

# Air cleaners and respiratory infections in schools: A modeling study using epidemiological, environmental, and molecular data

Nicolas Banholzer<sup>1,2</sup>, Philipp Jent<sup>2,3</sup>, Pascal Bittel<sup>2,4</sup>, Kathrin Zürcher<sup>1</sup>, Lavinia Furrer<sup>4</sup>, Simon Bertschinger<sup>1</sup>, Ernest Weingartner<sup>5</sup>, Alban Ramette<sup>2,4</sup>, Matthias Egger<sup>1,6,7</sup>, Tina Hascher<sup>2,8</sup>, and Lukas Fenner<sup>1\*,2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Institute of Social and Preventive Medicine, University of Bern, Bern, Switzerland

<sup>2</sup>Multidisciplinary Center for Infectious Diseases, University of Bern, Bern, Switzerland

<sup>3</sup>Department of Infectious Diseases, Inselspital, Bern University Hospital, University of Bern, Bern, Switzerland

<sup>4</sup>Institute for Infectious Diseases, University of Bern, Bern, Switzerland

<sup>5</sup>Institute for Sensors and Electronics, University of Applied Sciences and Arts Northwestern Switzerland, Windisch, Switzerland

<sup>6</sup>Population Health Sciences, University of Bristol, Bristol, UK

<sup>7</sup>Centre for Infectious Disease Epidemiology and Research, University of Cape Town, Cape Town, South Africa

<sup>8</sup>Institute of Educational Science, University of Bern, Bern, Switzerland

\*Corresponding author: [lukas.fenner@unibe.ch](mailto:lukas.fenner@unibe.ch)

## Manuscript information

**Summary:** Using a multiple-measurement approach in a school setting, we found that air cleaners improved air quality, showed a potential benefit in reducing non-SARS-CoV-2 respiratory infections, and were associated with less coughing in a crowded indoor environment.

**Word count:** Abstract 249 words, Main text 2,953 words, Summary: 36 words

**Display items:** Tables 2, Figures 3

**References:** 35

**Supporting information:** STROBE checklist, Supplementary Data with texts, tables, and figures.

30 **Abstract**

31 **Background:** Using a multiple-measurement approach, we examined the real-world effectiveness of  
32 portable HEPA-air filtration devices (air cleaners) in a school setting.

33 **Methods:** We collected environmental (CO<sub>2</sub>, particle concentrations), epidemiological (absences  
34 related to respiratory infections), audio (coughing), and molecular data (bioaerosol and saliva  
35 samples) over seven weeks during winter 2022/2023 in two Swiss secondary school classes. Using a  
36 cross-over study design, we compared particle concentrations, coughing, and the risk of infection  
37 with vs without air cleaners.

38 **Results:** All 38 students (age 13–15 years) participated. With air cleaners, mean particle con-  
39 centration decreased by 77% (95% credible interval 63%–86%). There were no differences in CO<sub>2</sub>  
40 levels. Absences related to respiratory infections were 22 without vs 13 with air cleaners. Bayesian  
41 modeling suggested a reduced risk of infection, with a posterior probability of 91% and a relative  
42 risk of 0.73 (95% credible interval 0.44–1.18). Coughing also tended to be less frequent (posterior  
43 probability 93%). Molecular analysis detected mainly non-SARS-CoV-2 viruses in saliva (50/448  
44 positive), but not in bioaerosols (2/105 positive) or HEPA-filters (4/160). The detection rate was  
45 similar with vs without air cleaners. Spatiotemporal analysis of positive saliva samples identified  
46 several likely transmissions.

47 **Conclusions:** Air cleaners improved air quality, showed a potential benefit in reducing respiratory  
48 infections, and were associated with less coughing. Airborne detection of non-SARS-CoV-2 viruses  
49 was rare, suggesting that these viruses may be more difficult to detect in the air. Future studies should  
50 examine the importance of close contact and long-range transmission, and the cost-effectiveness of  
51 using air cleaners.

52  
53 **Keywords:** schools, air cleaner, respiratory viruses, airborne transmission, molecular detection

## 54 **Introduction**

55 Transmission of respiratory infections such as SARS-CoV-2 and influenza are difficult to mitigate and  
56 control. Person-to-person transmission occurs primarily through the release of respiratory particles  
57 containing the viruses. Recently, the focus has been on small respiratory particles called aerosols,  
58 which have been found to carry the majority of viruses during respiratory activities.<sup>1</sup> Unlike larger  
59 respiratory droplets, which tend to settle quickly, aerosols can remain suspended in the air for several  
60 hours and travel long distances.<sup>2</sup>

61 Improved ventilation systems are critical for a healthy indoor environment and can reduce the risk  
62 of respiratory transmission,<sup>3, 4</sup> especially in schools where students spend most of their time indoors  
63 during the week. Portable HEPA-air filtration devices (air cleaners) may be another cost-effective  
64 alternative to upgrading ventilation systems, but their impact on respiratory viral transmission is  
65 less clear. A population-level study reported a lower incidence of SARS-CoV-2 in US elementary  
66 schools using different ventilation strategies, including air filtration devices.<sup>5</sup> While several studies  
67 showed that air cleaners reduce particle concentrations,<sup>6-8</sup> an association with viral RNA load in  
68 airborne samples could not be found,<sup>9, 10</sup> although recent studies showed that air cleaners effectively  
69 removed SARS-CoV-2 bioaerosols in hospitals and other indoor settings.<sup>11-13</sup> Simulation studies  
70 have further demonstrated the efficacy of air cleaners in reducing the risk of indoor transmission  
71 of SARS-CoV-2,<sup>14</sup> and other respiratory viruses.<sup>15</sup> However, most simulation studies assume that  
72 the detection of RNA equals transmissible virus, despite recent data showing a relevant loss of viral  
73 infectivity in respiratory particles over time.<sup>16</sup> To date, it remains unclear whether reducing particle  
74 concentrations and removing bioaerosols will reduce indoor transmission of respiratory infections.

