise is an important aspect for end-user acceptance, and 20” box fans made by Lasko running at their lowest speed (as tested below) are widely used in classroom applications. The HEPA were tested at their highest speed. Notably the lowest noise for DIY used ten 14 cm PC fans (“Tower of Power”, 429 cfm). The lowest noise HEPA was the SmartHealth Blast, 829 cfm. Both had comparatively high levels of CADR compared to most other models. A typical classroom of size 10,000 cubic feet would require 1000 cfm to reach 6 ACH, and 2000 cfm for 12 ACH. Of these models, the lowest cost approach would be to use the DIY box fan (Lasko) with 2” MERV 13 from Nordic Pure as assembled in [67] and tested in [63] which for typical 10’ ceiling heights translates to approximately $0.5 per square foot to get > 10 ACH. The cost per square foot would rise proportionally for other models based on the cost per 1000 cfm below.

Table 3: Performance characteristics of DIY and HEPA air purifiers

Purifier	Type	ACH-Derived CADR (cfm) @ 0.3 µm	Cost	CADR (cfm) per $100	Cost ($) of 1000 cfm	Noise at 9" (dBA)	Weight (lbs)	Volume (cubic feet)
Nordic Pure 2" MERV 13 (w/ box fan) @ speed low	DIY	197.4	$55	358.91	278.6220871	58	8.00	1.8
Nordic Pure 2" MERV 13 4-filter cube (w/ box fan) @ low	DIY	310.905	$100	310.91	321.641659	57	8.00	6.60
3M 1" MERV 14 (w/ box fan) @ low	DIY	212.205	$70	303.15	329.8697015	58	8.00	1.50
Taotronics TT-AP003 @ speed 3	HEPA	236	$79	299	334.4481605	58	13	1.4
Lasko Airflex MERV 10 (w/ box fan) @ speed low	DIY	162.855	$69	236.02	423.6897854	55	11.00	1.70
Lennox 5" MERV 16 (w/ box fan) @ speed low	DIY	330.645	$160	206.65	483.9026751	58	10.00	2.40
Tower of Power, 3M 1" MERV 13 (w/ 10 Arctic P14 PC fans)	DIY	429	$300	143	699.3006993	50	10	2.9
Levoit Core 600S @ speed 4	HEPA	419.475	$299	140.29	712.7957566	66	14.00	2.00
Honeywell HPA-5100B @ speed Turbo	HEPA	172.725	$129	133.90	746.8519323	62	14.00	1.10
Coway AP-1216L @ speed 3	HEPA	227.01	$179	126.82	788.519161	65	13.2	1.7

Smart Health Blast @ speed max	HEPA	829.08	$999	82.99	1204.950065	53	69	6.4
Coway Airmega 400 @ speed 3	HEPA	379.995	$494	76.92	1300.017105	63	25.00	3.00

Filter Replacement Cycle

With air filtration products the filters will need to be replaced at some point after they have been used. Below are measurements (tests) of the filtration efficiency for 5” Lennox MERV 16 filters used in DIY air purifiers at the MPPS of 0.3 µm. Each dot (Figure 9) represents a different filter instance and the x-axis was ordered in ascending order of filtration efficiency (not time). These filters were used for approximately 6 months and compared to fresh (new) filters installed in a school (Figure 9). The usage pattern was 5 days per week during school hours. The chart shows that some filters appear to have lower filtration efficiency than others possibly due to gradual loss of electrostatic charge since these are electret filters. The lower the efficiency the lower the clean air delivery rate, although the efficiency typically remains higher at larger particle diameters. Depending on the chosen threshold for replacement, policies for replacement intervals can be chosen based on testing the filters individually, or they may be replaced periodically (e.g. 1 year) without testing each one. Generally HEPA filters are expected to retain filtration efficiency longer than HVAC filters but actual results will vary based on a number of usage and environmental conditions.

