medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.08.23.22279118; this version posted August 24, 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 The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.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 4.0 International license .

# Air filtration mitigates aerosol levels both during and after OGD procedures

Frank Phillips, Jane Crowley, Samantha Warburton, Adolfo Parra-Blanco and George S.D. Gordon

1. **Frank Phillips,** frankmphillips@hotmail.com
   Consultant Gastroenterologist, NIHR Nottingham Biomedical Research Centre, Nottingham University Hospitals NHS Trust and the University of Nottingham, Nottingham, UK orcid.org/0000-0002-1671-2390
   *Contribution: study concept and design, acquisition of data, drafting of manuscript, critical revision of manuscript.*
2. **Jane Crowley,** Jane.Crowley@nottingham.ac.uk
   Research Fellow, Faculty of Engineering, University of Nottingham, Nottingham, UK
   *Contribution: collected and curated data.*
3. **Samantha Warburton,** Samantha.Warburton@nuh.nhs.uk
   Research Nurse, NIHR Nottingham Biomedical Research Centre, Nottingham University Hospitals NHS Trust and the University of Nottingham, Nottingham, UK
   *Contribution: collected and curated data.*
4. **Karren Staniforth**, Karren.Staniforth@nuh.nhs.uk
   Healthcare Scientist Infection Prevention & Control, Nottingham University Hospitals NHS Trust, Nottingham, UK
   *Contribution: study design, collected data*
5. **Adolfo Parra-Blanco**,* Adolfo.Parra-Blanco@nottingham.ac.uk
   Consultant Gastroenterologist, NIHR Nottingham Biomedical Research Centre, Nottingham University Hospitals NHS Trust and the University of Nottingham, Nottingham, UK orcid.org/0000-0003-2396-0226
   *Contribution: study concept and design, obtained funding, acquisition of data, critical revision of manuscript, study supervision.*
6. **George S.D. Gordon**,* George.Gordon@nottingham.ac.uk
   Associate Professor, Faculty of Engineering, University of Nottingham, Nottingham, UK orcid.org/0000-0002-7333-5106
   *Contribution: study concept and design, statistical analysis, drafting of manuscript, critical revision of manuscript, study supervision.*
   **Corresponding authors: George.Gordon@nottingham.ac.uk* and *Adolfo.Parra-Blanco@nottingham.ac.uk*

**FUNDING**
The authors also thank Nottingham University Hospitals NHS Trust for funding the rental of the N60 spray characteriser and rental of a particle counter, Norgine Pharmaceuticals for sponsoring the purchase of a particle counter, and Olympus Medical UK for providing the endoscopes for transnasal endoscopy. GSDG would like to acknowledge a UKRI Future Leaders Fellowship (MR/T041951/1).

**DATA AVAILABILITY STATEMENT**
Data associated with this publication is available at http://dx.doi.org/10.17639/nott.7112 Code used for data analysis in this publication can be found at https://github.com/gsdgordon/aerosols

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

**CONFLICTS OF INTERESTS**
None declared.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.08.23.22279118; this version posted August 24, 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 4.0 International license .

***Abstract:***

**Objectives:** Upper GI endoscopies are aerosol generating procedures (AGPs), increasing risk of spreading airborne pathogens. We aim to quantify mitigation of airborne particles via improved ventilation, specifically laminar flow theatres and portable HEPA filters, during and after upper GI endoscopies.

**Methods:** This observational study included patients undergoing routine oral gastroscopy in a standard endoscopy room with 15-17 air changes per hour, a standard endoscopy room with portable HEPA filtration unit, and a laminar flow theatre with 300 air changes per hour. A particle counter (diameter range 0.3µm-25µm) took measurements 10cm from the mouth. Three analyses were performed: whole procedure particle counts, event-based counts and air clearance estimation using post-procedure counts.