75 We used a multiple-measurement approach to study transmission of respiratory viruses under  
76 non-pandemic conditions and the effect of air cleaners in a school setting with a cross-over study  
77 design in the winter of 2022/2023. We collected environmental data (CO<sub>2</sub>, particle concentrations),  
78 epidemiological data (absences likely related to respiratory infections), audio recordings (coughing),  
79 and molecular data (detection of viruses in bioaerosol and saliva samples) during a seven-week study  
80 period from January to March 2023 in two Swiss secondary school classes. We determined changes in  
81 particle concentrations, absences related to respiratory infections, coughing, and the rate of positive  
82 saliva samples.

## 83 **Methods**

84 This study is reported as per the Strengthening the Reporting of Observational Studies in  
85 Epidemiology guideline (see STROBE checklist).

### 86 **Study setting and design**

87 We collected data in two classrooms of a secondary school (age of students 14-17 years) in the canton  
88 of Solothurn, Switzerland, for seven weeks from January 16 to March 11, 2023. Figure 1 shows the  
89 schematic study setup.

### 90 **Study intervention**

91 We used a cross-over design to study the effectiveness of air cleaners (Table 1). Air cleaners refer  
92 to commercially available portable HEPA-filtration devices (Xiaomi Mi Air Pro 70m2, Shenzhen,  
93 China). According to the manufacturer, these air cleaners run at clean air delivery rates of  $2 \times 600$   
94  $\text{m}^3/\text{h}$ . When testing the devices in an empty classroom with sub-micrometer sized particles, we  
95 measured a lower effective clean air delivery rate of  $2 \times 420 \text{ m}^3/\text{h}$  (Supplementary Text A).

### 96 **Data collection**

97 An overview of the collected data is provided in Supplementary Text B and Supplementary Table S1.

98

### 99 **Environmental data**

100 An air quality device (AQ Guard, Palas GmbH, Karlsruhe, Germany) continuously measured  
101 indoor  $\text{CO}_2$  levels, aerosol number (particle diameter between 175 nm to  $20 \mu\text{m}$ ) and particle mass  
102 concentrations (PM;  $\text{PM}_1$ ,  $\text{PM}_{2.5}$ ,  $\text{PM}_4$ ,  $\text{PM}_{10}$ ) by minute.<sup>8</sup>

### 103 **Epidemiological data**

104 At study start, we collected aggregated data on age, sex, COVID-19 vaccination and recovery status  
105 in the participating classes. Daily, we collected data on each absent student. For absences due to  
106 illness, we recorded symptoms and the date of symptom onset. We defined a case of respiratory  
107 infection as an absence in which the student reported an illness with at least one respiratory symptom  
108 (Supplementary Text C). All absences are listed in Supplementary Table S2.

**109 Audio recordings and cough detection**

110 We installed portable audio recorders (ZOOM H6; New York, USA) to record sounds continuously.  
111 We determined the number of coughs per minute using an AI algorithm.<sup>17</sup> A recent study showed a  
112 significant correlation between coughing and airborne viral detection.<sup>10</sup>

**113 Molecular data analyses**

114 Both classes participated in repetitive bi-weekly (Tuesdays and Thursdays) saliva testing. Samples  
115 were transported to the laboratory and stored at  $-80^{\circ}\text{C}$  until further processing.<sup>18</sup> All positive  
116 samples are listed in Supplementary Table S3 and Text D. Furthermore, we collected airborne  
117 respiratory viruses in both classrooms with a cyclonic bioaerosol sampling device (Coriolis Micro  
118 Air, Bertin Instruments Montigny-le-Bretonneux, France), running at 200 l/min and collecting  
119 into 15 mL Phosphate-Buffered Saline. The Coriolis Micro Air ran shortly before and during  
120 break times (approximately 60 min/day) to minimize noise. In one class, we also sampled with  
121 the BioSpot- VIVAS condensation particle growth collection device (Aerosol Devices Inc., Ft. Collins,  
122 CO, USA),<sup>19</sup> which operated throughout lessons. The removable parts were regularly autoclaved.  
123 At the end of the day, samples were transported to the Institute of Infectious Diseases and stored  
124 at  $-80^{\circ}\text{C}$ . Finally, we collected swabs from the air cleaners' HEPA filters after each intervention  
125 phase (see Table 1). The HEPA filters were removed and divided into 20 fields. One sterile  
126 Phosphate-Buffered Saline-moistened swab per field was then taken for a total of 20 swabs per  
127 filter.

