TITLE:

Assessment of indoor biological air quality at a mass gathering event in an unimproved exhibition facility during the COVID-19 pandemic using a novel air sampling technology.

AUTHORS:

Julian Gordon¹, Osama Abdullah¹, Rachel Reboulet¹, Kara Hanson¹, Christine Sadowski¹, Hunter Rennels¹, Steve Kuemmerle¹, Richard Tuttle², Kristen Solocinski², Brittany Knight², Jacob Wilkinson² and Gavin Macgregor-Skinner³.

¹Inspirotec Inc, North Chicago, IL

²MRI-Global, Kansas City, MO, an independent research organization

³Global Biorisk Advisory Council, A Division of ISSA, Rosemont, IL

KEY WORDS

Mold; allergens; trade show; (1→3)-β-D-Glucan; cat; dog

ABSTRACT

The objective was to evaluate the determination of biomarkers of air quality during a mass gathering event at a convention center using a novel air sampling device, AirAnswers®. This sampler has previously only been used in smaller locations. Here it was run at five crowded locations within the exhibit area for the four days duration of a trade show. The AirAnswers® device uses electro-kinetic flow to sample air at high rates and capture bio-aerosols on grounded electrodes in assayable form. Cartridges were removed from the devices and immediately conveyed to the Inspirotec facility in North Chicago, where assays were performed.

Biomarkers determined were for allergens and molds previously described for this system. Testing for a new marker, severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) RNA was also included. The method was validated by determination of capture efficiency with reference to an impinger sampler in a Class III controlled environment chamber. Average capture efficiency for triplicate runs was 14%. One SARS-CoV-2 positive sample as found at the registration area, which was physically separate from the main exhibit area.

Cat allergen Fel d 1 was found in four of the locations, dog allergen Can f 1 at two. The airborne biomarker of mold proliferation, (1→3)-β-D-Glucan, was above the assay range in all locations. The widespread presence of this mold marker could be accounted for by signs of water leakage. A generic 18S RNA marker for mold was developed and similarly showed the presence of mold in all locations, as was a genus marker for *penicillium*. A species marker for *Cladosporium cladosporioides* was in two locations. Species markers for *Eurotium amstelodami* and *Trichoderma viride* were each in a single location.

The main findings were of the widespread presence of mold markers, and the sporadic appearance of SARS-CoV-2. Masking was recommended but not enforced.

INTRODUCTION

The AirAnswers® device for air sampling uses electro-kinetic flow to sample air at high rates, and capture bio-aerosols on the grounded electrodes in assayable form. Published data to date using this system [1-4] has been for single home locations and in various locations in a school system [5]. Previous measurements have focused on common household allergens and (1→3)-β-D-Glucan, a fungal cell-wall fragment. In this study, the utility is extended to the validation of the measurement of airborne SARS-CoV-2.

As scientific understanding of the routes of severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) the causative agent of Coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) transmission progressed, experts in the field concluded that the main means of

transmission was via fine droplets in the air [6]. This was based on identification of spreader events from the origin in Hunan, China and subsequent global spread. However, direct measurements of the airborne coronavirus have been limited. Heneghan et al placed online a comprehensive review of work on airborne SARS-CoV-2 and showed the need for a standardized validated procedure [7]. All work thus far has been based on limited numbers of observations and no formal validation of methods. Methods that have been applied to attempts to detect airborne SARS-CoV-2 include glass fiber filter [8], gelatin filters [9] various other kinds of filters [10], condensate capture [11-14], NIOSH vortex sampler[15-17] electrostatic aerosol to hydrosol [18], SKC Impinger [19], personal environmental monitor [20], Sioutas Cascade Impactor [21].or bubbling through triazole [22]. One study made use of the AirAnswers® to show presence of airborne SARS-CoV-2 associated with the choir in a high school [5]. Here the measurement is validated in a controlled environmental chamber.

After being canceled in 2020, amid the COVID-19 pandemic, the trade show returned in 2021, and AirAnswers® devices were placed at five locations within the exhibit area. The facility had been unoccupied for two years, and only one other convention had been held immediately preceding this one. We analyzed air samples for biological agents that included allergens, mold, and SARS-CoV-2 virus.