**Results:** Compared to a standard endoscopy room, for whole procedures we observe a 28.5x reduction in particle counts in laminar flow ($p<0.001$) but no significant effect of HEPA filtration($p=0.50$). For event analysis we observe for lateral flow theatres reduction in particles >5µm for oral extubation (12.2x,$p<0.01$), reduction in particles <5µm for coughing/gagging (6.9x ,$p<0.05$) and reduction for all sizes in anaesthetic throat spray (8.4x,$p<0.01$) but no significant effect of HEPA filtration. However, we find that in the fallow period between procedures HEPA filtration reduces particle clearance times by 40%.

**Conclusions:** Laminar flow theatres are highly effective at dispersing aerosols immediately after production and should be considered for high-risk cases where patients are actively infectious or supply of PPE is limited. Portable HEPA filers can safely reduce fallow time between procedures by 40%.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.08.23.22279118; this version posted August 24, 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 4.0 International license .

## Introduction

Prior to the COVID-19 pandemic, gastrointestinal endoscopy was not considered an Aerosol Generating Procedure (AGP). However, it has now been proven that upper and lower endoscopic procedures can generate aerosols, although their infectivity by SARS-Cov-2 remains unclear, especially for lower GI endoscopy (1,2). Recommendations for ventilation requirements vary widely: newly designed endoscopy rooms in the UK require at least 10 air changes per hour (ACH), and negative pressure (3). Operating theatres with laminar air flow are widely used as means of limiting airborne transmission of pathogens and contaminants (4): for example, they have been shown to reduce aerosol concentration by factors of 100 or more in arthroplasty (5). Laminar flow theatres are therefore a promising approach to mitigate aerosols during digestive endoscopy. Gregson et al. measured particle counts during upper digestive endoscopy in an operating theatre with laminar flow but during measurements the ventilation was set to 'standby', reducing the ACH from 500-600 to 25 (6). Previous work has shown that reducing ACH to 25 does not significantly reduce particles measured from volitional coughing, but reducing ACH to zero dramatically increases particles (7). However, no comparison has been performed with ventilation conditions in typical endoscopy rooms without laminar flow and with ACH typically lower than a laminar flow theatre on standby, nor have typical events encountered in endoscopy (involuntary gagging, extubation, throatspray). The mitigating effect of fully operative laminar flow on aerosol levels during digestive endoscopy compared to typical endoscopy rooms has therefore not been assessed.

Portable high-efficiency particulate air (HEPA) filtration units are a lower-cost alternative to laminar flow systems for mitigating aerosols. Numerous studies have shown the ability of a range of portable HEPA units to remove aerosols from the air (8), but these have mostly been conducted under controlled laboratory conditions. More recently, clinical studies in intensive care units showed that portable HEPA filtration units can significantly reduce viable SARS-CoV-2 in air samples (9,10). The use of portable HEPA filtration has been proposed for use in endoscopy units (11) but there have been no clinical studies on the effect under typical procedure conditions.

## Methods

The methodology used for this study is based on that we developed for a previous 'baseline' study of aerosol generation in digestive endoscopy (2). This is a prospective observational study. Health Research Authority and ethical approval was granted by the Wales Research Ethics Committee prior to the start of the study. We included patients undergoing routine upper GI endoscopy on the lists of thirteen different participating endoscopists at the Endoscopy unit of the Nottingham University Hospitals NHS Trust Treatment Centre between October 2020-March 2021. The inclusion criteria were adult patients >18 years with capacity to consent. Procedures were performed as they normally would be in clinical practice. Patients chose whether they wanted sedation and procedures were performed with $CO_2$ or air for insufflation and intermittent suctioning.

We measured the concentration of aerosols (<5µm diameter) and droplets (>5µm diameter) produced during typical upper gastrointestinal endoscopy procedures conducted both in standard endoscopy rooms (n=33), standard endoscopy rooms with portable HEPA filtration units (Air Sentry Limited, Wiltshire, UK; n=4) and in laminar flow theatres (n=4 full procedures, n=9 volitional cough and throatspray). Particle counts were measured and analysed using an AeroTrak portable particle counter (TSI, Shoreview MN, model 9500-01) with inlet tube place 10cm from the patient's mouth (methodology described in (2)). In the standard endoscopy rooms, the nominal ACH rate is 15-17 while for the laminar flow theatre it is 300. The endoscopy rooms used were within the same

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.08.23.22279118; this version posted August 24, 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 4.0 International license .

endoscopy suite with similar ventilation, size, air temperature and humidity levels. All present in the room wore enhanced PPE which minimised the contribution of additional human aerosol sources.