128 Prior to the real-time (RT)-PCR analysis, daily bioaerosol samples were combined for each  
129 sampling device and filtered using Amicon Ultra-15 Centrifugal Filters with Ultracel 10,000 Dalton  
130 molecular weight cutoffs filters (UFC9010; MilliporeSigma, Burlington, USA) to a volume of 1 mL.  
131 Saliva samples were analyzed directly without prior filtration. The Allplex RV Master Assay  
132 (Seegene, Seoul, South Korea) detects a panel of 19 major respiratory viruses and viral subtypes,  
133 including SARS-CoV-2, influenza, respiratory syncytial, metapneumovirus, adenovirus, rhinovirus,  
134 and parainfluenza.

135 We also performed molecular genotyping for positive saliva, bioaerosol, and air filter samples of  
136 adenovirus and influenza.<sup>20</sup>

## 137 **Statistical analyses and modeling**

138 All statistical analyses were described in a statistical analysis plan<sup>21</sup>. Bioaerosol samples and viral  
 139 load concentrations could not be analyzed because there were too few positive samples. Further  
 140 minor deviations from the statistical analysis plan are documented in Supplementary Texts E–H,  
 141 including detailed descriptions of the models.

## 142 **Particle concentrations**

143 We compared daily mean particle concentrations between study conditions (Supplementary  
 144 Figure S1). We estimated the reduction in particle concentrations with air cleaners using  
 145 Bayesian log-linear regression models, adjusting for observed confounders (Supplementary Text  
 146 E).

## 147 **Risk of infection**

148 We estimated the relative risk of infection with air cleaners using a Bayesian latent variable regression  
 149 model (Supplementary Text F). The number of new respiratory cases  $C$  (observed absences related  
 150 to respiratory infections by date of symptom onset) on day  $t$  in class  $j$  are modeled with a Negative  
 151 Binomial distribution. The expected number of new cases is the weighted sum of the number of  
 152 new infections  $I_{js}$  (latent variable) in the previous days  $s < t$ , with the weights corresponding to the  
 153 probability distribution of the incubation period (Supplementary Figure S2). The number of new  
 154 infections is related to the presence of air cleaners as follows:

$$155 \log I_{js} = \log F_{js} - \log N_{js} + \beta_0 + \beta_1 \cdot \text{AirCleaner}_{js}, \quad (1)$$

157 where  $F_{js}$  is the number of infections in the previous week (a proxy for the number of infectious  
 158 students),  $N_{js}$  is the cumulative number of infections (a proxy for the number of susceptible students),  
 159  $\beta_0$  is the infection rate without air cleaners, and  $\beta_1$  is the effect of air cleaners. Furthermore, the  
 160 effect of air cleaners is adjusted for class-specific effects, the number of students in class, the daily  
 161 air change rate, and the weekly positivity rate for COVID-19 and the consultations for influenza-like  
 162 illnesses in the canton.  
 163

## 164 **Coughing**

165 We estimated the reduction in the daily number of coughs with air cleaners using a Bayesian  
 166 Negative Binomial regression model, using time in class as the model offset and adjusting for

167 observed confounders (Supplementary Text G). In addition, we estimated the association between  
168 the number of coughs and the virus-specific number of positive saliva samples, using only the days  
169 when saliva samples were collected (Tuesdays and Thursdays, for a total of 27 days).

### 170 **Saliva samples**

171 We analyzed the number of positive saliva samples with a Bayesian Multinomial logistic regression  
172 model (Supplementary Text H) and linked the expected number of positive samples to the presence  
173 of air cleaners, adjusting for the cumulative number of positive tests.

### 174 **Software**

175 All analyses were performed in R software (version 4.2.0) and model parameters estimated in Stan  
176 (version 2.21.0).<sup>22, 23</sup> For each outcome, we report the posterior probability of a reduction with air  
177 cleaners. The estimated reduction is reported with the posterior mean and 95% credible interval  
178 (CrI).

### 179 **Ethics statement**

180 The Ethics Committee of the canton of Bern, Switzerland, approved the study (reference no. 2021-  
181 02377). For the saliva samples, we included all students who were willing to participate and obtained  
182 written informed consent from their caregivers.

## 183 **Results**

184 The study population consisted of 38 students (age 13–15 years, 19/19 female/male; Table 2).  
185 Seven students had been vaccinated or recovered from a SARS-CoV-2 infection within the last four  
186 months. During the seven-week study period (total of 1,330 student-days), students were absent  
187 from school for 220 days (18% of the total) of which 129 days (59% of absences) were due to illness.

### 188 **Air quality**

189 The mean aerosol number concentration was 95 1/cm<sup>3</sup> (standard deviation [SD] 81 1/cm<sup>3</sup>) without vs  
190 27 1/cm<sup>3</sup> (SD 34 1/cm<sup>3</sup>) with air cleaners (Figure 2a). The Bayesian regression model suggested a clear  
191 reduction in the aerosol concentration with air cleaners, with a posterior probability of 100%. The  
192 model-estimated decrease was 76% (95%-CrI 63% to 86%), which was greater for larger (PM<sub>10</sub>) than  
193 for smaller (PM<sub>1–4</sub>) particles (Supplementary Figure S3, Supplementary Table S4). Daily mean  
194 CO<sub>2</sub> levels were comparable between study conditions (1,636 ppm (SD 341 ppm) without vs  
195 1,769 ppm (SD 391 ppm) with air cleaners). There was little change in other environmental  
196 variables (Supplementary Figure S4).

