Accuracy verification of low-cost CO₂ concentration measuring devices for general use as a countermeasure against COVID-19

Yo Ishigaki¹⁾, Koji Enoki¹⁾, Shinji Yokogawa^{1,2)}

Affiliations:

1) Graduate School of Informatics and Engineering, The University of Electro-communications, Chofu, Tokyo, Japan.

2) Info-powered Energy System Research Center (iPERC), The University of Electro-communications, Chofu, Tokyo, Japan.

Corresponding author:

Yo Ishigaki, ishigaki@uec.ac.jp, 1-5-1 Chofugaoka, Chofu, Tokyo 182-8585, Japan.

Declaration of competing financial interests (CFI):

The authors indicate no conflicts of interest.

Abstract:

Within the context of the COVID-19 pandemic, CO₂ sensors that measure ventilation conditions and thereby reduce the risk of airborne infection, are gaining increasing attention. We investigated and verified the accuracy of 12 relatively low-cost sensor models that retail for less than \$45 and are advertised as infection control measures on a major e-commerce site. Our results indicate that 25% of the tested sensors can be used to identify trends in CO₂ concentration, if correctly calibrated. However, 67% of sensors did not respond to the presence of CO₂, which suggests that a type of pseudo-technique is used to display the CO₂ concentration. We recommend that these sensors are not suitable for infection prevention purposes. We also found that all 67% of the sensors that did not respond to CO₂ responded strongly to alcohol. Owing to the widespread use of alcohol in preventing the spread of infectious diseases,

sensors that react to alcohol can display inaccurate values, resulting in inappropriate ventilation behavior. Therefore, we strongly recommended that these sensors not be used. Based on our results, we offer practical recommendations to the average consumer, who does not have special measuring equipment, on how to identify inaccurate CO₂ sensors.

Introduction

In enclosed spaces with inadequate ventilation and air treatment, the airborne spread of SARS-CoV-2 can occur even at a distance of 6 feet or more from an infected person, especially as concentrations of very fine droplets and aerosol particles drift through the air [1]. Within this context, airborne transmission may have accounted for more than 50% of the disease transmission on the Diamond Princess, the cruise ship associated with the SARS-CoV-2 outbreak in Japan [2].

The concentration of indoor carbon dioxide (CO₂) has attracted attention as a proxy for infection risk [3]. While outdoor fresh air has a constant CO₂ concentration of approximately 400 ppm, human breath contains a much larger amount of CO₂ at 30,000–40,000 ppm. Therefore, by measuring indoor CO₂ concentration, it is possible to understand how much human breath is retained in the air.

The American Society of Health Engineers (ASHAE) states that there is a correlation between ventilation capacity and the risk of airborne infection from tuberculosis, measles, chicken pox, influenza, smallpox, and SARS [4]. The

54 Wells-Riley equation (Equation 1) can be used to quantitatively evaluate the risk
55 of airborne infection by bacteria and viruses [5-6].

$$P = 1 - \exp \left[-\frac{Iqpt}{Q} \left\{ 1 - \frac{V}{Q\theta} \left[1 - \exp \left(-\frac{Q\theta}{V} \right) \right] \right\} \right] \quad (1)$$

56
57 In this equation, P is the probability that an infected person will be infected, I
58 is the number of infected persons in the enclosed space, p is the respiratory
59 volume of one person (m^3/h), q is the rate of infectious droplets ($/\text{h}$), t is the time
60 spent by the infected person in the space (h), θ is the time spent by the infected
61 person in the space (h), V is the volume of the room (m^3), and Q is the ventilation
62 rate (m^3/h). Thus, the Wells-Riley equation models the probability of exposure to
63 infectious droplets emitted by an infected person and inhaled by an uninfected
64 person through respiration as the risk quantity. As infectious droplets are
65 accompanied by a high concentration of CO_2 , both of which are airborne, it is
66 beneficial to use CO_2 concentration as an indicator of the airborne infection risk.

67 A number of researchers have suggested that the threshold ventilation
68 rate for maintaining the effective reproduction rate of tuberculosis (the ratio of
69 new secondary infected persons to the source of infection) below 1 corresponds
70 to a CO_2 concentration of 1,000 ppm. Specifically, Du et al. found that by
71 improving the ventilation system in a poorly ventilated university building, where
72 an outbreak of tuberculosis occurred (27 tuberculosis patients and 1,665
73 contacts), and by reducing the maximum CO_2 concentration from 3204 ± 50 to
74 591-603 ppm, the secondary infection rate among new contacts could be
75 reduced to zero (mean follow-up, 5.9 years). Furthermore, the incidence of

tuberculosis among contacts could be reduced by 97% (95% CI: 50–99.9%) when the CO₂ concentration remained below 1,000 ppm [7].

