medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.08.25.22279238; this version posted September 2, 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 The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.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-NC 4.0 International license .

Evaluation of Secondary Chemistry due to Disinfection of Indoor Air with Germicidal Ultraviolet Lamps

Zhe Peng[1]* and Jose L. Jimenez[1]*

[1] Cooperative Institute for Research in Environmental Sciences and Department of Chemistry, University of Colorado, Boulder, Colorado 80309, United States

* **Corresponding authors:** Zhe Peng <zhe.peng@colorado.edu>; Jose L. Jimenez <jose.jimenez@colorado.edu>

Abstract. The disinfection of air using Germicidal Ultraviolet light (GUV) is a long-standing technique, which has received intense attention during the COVID-19 pandemic. GUV generally uses UVC lamps as its light source, which are known to initiate photochemistry in air. However, the impact of GUV on indoor air quality and chemistry has not been investigated in detail, to our knowledge. In this study, we model the chemistry initiated by GUV at 254 or 222 nm ("GUV254" or "GUV222") in a typical room with typical indoor pollutant levels, and for different ventilation levels. GUV254 is irritating for skin and eyes, has an occupational exposure limit, and thus these fixtures typically irradiate a smaller volume near the ceiling, or inside ventilation ducts. In contrast, GUV222 is described by some as harmless to skin or eyes due to rapid absorption in a very thin external layer. Our analysis showed that GUV254 is able to significantly photolyze O_3, generating OH radicals, which initiates the oxidation of all indoor volatile organic compounds (VOCs). While secondary organic aerosol (SOA) can be formed as a product of VOC oxidation, most of SOA in our case studies is produced through GUV-independent terpene ozonolysis. GUV254-induced SOA formation is of the order of 0.1-1 μg m^{-3}. GUV222 with the same effective virus removal rate makes a smaller impact on indoor air quality at mid to high ventilation rates, mainly because of the significantly lower UV irradiance needed and substantially less efficient O_3 photolysis (for primary OH generation) than at 254 nm, while it has a higher impact than GUV254 when ventilation is poor due to a small but significant photochemical production of O_3 at 222 nm

Keywords: ultraviolet germicidal irradiation; SARS-CoV-2; indoor air quality; photochemistry; ventilation; airborne transmission

Synopsis: Germicidal ultraviolet at 254 nm initiates indoor oxidation chemistry, with limited impact under typical conditions. The impact of 222 nm germicidal UV disinfection is smaller.

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/10.1101/2022.08.25.22279238; this version posted September 2, 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-NC 4.0 International license .

Introduction

Germicidal ultraviolet light (GUV) has been employed to disinfect air in indoor spaces since the 1930s.[1] It has been shown to effectively limit the airborne transmission of pathogens of airborne infectious diseases, e.g., measles and tuberculosis.[1–3] This is due to photon-induced dimerization of pyrimidines in the nucleic acids of airborne pathogens (and loss of their viability as a result). GUV fixtures usually use lamps in the UVC range, most commonly at 254 nm (referred to hereinafter as "GUV254").[4] As 254 nm UV is harmful to humans,[5] GUV254 is usually applied near the ceiling, either inside an enclosed ceiling-mounted box, or irradiating the open air in the upper room (Figure 1a) or inside ventilation ducts. Recently, 222 nm UV has been shown to not only have strong capability of inactivating airborne viruses, but also is reported by some[6] to be safer to humans (despite reports of the contrary),[7] potentially allowing whole-room GUV applications (GUV222) (Fig. 1b). Ground-resting GUV-based air cleaners have also been commercialized, in which a fan continuously pulls air into a box and exposes it to UV light, from which the occupants are shielded.[8]

During the ongoing coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) pandemic, GUV has drawn renewed and increasing interest. Airborne transmission is widely accepted as the main spread route of COVID-19,[9–11] which explains the dominant indoor character of transmission.[12] An important component of the transmission is due to superspreading events,[13] which have been shown to be explained by shared-room airborne transmission.[14] Much transmission also happens in close proximity due to short-range airborne transmission, but even in this situation a substantial fraction of the inhaled virus may come from well-mixed room air.[15,16] As the pandemic continues, and with the possible appearance of new variants, there is a pressing need to remove viable severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) from indoor environments.[3] Similar measures would be beneficial for other airborne diseases such as tuberculosis, measles, or a future pandemic virus.

Physical measures such as (natural and/or mechanical) ventilation and air filtration have been proven safe and effective.[17] Nevertheless, mechanical ventilation and air filtration usually can remove airborne pathogens only at a few effective air changes per hour (ACH)[18] and natural ventilation can be highly variable and impractical depending on weather, or when pollution, allergens or noise are present outdoors. When a high virus removal rate (e.g., >10 ACH) needs to be ensured (e.g., in high-risk environments), GUV emerges as a practical and potentially cost-effective way to achieve it.[3,17]

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.08.25.22279238; this version posted September 2, 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-NC 4.0 International license .