### 197 **Risk of infection**

198 Absences related to respiratory infections included 22 cases without vs 13 cases with air cleaners  
199 (Figure 2b). The Bayesian latent variable hierarchical regression model suggested that air cleaners  
200 reduced the risk of infection, with a posterior probability of 91%. The adjusted relative risk of  
201 infection with air cleaners was 0.73 (95%-CrI 0.44 to 1.18). The estimated number of respiratory  
202 infections in school would have been 19 (95%-CrI 9 to 37) if air cleaners had been installed throughout  
203 the study period, compared to 36 (95%-CrI 12 to 92) infections if air cleaners had not been installed.  
204 Detailed estimation results are provided in Supplementary Information (Supplementary Text J,  
205 Supplementary Figure S5, Supplementary Table S5).

### 206 **Coughing**

207 On average, we detected 3.1 coughs/min (SD 1.2 coughs/min) without vs 2.6 coughs/min (SD  
208 1.1 coughs/min) with air cleaners (Figure 2c). The Bayesian model suggested that coughing was less  
209 frequent with air cleaners, with a posterior probability of 93%. The adjusted relative risk of coughing  
210 with air cleaners was 0.93 (95%-CrI 0.85 to 1.02). Coughing was associated with virus-specific  
211 transmission (Supplementary Figure S6).



**212 Saliva samples**

213 We analyzed a total of 448 saliva samples. We detected 15 influenza B, 15 rhinovirus, 14 adenovirus,  
214 3 SARS-CoV-2, 2 metapneumovirus, and 1 parainfluenza virus, respectively (Figure 3a). There were  
215 25 positive saliva samples in both study conditions (Figure 2d) and, based on the Bayesian model,  
216 the posterior probability that air cleaners reduced the positivity rate was 65%, with an adjusted  
217 relative risk of 0.93 (95%-CrI 0.49 to 1.61). The estimated relative risk was not sensitive to infection  
218 to testing delays (Supplementary Figure S7).

**219 Transmission patterns**

220 The distribution of positive saliva samples varied between classes. For example, all but one sample  
221 was positive for adenovirus in class A during the first three study weeks, while the vast majority  
222 of positive influenza B samples were found in class B. To illustrate possible transmission chains  
223 within classes, we linked positive saliva samples of the same virus that were less than one week apart.  
224 Based on this spatiotemporal analysis, we identified 10 possible transmission chains (Figure 3b).  
225 The longest potential transmission chains occurred in January, referring to a cluster of adenovirus  
226 infections in class A and influenza B infections in class B. Molecular genotyping to verify the  
227 proposed transmission network was unsuccessful because we could not amplify and sequence any  
228 of the gene targets. We also analyzed 105 bioaerosol samples and detected in two of them viral  
229 RNA (1 rhinovirus in class A and 1 adenovirus in class B). Similarly, we detected 1 influenza B,  
230 1 rhinovirus, 1 adenovirus, and 1 SARS-CoV-2 in the 20 swabs taken from each filter of an air cleaner  
231 after each intervention phase (160 swabs in total).

## 232 Discussion

233 We used a multiple-measurement approach within a cross-over study design to estimate the risk  
234 of respiratory virus infection in a Swiss school and to assess the effectiveness of air cleaners. We  
235 found a wide range of respiratory viruses in saliva samples, mainly adenovirus, influenza B, and  
236 rhinovirus, but very few viral RNA was detected in bioaerosol samples and on the filters of the  
237 air cleaners. Particle mass concentrations decreased significantly with air cleaners, and Bayesian  
238 modeling based on epidemiological data indicated a reduction in the relative risk of infection with  
239 air cleaners. Coughing was reduced, compatible with air cleaners preventing some symptomatic  
240 infections.

241 We detected a range of respiratory virus in students' saliva, mainly adenovirus, influenza B  
242 and rhinovirus, with only three positive SARS-CoV-2 saliva samples. In a previous, similar study  
243 in the same setting, we estimated the effectiveness of mask wearing and air cleaners during the  
244 SARS-CoV-2 omicron wave in the winter of 2021/2022 and detected almost exclusively SARS-CoV-2  
245 in the students' saliva.<sup>8</sup> A similar shift in the pattern of respiratory viruses has been observed in  
246 other studies.<sup>24, 25</sup> We found a reduction in the risk of SARS-CoV-2 infection for mask wearing, but  
247 not for air cleaners, possibly because the air cleaners were introduced only at the end of the study,  
248 when most students were already infected with SARS-CoV-2.