Figure 9: Filtration efficiency of DIY air filters in use for 6 months compared to new filters



Conclusion and Next Steps

The PFPA pilot with N=105 DFUs at the Pentagon reservation highlighted economic barriers to adoption of metagenomics for emerging bioaerosol threat detection on a daily or routine basis. If the Pentagon is experiencing these economic barriers, they are likely to be experienced at many other secure DoD facilities as well as civilian buildings around the world. These barriers included the reagents used for metagenomics being two orders of magnitude more costly than PCR, in addition to the cost of sequencing instruments (machines) and the labor (expertise) to analyze the bioinformatics. These economic barriers can be addressed in principle by dynamically pooling of samples from the network of DFUs called Spike Triggered Virtualization (STV), whereby the pooling factor and sequencing depth are modulated automatically based on novel biothreats in the sequencing output. By running at a high enough average pooling factor, the daily and annual cost per DFU can be reduced by one to two orders of magnitude depending on the trigger thresholds chosen.

It is unlikely, a covert aerosol release of a biological agent would only be captured by a single DFU, but the possibility exists. The risk of this possibility can be mitigated with deployment of more DFUs in the network. In case of contagious pathogens exhaled by infected people such as SARS-CoV-2, such “spikes” of bioaerosol can be observed not only as a result of a rising number of infected people (“waves”) but are likely because bioaerosol emissions can vary by

one or two orders of magnitude due to physiological differences among infected people. For contagious pathogens, a Monte-Carlo model of contagion in the Pentagon suggests same-day or next-day detection is necessary to provide early warning capability to break transmission chains. The sensitivity of the trigger for detection of pathogenic novelty in STV depends on the chosen threshold concentration to detect the spike. There are opportunities to enhance the sensitivity of the STV trigger further with artificial intelligence (AI).

Provided detection within 24 hours is achievable, the “Detect to Treat” doctrine for BSAT (known threats) becomes a risk with novel bioaerosol threats because novel treatments either may not exist or if they do they may still be hard to come by. Exposure to bioaerosols post-detection can be reduced by establishing protocols, for the duration of the detected incident, to use well-fitting, comfortable respirators not just cloth masks (e.g. N95, N99, P100, etc.) both outside and inside, optionally with temporary indoor use of GUV and higher speed air filtration.

People can still be infected during the 24 hour window between a bioaerosol incident and its detection (D2T gap). This infection risk during the D2T gap can be reduced economically with high-speed indoor air cleaning of more than 10 air changes per hour (10 ACH) similar to the ACH level observed on passenger airplanes inflight. 4 ACH or more is likely to be cost-prohibitive using central HVAC systems, but 10 ACH or more can be achieved economically using portable air filtration in rooms with typical ceiling heights (< 10’) for a per square foot cost of approximately $0.5 to $1 for Do-It-Yourself (DIY) and $2 to $5 for HEPA.

Next steps. Building on the groundwork in the Pentagon’s pilot study, a DFU network infrastructure in a campus or office at the similar scale as the Pentagon’s pilot (N=105) is needed to verify economical daily operations of using metagenomics for detection of novel bioaerosol threats, based on STV and AI-enhanced triggers. One test case for the detection system would be successfully tracking the rise and fall of SARS-Cov-2 waves using STV, efficiently modulating sequencing rate of SARS-CoV-2 variants and their location within the campus. Simultaneously, 12 ACH indoor air filtration throughout the campus using HEPA or DIY closes the gap between biothreat release and its detection in DFUs to secure from emerging bioaerosol threats. The viability of air purifiers used for high-speed air filtration (as complementary to DFUs) to sample the air for aerosolized pathogens needs to be tested and verified.

Declaration of competing interest

I am not associated with any of the manufacturers mentioned in this research. Inventor on US patent #11555764.

Funding

No external funding was received.

Appendix: Ambient aerosol decay with air filtration in enclosed indoor space

The mathematical model for aerosol concentration from an infected person in a room that was described in [33] can be adapted to measure ACH in a whole house or room after any ambient (or generated) aerosol has been introduced. The differential equation (Equation 2 in [33]) is the same, but in contrast to the rising solution that asymptotically approaches $C = E/\lambda V$ given in [33], the ambient aerosol concentration in the room or house at time t after windows are closed can be expressed as the alternate (decaying) solution to the same differential equation:

$$C(t) = (E/\lambda V) + [C(0) - E/\lambda V] \times \exp(-\lambda t).$$

where
$C(t)$ = ambient aerosol concentration at time t
$C(0)$ = initial concentration
E = rate of ambient aerosols “leaking” into room or house (per hour) e.g. from outside
V = volume of room or house
λ = ACH
exp = exponential function.

