medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.08.09.22278555; this version posted October 31, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.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-ND 4.0 International license .

What ACH is equivalent to a passenger airplane inflight for protection from SARS-Cov-2 and other aerosol contaminants?

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

Abstract

Multiple authors observed superspreading aboard airplanes with high passenger density was less frequent than expected. This is possibly due to rapid air filtration on airplanes inflight reported by CDC as 20-30 air changes per hour (ACH). Filters may degrade over time with particle loading, but testing ACH typically involves generating aerosol contaminants (e.g. salt water, smoke, tracers) which may be unsafe or disallowed e.g. in occupied rooms or passenger aircraft. Herein we report the first verification, to our knowledge in the open literature, of ACH aboard commercial airliners while in flight by using a novel test procedure at the most penetrating particle size (MPPS) of 0.3 µm. Procedure uses handheld, 7-channel optical particle counter (HOPC) to track decay of ambient aerosols at MPPS, validated in a room and house. ACH of 0.6 was measured for surface deposition in an unventilated room, and 3 to 17 ACH with low-noise HEPA purifiers at high speed and Do-It-Yourself (DIY) purifiers at low speed (for reduced noise generation) consistent with their CADR based on volume of room and house. Aboard an Airbus A319, A321 and a Boeing 737-Max8/9, HOPC recorded (1) a burst of ambient aerosols when starting from rest on runway suggesting pollution from thrusting engines enters cabin (2) 11-12 ACH at MPPS after liftoff (3) transient aerosol fluctuations. Air filtration may not stop spread of SARS-Cov-2 at near-field (e.g. talking close by), but can potentially emulate far-field equivalent of N95 with 95% reduction of MPPS particles (20x) in a well-mixed room. Using 0.6 ACH baseline for unventilated rooms, at least 12 ACH at MPPS is required for far-field protection equivalent to N95 (95%). These results offer independent, experimentally-derived interpretations of 12 ACH recommended for airborne infection isolation rooms by CDC and WHO.

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.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/10.1101/2022.08.09.22278555; this version posted October 31, 2022. 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-ND 4.0 International license .

Introduction

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 [56]. Australia published three flights with superspreading [57] [58]. We expect approximately 10% of infected people to be super spreaders [59] 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 [60]. However, even prior to mandatory masking aboard aircraft there were relatively few published documented superspreading (mass-transmission) events [61]. Another possible explanation maybe reduced 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 [62]. If masking or mixing does not account for lower than expected superspreading on flights perhaps one explanation is air filtration which, according to CDC, jet aircraft built after the late 1980s recirculate cabin air through filters 20 to 30 times per hour, and through high-efficiency particulate air (HEPA) filters in most newer-model airplanes [63]. If so, this is consistent with an interventional study of over 300 classrooms with mechanical ventilation during the Delta and Omicron waves in which reduced classroom infection rates were observed to be increasing with ACH: 40% at 2.4 ACH, 67% at 4 ACH, 83% at 6 ACH [2] [3]. This classroom study is unique in combining region wide investment in higher levels of ventilation in a period when testing was conducted during SARS-CoV-2 waves, and these three rare conditions (advance regional investment, regular testing, and Covid waves) need to be replicated to verify these results. However due to filter loading or other degradation with use, ACH resulting from installed filtration systems may vary over time especially at the most penetrating particle size (MPPS) [69]. Further research is needed, but published evidence suggests there is risk that significant quantities of SARS-CoV-2 virus and viable virus maybe present in submicron aerosolized particles exhaled from people [65] [66] [67] [68] and if so filtration (ACH) is important to verify especially at or near the MPPS. Few publications exist on the actual rate of air filtration aboard aircraft inflight, and specifically at or near the MPPS, and many of them are based on measurements generating aerosol contaminants (e.g. salt water, smoke, tracers) [64] which may be unsafe or disallowed to verify the ACH operating in an aircraft during any flight with passengers.

Emulating N95 protection with air filtration (or ventilation) requires 95% reduction of particles at all distances from the airborne particulate source. Air filtration is predicted to reduce near-field exposure to exhaled aerosols to some extent [53] dependent on aerodynamic factors [54]. However, a CDC laboratory experiment confirmed [36] 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

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.08.09.22278555; this version posted October 31, 2022. 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-ND 4.0 International license .

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. Respirators may not always be used by everyone in many non-healthcare settings (e.g. schools, homes, offices). In such settings, both HEPA and lower-cost DIY air filtration can mitigate spread of SARS-Cov-2 [55] and other viruses indoors [30] [40] by reducing far-field exposures in a room or building [42] [43] that may lead to super spreading events [37]. Covid and other viruses/bacteria, carcinogenic wildfire particles, allergens (e.g. pollen, dust), pollution (e.g. diesel soot, wood-burning), etc. can be present in the indoor air we breathe, and air changes per hour (ACH) measures how quickly these harmful particulates are removed by air filtration (or ventilation). Two questions emerge: how much ACH is actually needed to reduce far-field exposures to the same degree as an N95 respirator, and are there simple procedures to measure/check ACH in occupied rooms?