249 It is well documented that air cleaners improve indoor air quality.<sup>6-8</sup> There are several reasons  
250 why the effect of air cleaners is probably smaller than universal mask wearing, which has been  
251 shown to be a very effective infection control measure.<sup>5, 8, 26, 27</sup> Unlike masks, air cleaners cannot  
252 prevent transmission outside the classroom or transmission due to close range, high particle density.  
253 Prolonged and close contact may be necessary for transmission of some respiratory viruses,<sup>26, 28</sup>  
254 or make transmission more likely despite prior vaccination or infection.<sup>29</sup> Our results further  
255 suggests that air cleaners are more effective at removing larger particles ( $> 5\mu\text{m}$ ), which also explains  
256 the difference between our measured and the manufacturer's reported clean air delivery rate (see  
257 Supplementary Text A). However, many respiratory viruses are carried in smaller particles, which  
258 are more relevant for transmission ( $\leq 5\mu\text{m}$ ).<sup>1</sup> Finally, classroom activity, airflow and other unobserved,  
259 confounding factors make it challenging to evaluate the effects of air cleaners on transmission in  
260 real-world settings.

261 The beneficial effects of air cleaners on indoor air quality and transmission come at a reasonable  
262 cost. The portable air cleaners used in our study cost approximately USD 250 per unit. Their  
263 operating cost-effectiveness in providing clean air could be even higher than that of a ventilation  
264 system when compared in parallel using the same air delivery ratings.<sup>30</sup> Therefore, air cleaners could  
265 be a cost-effective public health measure, particularly during pandemics or epidemics when there is  
266 greater exposure to respiratory infections, and greater concern of becoming infected.<sup>31</sup> However,  
267 their acceptance may be hindered by noise, space limitations, technical issues, and maintenance  
268 requirements.<sup>32</sup> Therefore, investments in professional building ventilation systems are still preferred  
269 in the long run.<sup>33</sup>

270 We detected only few respiratory viruses in bioaerosol samples (1 sample of adenovirus and  
271 1 sample of rhinovirus) and on the filters of the air cleaners (4 positive samples). The low rate of  
272 positive bioaerosol samples may indicate that it is unlikely that airborne transmission occurred in  
273 classrooms. It may be possible that students had relatively little exposure to respiratory viruses at  
274 school and acquired their infections elsewhere. However, the distribution of positive saliva samples  
275 markedly differed between classes. Adenovirus spread in class A during the first three study weeks,  
276 with only two infections of influenza B over the study period. In contrast, influenza B spread  
277 throughout the study in class B, and adenovirus infections were detected only in the last week of  
278 the study. Furthermore, adenovirus infections tend to be mild,<sup>34</sup> and less frequently associated with  
279 cough than influenza,<sup>35</sup> consistent with the comparatively lower frequency of coughing in class B.  
280 Taken together, the class-specific, spatiotemporal patterns indicate that transmission of respiratory  
281 infections may have occurred within the classrooms.

282 Our study has limitations. Aerosol measurements and molecular detection of viruses in bioaerosol  
283 samples document exposure, but not transmission and the direction of transmission (person to air,  
284 air to person) cannot be determined. Further, the reasons for school absences were self-reported  
285 by students and some absences may have been incorrectly attributed to respiratory infections. In  
286 addition, we could only approximate the incubation period for each epidemiological case. Finally,  
287 although the study results are likely to apply to many settings in Switzerland and other European  
288 countries, they will not be applicable to settings in the global South.

289 In conclusion, a wide range of respiratory viruses, but rarely SARS-CoV-2, was detected in  
290 students under non-pandemic conditions when public health measures were lifted. Airborne detection

291 was rare, suggesting that respiratory viruses other than SARS-CoV-2 may be more difficult to detect  
292 and that prolonged close contact may be required for transmission. The risk reduction of respiratory  
293 infections conferred by air cleaners may be modest at the individual level, but the benefit at the  
294 population level in terms of illness and absences prevented is likely to be important. Future studies  
295 should examine the cost-effectiveness of using air cleaners in congregate settings.

## 296 **Acknowledgements**

297 We would like to thank the schools, teachers, and students participating in the study. We are  
298 grateful to the Educational Department of the canton of Solothurn for their support throughout the  
299 study. We would also like to thank Ronald Dijkman for the influenza molecular genotyping and the  
300 biosecurity team (Julia Feldmann, Monika Gsell, Kathrina Summermatter) from the Institute for  
301 Infectious Diseases at the University of Bern for their assistance with the bioaerosol devices. Finally,  
302 we are indebted to the student assistants (Khadija Ahmed, Marie-Joséphine Brancato, Michelle  
303 Bürki, Santiago Martinez, Moric Toszeghi, Sylvain Wasmer) who helped with the data collection in  
304 the schools.

## 305 **Data availability**

307 Preprocessed data and code are available from <https://osf.io/38j9g>.  
308

## 309 **Funding**

310 This work was supported by the Multidisciplinary Center for Infectious Diseases, University of Bern,  
311 Switzerland. NB, LF, and ME are supported by the National Institute of Allergy and Infectious  
312 Diseases (NIAID) through cooperative agreement 5U01-AI069924-05. ME is supported by special  
313 project funding from the Swiss National Science Foundation (grant 32FP30-189498). The funder of  
314 the study had no role in study design, data collection, data analysis, data interpretation, or writing  
315 of the report.

## 316 **Author contributions**

318 Conception and design: NB, KZ, LF, PB, PJ, TS. Epidemiological and environmental data collection:  
319 EW, NB, PJ, KZ, TS, LF. Laboratory data collection: PB, LFu. Additional data collection: TH.  
320 Cough detection: SB. Molecular genotyping: AR, PB, LFu. Statistical analysis: NB. Paper draft:  
321 NB, LF, ME. All authors reviewed and approved the final version of the manuscript.