Procedure

To measure the ACH of air filtration (HEPA or DIY) in an indoor space such as a room, first ambient aerosols from outdoors are allowed to enter the indoor space by opening windows and doors and get close to the level outdoors as measured by the optical particle counter described below. Then the windows are closed, and then finally the air filtration is turned on to track the decay of indoor aerosol concentrations with an optical particle counter. The shape of the decay curve and asymptote reveal the ACH and leaks of outdoor aerosols into the room or whole house. In case of an airplane, such control is not possible in which case the ambient aerosol concentration is determined by the opening/closing of doors by the crew, the entry of outdoor aerosols through airframe leaks or air intake in the cabin, and other in-cabin aerosol generating events.

Measurement of noise generated by air purifiers
Noise was measured for each air purifier/filter using an iPhone app [68] maintained by The National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH) at a 9″ distance perpendicular to the direction of the output airflow.

Estimation of ACH and rate of indoor leakage

All measurements (counts) were input into Google Sheets and compared to the model for ambient aerosol decay with different values of ACH and indoor aerosol leak rate. The aerosol concentration measurements representing $C(t)$ are fitted by a computer program (written in Python) to obtain the best approximation for ACH (λ) and the rate of indoor leak (E/V) at

0.3 µm particle size by minimizing sum of percent error across each measurement (in increments of 0.1 ACH and 100 particles per liter per hour). For example, (Figure 10) the best fit (2.7% average percent error) for surface deposition in the room with windows closed and without any filtration or HVAC enabled was with 0.6 ACH and leak equal to 4900 particles per liter per hour. The plot (Figure 10) of the best fit (4.3% average percent error) obtained for the Coway Airmega 400 in the Room with 7.7 ACH and leak equal to 4700 particles per liter per hour.

Figure 10: Example of best fit with 0.6 ACH the rate of surface deposition in Room, and best fit with 7.7 ACH for Coway Airmega 400 in Room





Similarly (Figure 10), the ACH estimates for each of the purifiers tested and their average percent error is listed (Table 4). Since the measurements were taken at different times and ambient aerosols outside vary from day to day, the leak was also observed to vary between tests. The tests were conducted in a representative room of estimated size 2961 cubic feet. Tests using particle decay rates were conducted by EPA for a variety of DIY air purifier configurations [69].

Table 4: ACH estimates for each of the HEPA / DIT air purifiers tested

Purifier	Type	ACH (per hour)	Average Percent Error (18 data points)	Leak (particles / L / hour)
Surface (Room)	n/a	0.6	2.70%	4900
Lasko Airflex MERV 10 (w/ box fan) @ speed low	DIY	3.3	2.10%	21700
Honeywell HPA-5100B @ speed Turbo	HEPA	3.5	3.70%	12900
Nordic Pure 2" MERV 13 (w/ box fan) @ speed low	DIY	4	2.70%	6500
3M 1" MERV 14 (w/ box fan) @ low	DIY	4.3	2.90%	11000
Coway AP-1216L (speed 3)	HEPA	4.6	5.70%	300
Taotronics TT-AP003 @ speed 3	HEPA	4.8	6.17%	30300
Nordic Pure 2" MERV 13 4-filter cube (w/ box fan) @ low	DIY	6.3	3.70%	9800
Lennox 5" MERV 16 (w/ box fan) @ speed low	DIY	6.7	2.80%	11500
Coway Airmega 400 @ speed 3	HEPA	7.7	4.30%	4700
Levoit Core 600S @ speed 4	HEPA	8.5	6.90%	2300
Tower of Power, 3M 1" MERV 13 (w/ 10 Arctic P14 PC fans)	DIY	8.7	8.70%	1900
Smart Health Blast @ speed max	HEPA	16.8	9.40%	10100

References

[1] Ruth N. Harding, Christine A. Hara, Sara B. Hall, Elizabeth A. Vitalis, Cynthia B. Thomas, A. Daniel Jones, James A. Day, Vicente R. Tur-Rojas, Trond Jorgensen, Edwin Herchert, Richard Yoder, Elizabeth K. Wheeler & George R. Farquar (2016) Unique DNA-barcoded aerosol test particles for studying aerosol transport, Aerosol Science and Technology, 50:5, 429-435, DOI: 10.1080/02786826.2016.1162903

[2] Ilan Arvelo, Frank Pagone, Jacob Persky, Carlos E. Carpio, Phil Arnold, Nicholas Clements, Decay rates of two tracer gases compared to DNA-tagged liquid aerosol tracer particles: Impact of varying dilution rate and filtration, Building and Environment, Volume 212, 2022, 108819, ISSN 0360-1323, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.buildenv.2022.108819.