After comprehensively considering laws and regulations concerning CO₂ concentration, the Occupational Hygiene and Ergonomics Subcommittee of the Japan Society for Occupational Health (JSOH) established classifications for estimating ventilation status according to CO₂ concentrations (Table 1), and recommended measures according to each classification [8].

Table 1 Ventilation criteria based on CO₂ concentrations, established by The Occupational Hygiene and Ergonomics Subcommittee of the Japan Society for Occupational Health (JSOH).

CO ₂ concentration	Classification	Description
Less than 1,000 ppm or less	Good	High quality air. The status should be maintained.
1,000 to 1,500 ppm or less	Moderately good	Acceptable limits. Occasional opening of a number of windows is recommended (for a few minutes per hour).
1,500 to 2,500 ppm or less	Poor	Open windows for at least a few minutes every half hour (fully open) and do not use the room.
2,500 to 3,500 ppm or less	Very poor	Open the windows all the time (fully open) and do not use the room.
3,500 ppm or	Extremely poor	Do not use the room.

greater		
---------	--	--

87

88 Like those of other countries, the Japanese Building Standard Law (revised
89 and implemented in 2003), requires the installation of a 24-hour ventilation
90 system in all living rooms to prevent the development of the sick building
91 syndrome, and requires an air change rate per hour (ACPH) of 0.5 times/h or
92 more inside houses. With an ACPH of 0.5 times/h, for example, in a 70 m² space
93 with a standard activity level, the CO₂ concentration at saturation is 800 ppm
94 with two people in the room, 1,000 ppm with three people in the room, and 1,200
95 ppm with four people in the room.

96 While the Building Standard Law specifies the amount of ventilation,
97 Japan's Building Management Law (enacted in 1970) specifies CO₂
98 concentration standards. These laws specify that in buildings used as
99 entertainment venues, department stores, restaurants, shops, offices, and
100 schools, where the enclosed area used for specific purposes is 3,000 m² or more,
101 defined as "specified buildings" (> 8,000 m² for schools), the CO₂ concentration
102 should be 1,000 ppm or less.

103 Against this background, the monitoring of CO₂ concentration by sensors is
104 currently being advocated to reduce the risk of COVID-19 in indoor
105 environments. In many instances, especially in the context of a pandemics, it is
106 recommended to maintain indoor CO₂ concentrations below 800 ppm (e.g.,
107 Minnesota Department of Health, Federation of European Heating Ventilation
108 and Air Conditioning Associations, UK Scientific Advisory Group for Emergency,
109 US Centers for Disease Control and Prevention) [9]. In Japan, a widespread

110 system is used, in which local government supports the cost of installing CO₂
 111 sensors in restaurants to prevent the spread of COVID-19. For example, the
 112 Tokyo Metropolitan Government, Kyoto Prefecture, and Osaka City support the
 113 purchase of infection prevention devices, including CO₂ sensors, up to
 114 100,000–300,000 yen. In addition, Shibuya Ward in Tokyo distributes free CO₂
 115 sensors to restaurants located in the ward.

116 In response to this sudden increase in demand, low-cost CO₂ sensors have
 117 rapidly become available on e-commerce sites such as Amazon, and are
 118 advertised as being effective in preventing the spread of infectious diseases.
 119 Many of these sensors have vague descriptions of their measurement principles,
 120 with several consumers questioning the CO₂ measuring ability of these sensors.
 121 In addition, there is a lack of guidelines for the use of CO₂ sensors in Japan, and
 122 a lack of laws or regulations regarding their accuracy and reliability. In response
 123 to this research need, we purchased several low-cost CO₂ sensors, to verify
 124 their accuracy and investigate the related measurement principles.

125 Although several studies have already evaluated low-cost gas sensors [10,
 126 11], including CO₂ sensors, the global outbreak of COVID-19 has led to a
 127 proliferation of new products on the market for the control of infectious diseases
 128 that have not been tested for efficacy and accuracy. Therefore, we conducted
 129 this study to investigate the accuracy and reliability of these sensors and to offer
 130 advice on these sensors to the general consumer, who does not have access to
 131 specialized inspection equipment.