How much ACH is actually needed to reduce far-field exposures to the same degree as an N95 respirator?

ACH is central to ventilation/filtration and is analogous to air pressure (PSI) in a car's tires. It's not good enough to say keep your tires inflated without a minimum PSI (pounds per square inch). In a car's tires, there is a big difference between 10 vs 20 vs 30 PSI. For example, top-heavy SUVs are more likely to roll over at 10 or 20 PSI than at 30 PSI. For hospitals, CDC specifies minimum ACH by type of room (e.g. airborne infection isolation room, surgery, etc.) in Table B.2 of [4]. Whereas CDC doesn't make such specific ACH recommendations in community settings (non-healthcare). For air filtration CDC recommends the so-called "⅔ rule" on their main page on ventilation [5] (updated June 2, 2021) which is mathematically equivalent to 5 ACH. Elsewhere on this page CDC alludes to 6 ACH and higher as having higher airflow rates. The viability of the aerosolized SARS-Cov-2 virus decays naturally at some rate even if inactivated virus still physically lingers in the air. To reduce infection risk with air cleaning, the ACH needs to 'outrun' this natural decay of viral viability indoors which can range from roughly an equivalent of less than one ACH to several ACH depending on ambient conditions of sunlight, humidity, temperature and so on [48] [49] [50].

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. Miller et. al. [37] 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 [37]. In experiments described below 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 study in 2017 found a cross section of recently constructed schools implemented approximately 2 ACH with HVAC on, and 0.2 ACH with HVAC off [38]. Whereas houses, offices, and other

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.08.09.22278555; this version posted October 31, 2022. 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-ND 4.0 International license .

structures with temperature-sensitive fan operation to conserve energy may result in ACH closer to the surface deposition approximation.

Retrospective analysis showed that use of KN95/N95 respirators by both community members [32] and in healthcare settings [51] 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 and more consistent at 98% than 81% for KN95 [33]. This 98% is reassuringly higher than the 95% filtration efficiency nominally required for N95, although N95 fit [34] and filtration efficiency (Figure 2 of [35]) 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).

How can ACH be measured or checked in occupied rooms or buildings?

The amount of filtration (or ventilation) that is required as a function of a chosen target ACH in a room is known as the clean air delivery rate (CADR). In case of air purifiers the number needed (predicted) can then be calculated from room volume and ACH in three steps:

Step 1: room vol. = length. x width x height (cf).

Step 2: CADR needed (cfm) = vol. x ACH needed / 60.

Step 3: # of purifiers = (CADR needed) / (CADR per purifier).

For a typical classroom (30'x30'x10') if ACH needed = 6, then CADR needed = 900 cfm. As a rule of thumb, 100 cfm per 1000 cf is needed to meet 6 ACH and double that for 12 ACH.

However, installing and running air filtration based on provisioning sufficient CADR to meet the desired ACH does not guarantee that the desired ACH level will be achieved. Many real-world factors can reduce ACH below the estimated levels including purifier design and aerodynamics, purifier placement, and other non-ideal effects such as leaks in the building allowing airborne pollutants to enter from outdoor air. It is therefore useful to check and verify the ACH actually achieved in a room or building by the air filtration system.

As a model, the University of San Diego transparently lists the ACH measured in each classroom [41]. Tracking the removal of an airborne contaminant as a function of time can be used to measure ACH with a standard procedure using aerosols generated from salt water [29], burning incense [31], or extreme aerosol concentrations present during wildfire smoke events [39]. For example, based on the formula provided by CDC, the time it takes to remove 90% of an airborne contaminant is 69 minutes at 2 ACH, 35 minutes at 4 ACH, 23 minutes at 6 ACH, and 12 minutes at 12 ACH [1]. Waiting for extreme events, or generating aerosols is

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.08.09.22278555; this version posted October 31, 2022. 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-ND 4.0 International license .

cumbersome and generally not possible in occupied rooms such as a classroom or home or aircraft inflight.

The novel procedure, described in detail below, to verify ACH indoors relies on ambient aerosols to measure ACH from surface deposition alone, with air filtration in a room and a whole house (multi-room), and on three flights (Airbus A319, A321 and Boeing 737-Max8/9). The procedure uses a handheld, 7-channel optical particle counter (HOPC) calibrated to meet ISO-2150 that can track decay of ambient aerosols at 0.3 μm channel, the MPPS for air filters at which the filtration efficiency (worst case) and expected to be higher at smaller or larger particle sizes. The procedure may be generalized to any indoor space which does not have very high amounts of outdoor air entering and for which the air filtration is capable of reducing the ambient aerosols inside once windows are closed (such as open windows or an extremely high rate of outside ventilation).