(a)



(b)



Figure 1. *(a) Schematics of germicidal ultraviolet air disinfection setups at 254 nm and at 222 nm in a room; (b) absorption cross sections of several important gas-phase species relevant to this study (a discontinuity in the spectrum of methacrolein is due to lack of data).*

On the other hand, UVC light is known to generate strong oxidants (e.g., OH radicals, and sometimes also O_3 depending on the wavelengths used),[19] which can subsequently oxidize volatile organic compounds (VOCs) indoors and initiate organic radical chemistry in indoor air.[20,21] Energetic UVC photons can also directly photolyze many VOCs, such as peroxides and carbonyls,[22] and generate organic radicals. This radical chemistry is thought to lead to further oxidation of indoor VOCs and the formation of oxygenated VOCs (OVOCs) and secondary organic aerosol (SOA), both of which may have negative health effects.[23] Surveys of the concentration of total VOCs in indoor environment range ~0.1-4 mg m^{-3}.[24–26] Thus there is

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.08.25.22279238; this version posted September 2, 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-NC 4.0 International license .

always a significant amount of VOC to react with any radicals and oxidants that are generated indoors, and all air cleaning techniques that can create radicals and/or oxidants indoors have the potential to lead to secondary chemistry. Very few studies on this topic have been conducted with state-of-the-art measurements or models. Recently, air cleaning devices based on chemistry induced by UV light (photocatalysis and OH generation, but not GUV), often also marketed as suitable for air disinfection, have been experimentally shown to produce significant amounts of OVOCs and SOA.[27,28]

Despite the potential of GUV to cause secondary chemistry, to our knowledge this topic has not been studied in detail to date. Some studies of germicidal UV inactivation effectiveness have included measurements of ozone, to assess whether any was generated. These studies report no production of ozone when mercury vapor lamps are coated to limit emission from wavelengths nearer to the ozone generating wavelength of 185 nm, as expected. However, some uncoated or improperly-coated lamps are commercially available, so ozone production can be a problem in some cases. In this study, we perform a first evaluation of the impacts of GUV at both 254 nm (assuming properly-coated lamps) and 222 nm on indoor air quality, using a model. The amounts of OVOC and SOA that can be formed in typical indoor environments are investigated.

Materials and Methods

Given the complexity of the composition of indoor air, both the chemical species representing the composition of indoor air and the reaction scheme for its photochemistry under GUV and subsequent radical, oxidation, and SOA formation chemistries, are simplified but kept representative of the state-of-the-art knowledge for indoor air. Surface reactions are neglected.

The chemical mechanism for this study is a combination of that of the inorganic radical chemistry in an oxidation flow reactor (OFR)[19,29,30] and part of the Regional Atmospheric Chemistry Mechanism (RACM)[31] relevant to this study. OFR also employs UVC lamps to generate oxidants. A common OFR operation mode ("OFR254") uses 254 nm UV light from filtered mercury lamps to photolyze O_3, through which $O(^1D)$ is generated, which subsequently reacts with water vapor to form OH.[19,29] OFR254 uses the same type of lamps as GUV254 and thus OH is expected to form through the same chemistry. Therefore, all reactions in the OFR chemical mechanism are adopted.[19] For organic chemistry, the relevant reactions in RACM are

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.08.25.22279238; this version posted September 2, 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-NC 4.0 International license .

adopted. Among major relevant (lumped) species are HC8 (alkanes, alcohols, and esters with relatively fast reaction rate with OH), LIM (limonene), KET (ketones), ALD (aldehydes), OP2 (higher organic peroxides), and ACO3 (acylperoxy radicals). Section S1 in the Supp. Info. provides more details of the adaptation of RACM to this study, and Table S1 lists all organic reactions modeled in the present work. All photolysis cross sections are adopted from refs [22,32] when available, otherwise estimated from those of molecules containing the same functional groups according to the framework of Peng et al.[33] All quantum efficiencies for reactant photodissociation except those with available data in refs [22,32] are assumed to be 1, given the high photon energies involved. For GUV222, the photolysis frequencies are calculated using the light flux at that wavelength. The chemical mechanisms are run within the open-source KinSim chemical kinetics simulator,[34] and are made available in the Supp. Info. and at the KinSim cases page.[35] We perform all simulations until a steady state is reached.

We investigate a typical indoor space with typical indoor species concentrations and urban outdoor air concentrations from the literature, as shown in Table S2. The atmospheric pressure and temperature in the room are assumed to be 1 atm and 295 K, respectively, relative humidity of 37% (water vapor mixing ratio of 1%), and NO, NO_2, and O_3 concentrations of 1, 10, and 10 ppbv, respectively. The initial concentrations of most VOCs are estimated based on the compilation of McDonald et al.,[36] with the total VOC concentration assumed to be 1.7 mg m^{-3}, a typical value for US indoor spaces.[24] Section S2 details how some individual species are lumped to enable combining the inventory of McDonald et al.[36] with the chemical reaction scheme of this study and how the fraction of each (lumped) species in the total VOC is estimated. The only exception to this initial VOC concentration estimation is that we assign a higher concentration of 300 ppb to acetone as measured by Price et al.,[26] because it is mostly emitted by humans while other VOCs are considered as mainly non-human emissions, as summarized by McDonald et al.[36]

The 254 nm GUV fixture in our simulations is based on the AeroMed LEXUS L2.1 Open.[37] The space irradiated by this device is 45 m^3, and is placed in a room of 300 m^3, thus the irradiated volume is 15% of the volume of the room, consistent with refs [38,39]. The model for 254 nm GUV has two compartments ("boxes"), one for the irradiated zone and the other for the rest of the room, while that for 222 nm GUV has only one box. For the GUV254 case we set an air exchange rate between the irradiated and unirradiated zones at 30 h^{-1} (for the irradiated zone),[40] which leads to an effective GUV virus removal rate for the whole room of ~30 h^{-1} (equivalent

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.08.25.22279238; this version posted September 2, 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-NC 4.0 International license .