We compared aerosol and droplet concentrations produced from whole procedures (normalised to a 20 minute duration) and from aerosol-producing events using background subtraction as described in our previous methodology (2). Specifically, we consider the following individual aerosol generating events: oral extubation, coughing/gagging during procedure, anaesthetic throat spray and volitional cough.

The HEPA filtration unit is significantly less powerful than a laminar flow system, and so to more sensitively quantify its effect we measured particle counts during the fallow periods between procedures, when active aerosol and droplet sources are expected to be minimal. First, we identified all periods when particle count was continuously decreasing (e.g. when no people are present in the room), which we denote as particle 'sink' windows, defined when particle concentration decreases for 4 or more consecutive measurements. Across 4 fallow periods measured in standard endoscopy rooms with portable HEPA filtrations units, we identified 490 such sink windows. As a control, we identified 2305 sink windows across 33 procedures in standard endoscopy rooms without a HEPA filter. Within these sink windows, we computed the rate of clearance of particles and fitted an exponential model to determine a dispersal rate constant. We extrapolated to estimate the time taken to clear 50% of particles in the room. Accounting for the highly non-normal distributions of these data, we applied a Mann-Whitney U test to establish statistical significance of any observed difference.

**Results**

For procedures conducted in the standard endoscopy room we observed the following demographics: age – range: 24-93, median: 63; sex – 20 male, 13 female; BMI – range: 16.3-38.2, median: 24.8; smoking – 8 smokers, 24 non-smokers; hiatus hernia – 9 yes, 24 no. For procedures with the HEPA filtration we observed: age – range: 24-71, median: 58, BMI – range: 19.8-26.3, median 24.8; sex – 3 male, 1 female; smoking – 1 smoker, 3 non-smokers; hiatus hernia – 1 yes, 3 no. For procedures in the laminar flow theatre we observed: age – range: 41-74, median: 52; BMI – range: 24.9-39.3, median: 32.4; sex – 1 male, 3 female; smoking – 1 smoker, 3 non-smokers; hiatus hernia – 1 yes, 3 no. The relevant demographics of the patients used in the 3 different rooms are therefore highly similar enabling a fair comparison, though we note that our previous work found of these features, only the presence of a hiatus hernia seemed to affect aerosol production.

For the whole procedure analysis, summarised in Figure 1a, in the aerosol size range we find no significant reduction in total particle count using the HEPA filtration unit ($p=0.50$) but a significant reduction when using a laminar flow room compared to standard endoscopy room (28.5x, 95%CI:13.9-58.3, $p<0.001$) and to standard endoscopy room with portable HEPA filtration unit (37.5x, 95%CI:5.7-245.5, $p<0.05$). A similar trend is observed for droplets (>5µm diameter) with a significant reduction in count for laminar flow theatre compared to the standard endoscopy room (30.7x, 95%CI: 16.9-55.9, $p<0.001$), and standard endoscopy room with HEPA filtration unit (50.0x, 95%CI:10.8-231.4, $p<0.001$).