[3] Lisa Foddrill, Director, CBRN Lab, Pentagon Force Protection Agency, “Beyond Traditional Biodetection: A Metagenomics Pilot Study for Strategic Decision-Making.” June 28, 2022. 2022 Biodetection Technologies Virtual. https://www.biodetectiontechnologies.com/22

[4] BASE STRUCTURE REPORT – FISCAL YEAR 2018 BASELINE A SUMMARY OF THE REAL PROPERTY INVENTORY DATA. https://www.acq.osd.mil/eie/Downloads/BSI/Base%20Structure%20Report%20FY18.pdf

[5] Naval Vessel Register. US Navy. https://www.nvr.navy.mil/NVRSHIPS/FLEETSIZE.HTML

[6] Dinoi A, Feltracco M, Chirizzi D, Trabucco S, Conte M, Gregoris E, Barbaro E, La Bella G, Ciccarese G, Belosi F, La Salandra G, Gambaro A, Contini D. A review on measurements of SARS-CoV-2 genetic material in air in outdoor and indoor environments: Implication for airborne transmission. Sci Total Environ. 2022 Feb 25;809:151137. doi: 10.1016/j.scitotenv.2021.151137. Epub 2021 Oct 23. PMID: 34699823; PMCID: PMC8539199.

[7] Whon TW, Kim MS, Roh SW, Shin NR, Lee HW, Bae JW. Metagenomic characterization of airborne viral DNA diversity in the near-surface atmosphere. J Virol. 2012 Aug;86(15):8221-31. doi: 10.1128/JVI.00293-12. Epub 2012 May 23. PMID: 22623790; PMCID: PMC3421691.

[8] HTG ILLUMINA SEQUENCING PRICING https://uofuhealth.utah.edu/huntsman/shared-resources/gba/htg/pricing

[9] Kutnjak D, Tamisier L, Adams I, Boonham N, Candresse T, Chiumenti M, De Jonghe K, Kreuze JF, Lefebvre M, Silva G, Malapi-Wight M, Margaria P, Mavrič Pleško I, McGreig S, Miozzi L, Remenant B, Reynard JS, Rollin J, Rott M, Schumpp O, Massart S, Haegeman A. A Primer on the Analysis of High-Throughput Sequencing Data for Detection of Plant Viruses. Microorganisms. 2021 Apr 14;9(4):841. doi: 10.3390/microorganisms9040841. PMID: 33920047; PMCID: PMC8071028.

[10] AIR FORCE TACTICS, TECHNIQUES AND PROCEDURES 3-10.26. 21 FEBRUARY 2020. Tactical Doctrine. BIOLOGICAL AGENT AEROSOL COLLECTION AND IDENTIFICATION https://static.e-publishing.af.mil/production/1/af_sg/publication/afttp3-10.26/afttp3-10.26.pdf

[11] Jianyu Lai, Kristen K Coleman, S H Sheldon Tai, Jennifer German, Filbert Hong, Barbara Albert, Yi Esparza, Aditya K Srikakulapu, Maria Schanz, Isabel Sierra Maldonado, Molly Oertel, Naja Fadul, T Louie Gold, Stuart Weston, Kristin Mullins, Kathleen M McPhaul, Matthew Frieman, Donald K Milton, Exhaled Breath Aerosol Shedding of Highly Transmissible Versus Prior Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 Variants, Clinical Infectious Diseases, 2022;, ciac846, https://doi.org/10.1093/cid/ciac846

[12] Diehl WE, Lin AE, Grubaugh ND, Carvalho LM, Kim K, Kyawe PP, McCauley SM, Donnard E, Kucukural A, McDonel P, Schaffner SF, Garber M, Rambaut A, Andersen KG, Sabeti PC,

Luban J. Ebola Virus Glycoprotein with Increased Infectivity Dominated the 2013-2016 Epidemic. Cell. 2016 Nov 3;167(4):1088-1098.e6. doi: 10.1016/j.cell.2016.10.014. PMID: 27814506; PMCID: PMC5115602.