ACH) using the SARS-CoV-2 inactivation results in ref [41]. Such an equivalent ACH is typical of well-designed indoor GUV applications.[3,38,39] Air within a box is assumed to be well mixed. Based on the UV inactivation rate constants at 222 nm for SARS-CoV-2,[6,41] the UV intensity of the 222 nm fixture is adjusted such that this fixture also provides the same whole-room effective virus removal rate as for GUV254 (see Section S3 for the details of UV intensity calculation). Three levels of ventilation, i.e., a typical residential level (0.3 ACH, "low ventilation"),[42] a typical commercial level (3 ACH, "medium ventilation"),[18] and a typical medical level (9 ACH, "high ventilation")[3] are simulated in this study. Indoor VOC emissions are set such that all VOC concentrations remain at their literature-constrained initial values at low ventilation without chemistry occurring. We assume no NO_x or O_3 emissions indoors, and 5 ppb NO, 20 ppb NO_2, 40 ppb O_3. No VOC is assumed to be present in outdoor air, as outdoor VOC levels are typically much lower than indoor ones.[25,26] The O_3 surface loss rate in the absence of chemistry is set to 2.8 h^{-1}, which is typical of residences.[43] To test COVID-19 infection risk in different situations, we assume the presence of a medium infector shedding SARS-CoV-2 at 16 quanta h^{-1} (roughly for light exercise while speaking 50% time),[44] which is consistent or lower than values constrained for literature superspreading events.[14] A quantum is an infectious dose, that if inhaled by a susceptible person, will lead to a probability of infection of 1-1/e.[14,45] The rate of SARS-CoV-2 loss apart from ventilation and GUV (i.e., due to intrinsic loss of infectivity, aerosol deposition etc.) is assumed to be 1 h^{-1}.

Results and Discussion

Disinfection. Figure 2 shows the amount of SARS-CoV-2 present in the room to be consistent with the steady state prediction. In the absence of GUV, the emission rate of SARS-CoV-2 is 16 quanta h^{-1}, and its total loss rate 1.3 h^{-1} (0.3 h^{-1} from ventilation and 1 h^{-1} from decay and deposition) for the low-ventilation case. The steady state SARS-CoV-2 quantity in the entire room is 12.3 quanta. Similarly, it is lowered to 4 (1.6) quanta by increasing the ventilation rate to 3 (9) ACH. When a GUV fixture with a whole-room virus removal rate of ~20 h^{-1} is applied, the SARS-CoV-2 quantity decreases to ~0.6, ~0.5, and ~0.4 quanta in the low-, medium-, and high-ventilation cases, respectively. The relative impact of GUV is higher at low ventilation, as expected.



Figure 2. *Final quantity/concentration of the main (types of) species of interest in this study under different GUV and ventilation conditions. In the GUV254 cases, the volume-weighted average concentrations for the whole room are shown. The stable chemical species concentrations are similar between the irradiated and unirradiated zones, while the radical (SARS-CoV-2) concentrations in the unirradiated zone can be significantly lower (higher) (Table S3). SOA is assumed to have a molar weight of 200 g mol^{-1}.*

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.08.25.22279238; this version posted September 2, 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-NC 4.0 International license .

The total quantity of SARS-CoV-2 does not directly reflect its infection risk, which also depends on the volume of the room and the inhalation of susceptible occupants. For an occupant with a breathing rate of 0.5 m^3 h^{-1} (typical for light physical activities)[46] present in the 300 m^3 room with low ventilation and no GUV fixture for 1 h, ~0.02 quantum is inhaled. This corresponds to an infection probability of ~2%, since the infection probability is approximately equal to the inhaled quanta if the latter is small.[47] For the cases studied in this work, infection risk is reduced by x~3 by medium ventilation, and by a factor of ~22 (~8) when adding GUV to a low (medium) ventilation situation. When adding GUV to a high ventilation situation, the risk reduction is less than a factor of 4.

Secondary Chemistry. For chemical species in the room, ventilation alone (without GUV) can make some difference (Fig. 2). The differences in O_3, NO, ketone concentrations are largely due to these species being ventilated in or out. For other chemical species, secondary chemical processes also play a role. OH radicals can form even without UV, i.e., from limonene ozonolysis. As a result, OH radicals are higher at medium and high ventilation, which introduces more O_3 from outdoors than at low ventilation. OH concentration at high ventilation is not higher than medium ventilation because high ventilation also dilutes limonene concentration indoors, reducing the overall limonene-O_3 reaction rate. HO_2 radicals are lower at higher ventilation because of higher NO being ventilated into the room, which reacts with HO_2. All other organic radicals and stable products shown in Fig. 2 (including SOA) have higher concentrations in the low-ventilation case due to higher VOC concentrations.