132

133 **Methodology**

134 In this study, we purchased and investigated 12 relatively low-cost CO₂
 135 sensors (1–12; Table 2), within a price range of 2,900–4,999 JPY (approximately
 136 26–45 USD, at the exchange rate in July 28, 2021) from the Amazon Japan
 137 website, and installed them according to instructions. The sensors were
 138 advertised as being effective in preventing COVID-19 infections. In addition to
 139 the 12 sensors, we purchased two relatively expensive CO₂ sensors, (A and B)
 140 that are widely used for industrial and experimental purposes as reference
 141 devices. Sensor A is manufactured by the T&D corporation TR-76Ui (54,780 JPY,
 142 approximately 500 USD), with a zero and 1500 ppm span calibration, while
 143 Sensor B is manufactured and factory calibrated by the C.H.C. System
 144 corporation NMA-PR-R (47,500 JPY, approximately 430 USD). Both sensors A
 145 and B are based on the non-dispersive infrared (NDIR) method.

146 All 14 sensors (1 to 12, A and B) were activated simultaneously and placed
 147 in a chamber (Fig. 1). The following protocol was used for the experiment:

148

- 149 1. Open the chamber lid.
- 150 2. Turn on the fan.
- 151 3. Ventilate the chamber with room air (adjusted to 25°C) for 5 min.
- 152 4. Close the chamber lid.
- 153 5. Turn off the fan.
- 154 6. <FRESH AIR> Record the displayed values of each measuring
 155 instrument. However, if a value outside the measurement range is
 156 displayed, it is not recorded.
- 157 7. Turn on the fan.

- 158 8. <INJECTION> Inject (additional) CO₂ gas, (additional) room air and/or
- 159 alcohol into the chamber to change the gas concentration in the
- 160 chamber.
- 161 9. Wait for 5 min until the inner air and gas are evenly mixed in the
- 162 chamber.
- 163 10. Turn off the fan.
- 164 11. <CONTROLLED ATMOSPHERE> Record the displayed values of
- 165 each measuring instrument. However, if a value outside the
- 166 measurement range is displayed, it is not recorded.
- 167 12. Return to step 7 (or terminate the experiment).

168

169 Table 2 List of CO₂ sensors used in the experiment.

ID	Manufacturer and/or product name indicated on the purchase page	Price (JPY)	Claimed specifications on the purchase page		
			Sensor type	Measurement range	Accuracy information
1	Kecheer	3,589	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
2	Walfront	4,909	Unknown	0–9,999	±50 ppm ± 5% rdg (0-5000 ppm) 0.05% FSO
3	ROOMMATE Tokyo Deco	3,480	Unknown	400–5,000	Unknown
4	Sign Kingdom Xmonitor-r1	3,680	NDIR	Unknown	Unknown
5	KKmoon	4,899	Unknown	350–2,000	Unknown

6	Elikliv-10	2,900	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
7	Atmonas	4,999	NDIR	400–5,000	Unknown
8	Seawardi	3,009	Unknown	Unknown	Error variation 3 to 30%
9	Rain Queen	4,700	Unknown	400–6,000	±50 ±5%
10	Lnicez	4,298	NDIR	400–5,000	Unknown
11	IUGGAN	4,800	Unknown	400–5,000	Unknown
12	YC22	4,599	Unknown	400–5,000	Unknown
A	T&D TR-76Ui	54,780	NDIR	0–9,999	CO ₂ ± 50 ppm or ± 5% of reading at ≤ 5000 ppm
B	C.H.C.System NMA-PR-R	47,500	NDIR	0–3,000	±75 ppm or ± 5% (whichever is greater)

171

172

173 Figure 1. Image of experimental equipment and setup used for an investigation
174 of the accuracy of 12 CO₂ sensors.

175

176 Results and Discussion

177 We compared the CO₂ values of the 12 investigated sensors to those of the
178 reference sensors (A and B; Fig. 2). The relatively expensive sensor B showed a
179 narrower measurement range than sensor A, although both had very similar
180 response characteristics. Sensor 10 generally displayed higher values than
181 sensor A, while sensors 4 and 7 displayed lower values than sensor A. Although
182 sensor 2 responded to CO₂, it seemed to malfunction, as it displayed very high

CO₂ values. Sensors 1, 3, 5, 6, 8, 9, 11 and 12 did not seem to respond to CO₂ levels. As these eight sensors are able to display total volatile organic compound (tVOC) values, we conducted an additional experiment by applying approximately 5 ml of rubbing alcohol to the inside of the acrylic plate of the chamber.