## References

- 322 **1.** Fennelly KP. Particle sizes of infectious aerosols: Implications for infection control. *Lancet*  
323 *Respir Med.* 2020;8(9):914–924. doi:10.1016/S2213-2600(20)30323-4.
- 324 **2.** Wang C, Pan R, Wan X, Tan Y, Xu L, Ho CS, et al. Immediate psychological responses and  
325 associated factors during the initial stage of the 2019 Coronavirus Disease (COVID-19) epidemic  
326 among the general population in China. *Int J Environ Res Public Health.* 2020;17(5):E1729.  
327 doi:10.3390/ijerph17051729.
- 328 **3.** Wang CC, Prather KA, Sznitman J, Jimenez JL, Lakdawala SS, Tufekci Z, et al. Airborne trans-  
329 mission of respiratory viruses. *Science.* 2021;373(6558):eabd9149. doi:10.1126/science.abd9149.
- 330 **4.** Morawska L, Allen J, Bahnfleth W, Bluysen PM, Boerstra A, Buonanno G, et al. A  
331 paradigm shift to combat indoor respiratory infection. *Science.* 2021;372(6543):689–691.  
332 doi:10.1126/science.abg2025.
- 333 **5.** Gettings J, Czarnik M, Morris E, Haller E, Thompson-Paul AM, Rasberry C, et al.  
334 Mask use and ventilation improvements to reduce COVID-19 incidence in elementary  
335 schools — Georgia, November 16–December 11, 2020. *MMWR.* 2021;70(21):779–784.  
336 doi:10.15585/mmwr.mm7021e1.
- 337 **6.** Park JH, Lee TJ, Park MJ, Oh H, Jo YM. Effects of air cleaners and school characteristics  
338 on classroom concentrations of particulate matter in 34 elementary schools in Korea. *Build*  
339 *Environ.* 2020;167:106437. doi:10.1016/j.buildenv.2019.106437.
- 340 **7.** Buising KL, Schofield R, Irving L, Keywood M, Stevens A, Keogh N, et al. Use of portable  
341 air cleaners to reduce aerosol transmission on a hospital coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19)  
342 ward. *Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol.* 2022;43(8):987–992. doi:10.1017/ice.2021.284.
- 343 **8.** Banholzer N, Zürcher K, Jent P, Bittel P, Furrer L, Egger M, et al. SARS-CoV-2 transmission  
344 with and without mask wearing or air cleaners in schools in Switzerland: A modeling study  
345 of epidemiological, environmental, and molecular data. *PLOS Med.* 2023;20(5):e1004226.  
346 doi:10.1371/journal.pmed.1004226.
- 347

- 348  
349 **9.** Nor NSM, Yip CW, Ibrahim N, Jaafar MH, Rashid ZZ, Mustafa N, et al. Particulate matter  
350 (PM2.5) as a potential SARS-CoV-2 carrier. *Sci Rep.* 2021;11:2508. doi:10.1038/s41598-021-  
351 81935-9.
- 352 **10.** Hanna F, Alameddine I, Zaraket H, Alkalamouni H, El-Fadel M. Airborne influenza virus  
353 shedding by patients in health care units: Removal mechanisms affecting virus transmission.  
354 *PLOS One.* 2023;18(10):e0290124. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0290124.
- 355 **11.** Conway Morris A, Sharrocks K, Bousfield R, Kermack L, Maes M, Higginson E, et al. The  
356 removal of airborne Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) and  
357 other microbial bioaerosols by air filtration on Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) surge  
358 units. *Clin Infect Dis.* 2022;75(1):e97–e101. doi:10.1093/cid/ciab933.
- 359 **12.** Ueki H, Ujie M, Komori Y, Kato T, Imai M, Kawaoka Y. Effectiveness of HEPA fil-  
360 ters at removing infectious SARS-CoV-2 from the air. *mSphere.* 2022;7(4):e00086–22.  
361 doi:10.1128/msphere.00086-22.
- 362 **13.** Myers NT, Laumbach RJ, Black KG, Ohman-Strickland P, Alimokhtari S, Legard A, et al.  
363 Portable air cleaners and residential exposure to SARS-CoV-2 aerosols: A real-world study.  
364 *Indoor Air.* 2022;32(4):e13029. doi:10.1111/ina.13029.
- 365 **14.** Lindsley WG, Derk RC, Coyle JP, Martin SB, Mead KR, Blachere FM, et al. Efficacy of portable  
366 air cleaners and masking for reducing indoor exposure to simulated exhaled SARS-CoV-2 aerosols  
367 — United States, 2021. *MMWR.* 2021;70(27):972–976. doi:10.15585/mmwr.mm7027e1.  
368
- 369 **15.** Cortellessa G, Canale C, Stabile L, Grossi G, Buonanno G, Arpino F. Effectiveness of a portable  
370 personal air cleaner in reducing the airborne transmission of respiratory pathogens. *Build*  
371 *Environ.* 2023;235:110222. doi:10.1016/j.buildenv.2023.110222.
- 372 **16.** Oswin HP, Haddrell AE, Otero-Fernandez M, Mann JFS, Cogan TA, Hilditch TG, et al. The  
373 dynamics of SARS-CoV-2 infectivity with changes in aerosol microenvironment. *Proc Natl Acad*  
374 *Sci.* 2022;119(27):e2200109119. doi:10.1073/pnas.2200109119.
- 375 **17.** Bertschinger S, Fenner L, Denecke K. Feasibility of Cough Detection and Classification Using  
376 Artificial Intelligence in an Ambulatory Setting with a Ceiling Mounted Microphone. In: *IEEE*