When GUV254 is employed, although the concentration of photolyzable O_3 remains relatively stable due to much stronger replenishment from outdoor air ventilation than photolytic destruction, the chemistry is significantly altered by UV (Fig. 2). The fundamental cause of this change is OH production from O_3 photolysis under 254 nm UV irradiation.[19] OH concentrations in the GUV254 cases are x~1.5-5 (x~3-20) the corresponding no-UV cases in the whole room average (irradiated zone), with the difference in the higher-ventilation cases being larger, due to higher O_3 in the room (Fig. 2 and Table S3). OH in the higher-ventilation cases is similar to daytime outdoor urban levels.[48] This OH level is high enough to drive substantial oxidation of VOCs, production of other radicals (e.g., HO_2 and organic peroxy radicals (RO_2)), and SOA formation. Organic peroxides (including hydroperoxides), carbonyls (aldehydes and ketones), and organic nitrates (including peroxynitrates) are among common VOC oxidation products and all have 50% to several-fold concentration increases (Fig. 2). The exceptions are ketones, which

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.08.25.22279238; this version posted September 2, 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-NC 4.0 International license .

are relatively unreactive and dominated in the model by the chemistry-independent acetone emission and its dilution by ventilation (Fig. 2). In addition to VOC oxidation by OH, radicals (OH, HO_2, and RO_2) are also produced by active photolysis of carbonyls and peroxides at 254 nm, where both strongly absorb (Fig. 1b).

Due to higher peroxy radical concentrations, NO is lowered to ~20 ppt at low ventilation (Fig. 2). Such a low NO concentration leads to reactions of RO_2 with both HO_2 and NO being important, as estimated per Peng et al.[49] They both account for nearly half of the RO_2 bimolecular loss in the irradiated space (Fig. S1). Also, without fast RO_2+NO, RO_2 lifetime is sufficiently long for unimolecular reactions of RO_2 to occur (Fig. S1) as observed previously indoors for similar conditions,[50] although RACM does not include these reactions. In the higher ventilation cases, NO, though still consumed by the photochemistry, is much higher due to a stronger replenishment from outdoor air and can dominate RO_2 bimolecular fate (Fig. S1).

SOA formation is estimated from the consumption of individual VOCs and SOA mass yields from the literature (Table S4). Significant SOA production (~10 μg m^{-3} at low ventilation) occurs even with GUV irradiation, through limonene ozonolysis, as this reaction has a high SOA yield (20%). In the GUV254 cases, SOA is contributed by both limonene ozonolysis and VOC oxidation by OH. Nevertheless, the enhanced contribution from OH oxidation of VOC under GUV irradiation is a fraction of SOA formed in the no-UV cases (Fig. 2), because of a large fraction of total VOC present being species too small to form SOA through oxidation (e.g., ethanol, acetone, and isopropyl alcohol). The overall SOA mass yield from total VOC is of the order of 0.1%. Given that 1.5 mg m^{-3} of total VOCs (excluding limonene) are present, that leads to ~1.5 μg m^{-3} due to GUV254. The enhancement of SOA formation by OH oxidation relative to the no-UV cases (mainly from VOC ozonolysis) decreases with ventilation, as VOC concentrations are lowered by higher ventilation (Fig. 2). The SOA precursors and mechanism used in this work are likely incomplete, given the incomplete scientific understanding of this topic.[51]

Due to the fast air exchange between the GUV254 irradiated and unirradiated spaces, the concentrations of stable species are similar between these two spaces (Table S3). In contrast, radicals are more rapidly consumed in the unirradiated space than supplied by the transport from the irradiated space, and thus have much lower concentrations (up to >1 order of

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.08.25.22279238; this version posted September 2, 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-NC 4.0 International license .

magnitude for highly reactive ones such as OH and acylperoxy) in the unirradiated space than in the irradiated space.

The GUV222 cases in this study assume irradiation of the entire room volume (Fig. 1a). Also, photons at 222 nm are able to photolyze O_2 and produce O_3, albeit at a small rate, leading to higher O_3 in all cases relative to GUV254. The amounts of organic products formed in the medium- and high-ventilation (low-ventilation) cases are lower (higher) than in the unirradiated zone in the GUV254 cases (Fig. 2).

At medium and high ventilation rates, the main O_3 source in the GUV222 cases is still outdoor O_3 through ventilation. Despite the slightly stronger O_3 production due to O_2 photolysis, the product formation enhancement in these GUV222 cases is much smaller than in the corresponding GUV254 cases (Fig. 2). These results indicate a very weak OH-initiated VOC oxidation in these cases on top of the VOC ozonolysis chemistry that is active in the no-UV cases.

This remarkable difference from the active photochemistry in the GUV254 cases can be attributed to several factors. First, the UV irradiance of the 222 nm fixture is significantly lower, even in terms of the number of photons emitted per unit time. 222 nm photons are ~40% more efficient in inactivating SARS-CoV-2 than 254 nm photons.[41] In addition the latter cannot be used in the most efficient fashion. Due to the need to protect humans from irradiation, all photons are concentrated in the small irradiated zone (15% of the room volume). Because of the limitation of transport of virus-containing aerosols from the unirradiated zone, the steady-state infectious virus concentration is ~70% lower than in the unirradiated zone, where the infector and the susceptible individuals are present (Table S3). Even with the same per-photon virus inactivation efficiency, GUV254 needs about 3 times the photons for GUV222 to reach the same effective GUV virus removal rate for the occupied unirradiated space. Furthermore, the first step of OH photochemical production is O_3 photolysis, whose corresponding absorption at 222 nm is about ~5 times lower than at 254 nm (Fig. 1b). Simple carbonyl compounds, the most abundant OVOCs in this study, also absorb much less efficiently at 222 nm than at 254 nm (Fig. 1b), further reducing radical production. Although other products, such peroxides and conjugated carbonyl species, can have stronger absorption at 222 nm, their relatively low concentrations (~1 ppb or lower vs. hundreds of ppb of ketones) limit their relative contributions to the radical budget.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.08.25.22279238; this version posted September 2, 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-NC 4.0 International license .