Figure 2. Response characteristics of CO₂ sensors. Measured values of sensor A, the reference device, are plotted on the horizontal axis, and the measured values of sensors A, B, and 1 to 12 are plotted on the vertical axis, connected by spline curves.

Figure 3. Response characteristics of 14 CO₂ sensors to alcohol, including two reference sensors (A and B). “1. Air” on the x-axis corresponds to the sixth step (FRESH AIR) in the experimental protocol, while “2. Alcohol” refers to the twelfth step of the protocol (CONTROLLED AIR), with 5 ml of alcohol added to the chamber at the step 8 (INJECTION) instead of CO₂.

During this experiment, rather than adding CO₂ gas, 5 ml of alcohol was sprayed on the acrylic wall in the chamber (Fig. 3). To eliminate the cross-recruitment and contamination effect of alcohol, the experiment was performed independently to the previous experiment.

Our results (Fig. 3) indicate that the readings of sensors A, B, 2, 4, 7, and 10 were not affected by the presence of alcohol. On the other hand, sensors 1, 3, 5, 6, 8, 9, 11 and 12 reacted strongly to alcohol. Furthermore, these eight sensors match the sensors that did not respond to CO₂ (Fig. 2).

210 Of the 12 relatively low-cost sensors investigated in this study, three models
211 (sensors 4, 7, and 10; 25% of the total) can potentially be used to determine CO₂
212 concentration levels, if correctly calibrated. However, the accuracy of the
213 sensors was not as good as that of the more expensive reference sensors.
214 Machine learning methods have been proposed for calibration of inexpensive
215 sensors [12, 13]. Sensor 2 seemed to be malfunctioning (8% of the total), while
216 eight sensor models (67%) did not respond to CO₂, and they responded strongly
217 to alcohol, suggesting that the sensors were equipped with different sensors to
218 the CO₂ sensing module.

219 To investigate the sensing module, we purchased and disassembled an
220 extra model of sensor 12 (Fig. 4). Notably, the NDIR sensor was not present.
221 Based on the model number of the sensing module and the manufacturer's
222 specifications [14], we identified that the sensor was not designed for CO₂
223 measurements, but rather for the measurement of "ammonia, hydrogen, alcohol,
224 carbon monoxide, methane, propane, Gan, styrene, propylene glycol, alkyl
225 phenol, toluene, ethylbenzene, xylene, formaldehyde, and other volatile organic
226 gases, incense smoke, wood, paper smoke burning out." This suggests that
227 sensor 12 is designed to display the concentration of CO₂ by a type of imitating
228 algorithm based on the value of the sensing module that detects miscellaneous
229 gases, excluding CO₂.

230 Globally, several sensors display a very vaguely defined measurement
231 called eCO₂ (equivalent CO₂). This is estimated from the tVOC value and has
232 been shown to differ from the actual CO₂ concentration [15].

233 Sensors 1, 3, 6, 8, 9, 11, and 12, which responded strongly to alcohol (Fig.
234 3), all displayed tVOC values separately from the CO₂ concentration. Therefore,
235 we suspected that these six sensor models were displaying eCO₂ values rather
236 than actual CO₂ concentrations. However, the sales pages for these six sensors
237 did not indicate that they used eCO₂ sensors.

238

239

240

241 Figure 4. Sensing module of Sensor 12. A cylindrical object was suspended
242 in the air by four wire bonds, and inside it was a coil heater.

243

244 Based on the results of our experiments, we developed a simple method for
245 consumers to verify the quality of sensors on offer, without needing specialized
246 equipment. Within this context, we recommend the following:

247

1. Ensure that the sensor displays a value of approximately 400 ppm in fresh air outdoors (this will allow for the detection of faulty sensors such as sensor 2, with a large deviation in CO₂ values).
2. Ensure that the CO₂ concentration rises significantly when breathing on the sensor (this will help identify sensors that do not respond to increases in CO₂, such as Sensors 1, 3, 5, 6, 8, 9, 11 and 12).
3. Ensure that the sensor does not react erroneously to alcohol by holding a hand dipped in an alcohol disinfectant close to the sensor (this eliminates low-quality sensors that pseudo-indicate CO₂ concentration from tVOC concentrations such as alcohol).