[13] Liu, Y., Liu, J., Du, S. et al. Evolutionary enhancement of Zika virus infectivity in Aedes aegypti mosquitoes. Nature 545, 482–486 (2017). https://doi.org/10.1038/nature22365

[14] Yuan L, Huang XY, Liu ZY, Zhang F, Zhu XL, Yu JY, Ji X, Xu YP, Li G, Li C, Wang HJ, Deng YQ, Wu M, Cheng ML, Ye Q, Xie DY, Li XF, Wang X, Shi W, Hu B, Shi PY, Xu Z, Qin CF. A single mutation in the prM protein of Zika virus contributes to fetal microcephaly. Science. 2017 Nov 17;358(6365):933-936. doi: 10.1126/science.aam7120. Epub 2017 Sep 28. PMID: 28971967.

[17] Carlson CJ, Farrell MJ, Grange Z, Han BA, Mollentze N, Phelan AL, Rasmussen AL, Albery GF, Bett B, Brett-Major DM, Cohen LE, Dallas T, Eskew EA, Fagre AC, Forbes KM, Gibb R, Halabi S, Hammer CC, Katz R, Kindrachuk J, Muylaert RL, Nutter FB, Ogola J, Olival KJ, Rourke M, Ryan SJ, Ross N, Seifert SN, Sironen T, Standley CJ, Taylor K, Venter M, Webala PW. The future of zoonotic risk prediction. Philos Trans R Soc Lond B Biol Sci. 2021 Nov 8;376(1837):20200358. doi: 10.1098/rstb.2020.0358. Epub 2021 Sep 20. PMID: 34538140; PMCID: PMC8450624.

[18] Rebolledo-Mendez JD, Vaishnav RA, Cooper NG, Friedland RP. Cross-kingdom sequence similarities between human micro-RNAs and plant viruses. Commun Integr Biol. 2013 Sep 1;6(5):e24951. doi: 10.4161/cib.24951. Epub 2013 May 21. PMID: 24228136; PMCID: PMC3821693.

[19] Dongsheng Chen, Cong Tan, Peiwen Ding, Lihua Luo, Jiacheng Zhu, Xiaosen Jiang, Zhihua Ou, Xiangning Ding, Tianming Lan, Yixin Zhu, Yi Jia, Yanan Wei, Runchu Li, Qiuyu Qin, Chengcheng Sun, Wandong Zhao, Zhiyuan Lv, Haoyu Wang, Wendi Wu, Yuting Yuan, Mingyi Pu, Yuejiao Li, Yanan Zhang, Ashley Chang, Guoji Guo, Yong Bai, Xin Jin, Huan Liu, VThunter: a database for single-cell screening of virus target cells in the animal kingdom, Nucleic Acids Research, Volume 50, Issue D1, 7 January 2022, Pages D934–D942, https://doi.org/10.1093/nar/gkab894

[20] “Implementing Force Health Protection Measures on the Pentagon Reservation” https://www.whs.mil/COVID-19/

[21] William Haseltine, “Infection Through “Fleeting Contact” With The Delta Variant Leads To Lockdowns Across Australia” https://www.forbes.com/sites/williamhaseltine/2021/06/28/infection-through-fleeting-contact-with-the-delta-variant-leads-to-lockdowns-across-australia/amp/

[22] “Deputy Secretary of Defense Norquist and Vice Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff General Hyten Hold a Press Briefing at the Pentagon,” April 9, 2020

https://www.defense.gov/News/Transcripts/Transcript/Article/2145912/deputy-secretary-of-defense-norquist-and-vice-chairman-of-the-joint-chiefs-of-s/

[23] Bunyasi EW, Middelkoop K, Koch A, Hoosen Z, Mulenga H, Luabeya AKK, Shenje J, Mendelsohn SC, Tameris M, Scriba TJ, Warner DF, Wood R, Andrews JR, Hatherill M. Molecular Detection of Airborne Mycobacterium tuberculosis in South African High Schools. Am J Respir Crit Care Med. 2022 Feb 1;205(3):350-356. doi: 10.1164/rccm.202102-0405OC. PMID: 34752730; PMCID: PMC8886998.