Safety notes

These safety notes are included here from [30] and are applicable here, “California Air Resource Board recommends never leaving box-fan air filters unattended while turned on, and to use box fans manufactured after 2012 and are clearly identified with the UL or ETL safety markings because it is likely they have a fused plug to prevent electrical fires e.g. if the device is inadvertently knocked over [45]. 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 [46]. In detail, in addition to assessing DIY fans with clean MERV 13 filters, 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. 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.”

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.08.09.22278555; this version posted October 31, 2022. 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-ND 4.0 International license .

Methods

Procedure

To measure the ACH of air filtration (HEPA or DIY) in an indoor space such as a room or a whole house, 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 ambient aerosol concentration

At each point in time, the aerosol concentrations (count per liter) for 0.3 μm particle size were measured using a handheld optical particle counter (HOPC) called the Temtop Particle Counter PMD 331 calibrated to meet ISO-2150. In case of house or home, each measurement was conducted in the center of the room or house for 30 seconds. In the case of the Airbus 319, measurement was conducted at a seat near the rear of the aircraft.

Measurement of noise generated by air purifiers

Noise was measured for each air purifier/filter using an iPhone app [44] maintained by The National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH) at a 9″ distance perpendicular to the direction of the output airflow.

Measurement of maximum airspeed of air purifiers

For each HEPA-purifier or DIY box fan filter, the airspeed was measured using an anemometer (BTMETER BT-100 Handheld Anemometer available) held at the output perpendicular to the airflow. The maximum three or more airspeed measurements (feet per minute) in different locations at the fan output was used.

Air purifiers and their placement

Air purifiers of different types were placed inside a single room or entire house for each test of ACH. The purifiers were DIY (box fan and filter) and commercial HEPA as described in detail in [30]. Step by step instructions to make the DIY air purifiers are in [40] which includes an aluminum screen for child safety that is expected to reduce CADR slightly by approximately 10%. DIY air purifiers were run on lowest speed #1 and HEPA were run on maximum (#3 or #4) unless otherwise noted. Estimated costs and noise generated are shown in brackets.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.08.09.22278555; this version posted October 31, 2022. 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-ND 4.0 International license .

The room is estimated to be 2961 cubic feet with different air purifiers placed in the same locations, doors closed, windows closed, HVAC turned off.

- **Surface ($0, 38 dBA, 0 lbs):** No air filtration or HVAC ventilation with windows closed (to measure surface deposition)
- **Coway Airmega 400 ($494, 63 dBA, 25 lbs):** A HEPA Coway Airmega 400 at speed #3
- **Coway AP-1216L ($179, 65 dBA, 13 lbs): A HEPA Coway AP-1216L at speed #3**
- **Smart Health ($999, 53 dBA, 69 lbs):** One HEPA Smart Health Blast at maximum speed
- **Levoit ($299, 66 dBA, 14 lbs):** A HEPA Levoit Core 600s at maximum speed (#4)
- **Honeywell ($129, 62 dBA, 14 lbs):** A HEPA Honeywell HPA5100B at maximum speed (Turbo)
- **Taotronics ($79, 57 dBA, 13 lbs):** A HEPA Taotronics TT-AP003 at maximum speed (#3)
- **Lasko ($69, 55 dBA, 11 lbs):** A Lasko Air Flex air purifier -- box fan with integrated MERV 10 filter at lowest speed (1)
- **One Lennox ($160, 58 dBA, 10 lbs):** A 1-filter DIY 5” Lennox MERV 16 at lowest speed (#1)
- **Two Lennox ($320, 61 dBA = 3dB + 58 dBA, 20 lbs):** Two 1-filter DIY 5” Lennox MERV 16 at lowest speed (#1)
- **3M ($70, 58 dBA, 8 lbs):** A 1-filter DIY 1” 3M Filtrete MERV 14 at lowest speed (#1)
- **Nordic Pure ($55, 58 dBA, 8 lbs):** A 1-filter DIY 2” Nordic Pure MERV 13 at lowest speed (#1)
- **Nordic Pure ($100, 57 dBA, 8 lbs):** A 4-filter DIY 2” Nordic Pure MERV 13 (Corsi-Rosenthal box) at lowest speed (#1)

The three story house is estimated to be 17,800 cubic feet. For comparison purposes, the different air purifiers were placed in the same locations in different interconnected rooms, inside doors open, windows and outside doors closed, HVAC turned off.