Because of the small direct production of O_3 by the GUV lights, O_3 in the GUV222 low-ventilation case is substantially less depleted by limonene ozonolysis than for GUV254. As a result, compared to GUV254 SOA formation through limonene ozonolysis is substantially stronger and OH concentration is also higher (Fig. 2) despite a lower cross section of O_3 photolysis at 222 nm. Other gas-phase stable organic products have comparable concentrations with those in the GUV254 case.

Implications. We have shown that GUV disinfection can induce active photochemistry producing OVOCs and SOA. Under the typical conditions simulated here, these products do not necessarily have significant negative effects on human health because of their relatively low concentrations. Among the VOCs (including OVOCs) modeled in this study, none has a concentration exceeding the Minimal Risk Level (MRL) recommended by the CDC.[52] However, only a very limited number of species were explicitly modeled in this study, particularly aldehydes, whose toxicity is generally high. Future studies with higher chemical speciation are needed to better assess the toxicity of gas-phase products. In polluted indoor spaces and/or urban atmospheres, the indoor concentrations of the VOCs of interest can be several times higher,[24] while the GUV-induced photochemistry can still be active (see Section S4 for more detail). In this case, OVOC products might exceed the MSLs and SOA SOA formation is estimated to be tens of μg m^{-3}. Per our first assessment, the risk of GUV254 due to secondary photochemical products is generally low under typical indoor conditions. The risk for GUV222 appears to be substantially lower when ventilation is not poor, but comparable or slightly higher in case of poor ventilation. If GUV222 is confirmed to be safe for direct human exposure, it would have an advantage over GUV254 at mid to high ventilation rates in terms of indoor chemistry, in addition to more efficient air disinfection. When 254 nm fixtures are used, a strong air exchange between the irradiated and unirradiated zones (e.g., by fans) is preferable. It can lower the UV irradiance needed for a given virus inactivation rate,[53] and hence limit the induced photochemistry. Good ventilation can not only remove airborne pathogens, but also limit the production of secondary indoor pollutants, and is thus also recommended when outdoor air is relatively clean.[18,54] Similarly, air filtration is also recommended as it removes both virus-containing aerosols, indoor-formed SOA, and particulate pollution from other indoor and outdoor sources. The findings of this study are limited due to the use of a model, in particular as UVC species photolysis parameters (in particular quantum yields), VOC composition indoors, and the precursors and yields of SOA formation are still uncertain. Experimental studies in both

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.08.25.22279238; this version posted September 2, 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-NC 4.0 International license .

simplified laboratory settings and real indoor conditions are needed to fully constrain the impacts of GUV in indoor chemistry.

Acknowledgements

ZP and JLJ were partially supported by the CIRES Innovative Research Program. We thank Vito Ilacqua, Donald Milton, and Edward Nardell for valuable discussions.

References

(1) Wells, W. F.; Wells, M. W.; Wilder, T. S. The Environmental Control of Epidemic Contagion. I. *An epidemiologic study of radiant disinfection of air in day schools Am J Hyg* **1942**, *35*, 97–121.
(2) Riley, R. L.; Mills, C. C.; O'grady, F.; Sultan, L. U.; Wittstadt, F.; Shivpuri, D. N. Infectiousness of Air from a Tuberculosis Ward. Ultraviolet Irradiation of Infected Air: Comparative Infectiousness of Different Patients. *Am. Rev. Respir. Dis.* **1962**, *85*, 511–525.
(3) Nardell, E. A. Air Disinfection for Airborne Infection Control with a Focus on COVID-19: Why Germicidal UV Is Essential. *Photochem. Photobiol.* **2021**, *97* (3), 493–497.
(4) Riley, R. L.; Nardell, E. A. Clearing the Air: The Theory and Application of Ultraviolet Air Disinfection. *American Review of Respiratory Disease*. 1989, pp 1832–1832. https://doi.org/10.1164/ajrccm/140.6.1832b.
(5) Zaffina, S.; Camisa, V.; Lembo, M.; Vinci, M. R.; Tucci, M. G.; Borra, M.; Napolitano, A.; Cannatà, V. Accidental Exposure to UV Radiation Produced by Germicidal Lamp: Case Report and Risk Assessment. *Photochem. Photobiol.* **2012**, *88* (4), 1001–1004.
(6) Buonanno, M.; Welch, D.; Shuryak, I.; Brenner, D. J. Far-UVC Light (222 Nm) Efficiently and Safely Inactivates Airborne Human Coronaviruses. *Sci. Rep.* **2020**, *10* (1), 10285.
(7) Ong, Q.; Wee, W.; Cruz, J. D.; Ronnie Teo, J. W.; Han, W. 222-Nm Far UVC Exposure Results in DNA Damage and Transcriptional Changes to Mammalian Cells. *bioRxiv*, 2022, 2022.02.22.481471. https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.02.22.481471.
(8) Kujundzic, E.; Matalkah, F.; Howard, C. J.; Hernandez, M.; Miller, S. L. UV Air Cleaners and Upper-Room Air Ultraviolet Germicidal Irradiation for Controlling Airborne Bacteria and Fungal Spores. *J. Occup. Environ. Hyg.* **2006**, *3* (10), 536–546.
(9) Wang, C. C.; Prather, K. A.; Sznitman, J.; Jimenez, J. L.; Lakdawala, S. S.; Tufekci, Z.; Marr, L. C. Airborne Transmission of Respiratory Viruses. *Science* **2021**, *373* (6558), eabd9149.
(10) Greenhalgh, T.; Jimenez, J. L.; Prather, K. A.; Tufekci, Z.; Fisman, D.; Schooley, R. Ten Scientific Reasons in Support of Airborne Transmission of SARS-CoV-2. *Lancet* **2021**. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(21)00869-2.
(11) Klompas, M.; Milton, D. K.; Rhee, C.; Baker, M. A.; Leekha, S. Current Insights Into Respiratory Virus Transmission and Potential Implications for Infection Control Programs : A Narrative Review. *Ann. Intern. Med.* **2021**, *174* (12), 1710–1718.
(12) Qian, H.; Miao, T.; Liu, L.; Zheng, X.; Luo, D.; Li, Y. Indoor Transmission of SARS-CoV-2. *Indoor Air* **2020**, in press.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.08.25.22279238; this version posted September 2, 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-NC 4.0 International license .