[24] Sakai K, Yoshikawa T, Seki F, Fukushi S, Tahara M, Nagata N, Ami Y, Mizutani T, Kurane I, Yamaguchi R, Hasegawa H, Saijo M, Komase K, Morikawa S, Takeda M. Canine distemper virus associated with a lethal outbreak in monkeys can readily adapt to use human receptors. J Virol. 2013 Jun;87(12):7170-5. doi: 10.1128/JVI.03479-12. Epub 2013 Apr 17. PMID: 23596291; PMCID: PMC3676118.

[25] Bieringer M, Han JW, Kendl S, Khosravi M, Plattet P, Schneider-Schaulies J. Experimental adaptation of wild-type canine distemper virus (CDV) to the human entry receptor CD150. PLoS One. 2013;8(3):e57488. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0057488. Epub 2013 Mar 12. PMID: 23554862; PMCID: PMC3595274.

[26] Abdullah N, Kelly JT, Graham SC, Birch J, Gonçalves-Carneiro D, Mitchell T, Thompson RN, Lythgoe KA, Logan N, Hosie MJ, Bavro VN, Willett BJ, Heaton MP, Bailey D. Structure-Guided Identification of a Nonhuman Morbillivirus with Zoonotic Potential. J Virol. 2018 Nov 12;92(23):e01248-18. doi: 10.1128/JVI.01248-18. PMID: 30232185; PMCID: PMC6232486.

[27] *Li Y, Cheng P, Jia W. Poor ventilation worsens short-range airborne transmission of respiratory infection. Indoor Air. 2022 Jan;32(1):e12946.

[28] Pfizer Is Using AI to Discover Breakthrough Medicines.April 25, 2022. https://insights.pfizer.com/pfizer-is-using-ai-to-discover-breakthrough-medicines/

[29] LARA SELIGMAN and ERIN BANCO. New worldwide threats prompt Pentagon to overhaul chem-bio defenses. 01/09/2023. https://www.politico.com/news/2023/01/09/russia-china-chemical-biological-weapons-pentagon-00077035

[30] Indoor Air Quality, EPA. https://www.epa.gov/report-environment/indoor-air-quality

[31] “Controlled Mechanical Ventilation (CMV) works,” 25 March 2022. Hume Foundation https://www.fondazionehume.it/data-analysis/controlled-mechanical-ventilation-cmv-works/

[32] Buonanno G, Ricolfi L, Morawska L and Stabile L (2022) Increasing ventilation reduces SARS-CoV-2 airborne transmission in schools: A retrospective cohort study in Italy's Marche region. Front. Public Health 10:1087087. doi: 10.3389/fpubh.2022.1087087

[33] 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. Epub 2020 Oct 13. PMID: 32979298; PMCID: PMC7537089.

[34] Dowell D, Lindsley WG, Brooks JT. SARS-CoV-2 Reduction in Shared Indoor Air—Reply. JAMA. 2022;328(21):2163–2164. doi:10.1001/jama.2022.18031

[35] Srikrishna D, Karan A, Dhillon RS. SARS-CoV-2 Reduction in Shared Indoor Air. JAMA. 2022;328(21):2162. doi:10.1001/jama.2022.18028

[36] Travel by Air, Land & Sea, CDC, https://wwwnc.cdc.gov/travel/yellowbook/2020/travel-by-air-land-sea/air-travel

[37] 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.

[38] Hogarth F, Coffey P, Goddard L, Lewis S, Labib S, Wilmot M, Andersson P, Sherry N, Seemann T, Howden BP, Freeman K, Baird R, Hosegood I, McDermott K, Walsh N, Polkinghorne B, Marshall C, Davies J, Krause V, Meumann EM. Genomic Evidence of In-Flight SARS-CoV-2 Transmission, India to Australia, April 2021. Emerg Infect Dis. 2022 Jul;28(7):1527-1530. doi: 10.3201/eid2807.212466. Epub 2022 Apr 28. PMID: 35483111; PMCID: PMC9239893.

[39] Speake H, Phillips A, Chong T, et al. Flight-Associated Transmission of Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 Corroborated by Whole-Genome Sequencing. Emerging Infectious Diseases. 2020;26(12):2872-2880. doi:10.3201/eid2612.203910.

[40] 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.

[41] 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.

[42] 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.

[43] 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.