- **Coway at speed 3 (63 dBA), 2 (55 dBA), 1 ($39 dBA):** Nine HEPA Coway Airmega 400 and one Coway AP-1512 where fan speed is varied 3 to 2 to 1
- **Lennox (58 dBA):** Ten DIY 5” Lennox MERV 16 at lowest speed (#1)
- **3M (58 dBA):** Ten DIY 1” 3M Filtrete MERV 14 at lowest speed (#1)
- **Nordic Pure (58 dBA):** Ten DIY 2” Nordic Pure MERV 13 at lowest speed (#1)

Model for 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 [37] 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) is the same, but in contrast to the rising solution that asymptotically approaches $C = E/\lambda V$ given in [37], 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:

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

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.08.09.22278555; this version posted October 31, 2022. 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-ND 4.0 International license .

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.

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 1 shows the best fit (2.7% average percent error) for surface deposition in the room with windows closed and without any filtration or HVAC enabled with 0.6 ACH and leak equal to 4900 particles per liter per hour. Figure 2 shows a plot 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 1: Example of best fit with 0.6 ACH the rate of surface deposition in Room



Figure 2: Example of best fit with 7.7 ACH for Coway Airmega 400 in Room

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.08.09.22278555; this version posted October 31, 2022. 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-ND 4.0 International license .

Results

The ACH measured for each purifier in the room is shown in Figure 3, and for those tested with the purifiers in the whole house in Figure 4.

Figure 3: ACH measured for each purifier in single room



medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.08.09.22278555; this version posted October 31, 2022. 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-ND 4.0 International license .

Figure 4: ACH measured for 10 purifiers in whole house



Each of the ACH estimates and their percent error is listed in Table 1 below.

Table 1: Estimated ACH and leak with percent error

Purifier	ACH (per hour)	Percent Error	Leak (particles / L / hour)
Surface (Room)	0.6	2.70%	4900
3M	4.3	2.90%	11000
3M (10x in House)	6.2	10.10%	4100
Coway @ speed 1 (10x in House)	5.4	9.40%	4600
Coway @ speed 2 (10x in House)	9.5	8.50%	2500
Coway Airmega 400 @ speed 3	7.7	4.30%	4700
Coway @ speed 3 (10x in House)	15	10.90%	2100
Honeywell	3.5	3.70%	12900
Coway AP-1216L (speed 3)	4.6	5.70%	300
Taotronics TT-AP003	4.8	6.17%	30300

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.08.09.22278555; this version posted October 31, 2022. 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-ND 4.0 International license .

Lasko	3.3	2.10%	21700
Lennox	6.7	2.80%	11500
Lennox (10x in House)	8.7	5.60%	5800
Lennox (2x in Room)	11.1	7.80%	2900
Levoit @ speed 4	8.5	6.90%	2300
Nordic Pure	4	2.70%	6500
Nordic Pure (10x in House)	5.4	6.20%	1400
Nordic Pure 4-filter	6.3	3.70%	9800
Smart Health @ speed max	16.8	9.40%	10100

The clean air delivery rate of each purifier may be estimated based on measured ACH and estimates of the volume of the room and house (CADR = Volume x ACH / 60 / # of purifiers) as shown in Figure 5 which is compared to the cost of each purifier.

Figure 5: ACH-derived estimate of CADR (cfm) and Cost per purifier



medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.08.09.22278555; this version posted October 31, 2022. 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-ND 4.0 International license .

For each purifier, ACH-derived CADR and cost are compared to other relevant metrics in Table 2: cost-efficiency (CADR per $100), noise generated (dBA), weight (lbs), and volume (cubic feet).

Table 2: ACH-derived CADR, Cost, Cost-efficiency, Noise generated, Weight, Volume

Purifier	ACH-Derived CADR (cfm) @ 0.3 µm	Cost	CADR (cfm) per $100	Cost of 900 cfm	Noise generated (dBA)	Weight (lbs)
Nordic Pure	197.4	$55	358.91	250.7598784	58	8.00
Nordic Pure 4-filter	310.905	$100	310.91	289.4774931	57	8.00
3M	212.205	$70	303.15	296.8827313	58	8.00
Nordic Pure (10x in House)	160.38	$55	291.60	308.6419753	58	8.00
3M (10x in House)	184.14	$70	263.06	342.1309873	58	8.00
Lasko	162.855	$69	236.02	381.3208069	55	11.00
Lennox	330.645	$160	206.65	435.5124076	58	10.00
Lennox (2x in Room)	273.8925	$160	171.18	525.7537172	58	10.00
Lennox (10x in House)	258.39	$160	161.49	557.297109	58	10.00
Levoit @ speed 4	419.475	$299	140.29	641.5161809	66	14.00
Honeywell	172.725	$129	133.90	672.166739	62	14.00
Coway AP-1216L (speed 3)	227.01	$179	126.82	709.6672449	65	13.2
Coway @ speed 3 (10x in House)	445.5	$494	90.18	997.979798	63	25.00
Smart Health @ speed max	829.08	$999	82.99	1084.455059	53	69
Coway Airmega 400 @ speed 3	379.995	$494	76.92	1170.015395	63	25.00
Coway @ speed 2 (10x in House)	282.15	$494	57.12	1575.757576	55	25.00

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.08.09.22278555; this version posted October 31, 2022. 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-ND 4.0 International license .