METHODS

1. Description of venue.

At the request of the trade show organizers, identifiers to the actual congress have been kept anonymous. Air samples were taken at the positions indicated as 1-5 in Fig 1. The location was in a ballroom in a conference center during a four-day trade show for environmental remediation and cleaning professionals. The ballroom is 85,204 sq. ft, 358 ft width, 238 ft length and 30–34 ft high. The foyer was separated from the ballroom by full height walls and is 15,670 sq. ft. Positions of doorways into the ballroom area are indicated in Fig. 1.

Fig. 1. Layout of tradeshow.

Exhibit area and locations of individual exhibits are shown. Dispositions of samplers are numbered locations in yellow boxes. Registration area is in a foyer outside of general exhibit area.

There were approximately 3500 people registered to attend the meeting. Of these 3500, it is estimated that up to 2500 people may have been in the ballroom at any one time. Masking or distancing were not strictly observed, but evidence of vaccination had been required of participants. Locations in high traffic and/or congregation areas, e.g. meeting

registration areas, concourses, waiting areas, water stations, etc. were identified as possible positions for Air Answers™ device placements. Actual positions selected were in the registration area (1), at a water station where bottled water was handed out (2), AirAnswers® Booth (3), and other vendors' booths at (4) (5). Multiple 30-minute seminars were conducted each day at booth (5). Permission for the placements were provided by the trade show organizers and no complaints were received about the presence of AirAnswers® devices.

AirAnswers® devices were run for four days for the duration of the trade show. Cartridges containing captured bioaerosol sample were removed from the devices and immediately conveyed to the Inspirotec facility in North Chicago where assays were performed.

2. Test methods.

Multiplex immunoassays for allergens were performed at Indoor Biotechnologies (Charlottesville, Va) using their proprietary MARIA® technology for: pollens: Birch (Amb a 1), Ragweed (Bet v 1), Timothy grass (Phl p 5); Pets: Dog (Can f1), Cat (Fel d 1); Pests: Cockroach (Bla g 2) and Mouse (Mus m1). Assay of (1→3)-β-D-glucan, a measure of aerosolized fungal cell wall fragments, was performed using the kinetic Limulus Amebocyte assay (Associates of Cape Cod, Inc., Woods Hole, Massachusetts).

Species-specific mold spore analysis was on the insoluble fraction from the electrode extracts with the fungal-specific quantitative polymerase chain reaction (qPCR) for 23 species, provided by Eurofins (Eurofins EMLab P&K Chicago, Naperville, IL) based on EPA designs [23, 24]. Further, we have designed a set of genus-specific primers and probes based on the sequences listed by the EPA [25], see supplementary data, Table S1. A BLAST search was conducted on each set of primers and probes to confirm *in silico* specificity. In addition, total fungal load was measured with primers for a conserved region of the 18S RNA gene [25] (supplementary data Table S1)..

3. Validation of SARS-CoV-2 virus capture efficiency.

Testing was performed at MRI-Global, an independent research organization, in a 2.5 ft X 3.5 ft 1.5 ft plexiglass Class III biosafety cabinet, total volume about 371 L. USA-WA1/2020 strain of virus (BEI Resources, Manassas, VA) was cultivated in Dulbecco Modified Eagles Medium with 5% fetal bovine serum, and penicillin, streptomycin and neomycin. Freshly grown stock at 3.16×10^6 TCID₅₀/mL was injected into the chamber. Test runs were for 30 minutes. The chamber contained triplicate AirAnswers® devices and a Midget Sample Impinger (Ace Glass) as reference method. Devices were placed in the chamber equidistant from the walls with a fan running for 10 minutes prior to run. A collision 6 Jet Nebulizer for aerosol generation, driven by HEPA filtered air, was filled with 10 mL of viral suspension prior to the run. An APS 3221 aerosol particle sizer

pulled air for 30 seconds at times 0, 10 and 20 minutes, with dynamic particle size range 0.3 to 20 μm . Particle count results are given in Supplementary Data Table S2 for the three runs

Table 1. Capture efficiency of COVID-19 amplicons compared to impinger reference device.