[44] Li Y, Cheng P, Jia W. Poor ventilation worsens short-range airborne transmission of respiratory infection. Indoor Air. 2022 Jan;32(1):e12946. doi: 10.1111/ina.12946. Epub 2021 Oct 27. PMID: 34704625; PMCID: PMC8652937.

[45] Hunziker P. Minimising exposure to respiratory droplets, 'jet riders' and aerosols in air-conditioned hospital rooms by a 'Shield-and-Sink' strategy. BMJ Open. 2021 Oct 12;11(10):e047772. doi: 10.1136/bmjopen-2020-047772. PMID: 34642190; PMCID: PMC8520596.

[46] Coyle JP, Derk RC, Lindsley WG, Blachere FM, Boots T, Lemons AR, Martin SB Jr, Mead KR, Fotta SA, Reynolds JS, McKinney WG, Sinsel EW, Beezhold DH, Noti JD. Efficacy of Ventilation, HEPA Air Cleaners, Universal Masking, and Physical Distancing for Reducing Exposure to Simulated Exhaled Aerosols in a Meeting Room. Viruses. 2021 Dec 17;13(12):2536. doi: 10.3390/v13122536. PMID: 34960804; PMCID: PMC8707272.

[47] Andrejko KL, Pry JM, Myers JF, et al. Effectiveness of Face Mask or Respirator Use in Indoor Public Settings for Prevention of SARS-CoV-2 Infection — California, February–December 2021. MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep 2022;71:212–216. DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.15585/mmwr.mm7106e1

[48] Dörr T, Haller S, Müller MF, et al. Risk of SARS-CoV-2 Acquisition in Health Care Workers According to Cumulative Patient Exposure and Preferred Mask Type. JAMA Netw Open. 2022;5(8):e2226816. doi:10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2022.26816

[49] Plana, D., Tian, E., Cramer, A.K. et al. Assessing the filtration efficiency and regulatory status of N95s and nontraditional filtering face-piece respirators available during the COVID-19 pandemic. BMC Infect Dis 21, 712 (2021). https://doi.org/10.1186/s12879-021-06008-8

[50] Maranhao B, Scott AW, Scott AR, Maeng J, Song Z, Baddigam R, King CR, McCormick M, Kangrga I, Guffey R. Probability of fit failure with reuse of N95 mask respirators. Br J Anaesth. 2020 Sep;125(3):e322-e324. doi: 10.1016/j.bja.2020.06.023. Epub 2020 Jun 26. PMID: 32682553; PMCID: PMC7318975.

[51] Chen H, Samet JM, Tong H, Abzhanova A, Rappold AG, Prince SE. Can disposable masks be worn more than once? Ecotoxicol Environ Saf. 2022 Sep 1;242:113908. doi: 10.1016/j.ecoenv.2022.113908. Epub 2022 Jul 21. PMID: 35872486; PMCID: PMC9301359.

[52] https://twitter.com/CathNoakes/status/1586299281752920064

[53] CDC, "Ventilation in Buildings" https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/community/ventilation.html

[54] EPA, "Air Cleaners, HVAC Filters, and Coronavirus (COVID-19)" https://www.epa.gov/coronavirus/air-cleaners-hvac-filters-and-coronavirus-covid-19

[55] "Clean Indoor Air Benefits Everyone", Erica Kimmerling, Steph Guerra, Georgia Lagoudas, Office of Science Technology and Policy. https://www.whitehouse.gov/ostp/news-updates/2022/12/08/clean-indoor-air-benefits-everyone/

[56] Alondra Nelson, White House, "Let's Clear The Air On COVID" https://www.whitehouse.gov/ostp/news-updates/2022/03/23/lets-clear-the-air-on-covid/

[57] COVID-19 and Improving Indoor Air Quality in Schools, February 10, 2022, California Department of Health https://www.cdph.ca.gov/Programs/CID/DCDC/Pages/COVID-19/COVID-19-and-Improving-Indoor-Air-Quality-in-Schools.aspx

[58] "UV Lights and Lamps: Ultraviolet-C Radiation, Disinfection, and Coronavirus" https://www.fda.gov/medical-devices/coronavirus-covid-19-and-medical-devices/uv-lights-and-lamps-ultraviolet-c-radiation-disinfection-and-coronavirus