- 377  
378 36th International Symposium on Computer-Based Medical Systems (CBMS); 2023. p. 660–665.  
379 doi:10.1109/CBMS58004.2023.00296.
- 380 **18.** Huber M, Schreiber PW, Scheier T, Audigé A, Buonomano R, Rudiger A, et al. High efficacy  
381 of saliva in detecting SARS-CoV-2 by RT-PCR in adults and children. *Microorganisms*.  
382 2021;9(3):642. doi:10.3390/microorganisms9030642.
- 383 **19.** Lednicky J, Pan M, Loeb J, Hsieh H, Eiguren-Fernandez A, Hering S, et al. Highly efficient  
384 collection of infectious pandemic influenza H1N1 virus (2009) through laminar-flow water based  
385 condensation. *Aerosol Sci Tech*. 2016;50(7):i–iv. doi:10.1080/02786826.2016.1179254.
- 386 **20.** Kelly JN, Laloli L, V'kovski P, Holwerda M, Portmann J, Thiel V, et al. Comprehensive single  
387 cell analysis of pandemic influenza A virus infection in the human airways uncovers cell-type  
388 specific host transcriptional signatures relevant for disease progression and pathogenesis. *Front*  
389 *Immunol*. 2022;13. doi:10.3389/fimmu.2022.978824.
- 390 **21.** Banholzer N, Jent P, Bittel P, Furrer L, Egger M, Hascher T, et al.. Transmission of airborne  
391 respiratory infections with and without air cleaners in a school in Switzerland: A modeling  
392 study of epidemiological, environmental, and molecular data – Statistical analysis plan (SAP);  
393 2023. Available from: <https://osf.io/krcms> [last accessed 2023-05-24].
- 394 **22.** Carpenter B, Gelman A, Hoffman MD, Lee D, Goodrich B, Betancourt M, et al. Stan: A  
395 probabilistic programming language. *J Stat Softw*. 2017;76:1–32. doi:10.18637/jss.v076.i01.
- 396 **23.** Hoffman MD, Gelman A. The No-U-Turn Sampler: Adaptively setting path lengths in Hamilto-  
397 nian Monte Carlo. *J Mach Learn Res*. 2014;15:1593–1623. doi:10.5555/2627435.2638586.
- 398 **24.** Nygaard U, Hartling UB, Nielsen J, Vestergaard LS, Dungu KHS, Nielsen JSA, et al. Hospital  
399 admissions and need for mechanical ventilation in children with respiratory syncytial virus  
400 before and during the COVID-19 pandemic: A Danish nationwide cohort study. *Lancet Child*  
401 *Adolesc*. 2023;7(3):171–179. doi:10.1016/S2352-4642(22)00371-6.
- 402 **25.** Sauteur PMM, Beeton ML, Uldum SA, Bossuyt N, Vermeulen M, Loens K, et al. *Mycoplasma*  
403 *pneumoniae* detections before and during the COVID-19 pandemic: Results of a global survey,  
404 2017 to 2021. *Euro Surveill*. 2022;27(19):2100746. doi:10.2807/1560-7917.ES.2022.27.19.2100746.