Sampler	Copies/mL	Copies/extr.	Flow rate(lpm)	Volume sampled L/run	Copies/L	Capture efficiency (%)
1	4.30E+06	8.60E+07	110	3300	2.61E+04	16.1
2	4.30E+06	8.60E+07	104	3120	2.76E+04	17.0
3	2.50E+06	5.00E+07	113	3390	1.47E+04	9.1
Impinger	6.80.E+05	6.80.E+06	1.4	42	1.62E+05	

Copies/mL were from samples extracted with 10 mL DMEM per electrode and 10 mL DMEM initially in Impinger. PCR analysis of the extracts was as follows. The PCR plates included a five-point standard curve prepared using the synthetic quantitative SARS-CoV-2 RNA from ATCC (Cat # VR-3276SD) containing the ORF, E, and N genes at 10,000 copies/ μL down to 1 copy/ μL . All PCR reactions were performed in triplicate for each sample. The amplification within the range of the standard curve was verified for the Test Device collection plate sample extracts, impinger reference samples, and virus stock dilutions. The slope and y-intercept from the standard curve were then used to calculate the copies/mL of SARS- CoV-2 nucleocapsid RNA detected in the test samples, as well as the concentration of the stock virus. Number of amplicons per unit volume of air was calculated from the amount captured the volume of air sampled for each device. The capture efficiencies were determined with the reference method defined as 100%. The average capture efficiency for COVID-19 by the AirAnswers™ device was 14.1% (Table 1). At this value, the lower limit of detection (LLOD) for four days of sampling is approximately 1 copy per 5 M^3 of air.

The samples collected with the AirAnswers® device were assayed by real-time PCR with a BioRad CFX96 Thermocycler. A modified CDC guideline protocol was adjusted for air samples [26]. RNA Isolation was performed with (QIAGEN Viral RNA Mini Kit). N1 primers and probe, MasterMix and Positive control were provided by Integrated DNA Technologies, Thermo Fisher Scientific, and ATCC.

RESULTS.

(1) Allergen at 5 locations in the Convention Center.

AirAnswers® devices were run at 5 locations during the course of the trade show. Of the common airborne allergens tested, cat (Fel d 1) and dog (Can f 1) were detected (Table 2). Both were present in the registration area and Fel d 1 only was present in three booth locations. Can f 1 was additionally found at an area where multiple 30-minute seminars were conducted each day. The cat allergen is well known to be easily spread and could be carried on participants' clothes. The fact that not all locations in the

Table 2. Allergen levels in air at 5 locations in conference center.

Location	1	2	3	4	5
Allergen	Registration	Water station	Air Answers Booth	Booth	Seminar Booth
Amb a 1	<0.09	<0.09	<0.09	<0.09	<0.09
Bet v 1	<0.3	<0.3	<0.3	<0.3	<0.3
Bla g 2	<1.7	<1.7	<1.7	<1.7	<1.7
Can f 1	0.18	<0.10	<0.10	<0.10	0.18
Fel d 1	0.09	<0.03	0.07	0.19	0.09
Mus m 1	<0.02	<0.02	<0.02	<0.02	<0.02
Phl p 5	<0.3	<0.3	<0.3	<0.3	<0.3
(1→3)-β-D-Glucan	>100	>100	>100	>100	>100

Allergen levels (pg/M³) in air at 5 locations indicated in Fig 1. Samples were analyzed by MARIA and Limulus Amebocyte assay as described in methods.

hall had the same allergen profile shows that there is not perfect mixing of the air during the four day course of the sampling.

(2) Fungal presence in the air of Convention Center.

All (1→3)-β-D-Glucan results were elevated above the measuring range of the assay (>100 pg/M³: Table 2). This suggests the extensive presence of mold or residues of