Coway @ speed 1 (10x in House)	160.38	$494	32.47	2772.166105	39	25.00
Taotronics TT-AP003	236	$79	299	301.0033445	58	13

Figure 6 shows the percent difference between ACH-derived CADR and the expected CADR reported by the manufacturer of HEPA purifiers and derived from airflow/efficiency measurements for DIY purifiers in [30]. Figure 6 also compares this percent difference to the maximum airspeed (ft/min) measured at the output of each purifier.

Figure 6: Percent difference between expected CADR and ACH-derived CADR compared to maximum airspeed for each purifier



The timeline of aerosol particle counts aboard the Airbus A319, Airbus 321, and Boeing 737-Max8/9 as measured by the HOPC (at the MPPS of 0.3 µm) is shown in Figure 7. The timeline can be broken down before and after takeoff with a large increase in aerosol concentration observed at the time the thrust on the jet engines was increased at take off on both Airbus flights, but no such increase on the Boeing. Several large transient aerosol fluctuations can also be seen, and the best fit for ACH was determined after the last instance of such large fluctuations.

- **Airbus A319:** Prior to takeoff the aerosol concentration averaging 3124 particles per liter (6 measurements) was higher than during most of the flight 1458 (61 measurements),

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.08.09.22278555; this version posted October 31, 2022. 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-ND 4.0 International license .

but lower than on the jet bridge averaging 16237 (2 measurements) and 12982 (4 measurements) standing in line at the gate. The pilot confirmed the Auxiliary Power Unit was enabled during boarding prior to take off.

- **Airbus A321:** Prior to takeoff the aerosol concentration averaging 2181 particles per liter (24 measurements) was higher than during most of the flight 1310 (44 measurements), but lower than on the jet bridge averaging 6545 (2 measurements) and 11019 (5 measurements) standing in line at the gate. The pilot confirmed the Auxiliary Power Unit was enabled during boarding prior to take off.
- **Boeing 737-Max8/9:** Prior to takeoff the aerosol concentration averaging 1994 particles per liter (16 measurements) was higher than during most of the flight 692 (32 measurements), but lower than on the jet bridge averaging 5097 (1 measurements) and 6606 (5 measurements) sitting at the gate. The pilot was not available to confirm if the Auxiliary Power Unit was enabled during boarding prior to take off.



medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.08.09.22278555; this version posted October 31, 2022. 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-ND 4.0 International license .



Figure 7: Particle concentration aboard the Airbus A319, Airbus 321, and Boeing 737-Max8/9 during before and after takeoff

Figure 8 shows the aerosol particle counts by the HOPC at MPPS (0.3 µm) after take-off for the three airplanes. Since the airplane is an uncontrolled environment several transient aerosol fluctuations can also be observed.

- **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).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.08.09.22278555; this version posted October 31, 2022. 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-ND 4.0 International license .

- **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).







medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.08.09.22278555; this version posted October 31, 2022. 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-ND 4.0 International license .

Figure 8: Best fit after takeoff aboard the Airbus A319, Airbus A321, and Boeing 737-Max8/9

Limitations

These are included here from [30]. “Although SARS-Cov-2 is extremely small (approximately 100 nm in diameter [47], it may be exhaled in respiratory aerosols and droplets that are much larger (several hundreds of nanometers to several microns). The research on which are the most common COVID transmission modes (aerosol, droplet, or surfaces), and what is the most common aerosol particle sizes by which it is transmitted continues to evolve as new variants emerge. One potential limitation is in extrapolating results from the ambient test aerosols used in this study to real-world applications for removal aerosols relevant to SARS-Cov-2. Filtration efficiency and CADR results from DIY air cleaners highlight potential performance differences between filters made by different manufacturers of comparably rated MERV 13, 14, and 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 a well-understood operational history.” Also see limitations of the optical particle counter in the Limitations section of [30].