(13) Adam, D. C.; Wu, P.; Wong, J. Y.; Lau, E. H. Y.; Tsang, T. K.; Cauchemez, S.; Leung, G. M.; Cowling, B. J. Clustering and Superspreading Potential of SARS-CoV-2 Infections in Hong Kong. *Nat. Med.* **2020**, *26* (11), 1714–1719.

(14) Peng, Z.; Rojas, A. L. P.; Kropff, E.; Bahnfleth, W.; Buonanno, G.; Dancer, S. J.; Kurnitski, J.; Li, Y.; Loomans, M. G. L. C.; Marr, L. C.; Morawska, L.; Nazaroff, W.; Noakes, C.; Querol, X.; Sekhar, C.; Tellier, R.; Greenhalgh, T.; Bourouiba, L.; Boerstra, A.; Tang, J. W.; Miller, S. L.; Jimenez, J. L. Practical Indicators for Risk of Airborne Transmission in Shared Indoor Environments and Their Application to COVID-19 Outbreaks. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* **2022**, *56* (2), 1125–1137.

(15) Li, Y.; Cheng, P.; Jia, W. Poor Ventilation Worsens Short-Range Airborne Transmission of Respiratory Infection. *Indoor Air* **2022**, *32* (1), e12946.

(16) Jimenez, J. L.; Peng, Z.; Pagonis, D. Systematic Way to Understand and Classify the Shared-Room Airborne Transmission Risk of Indoor Spaces. *Indoor Air* **2022**, *32* (5), e13025.

(17) Morawska, L.; Allen, J.; Bahnfleth, W.; Bluyssen, P. M.; Boerstra, A.; Buonanno, G.; Cao, J.; Dancer, S. J.; Floto, A.; Franchimon, F.; Greenhalgh, T.; Haworth, C.; Hogeling, J.; Isaxon, C.; Jimenez, J. L.; Kurnitski, J.; Li, Y.; Loomans, M.; Marks, G.; Marr, L. C.; Mazzarella, L.; Melikov, A. K.; Miller, S.; Milton, D. K.; Nazaroff, W.; Nielsen, P. V.; Noakes, C.; Peccia, J.; Prather, K.; Querol, X.; Sekhar, C.; Seppänen, O.; Tanabe, S.-I.; Tang, J. W.; Tellier, R.; Tham, K. W.; Wargocki, P.; Wierzbicka, A.; Yao, M. A Paradigm Shift to Combat Indoor Respiratory Infection. *Science* **2021**, *372* (6543), 689–691.

(18) ASHRAE. *Ventilation for Acceptable Indoor Air Quality: ANSI/ASHRAE Standard 62.1-2019*; ANSI/ASHRAE, 2019.

(19) Peng, Z.; Jimenez, J. L. Radical Chemistry in Oxidation Flow Reactors for Atmospheric Chemistry Research. *Chem. Soc. Rev.* **2020**, *49* (9), 2570–2616.

(20) Atkinson, R.; Arey, J. Atmospheric Degradation of Volatile Organic Compounds. *Chem. Rev.* **2003**, *103* (12), 4605–4638.

(21) Ziemann, P. J.; Atkinson, R. Kinetics, Products, and Mechanisms of Secondary Organic Aerosol Formation. *Chem. Soc. Rev.* **2012**, *41* (19), 6582–6605.

(22) Keller-Rudek, H.; Moortgat, G. K.; Sander, R.; Sörensen, R. *The MPI-Mainz UV/VIS Spectral Atlas of Gaseous Molecules of Atmospheric Interest*. http://satellite.mpic.de/spectral_atlas (accessed 2022-02-10).

(23) Collins, D. B.; Farmer, D. K. Unintended Consequences of Air Cleaning Chemistry. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* **2021**. https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.1c02582.

(24) Logue, J. M.; McKone, T. E.; Sherman, M. H.; Singer, B. C. Hazard Assessment of Chemical Air Contaminants Measured in Residences. *Indoor Air* **2011**, *21* (2), 92–109.

(25) Mattila, J. M.; Arata, C.; Abeleira, A.; Zhou, Y.; Wang, C.; Katz, E. F.; Goldstein, A. H.; Abbatt, J. P. D.; DeCarlo, P. F.; Vance, M. E.; Farmer, D. K. Contrasting Chemical Complexity and the Reactive Organic Carbon Budget of Indoor and Outdoor Air. *Environmental Science & Technology*. 2022, pp 109–118. https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.1c03915.