Table 3. Mold genus and species at 5 location in the Convention Center

Location on floor plan	1	2	3	4	5
Species	Registration	Water station	AirAnswers booth	Booth	Seminar booth
Acremonium strictum	<3	<3	<6	<5	<3
Alternaria alternata	<7	<6	<13	<12	<6
Aspergillus flavus	9	<5	<12	<11	<5
Aspergillus fumigatus	20	<2	<5	<5	<3
Aspergillus niger	<3	<2	<5	<4	<2
Aspergillus ochraceus	<4	<3	<7	<6	<3
Aspergillus sydowii	<109	<85	<195	<177	<92
Aspergillus ustus	<1	<1	<2	<1	<1
Aspergillus versicolor	<14	<11	<25	<23	<11
Chaetomium globosum	<1	<1	<1	<1	<1
Cladosporium cladosporioides (Type 1)	160.0	<3	26	<6	<3
Eurotium (Asp.) amstelodami	<5	<4	103	<8	<4
Memnoniella echinata	<4	<3	<8	<7	<3
Paecilomyces variotii	<1	<1	<1	<1	<1
Penicillium aurantiogriseum	<30	<23	<55	<49	<25
Penicillium brevicompactum	<25	<20	<45	<41	<21
Penicillium chrysogenum (Type 2)	<8	<6	<15	<13	<7
Penicillium purpurogenum	<37	<26	<84	<73	<29
Penicillium variable	<88	<66	<171	<153	<72
Scopulariopsis brevicaulis	<2	<1	<3	<3	<2
Stachybotrys chartarum	<1	<1	<1	<1	<1
Trichoderma viride	340	<4	<10	<9	<5
Ulocladium botrytis	<1	<1	<2	<2	<1
Genus					
Aspergillus	6	<3	<3	<3	4
Chaetomium	<5	<5	<5	<5	<5
Fusarium	<3	<3	<3	<3	<3
Memnionella	8	<2	5	<2	8
Penicillium	7	4	6	6	8
Stachybotrys	<1	<1	<1	<1	<1
Trichoderma	<4	<4	<4	<4	<4
Fungal generic 18s	47	15	30	21	48

Mold species were based on qPCR on spores for the RMI group and genus based on qPCR of total extracts as described in methods. Results are in spore equivalents per sample.

mold in the building. Some water leak was noted in the ceiling above the water station (Location 2), but high values of (1→3)- β -D-Glucan were found in all areas. Therefore, more detailed analysis of mold speciation was undertaken making use of the availability of standard primer and probe sets as used for detecting species for calculation of relative moldiness index (RMI), as provided by Fintech. Table 3 lists the results for each species but we did not calculate RMI as RMI is based on values from spores collected in dust, and this study focused on measurement of airborne spores. The results are informative of the degree to which species detected, if any, will spread through the entire space. *Cladosporium cladosporioides* and *Trichoderma viride* are present in the two locations, the registration desk area and the AirAnswers® Booth (location 3 in Fig 1). This parallels the distribution of the dog allergen Can f 1. The Registration desk area is located in the foyer, which is walled off from the main exhibit, although there may be some air exchange through the connecting doors. The AirAnswers® Booth also shows the presence of *Eurotium* (Asp.) *amstelodami*, not detected in the other sample locations.

The RMI primer-probe sets are well-established for mold species. Possible mold species may be missed by not being included in the RMI list. We, therefore, designed genus-specific probes and primers that may lead to results with more generality. The genus tests were done on total extract from the electrodes, so that, in addition to spores, any airborne fragments of fungus that included amplifiable DNA or DNA fragments would be included, if present. Results in Table 2 show *Aspergillus* was detected in the registration desk area, even though no species of aspergillus spores was found. *Penicillium* was detected at all 5 locations, even though no *Penicillium* spores had been detected at the species level. This suggests that some undefined *Penicillium* species spore or fragments was in the air of the entire facility, and that was not included in the RMI 23. *Memnionella* was detected at three locations of the facility, even though no *Memnionella* spores had been detected at the species level. Not unexpectedly, the fungal-generic 18S primer and probe set confirmed the presence of fungal material in the air throughout.

(3). Presence of SARS-CoV-2 in the Exhibit Hall.

SARS-CoV-2 was detected at the registration desk area and not at the other four sampling sites. This is an area of daily high-density crowding and high people traffic between the foyer and the main exhibit hall. The sampler at the registration desk area was positive at approximately 260,000 gene copies/M³ while four other sites were all negative at <1 gene copy/5 M³ of air. The presence of the virus only in the registration desk area could be explained by an infected individual or an asymptomatic virus shedder who either did not go on to visit the exhibition area, or that the air volume in the exhibit was so large that the shed virus was diluted to undetectable levels. This supports results above that a particular mold species may be confined to a relatively limited air space like that around the registration desk. Nevertheless, the occurrence of virus in the air at any location means that it is premature to relax restrictions that are intended to prevent occurrence of spreader events.