Discussion

The measurement of approximately 11 to 12 ACH (rounded) in Figures 7 and 8 aboard the Airbus A319, A321, and Boeing 737-Max8/9 was uniquely enabled by the handheld aspect of the 7-channel optical particle counter (HOPC) at MPPS of 0.3 μm, and is the first ACH measurement in flight reported in the open literature to our knowledge. The novel procedure is able to overcome the need to generate aerosols or tracers aboard the aircraft while in flight by leveraging ambient aerosols at MPPS. The novel technique also reveals transient aerosol fluctuations, including potential pollution introduced into the cabin from the jet engines thrusting during takeoff when the airplane is starting from rest on the runway. The 11-12 ACH at MPPS revealed by the rate of exponential decay of ambient aerosols on the Airbus A319, A321, and Boeing 737-Max8/9 was well below the 20-30 ACH range referenced by CDC and others, but still effective in clearing aerosols in the cabin down to low levels (to below 1000 particles per liter) within 20 minutes of takeoff.

The experimental results summarized in Figures 3 and 4 demonstrate that ACH at MPPS with or without air filtration can be measured (checked) in both a single room and a whole building, respectively, by tracking the rate of decay of ambient aerosols present inside. Adding two identical Lennox purifiers in the room nearly doubled the ACH to 11 from 6.7 compared to one Lennox purifier as seen in Figure 3. The different fan speeds of the Coway purifiers (1,2,3) in the house are reflected in the ratio of approximately 1:2:3 (5.4 to 9.5 to 15) as seen in Figure 4.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.08.09.22278555; this version posted October 31, 2022. 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-ND 4.0 International license .

As shown in Figure 5, the effective CADR and cost for each purifier can also be estimated based on measured ACH and estimates of the volume of the room and house.

For each of the DIY purifiers, the ACH-derived CADR averaged across 10 units in the house was slightly lower than that measured with a single unit in the room (-22% for Lennox, -13% for 3M, -19% for Nordic Pure), whereas it was the higher for the Coway HEPA purifiers (+17%). In all cases the differences were within 25%, but these the differences may reflect differences in placement and orientation of the purifiers within each room of the house.

The ACH-derived CADR (at MPPS) for DIY air purifiers and for one of the HEPA purifiers was lower than that expected from airflow/efficiency measurements in [30] in case of DIY and those reported by that manufacturer in case of HEPA, but it was also significantly higher for the remaining HEPA purifiers. One possible explanation may be the maximum airspeed (not airflow) measured at the output of each of the purifiers as shown in Figure 6. The purifiers with higher airspeed may contribute to higher rates of mixing within the room resulting in higher rate of air cleaning and observed CADR, and conversely lower airspeed may contribute to lower mixing resulting in some degree of recirculation of clean air nearby the purifier back into its input. This points to a possible way to improve DIY air purifier design is to enhance the airspeed in order to promote better mixing.

Table 2 compares the CADR (cfm) per $100 and noise generated for each of the purifiers which varies by a factor of over 4x among the HEPA and DIY air purifiers. Although a HEPA purifier produced the highest CADR and least noise, the highest CADR per $100 was for a DIY air purifier at a lower noise level, weight, and volume than many of the tested HEPA purifiers. Consistent with CADR estimates based on airflow/efficiency in [30], the ACH-derived CADR for the four-filter DIY purifier (Nordic Pure) known as the Corsi-Rosenthal box (311 cfm) was approximately 50% more than the single-filter version (197 cfm). With few exceptions, HEPA purifiers that are bulky or heavy can be hard to bring to hotel rooms or for temporary use in large gatherings. Portable (< 10 lbs, 1-3 cubic feet) and easy-to-assemble DIY air cleaning can come in handy for these purposes.

ASHRAE minimum outdoor air rates set forth in 62.1-2019 for non-healthcare facilities are meant for removal of common indoor contaminants but may not be sufficient to achieve a desired level of infection risk reduction [6]. For a typical classroom (30'x30'x10'), 62.1-2019 says add per-person minimum (25 x 10 = 250 cfm) to per-area minimum (900 sf x 0.12 = 108 cfm) which equals 358 cfm or 2.4 ACH. To achieve suitable risk reduction for infection control, the ASHRAE Epidemics Task force suggests additional steps most likely needed but ASHRAE does not appear to make minimum recommendations for these steps [7]. Although a 2020 version of this same document recommended a 2 ACH minimum ("2 rotations/hour") which was linked to in April, 2022 by Michigan.

As shown in the map below, at least 19 states across the US have independently issued their own ACH guidelines or linked to recommendations from CDC or ASHRAE noted above.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.08.09.22278555; this version posted October 31, 2022. 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-ND 4.0 International license .

Although the laws of physics/chemistry/biology are the same in 50 states, there a wide range of ACH recommendations ranging from 2 to 12.