- 405  
406 **26.** Leung NHL, Chu DKW, Shiu EYC, Chan KH, McDevitt JJ, Hau BJP, et al. Respiratory  
407 virus shedding in exhaled breath and efficacy of face masks. *Nat Med.* 2020;26(5):676–680.  
408 doi:10.1038/s41591-020-0843-2.
- 409 **27.** Milton DK, Fabian MP, Cowling BJ, Grantham ML, McDevitt JJ. Influenza virus aerosols in  
410 human exhaled breath: Particle size, culturability, and effect of surgical masks. *PLOS Pathog.*  
411 2013;9(3):e1003205. doi:10.1371/journal.ppat.1003205.
- 412 **28.** Brankston G, Gitterman L, Hirji Z, Lemieux C, Gardam M. Transmission of influenza A in  
413 human beings. *Lancet Infect Dis.* 2007;7(4):257–265. doi:10.1016/S1473-3099(07)70029-4.
- 414 **29.** Lind ML, Dorion M, Houde AJ, Lansing M, Lapidus S, Thomas R, et al. Evidence of leaky  
415 protection following COVID-19 vaccination and SARS-CoV-2 infection in an incarcerated  
416 population. *Nat Commun.* 2023;14:5055. doi:10.1038/s41467-023-40750-8.
- 417 **30.** Noh KC, Yook SJ. Evaluation of clean air delivery rates and operating cost effectiveness for  
418 room air cleaner and ventilation system in a small lecture room. *Energy Build.* 2016;119:111–118.  
419 doi:10.1016/j.enbuild.2016.03.027.
- 420 **31.** Yürekli H, Yiğit OE, Bulut O, Lu M, Öz E. Exploring factors that affected student well-being  
421 during the COVID-19 pandemic: A comparison of data-mining approaches. *Int J Environ Res*  
422 *Public Health.* 2022;19(18):11267. doi:10.3390/ijerph191811267.
- 423 **32.** Sanguinetti A, Outcault S, Pistochini T, Hoffacker M. Understanding teachers' experiences of  
424 ventilation in California K-12 classrooms and implications for supporting safe operation of schools  
425 in the wake of the COVID-19 pandemic. *Indoor Air.* 2022;32(2):e12998. doi:10.1111/ina.12998.
- 426 **33.** Nardell EA. Transmission and institutional infection control of tuberculosis. *Cold Spring Harb*  
427 *Perspect Med.* 2016;6(2):a018192. doi:10.1101/cshperspect.a018192.
- 428 **34.** Kunz AN, Ottolini M. The role of adenovirus in respiratory tract infections. *Curr Infect Dis*  
429 *Rep.* 2010;12(2):81–87. doi:10.1007/s11908-010-0084-5.
- 430 **35.** Ma X, Conrad T, Alchikh M, Reiche J, Schweiger B, Rath B. Can we distinguish respiratory  
431 viral infections based on clinical features? A prospective pediatric cohort compared to systematic  
432 literature review. *Rev Med Virol.* 2018;28(5):e1997. doi:10.1002/rmv.1997.


433 **Table 1. Cross-over study design.** Description of when portable air cleaners (PAC) were installed in the  
 434 rooms of classes A and B during a seven-week study period from January 16 to March 11, 2023, excluding a  
 435 week of vacation from February 6 to 11.  
 436

|          | <b>Week 1</b><br>Jan 16-21 | <b>Week 2</b><br>Jan 23-28 | <b>Week 3</b><br>Jan 30-Feb 3 | Vacation<br>Feb 6-11 | <b>Week 4</b><br>Feb 13-18 | <b>Week 5</b><br>Feb 20-25 | <b>Week 6</b><br>Feb 27-Mar 3 | <b>Week 7</b><br>Mar 6-11 |
|----------|----------------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------------|----------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------------|
| <b>A</b> | PAC                        | PAC *                      | None                          |                      | None                       | None                       | PAC                           | PAC *                     |
| <b>B</b> | None                       | None                       | PAC *                         |                      | PAC                        | PAC *                      | None                          | None                      |

441 \* Swabs from the HEPA filters taken after each intervention phase and before the vacation.

442  
443**Table 2.** Overview of the study population and person-days of absences.

|  | Class A          | Class B          | Total             |
|--|------------------|------------------|-------------------|
| <b>Students</b>                          | <b>20 (53%)</b>  | <b>18 (47%)</b>  | <b>38 (100%)</b>  |
| <i>Gender</i>                            |                  |                  |                   |
| - Female                                 | 11 (55%)         | 8 (44%)          | 19 ( 50%)         |
| - Male                                   | 9 (45%)          | 10 (56%)         | 19 ( 50%)         |
| <i>Immunity status</i>                   |                  |                  |                   |
| - Recently vaccinated (or recovered)     | 7 (39%)          | 0 (0%)           | 7 ( 18%)          |
| - Not recently vaccinated (or recovered) | 11 (61%)         | 20 (100%)        | 31 ( 82%)         |
| <b>Absent person-days</b>                | <b>110 (50%)</b> | <b>110 (50%)</b> | <b>220 (100%)</b> |
| - Sickness                               | 52 (47%)         | 77 (70%)         | 129 ( 59%)        |
| - Other                                  | 58 (53%)         | 33 (30%)         | 91 ( 41%)         |



444

445


446

447

448

449

**Fig 1. Study setting.** Schematic study setup of the classrooms. One air cleaner was placed in the front and one in the back of the classrooms. All devices were placed at the head level of the students when they were seated. Both classrooms lacked an active HVAC (Heating, Ventilation, Air conditioning) system, but they were ventilated naturally by opening windows at the discretion of the teachers.




450

451

452 **Fig 2. Comparison of outcomes with vs without air cleaners.** At the top of each plot, the posterior  
 453 probability for a reduction with air cleaners is shown, based on the Bayesian model. **(a)** Daily average aerosol  
 454 number concentrations as boxplots. **(b)** Number of respiratory cases. **(c)** Daily average number of detected  
 455 coughs per minute as boxplots. **(d)** Number of positive saliva samples.

456  
457



458

459

460

461

462

463

464

**Fig 3. Molecular detection of respiratory viruses and transmission network based on spatiotemporal analysis of students' saliva samples. (a)** Number of positive saliva samples by virus. **(b)** Daily number of positive saliva samples (colored circles) and possible transmission chains within classes (directed arrows). Positive samples are linked if they belong to the same virus and are less than 1 week apart. Positive samples from the air and filters as blank squares aligned. IFB: influenza B, HRV: human rhinovirus, AdV: adenovirus, CoV: SARS-CoV-2, MPV: human metapneumovirus, PIV: parainfluenza virus.