Conclusions

Twenty-five percent of the relatively low-cost sensors investigated in this study have the potential to be used for identifying trends in CO₂ concentration, if correctly calibrated, although with a poor accuracy. Notably, 67% of the sensors did not respond to changes in CO₂ levels, which suggests that various pseudo-masquerading techniques are being used to display CO₂ concentrations. These sensors should not be used to prevent the spread of infectious diseases. In addition, the 67% of the sensors reacted strongly to alcohol. As alcohol is widely used indoors to prevent the spread of COVID-19, sensors that respond to alcohol will display inflated values, which can lead to incorrect ventilation behavior. Therefore, we strongly recommended that these sensors not be used.

This study was conducted using a total of 14 commercially available sensor models. However, there are many models of CO₂ sensors available in the

272 market. We suggest that future research focus on an exhaustive analysis of the
273 sensors available in the market as a basis for a discussion on the guidelines and
274 regulations for CO₂ sensors. We are planning to use gas chromatography with
275 an accuracy of ± 0.1 ppm to simultaneously detect the concentration of alcohol
276 and carbon dioxide for more accurate verification. With this method, we will be
277 able to measure both organic and inorganic gases, which was not possible
278 before.

279 In addition, clarification of the electrical circuit, catalyst, semiconductor
280 composition, and solid-state properties of the sensing modules (Fig. 4) will assist
281 to pinpointing the purpose for which these sensors were developed. Furthermore,
282 we suggest that future research focus on not only conducting exposure
283 experiments with pure CO₂ gas, but also include accurate measurements with
284 human-derived CO₂ gases, including various volatile organic compounds.

285

286 **Notes**

287 The authors declare no conflicts of interest. This paper has been previously
288 submitted to medRxiv, a preprint server for health sciences. This study was
289 approved by the Ethics Committee on Experiments on Human Subjects
290 (approval number of 21005), The University of Electro-communications, located
291 at Chofugaoka 1-5-1, Chofu, Tokyo, Japan.

292

293 **Acknowledgments**

294 This work was supported by the Research Grant Program of the KDDI
295 Foundation. In addition, some of the data acquisition technologies in this study
296 are based on results obtained from a project commissioned by the New Energy
297 and Industrial Technology Development Organization (NEDO).

298

299 **Data availability**

300 The raw data of the graphs are available on FigShare.

301 [https://figshare.com/articles/figure/Accuracy_verification_of_low-cost_CO2_con](https://figshare.com/articles/figure/Accuracy_verification_of_low-cost_CO2_concentration_measuring_devices_for_general_use_as_a_countermeasure_against_infectious_diseases/15067557)
 302 [centration_measuring_devices_for_general_use_as_a_countermeasure_against](https://figshare.com/articles/figure/Accuracy_verification_of_low-cost_CO2_concentration_measuring_devices_for_general_use_as_a_countermeasure_against_infectious_diseases/15067557)
 303 [infectious_diseases/15067557](https://figshare.com/articles/figure/Accuracy_verification_of_low-cost_CO2_concentration_measuring_devices_for_general_use_as_a_countermeasure_against_infectious_diseases/15067557)

304

305 **References**

- 306 1) CDC (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention), SARS-CoV-2
 307 Transmission, Summary of recent changes, Updated May 7, 2021
 308 Online:
 309 [https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/science/science-briefs/sars-cov](https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/science/science-briefs/sars-cov-2-transmission.html)
 310 [-2-transmission.html](https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/science/science-briefs/sars-cov-2-transmission.html) (accessed 25 July 2021)
- 311 2) Azimi P, Keshavarz Z, Laurent JGC, Stephens B, Allen JG. Mechanistic
 312 transmission modeling of COVID-19 on the Diamond Princess cruise ship
 313 demonstrates the importance of aerosol transmission. Proc Natl Acad Sci
 314 2021; 118(8) e2015482118; DOI: 10.1073/pnas.2015482118.
- 315 3) Memarzadeh F. Room Ventilation and Airborne Disease Transmission,
 316 American Hospital Association, Editor: The American Society for Healthcare
 317 Engineering; 2013.
- 318 4) Wells WF. *Airborne contagion and air hygiene*. Harvard: Harvard University
 319 Press, 1955.
- 320 5) Riley EC, Murphy G, Riley RL. Airborne spread of measles in a suburban
 321 elementary school. Am J Epidemiol 1978; 107: 421-432.
- 322 6) Buonanno G, Stabile L, Morawska L. Estimation of airborne viral emission;
 323 Quanta emission rate of SARS CoV-2 for infection risk assessment. Environ
 324 Int 2020; 141: 1–8.
- 325 7) Du CR, Wang SC, Yu MC, Chiu TF, Wang JY, Chuang PC, Jou R, Chan PC,
 326 Fang CT. Effect of ventilation improvement during a tuberculosis outbreak in
 327 underventilated university buildings , Indoor Air 2019; 30(3); 422-432.
- 328 8) The Occupational Hygiene and Ergonomics Subcommittee of the Japan
 329 Society for Occupational Health (JSOH): Ventilation simulator for COVID-19
 330 countermeasures (COVID-19 Taisaku-you Kanki Simulator). Online:
 331 [http://jsoh-ohe.umin.jp/covid_simulator/ventilation_simulator_manual_ver1.0](http://jsoh-ohe.umin.jp/covid_simulator/ventilation_simulator_manual_ver1.0.pdf)
 332 [.pdf](http://jsoh-ohe.umin.jp/covid_simulator/ventilation_simulator_manual_ver1.0.pdf) (accessed 25 July 2021)
- 333 9) Eykelbosh, A. Indoor CO₂ Sensors for COVID-19 Risk Mitigation: Current
 334 Guidance and Limitations. Vancouver, BC: National Collaborating Centre for
 335 Environmental Health. 2021 May.