Figure 9: ACH levels recommended for air filtration in 19 states across the USA



- California recommends 6-12 ACH for schools [10], and only recommends 4-6 ACH for other poorly ventilated indoor spaces [11]
- Hawaii refers to CDC (5 ACH) [12]
- Illinois refers to CDC (5 ACH) [13]
- Kentucky recommended 6 ACH for schools, "All day: Program system to run terminal unit fans (classroom unit fans) continuously (don't cycle them on and off) to provide more than six air changes per hour of MERV-13 filtered air." [14]
- Maryland recommended "~3-5 per hour" or 3-5 ACH for schools [15]
- Michigan refers to ASHRAE (2020) for schools (2 ACH based on 2020 guidance) [9]
- Minnesota refers to CDC (5 ACH) [16]
- Missouri (St. Louis) recommended 6 ACH [17]
- Montana refers to ASHRAE for schools (2 ACH based on 2020 guidance) [18]
- New Jersey refers to CDC (5 ACH) [19]
- New Hampshire refers to CDC (5 ACH) [20]
- New York refers to CDC (5 ACH) for schools [21]
- Oregon recommends 3-6 ACH [22]
- Rhode Island recommends 4-6 ACH [23]
- Tennessee recommends 6 ACH [24]
- Virginia recommends 4-6 ACH for schools [25]

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.08.09.22278555; this version posted October 31, 2022. 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-ND 4.0 International license .

- Vermont recommends 6 ACH for schools [26]
- Washington recommends 5-6 ACH [27]
- Wisconsin refers to CDC (5 ACH) [28]

In conclusion, the results of this study demonstrate that the wide range of 5 to 12 ACH as recommended by federal and state public health agencies (CDC, CDPH, etc.) and 12 ACH implemented on airplanes is achievable with one or more HEPA / DIY air purifiers in each room in a building. The level of ACH can be checked or verified using ambient aerosols. However, based on the measurement of 0.6 ACH for surface deposition, at least 12 ACH if not more would be required to reduce far-field exposures and emulate protection of N95 respirators (95%) with higher ACH for greater margins of safety. At least 3 ACH would be needed to emulate the protection from a typical KN95. Independently, CDC [4] and WHO [52] recommend 12 ACH for airborne infection isolation rooms (AIIR). These experimental results in a room, home, and airplane offer an interpretation for the 12 ACH recommendations in that they provide 95% reduction in aerosol concentrations relative to an unventilated room, comparable to an N95 for far-field exposures.

Declaration of interests

I am not associated with any of the manufacturers mentioned in this research.

References

[1] https://www.cdc.gov/infectioncontrol/guidelines/environmental/appendix/air.html

[2] https://www.fondazionehume.it/data-analysis/controlled-mechanical-ventilation-cmv-works/

[3] https://arxiv.org/abs/2207.02678

[4] https://www.cdc.gov/infectioncontrol/guidelines/environmental/appendix/air.html

[5] https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/community/ventilation.html

[6] https://www.ashrae.org/file%20library/technical%20resources/covid-19/may2021_18-21_ieq_bahnfleth.pdf

[7] https://www.ashrae.org/file%20library/technical%20resources/covid-19/ashrae-reopening-schools-and-universities-c19-guidance.pdf

[8] https://images.magnetmail.net/images/clients/ASHRAE/attach/ashrae_reopening_schools_and_universities_c19_guidance.pdf

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.08.09.22278555; this version posted October 31, 2022. 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-ND 4.0 International license .

[9] https://www.michigan.gov/coronavirus/-/media/Project/Websites/coronavirus/k12-Schools/COVID-19-Guidance-for-Operating-Schools-Safely---April-2022.pdf

[10] https://www.cdph.ca.gov/Programs/CCDPHP/DEODC/EHLB/IAQ/CDPH%20Document%20Library/School_ventilation_and_filtration_ADA.pdf

[11] https://www.cdph.ca.gov/Programs/CID/DCDC/Pages/COVID-19/Interim-Guidance-for-Ventilation-Filtration-and-Air-Quality-in-Indoor-Environments.aspx

[12] https://health.hawaii.gov/coronavirusdisease2019/files/2021/08/COVID-19-Guidance-for-Schools.pdf

[13] https://dph.illinois.gov/covid19/community-guidance/ventilation-filtration-air-cleaning.html

[14] https://education.ky.gov/comm/Documents/Ventilation%20Final.pdf

[15] https://health.maryland.gov/phpa/Documents/COVID-19%20TA%20for%20Schools_8.19.21%20v2.pdf

[16] https://www.health.state.mn.us/diseases/coronavirus/indoorair.html

[17] https://www.stlouis-mo.gov/government/departments/health/communicable-disease/covid-19/guidance/upload/Ventilation-Guidance-1-7-2022.pdf

[18] https://dphhs.mt.gov/assets/publichealth/Asthma/COVID-19/HEPAAirPurifiersSchoolsCOVID19.pdf

[19] https://www.state.nj.us/health/ceohs/documents/ceohs%20content/NJDOH_Ventilation_Indoor_Spaces.pdf

[20] https://www.covid19.nh.gov/sites/g/files/ehbemt481/files/inline-images/universal-best-practices.pdf

[21] http://www.nysed.gov/common/nysed/files/programs/back-school/nysed-health-and-safety-guide-for-the-2021-2022-school-year.pdf

[22] https://sharedsystems.dhsoha.state.or.us/DHSForms/Served/le3725_R.pdf

[23] https://covid.ri.gov/covid-19-prevention/indoor-air-circulation

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.08.09.22278555; this version posted October 31, 2022. 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-ND 4.0 International license .