240

241 DISCUSSION.

242 With the advent of widespread vaccination and combined with masking and distancing,
 243 the risk of spread of the virus may be less, but this should not promote a false sense of
 244 security where precautions are relaxed. Indeed, the occurrence of waves of infection
 245 can be seen as feedback oscillations, when the frequency of hospitalizations and
 246 deaths is seen to decrease, public officials relax precautions to minimize damage to the
 247 economy, followed by rise of infection rates. This is exacerbated by the positive
 248 selection for more aggressive strains such as the delta variant and now the Omicron
 249 variant. The results presented here show that break-through events may occur with
 250 current practices. While it is not known to what extent the SARS-CoV-2 was associated
 251 with active disease or resulted in the spread of active disease technology for
 252 environmental surveillance to determine whether environmental measures are effective,
 253 and, if not, what remedial measures might be applicable for future events. The
 254 measurements of airborne molds and allergens also provide supportive information on
 255 the performance of whatever air-cleaning system is in place. Of those mold species
 256 identified as being present in the Convention (Table 3), *Trichoderma viride*, one of the
 257 zero tolerance molds, was detected along with *Cladosporium*. *Cladosporium*, one of the
 258 most allergenic molds, was detected in the registration desk area (1). *Cladosporium*
 259 was also located at the AirAnswers booth. For the air to be considered clean, the
 260 sources of these molds should be identified and eliminated.

261

262 It is noteworthy that no single strategy will eliminate the pandemic. Vaccination is never
 263 100% effective. Masking and distancing lower the risk, but even masking does not
 264 completely eliminate the risk of infection. There is work suggesting that eyes may be a
 265 site for viral penetration [27] although eye protection is no longer widely used.

266 For a facility with an existing HVAC system, the cost of replacement or updating will
 267 depend on the specific facility. For a facility such as that which is the subject of this
 268 work, a more direct way of cleaning the air could be to add mobile air-cleaning devices
 269 throughout the facility. An example of a current system is that from Integrated Viral
 270 Protection portable air sterilization units (www.ivpair.com). Costs range from \$750 to
 271 \$9,999, depending on capacity. Their Venue Mobile Unit costs \$13,995.00. This unit
 272 provides powerful circulation up to 30,000 cubic feet, over 3-5 changes an hour. This
 273 unit is built for large commercial spaces & facilities, delivering clean, virus-free indoor air
 274 [28]. The area of the Ballroom, which is the subject of the current work, is 85,204 sq ft.
 275 We estimate that 6 such units would be required to clean the air of this large space, at a
 276 cost of \$84,000. This would be the minimal cost to remediate the air during a crowded
 277 congress, in the absence of a radical upgrade to the current HVAC system. In contrast,
 278 the analysis provided by AirAnswers would cost approximately \$5,500. It is a cost-
 279 effective way of determining whether a more expensive remediation will be required.

280 The presence of devices was accepted by organizers and no complaints received. A
 281 single measurement of SARS-CoV-2 above detection limits could be the initiation of a
 282 spreader event. The present study provides a baseline against which to monitor any
 283 future improvements of the air handling system. Karimzadeh et al [29] speculated that
 284 approximately 100 particles inhaled are sufficient to trigger an infection. From the
 285 concentration of particles measured at the registration desk, 260/L, an infectious dose
 286 would be inhaled in approximately 23 seconds, based on a standard breathing rate of
 287 70 lpm. However, the PCR assays for SARS-CoV-2 may greatly overestimate the
 288 number of infectious particles in the air as non-viable damaged virus or viral fragments.
 289 There was no indication that this was a superspreader event as there was no
 290 documented number of actual cases following the event. Spread may have also been
 291 mitigated by the organizer's requirement that participants be vaccinated. Nevertheless,
 292 this provides a powerful motivation to ensure that indoor air quality should be monitored
 293 at mass gathering events especially during a pandemic.