(26) Price, D. J.; Day, D. A.; Pagonis, D.; Stark, H.; Algrim, L. B.; Handschy, A. V.; Liu, S.; Krechmer, J. E.; Miller, S. L.; Hunter, J. F.; de Gouw, J. A.; Ziemann, P. J.; Jimenez, J. L. Budgets of Organic Carbon Composition and Oxidation in Indoor Air. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* **2019**. https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.9b04689.

(27) Ye, Q.; Krechmer, J. E.; Shutter, J. D.; Barber, V. P.; Li, Y.; Helstrom, E.; Franco, L. J.; Cox, J. L.; Hrdina, A. I. H.; Goss, M. B.; Tahsini, N.; Canagaratna, M.; Keutsch, F. N.; Kroll, J. H. Real-Time Laboratory Measurements of VOC Emissions, Removal Rates, and Byproduct Formation from Consumer-Grade Oxidation-Based Air Cleaners. *Environmental Science & Technology Letters* **2021**. https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.estlett.1c00773.

(28) Joo, T.; Rivera-Rios, J. C.; Alvarado-Velez, D.; Westgate, S.; Lee Ng, N. Formation of

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.08.25.22279238; this version posted September 2, 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-NC 4.0 International license .

Oxidized Gases and Secondary Organic Aerosol from a Commercial Oxidant-Generating Electronic Air Cleaner. *Environmental Science & Technology Letters* **2021**. https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.estlett.1c00416.

(29) Peng, Z.; Day, D. A.; Stark, H.; Li, R.; Lee-Taylor, J.; Palm, B. B.; Brune, W. H.; Jimenez, J. L. HOx Radical Chemistry in Oxidation Flow Reactors with Low-Pressure Mercury Lamps Systematically Examined by Modeling. *Atmospheric Measurement Techniques* **2015**, *8* (11), 4863–4890.

(30) Peng, Z.; Jimenez, J. L. Modeling of the Chemistry in Oxidation Flow Reactors with High Initial NO. *Atmos. Chem. Phys.* **2017**, *17* (19), 11991–12010.

(31) Stockwell, W. R.; Kirchner, F.; Kuhn, M.; Seefeld, S. A New Mechanism for Regional Atmospheric Chemistry Modeling. *J. Geophys. Res.* **1997**, *102* (D22), 25847–25879.

(32) Burkholder, J. B.; Sander, S. P.; Abbatt, J.; Barker, J. R.; Huie, R. E.; Kolb, C. E.; Kurylo, M. J.; Orkin, V. L.; Wilmouth, D. M.; Wine, P. H. *Chemical Kinetics and Photochemical Data for Use in Atmospheric Studies: Evaluation Number 18*; Jet Propulsion Laboratory: Pasadena, CA, USA, 2015.

(33) Peng, Z.; Lee-Taylor, J.; Stark, H.; Orlando, J. J.; Aumont, B.; Jimenez, J. L. Evolution of OH Reactivity in NO-Free Volatile Organic Compound Photooxidation Investigated by the Fully Explicit GECKO-A Model. *Atmos. Chem. Phys.* **2021**, *21* (19), 14649–14669.

(34) Peng, Z.; Jimenez, J. L. KinSim: A Research-Grade, User-Friendly, Visual Kinetics Simulator for Chemical-Kinetics and Environmental-Chemistry Teaching. *J. Chem. Educ.* **2019**, *96* (4), 806–811.

(35) *Downloadable KinSim cases and mechanisms*. Google Docs. https://docs.google.com/document/d/10OuUMtMGJsh90cQ3p4Y_oiKQdPRHYQnxKQr2_l62Kx0 (accessed 2022-07-31).

(36) McDonald, B. C.; de Gouw, J. A.; Gilman, J. B.; Jathar, S. H.; Akherati, A.; Cappa, C. D.; Jimenez1, J. L.; Lee-Taylor, J.; Hayes, P. L.; McKeen, S. A.; Cui, Y. Y.; Kim, S.-W.; Gentner, D. R.; Isaacman-VanWertz, G.; Goldstein, A. H.; Harley, R. A.; Frost, G. J.; Roberts, J. M.; Ryerson, T. B.; Trainer, M. Volatile Chemical Products Emerging as Largest Petrochemical Source of Urban Organic Emissions. *Science* **2018**, *359* (6377), 760–764.

(37) *Upper room germicidal ultraviolet fixtures*. AeroMed Technologies. https://aeromed.com/product/upper-room-guv-fixtures/ (accessed 2022-02-21).

(38) Xu, P.; Kujundzic, E.; Peccia, J.; Schafer, M. P.; Moss, G.; Hernandez, M.; Miller, S. L. Impact of Environmental Factors on Efficacy of Upper-Room Air Ultraviolet Germicidal Irradiation for Inactivating Airborne Mycobacteria. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* **2005**, *39* (24), 9656–9664.

(39) Xu, P.; Peccia, J.; Fabian, P.; Martyny, J. W.; Fennelly, K. P.; Hernandez, M.; Miller, S. L. Efficacy of Ultraviolet Germicidal Irradiation of Upper-Room Air in Inactivating Airborne Bacterial Spores and Mycobacteria in Full-Scale Studies. *Atmos. Environ.* **2003**, *37* (3), 405–419.