[24] https://www.tn.gov/content/dam/tn/health/documents/healthy-places/healthy-schools/HSW_School_IAQ_Fact_Sheets_Compiled.pdf

[25] https://www.apsva.us/maintenance/return-to-school-classroom-capacity/

[26] https://education.vermont.gov/sites/aoe/files/documents/edu-health-and-safety-faq-8-hvac.pdf

[27] https://doh.wa.gov/sites/default/files/legacy/Documents/1600/coronavirus/VentilationGuidance.pdf

[28] https://www.dhs.wisconsin.gov/covid-19/employers.htm

[29] https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2590088921000597

[30] https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0048969722029813

[31] https://www.nytimes.com/wirecutter/reviews/best-air-purifier/

[32] https://www.cdc.gov/mmwr/volumes/71/wr/mm7106e1.htm

[33] https://bmcinfectdis.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s12879-021-06008-8/tables/2

[34] https://www.bjanaesthesia.org/article/S0007-0912(20)30480-3/fulltext

[35] https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC9301359/

[36] https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC8707272/

[37] https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/ina.12751

[38] https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/28370427/

[39] https://aaqr.org/articles/aaqr-21-03-tn-0046

[40] https://www.patientknowhow.com/safe.html

[41] https://www.sandiego.edu/onward/classroom-air-quality.php

[42] https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC8798678/

[43] https://wwwnc.cdc.gov/eid/article/26/7/20-0764_article

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.08.09.22278555; this version posted October 31, 2022. 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-ND 4.0 International license .

[44] https://www.cdc.gov/niosh/topics/noise/app.html

[45] https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/protecting-yourself-wildfire-smoke

[46] https://chemicalinsights.org/wp-content/uploads/DIY-Box-Fan-Report-2021.pdf

[47] https://elifesciences.org/articles/57309

[48] https://www.nejm.org/doi/full/10.1056/NEJMc2004973

[49] https://academic.oup.com/jid/article/222/4/564/5856149

[50] https://www.pnas.org/doi/10.1073/pnas.2200109119

[51] https://jamanetwork.com/journals/jamanetworkopen/fullarticle/2795150

[52] https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK143268/

[53] https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC8652937/

[54] https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC8520596/

[55] https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC7536125/

[56] https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC7920679/

[57] https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC9239893/

[58] https://wwwnc.cdc.gov/eid/article/26/12/20-3910_article/

[59] https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC8328407/

[60] https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC7454758/

[61] https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC8379567/

[62] https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC5889623/

[63] https://wwwnc.cdc.gov/travel/yellowbook/2020/travel-by-air-land-sea/air-travel

[64] https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC8635387/

[65] https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC8372686/

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.08.09.22278555; this version posted October 31, 2022. 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-ND 4.0 International license .

[66] https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC8401278/

[67] https://www.ijidonline.com/article/S1201-9712(21)00375-1/fulltext

[68] https://www.nature.com/articles/s41586-020-2271-3

[69] https://www.epa.gov/indoor-air-quality-iaq/what-hepa-filter

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.08.09.22278555; this version posted October 31, 2022. 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-ND 4.0 International license .

Supplementary Material

Best fit for ten Lennox in House



Best fit for ten 3M in House



Best fit for ten Nordic Pure in House



medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.08.09.22278555; this version posted October 31, 2022. 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-ND 4.0 International license .

Best fit for ten Coway (speed #3) in House



Best fit for ten Coway (speed #2) in House



Best fit for ten Coway (speed #1) in House



medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.08.09.22278555; this version posted October 31, 2022. 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-ND 4.0 International license .

Best fit for one Lennox in Room



Best fit for two Lennox in Room



Best fit for one Nordic Pure in Room



medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.08.09.22278555; this version posted October 31, 2022. 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-ND 4.0 International license .

Best fit for one 4-filter Nordic Pure (Corsi-Rosenthal Box) in Room



Best fit for one Coway in Room



Best fit for one Smart Health Blast in Room



medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.08.09.22278555; this version posted October 31, 2022. 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-ND 4.0 International license .

Best fit for one Levoit in Room



Best fit for one Lasko in Room



Best fit with one Honeywell in Room