294

295 ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

296

297 This work was funded by Inspirotec Inc.

298 We gratefully acknowledge the help of Larry Cooper of The Experience for supporting
299 the facilitation and the execution of this study

300

REFERENCES

1. Gordon, J., et al., *A new patient-operated sampling device for measurement of aeroallergens*. Annals of Allergy Asthma & Immunology, 2016. **116**(5): p. 475-476.
2. Gordon, J., et al., *A simple novel device for air sampling by electrokinetic capture*. Microbiome, 2015. **3**.
3. Gordon, J., et al., *Validation of a novel sampling technology for airborne allergens in low-income urban homes*. Annals of Allergy Asthma & Immunology, 2018. **120**(1): p. 96-+.
4. Richardson, M., et al., *Concurrent measurement of microbiome and allergens in the air of bedrooms of allergy disease patients in the Chicago area*. Microbiome, 2019. **7**(1): p. 82.
5. Crowe, J., et al., *Assessment of a Program for SARS-CoV-2 Screening and Environmental Monitoring in an Urban Public School District*. Jama Network Open, 2021. **4**(9).
6. Morawska, L. and D.K. Milton, *It Is Time to Address Airborne Transmission of Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19)*. Clinical Infectious Diseases, 2020. **71**(9): p. 2311-2313.
7. Heneghan, C., et al., *SARS-CoV-2 and the Role of Airborne Transmission: Systematic review*. Figshare. <http://dx.doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.14248055.v2>, 2021. Last accessed nov 17, 2021.
8. Pivato, A., et al., *Evaluating the presence of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in the particulate matters during the peak of COVID-19 in Padua, northern Italy*. Science of the Total Environment, 2021. **784**.
9. Santarpia, J.L., et al., *Aerosol and surface contamination of SARS-CoV-2 observed in quarantine and isolation care (vol 10, 12732, 2020)*. Scientific Reports, 2020. **10**(1).
10. Passos, R.G., M.B. Silveira, and J.S. Abrahao, *Exploratory assessment of the occurrence of SARS-CoV-2 in aerosols in hospital facilities and public spaces of a metropolitan center in Brazil*. Environmental Research, 2021. **195**.
11. Coleman, K.K., et al., *Viral Load of SARS-CoV-2 in Respiratory Aerosols Emitted by COVID-19 Patients while Breathing, Talking, and Singing*. Clinical infectious diseases, 2021. In Press.
12. Zverzhinetsky, M., V. Krivitsky, and F. Patolsky, *Direct whole blood analysis by the antigen - antibody chemically-delayed dissociation from nanosensors arrays*. Biosensors & Bioelectronics, 2020. **170**.
13. Lednickya, J.A., et al., *Viable SARS-CoV-2 in the air of a hospital room with COVID-19 patients*. International Journal of Infectious Diseases, 2020. **100**: p. 476-482.
14. Moitra, P., et al., *Rapid and low-cost sampling for detection of airborne SARS-CoV-2 in dehumidifier condensate*. Biotechnology and Bioengineering, 2021. **118**(8): p. 3029-3036.
15. Lane, M.A., et al., *Bioaerosol Sampling for Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) in a Referral Center with Critically Ill Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) Patients March-May 2020*. Clinical Infectious Diseases, 2021. **73**(7): p. E1790-E1794.
16. Lane, M.A., et al., *Bioaerosol sampling for SARS-CoV-2 in a referral center with critically ill COVID-19 patients March-May 2020*. Clinical infectious diseases : an official publication of the Infectious Diseases Society of America, 2021.
17. Santarpia, J.L., et al., *The size and culturability of patient-generated SARS-CoV-2 aerosol*. Journal of Exposure Science and Environmental Epidemiology, 2021.
18. Piri, A., et al., *Increased survivability of coronavirus and H1N1 influenza virus under electrostatic aerosol-to-hydrosol sampling*. Journal of Hazardous Materials, 2021. **413**.
19. Vosoughi, M., et al., *Investigation of SARS-CoV-2 in hospital indoor air of COVID-19 patients' ward with impinger method*. Environmental Science and Pollution Research, 2021. **28**(36): p. 50480-50488.
20. Moreno, T., et al., *Tracing surface and airborne SARS-CoV-2 RNA inside public buses and subway trains*. Environment International, 2021. **147**.