We next consider individual aerosols generating events: oral extubation, coughing/gagging anaesthetic throat spray, and volitional cough (summarised in Figure 1b). For oral extubation, we find that in the aerosol size range particle counts are statistically comparable across the 3 room types, but in the droplet size range particle counts are significantly reduced in laminar flow room compared to standard endoscopy room (12.2x, 95%CI:5.0-38.3, $p<0.01$) and to standard endoscopy

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.08.23.22279118; this version posted August 24, 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 4.0 International license .

room with portable HEPA filtration (10.1x, 95%CI:4.0-35.7, p<0.01). The average particle diameter for oral extubation is significantly smaller in laminar flow (0.22µm) compared to endoscopy room (2.8µm, p<0.05) and to endoscopy room with a portable HEPA filter (4.6µm, p<0.01). Together, these results suggest laminar flow removes larger particles very effectively, either through direct dispersal or evaporation, although we would not expect evaporation to have major impact over such short distances of travel (0.1m) particularly for larger particles (7). For coughing/gagging in the aerosol size range we measure a significant reduction in laminar flow theatres compared to endoscopy (6.9x, 95%CI:1.22-61.9,p<0.05) but find no significant difference compared to standard endoscopy room with portable HEPA filtration system. In the droplet size range, we find no significant difference between any of the room types, but this may simply reflect the small average particle size of coughing/gagging (2). For the application of anaesthetic throatspray in the aerosol size range we find significant reduction in laminar flow theatres compared to standard endoscopy rooms (8.4x, 95%CI: 2.03-64.1,p<0.01) and standard endoscopy rooms with portable HEPA filtration (20.7x, 95%CI: 2.9-199.3,p<0.01). A similar trend is observed in the droplet size range with laminar flow theatres measuring fewer particles than standard endoscopy rooms (46.0x, 95%CI:7.4-438.6,p<0.01) and standard endoscopy rooms with portable HEPA filtration (169.0x, 95%CI: 21.2-1855.3,p<0.001). For volitional coughing, we did not observe a significant reduction (p=0.11) between laminar flow and standard endoscopy rooms (comparison not possible with HEPA filtered room due to only one recorded event). We hypothesise this may be due to the substantially higher particle velocity for volitional coughing compared to less forceful involuntary gagging, enabling more airborne particles to reach the detector. This finding is consistent with previous work measuring volitional coughs in laminar flow theatres (7)




*Figure 1.* Effect of different room ventilation schemes on aerosol and droplet counts. a) Total particle counts across whole procedures. b) Comparison of 3 aerosol generating events. c) Investigation of particle clearance rate with and without portable HEPA filter, showing significant speed increase. *p<0.05, **p<0.01, ***p<0.001.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.08.23.22279118; this version posted August 24, 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 4.0 International license .

Finally, for our analysis of particle clearance rates (presented in Figure 1c.) we found that with the HEPA filtration units the median 50% clearance time was 16.8 minutes, compared to 23.8 minutes without HEPA filtration. Further, we found that the decay rate in the aerosol size range with the HEPA filter is 1.41x faster ($p<0.001$), implying an effective increase in air change rate from 15-17 to 21-24 ACH. We did not observe any significant reduction for particles in the droplet size range, likely because these particles clear much more quickly due to to gravity (median: 3.1 minutes for 50% clearance).

**Discussion**

Overall, we find that use of laminar flow theatres significantly reduces aerosols and droplets measured near the patient's mouth, typically by a factor of >5x during upper GI endoscopic procedures. This finding also applies to individual aerosol generating events (oral extubation, coughing/gagging, application of throatspray), which are significantly reduced in magnitude (>5x). However, respiratory coughing may still pose a risk as this is not significantly reduced. We do not find a significant reduction in particle counts during procedures using portable HEPA filtration units, implying their effect is too small to be measured with our sample size, particularly when used in a room with pre-existing adequate ventilation. This is expected because these filters are significantly less powerful than the whole-room ventilation in laminar flow theatres. However, by analysing fallow periods we find that portable HEPA filtration units can increases aerosol clearance speed by ~40%, which could reduce safe fallow time between procedures by 5-7 minutes.

**Keywords**

COVID-19; Endoscopy; Aerosol generating procedures; Air filtration

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.08.23.22279118; this version posted August 24, 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 4.0 International license .

**ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**
The authors thank Guru Aithal for critically reviewing the manuscript; Martin James and Bu Hayee for reviewing the study protocol; Matthew Sanderson, Andy Wragg, Nottingham University Hospitals Research and Innovation, University of Nottingham Biomedical Research Centre, Karren Staniforth, Laura Leman, Nina Duffy, Allison Ball and the Endoscopy Unit Staff in their support of the development of this study; the NIHR Aerosol Generating Procedures Group for their support during the study; Tina Rodriguez, Paul Brocklebank, Mirela Pana, Sabina Beg, Stefano Sansone, James Catton, Emilie Wilkes, Lorraine Clark, Andrew Horton, John White, Suresh Vasan Venkatachalapathy, Aida Jawhari, Ioannis Varmpompitis, and Muthuram Rajaram for performing endoscopic procedures in this study; and Olympus for loan of the trans-nasal endoscopes

**PATIENT CONSENT**
Obtained

**ETHICS APPROVAL**
Wales Research Ethics Committee

**REFERENCES**
1. Chan MS. Esophagogastroduodenoscopy (EGD) is an Aerosol-generating Procedure: Proof of Concept Study The. 2020;(March).
2. Phillips F, Crowley J, Warburton S, Gordon GSD, Parra-Blanco A. Aerosol and droplet generation in upper and lower gastrointestinal endoscopy: whole procedure and event-based analysis. Gastrointestinal Endoscopy. 2022 Jun;
3. NHS England. Health Technical Memorandum 03-01 Specialised ventilation for healthcare premises Part A: The concept, design, specification, installation and acceptance testing of healthcare ventilation systems [Internet]. 2021 [cited 2022 May 29]. Available from: https://www.england.nhs.uk/wp-content/uploads/2021/05/HTM0301-PartA-accessible-F6.pdf
4. Chow TT, Yang XY. Ventilation performance in the operating theatre against airborne infection: Numerical study on an ultra-clean system. Journal of Hospital Infection. 2005;59(2):138–47.
5. Rezapoor M, Alvand A, Jacek E, Paziuk T, Maltenfort MG, Parvizi J. Operating Room Traffic Increases Aerosolized Particles and Compromises the Air Quality: A Simulated Study. The Journal of Arthroplasty. 2018 Mar;33(3):851–5.
6. Gregson FKA, Shrimpton AJ, Hamilton F, Cook TM, Reid JP, Pickering AE, et al. Identification of the source events for aerosol generation during oesophago-gastro-duodenoscopy. Gut [Internet]. 2021 Jun 29;gutjnl-2021-324588. Available from: https://gut.bmj.com/lookup/doi/10.1136/gutjnl-2021-324588
7. Gregson FKA, Sheikh S, Archer J, Symons HE, Walker JS, Haddrell AE, et al. Analytical challenges when sampling and characterising exhaled aerosol. Aerosol Science and Technology [Internet]. 2021;56(2):160–75. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1080/02786826.2021.1990207
8. Liu DT, Phillips KM, Speth MM, Besser G, Mueller CA, Sedaghat AR. Portable HEPA Purifiers to Eliminate Airborne SARS-CoV-2: A Systematic Review. Vol. 166, Otolaryngology - Head and Neck Surgery (United States). SAGE Publications Inc.; 2022. p. 615–22.
9. Thuresson S, Fraenkel CJ, Sasinovich S, Soldemyr J, Widell A, Medstrand P, et al. Airborne Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) in Hospitals: Effects of Aerosol-Generating Procedures, HEPA-Filtration Units, Patient Viral Load, and Physical Distance. Clinical Infectious Diseases. 2022 Feb 28;

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.08.23.22279118; this version posted August 24, 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 4.0 International license .

10. Conway Morris A, Sharrocks K, Bousfield R, Kermack L, Maes M, Higginson E, et al. The Removal of Airborne Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) and Other Microbial Bioaerosols by Air Filtration on Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) Surge Units. Clinical Infectious Diseases. 2021 Oct 30;
11. Fujimura H, Nishikawa J, Okamoto T, Goto A, Hamabe K, Sakaida I. Use of portable partitions with high-efficiency particulate air filters in the endoscopy unit. Endoscopy International Open. 2021 Feb 3;09(02):E278–9.