- 336 Online:
337 [https://ncceh.ca/documents/field-inquiry/indoor-co2-sensors-COVID-19-risk-](https://ncceh.ca/documents/field-inquiry/indoor-co2-sensors-COVID-19-risk-mitigation-current-guidance-and)
338 [mitigation-current-guidance-and](https://ncceh.ca/documents/field-inquiry/indoor-co2-sensors-COVID-19-risk-mitigation-current-guidance-and) (accessed 25 July 2021).
- 339 10) Lewis AC, Lee JD, Edwards PM, Shaw MD, Evans MJ, Moller SJ, Smith KR,
340 Buckley JW, Ellis M, Gillot SR, Whited A. Evaluating the performance of low
341 cost chemical sensors for air pollution research. Faraday Discuss 2016; 189
342 Online: <https://doi.org/10.1039/C5FD00201J> (accessed 25 July 2021).
- 343 11) Castell N, Dauge FR, Schneider P, Vogt M, Lerner U, Fishbain B, Broday D,
344 Bartonova A. Can commercial low-cost sensor platforms contribute to air
345 quality monitoring and exposure estimates? Environ Int 2017; 99: 293-302,
346 ISSN 0160-4120, 2017.
347 Online: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envint.2016.12.007> (accessed 25 July 2021)
- 348 12) Zimmerman N, Presto AA, Kumar SPN, Gu J, Hauryliuk A, Robinson ES,
349 Robinson AL, Subramanian R. A machine learning calibration model using
350 random forests to improve sensor performance for lower-cost air quality
351 monitoring. Atmos Meas Tech, 2018; 11:291–313.
352 Online: <https://doi.org/10.5194/amt-11-291-2018> (accessed 25 July 2021)
- 353 13) Zaidan MA, Motlagh NH, Fung PL, Lu D, Timonen H, Kuula J, Niemi JV,
354 Tarkoma S, Petäjä T, Kulmala M, Hussein T. Intelligent Calibration and
355 Virtual Sensing for Integrated Low-Cost Air Quality Sensors. IEEE Sensors
356 Journal 2020; 20(22): 13638-13652 doi: 10.1109/JSEN.2020.3010316.
357 Online: <https://ieeexplore.ieee.org/document/9144227> (accessed 25 July
358 2021)
- 359 14) TPM-300 Air Quality Module Intelligent Air Quality Monitoring Module Air
360 Sensor
361 Online:
362 [https://ardubotics.eu/en/sensors/1243-tpm-300-air-quality-module-intelligent](https://ardubotics.eu/en/sensors/1243-tpm-300-air-quality-module-intelligent-air-quality-monitoring-module-air-sensor.html)
363 [-air-quality-monitoring-module-air-sensor.html](https://ardubotics.eu/en/sensors/1243-tpm-300-air-quality-module-intelligent-air-quality-monitoring-module-air-sensor.html) (accessed 25 July 2021)
- 364 15) Varzaru G, Zarnescu A, Ungurelu R, Secere M. Dismantling the confusion
365 between the equivalent CO₂ and CO₂ concentration levels. 11th International
366 Conference on Electronics, Computers and Artificial Intelligence (ECAI)
367 2019: pp. 1-4, doi: 10.1109/ECAI46879.2019.9042113.