21. Lednicky, J.A., et al., *Isolation of SARS-CoV-2 from the air in a car driven by a COVID patient with mild illness*. International Journal of Infectious Diseases, 2021. **108**: p. 212-216.
22. Habibi N, et al., *A safe and effective sample collection method for assessment of SARSCoV2 in aerosol samples*. In: Ramanathan AL, Chidambaram S, Jonathan MP, Munoz-Arriola F, Prasanna MV, Kumar P. ed. Environmental resilience and transformation in times of COVID-19. Elsevier; 2021. pp173-178.
23. Vesper, S., *Traditional mould analysis compared to a DNA-based method of mould analysis*. Critical Reviews in Microbiology, 2011. **37**(1): p. 15-24.
24. Vesper, S., et al., *Development of an environmental relative moldiness index for US homes*. Journal of Occupational and Environmental Medicine, 2007. **49**(8): p. 829-833.
25. Haugland, R. and S. Vesper, *Method of Identifying and Quantifying Specific Fungi and Bacteria*. "Method of Identifying and Quantifying Specific Fungi and Bacteria". U.S. Patent 6,387,652, 2002.
26. <https://www.fda.gov/media/134922/download>., CDC 2019-Novel Coronavirus (2019-nCoV) Real-Time RT-PCR Diagnostic Panel. Last accessed November 17, 2021, 2021.
27. Zhou, L., et al., *ACE2 and TMPRSS2 are expressed on the human ocular surface, suggesting susceptibility to SARS-CoV-2 infection*. Ocular Surface, 2020. **18**(4): p. 537-544.
28. Yu, L., et al., *Catching and killing of airborne SARS-CoV-2 to control spread of COVID-19 by a heated air disinfection system*. Materials Today Physics, 2020. **15**.
29. Karimzadeh, S., R. Bhopal, and H.N. Tien, *Review of infective dose, routes of transmission and outcome of COVID-19 caused by the SARS-COV-2: comparison with other respiratory viruses*. Epidemiology and Infection, 2021. **149**.

SUPPLEMENTARY DATA

Table S1: Primers and probes used for Genus-specific RT-PCR analysis'

Genus	Forward Primer	Reverse Primer	Probe
Aspergillus	5'-GCCCCGCCGTTTCGAC	5'-CCGTTGTTGAAAGTTTAACTGATTAC	5'-CCCGCCGAAGACCCCAACATG
Penicillium	5'-GCCTGTCCGAGCGTCACTT	5'-CCCCCGGGATCGGAG	5'-CCAACACACAAGCCGTGCTTGAGG
Stachybotrys	5'-TCCCAAACCCCTTATGTGAACC	5'-GTTTGCCACTCAGAGAATACTGAAA	5'-CTGCGCCCGGATCCAGGC
Memnoniella	5'-TCCCAAACCCCTTATGTGAACC	5'-TGTTTATACCACTCAGACGATACTCAAGT	5'-CTCGGGCCCCGGAGTCAGGC
Chaetomium	5'-CCGCAGGCCCTGAAAAG	5'-CGCGGCGCGACCA	5'-AGATGTATGCTACTACGCTCGGTGC
Fusarium	5'-CAGCCGCAGCTTCCAGT	5'-CGTGGCCGAGCCTCTG	5'-CGTAGTAGCTAACACCTC
Trichoderma	5'-TTGCCTCGGCGGGAT	5'-ATTTTCGAAACGCCTACGAGA	5'-CTGCCCCGGGTGCGTCG

Table S2. Particle levels during test runs of air samplers in environmental chamber.

	Time (min)	Particle Counts	Mass mg/m ³	Median diameter (μm)
Test 1	0	1,708,970	9.20	3.23
	10	3,810	0.01	1.46
	20	35	0.00	1.52
Test 2	0	1,754,445	9.38	3.16
	10	10,355	0.02	1.45
	20	44	0.00	1.17
Test 3	0	1,786,277	9.53	3.18
	10	2,541	0.00	1.39
	20	4	0.00	0.65

APS 3221 aerosol particle sizer measurements in environmental chamber in 3 independent runs taken for 10 seconds at times indicated. Note that although particles are rapidly depleted from the chamber due to capture by the three AirAnswers devices, they are subject to the same environment as the impinger reference sampling device.