[59] Model Evaluation of Secondary Chemistry due to Disinfection of Indoor Air with Germicidal Ultraviolet Lamps. Zhe Peng, Shelly L. Miller, and Jose L. Jimenez. Environmental Science & Technology Letters 2023 10 (1), 6-13. DOI: 10.1021/acs.estlett.2c00599

[60] Unwanted Indoor Air Quality Effects from Using Ultraviolet C Lamps for Disinfection. Frans Graeffe, Yuanyuan Luo, Yishuo Guo, and Mikael Ehn. Environmental Science & Technology Letters Article ASAP. DOI: 10.1021/acs.estlett.2c00807

[61] EPA. "Volatile Organic Compounds' Impact on Indoor Air Quality" https://www.epa.gov/indoor-air-quality-iaq/volatile-organic-compounds-impact-indoor-air-quality

[62] Abraar Karan, Devabhaktuni Srikrishna and Ranu Dhillon, "The Biden administration is wrong. Many N95 masks are comfortable — and they work." Washington Post, January 11, 2022. https://www.washingtonpost.com/outlook/2022/01/11/n95-masks-cdc-walensky/

[63] Srikrishna D. Can 10× cheaper, lower-efficiency particulate air filters and box fans complement High-Efficiency Particulate Air (HEPA) purifiers to help control the COVID-19 pandemic? Sci Total Environ. 2022 Sep 10;838(Pt 1):155884. doi: 10.1016/j.scitotenv.2022.155884. Epub 2022 May 14. PMID: 35580674; PMCID: PMC9107182.

[64] Derk RC, Coyle JP, Lindsley WG, Blachere FM, Lemons AR, Service SK, Martin SB Jr, Mead KR, Fotta SA, Reynolds JS, McKinney WG, Sinsel EW, Beezhold DH, Noti JD. Efficacy of Do-It-Yourself air filtration units in reducing exposure to simulated respiratory aerosols. Build Environ. 2023 Feb 1;229:109920. doi: 10.1016/j.buildenv.2022.109920. Epub 2022 Dec 18. PMID: 36569517; PMCID: PMC9759459.

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

[66] Maestre JP, Jennings W, Wylie D, Horner SD, Siegel J, Kinney KA. Filter forensics: microbiota recovery from residential HVAC filters. Microbiome. 2018 Jan 30;6(1):22. doi: 10.1186/s40168-018-0407-6. PMID: 29382378; PMCID: PMC5791358.

[67] Patient Knowhow. Supplementary Air Filtered Exchanges (SAFE). https://www.patientknowhow.com/safe.html

[68] The National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH). “NIOSH Sound Level Meter App” https://www.cdc.gov/niosh/topics/noise/app.html

[69] Holder AL, Halliday HS, Virtaranta L. Impact of do-it-yourself air cleaner design on the reduction of simulated wildfire smoke in a controlled chamber environment. Indoor Air. 2022 Nov;32(11):e13163. doi: 10.1111/ina.13163. PMID: 36437679; PMCID: PMC9828579.

[70] Herfst S, Schrauwen EJ, Linster M, Chutinimitkul S, de Wit E, Munster VJ, Sorrell EM, Bestebroer TM, Burke DF, Smith DJ, Rimmelzwaan GF, Osterhaus AD, Fouchier RA. Airborne transmission of influenza A/H5N1 virus between ferrets. Science. 2012 Jun 22;336(6088):1534-41. doi: 10.1126/science.1213362. PMID: 22723413; PMCID: PMC4810786.

[71] A. Athamna, M. Athamna, N. Abu-Rashed, B. Medlej, D. J. Bast, E. Rubinstein, Selection of Bacillus anthracis isolates resistant to antibiotics, Journal of Antimicrobial Chemotherapy, Volume 54, Issue 2, August 2004, Pages 424–428, https://doi.org/10.1093/jac/dkh258

[72] Garza AG, Van Cuyk SM, Brown MJ, Omberg KM. Detection of the urban release of a bacillus anthracis simulant by air sampling. Biosecur Bioterror. 2014 Mar-Apr;12(2):66-75. doi: 10.1089/bsp.2013.0086. Epub 2014 Apr 3. PMID: 24697146; PMCID: PMC3993016.

[73] Jessica Roles, 189th Airlift Wing, “Ultraviolet light system could mitigate COVID risk in schools” https://www.dvidshub.net/news/403795/ultraviolet-light-system-could-mitigate-covid-risk-schools