(40) Nicas, M.; Miller, S. L. A Multi-Zone Model Evaluation of the Efficacy of Upper-Room Air Ultraviolet Germicidal Irradiation. *Appl. Occup. Environ. Hyg.* **1999**, *14* (5), 317–328.

(41) Ma, B.; Gundy, P. M.; Gerba, C. P.; Sobsey, M. D.; Linden, K. G. UV Inactivation of SARS-CoV-2 across the UVC Spectrum: KrCl* Excimer, Mercury-Vapor, and Light-Emitting-Diode (LED) Sources. *Appl. Environ. Microbiol.* **2021**, *87* (22), e0153221.

(42) Daisey, J. M.; Angell, W. J.; Apte, M. G. Indoor Air Quality, Ventilation and Health Symptoms in Schools: An Analysis of Existing Information. *Indoor Air* **2003**, *13* (1), 53–64.

(43) Lee, K.; Vallarino, J.; Dumyahn, T.; Ozkaynak, H.; Spengler, J. D. Ozone Decay Rates in Residences. *J. Air Waste Manage. Assoc.* **1999**, *49* (10), 1238–1244.

(44) Buonanno, G.; Morawska, L.; Stabile, L. Quantitative Assessment of the Risk of Airborne Transmission of SARS-CoV-2 Infection: Prospective and Retrospective Applications. *Environ. Int.* **2020**, *145*, 106112.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.08.25.22279238; this version posted September 2, 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-NC 4.0 International license .

(45) Riley, E. C.; Murphy, G.; Riley, R. L. Airborne Spread of Measles in a Suburban Elementary School. *Am. J. Epidemiol.* **1978**, *107* (5), 421–432.

(46) EPA. Chapter 6—Inhalation Rates. In *Exposure Factors Handbook*; U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 2011.

(47) Peng, Z.; Jimenez, J. L. Exhaled CO 2 as a COVID-19 Infection Risk Proxy for Different Indoor Environments and Activities. *Environmental Science & Technology Letters* **2021**, *8* (5), 392–397.

(48) Ren, X.; Olson, J. R.; Crawford, J. H.; Brune, W. H.; Mao, J.; Long, R. B.; Chen, Z.; Chen, G.; Avery, M. A.; Sachse, G. W.; Barrick, J. D.; Diskin, G. S.; Huey, L. G.; Fried, A.; Cohen, R. C.; Heikes, B.; Wennberg, P. O.; Singh, H. B.; Blake, D. R.; Shetter, R. E. HOxchemistry during INTEX-A 2004: Observation, Model Calculation, and Comparison with Previous Studies. *J. Geophys. Res.* **2008**, *113* (D5). https://doi.org/10.1029/2007jd009166.

(49) Peng, Z.; Lee-Taylor, J.; Orlando, J. J.; Tyndall, G. S.; Jimenez, J. L. Organic Peroxy Radical Chemistry in Oxidation Flow Reactors and Environmental Chambers and Their Atmospheric Relevance. *Atmos. Chem. Phys.* **2019**, *19* (2), 813–834.

(50) Pagonis, D.; Algrim, L. B.; Price, D. J.; Day, D. A.; Handschy, A. V.; Stark, H.; Miller, S. L.; de Gouw, J. A.; Jimenez, J. L.; Ziemann, P. J. Autoxidation of Limonene Emitted in a University Art Museum. *Environ. Sci. Technol. Lett.* **2019**, *6* (9), 520–524.

(51) Shrivastava, M.; Cappa, C. D.; Fan, J.; Goldstein, A. H.; Guenther, A. B.; Jimenez, J. L.; Kuang, C.; Laskin, A.; Martin, S. T.; Ng, N. L.; Petaja, T.; Pierce, J. R.; Rasch, P. J.; Roldin, P.; Seinfeld, J. H.; Shilling, J.; Smith, J. N.; Thornton, J. A.; Volkamer, R.; Wang, J.; Worsnop, D. R.; Zaveri, R. A.; Zelenyuk, A.; Zhang, Q. Recent Advances in Understanding Secondary Organic Aerosol: Implications for Global Climate Forcing. *Rev. Geophys.* **2017**, *55* (2), 509–559.

(52) Hhs, U. S. Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry Minimal Risk Levels [WWW Document]. *URL https://www. atsdr. cdc. gov/about/index. html (accessed 12. 18. 18)* **2018**.

(53) Riley, R. L.; Permutt, S. Room Air Disinfection by Ultraviolet Irradiation of Upper Air. Air Mixing and Germicidal Effectiveness. *Arch. Environ. Health* **1971**, *22* (2), 208–219.

(54) Morawska, L.; Tang, J. W.; Bahnfleth, W.; Bluyssen, P. M.; Boerstra, A.; Buonanno, G.; Cao, J.; Dancer, S.; Floto, A.; Franchimon, F.; Haworth, C.; Hogeling, J.; Isaxon, C.; Jimenez, J. L.; Kurnitski, J.; Li, Y.; Loomans, M.; Marks, G.; Marr, L. C.; Mazzarella, L.; Melikov, A. K.; Miller, S.; Milton, D. K.; Nazaroff, W.; Nielsen, P. V.; Noakes, C.; Peccia, J.; Querol, X.; Sekhar, C.; Seppänen, O.; Tanabe, S.-I.; Tellier, R.; Tham, K. W.; Wargocki, P.; Wierzbicka, A.; Yao, M. How Can Airborne Transmission of COVID-19 Indoors Be Minimised? *Environ. Int.* **2020**, *142*, 105832.