

1
2
3
4
5
6

Can 10x cheaper, rapid air filtration using a wide range of DIY options complement commercial HEPA purifiers to help control the pandemic?

Devabhaktuni Srikrishna, Patient Knowhow, Inc.

sri.devabhaktuni@gmail.com, www.patientknowhow.com

Abstract: Public health departments such as CDC and California Department of Public Health (CA-DPH) advise HEPA-purifiers to limit transmission of SARS-CoV-2 in classrooms and community spaces. CA-DPH recommends 4-6 air exchanges per hour often necessitating multiple HEPA-purifiers per room, unaffordable in under-resourced community settings. Pressure to seek cheap, rapid air filtration resulted in proliferation of lower-cost, Do-It-Yourself (DIY) air purifiers whose performance is not well characterized compared to HEPA-purifiers. Primary metrics are clean air delivery rate (CADR), noise generated (dBA), and affordability (\$\$). CADR measurement often requires hard-to-replicate laboratory experiments with generated aerosols. In this study, we use simplified, low-cost measurement tools of ambient aerosols enabling scalable evaluation of aerosol filtration efficiencies (0.3 to 10 microns), estimated CADR, and noise generation to compare a dozen HEPA-purifiers and DIY purifier designs. DIY purifiers consist of one or two box fans coupled to single MERV 13-16 filters (1"-5" thick) or quad filters in a cube. Accounting for reduced filtration efficiency (%) of MERV 13-16 filters (versus HEPA) at the most penetrating particle size of 0.3 microns, estimated CADR of DIY purifiers using 2" (67%), 4" (66%), and 5" (85%) filters at lowest fan speed was 293 cfm (\$35), 322 cfm (\$58), and 405 cfm (\$120) comparable to best-in-class, low-noise generating HEPA-purifier running at maximum speed with at 282 cfm (\$549). Quad filter designs, popularly known as Corsi-Rosenthal box, achieved gains in estimated CADR less than 80% over single filter designs, less than the 100% gain by adding a second DIY purifier. Replacing one of the four filters with a second fan resulted in gains of 125%-150% in estimated CADR. DIY alternatives using single filters compare favorably to HEPA-purifiers in estimated CADR, noise generated at five to ten times lower cost, enabling cheap, rapid aerosol removal around the world.

7

8 **Conflicts of Interest**

9 I have no relevant interests to declare. I am not associated with any of the manufacturers
10 mentioned in this research.

11 **Introduction**

12

13 Recent studies demonstrate live SARS-CoV-2 in micron^{1,2} and submicron³ aerosols from the

14

exhaled breath of infected people. Pathogen-carrying aerosols have potential to accumulate in

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

15 airspaces of poorly ventilated, indoor spaces such as classrooms, clinics, offices, homes,
16 restaurants, and bars and other community settings, and if inhaled may result in COVID-19
17 infections.⁴ Separately, toxic aerosol pollution such as from wildfires, wood burning, and
18 other sources can be encountered in these same locations with ventilation using unfiltered,
19 outdoor air. Portable air filtration in the form of commercially available, high efficiency
20 particulate air purifiers (HEPA-purifiers) is useful to remove both types of aerosols without
21 relying on centralized air-handling systems designed to turn on / off to control temperature,
22 not necessarily to run continuously to sanitize the air.

23
24 Indoor ventilation upgrades, HEPA-purifiers, and respirators can reduce inhalation of SARS-
25 CoV-2 and its variants, other airborne viruses, aerosolized bacteria⁸⁶ (e.g. anthrax),
26 particulate pollution, allergens (pollen, dust, bacteria, fungi, etc.) but purifiers/ventilation can
27 be expensive⁷¹ and respirators can be difficult to wear for an extended period of time causing
28 many organizations or households to hesitate. A design target is to meet or exceed 4 to 6 air
29 exchanges per hour (ACH) recommended⁵⁸ by California Department of Public Health, or
30 even exceed 15 ACH used in passenger aircraft where, as discussed below, several observers
31 have noted that (published) super-spreading events are much more infrequent (fewer) than
32 would be expected with such high occupant density. For both targets, high price-points for
33 select HEPA-purifier models without incurring excessive noise generation make them
34 unaffordable for many households and communities.

35
36 For example, in a typical classroom (30'x30'x8'), a HEPA-purifier with clean air delivery rate
37 (CADR) of 300 cubic feet per minute (cfm) needs 24 minutes to cycle the air once (2.5 air
38 exchanges per hour or ACH) under ideal mixing conditions.^{5 6} This classroom would require
39 2-3 air HEPA-purifiers with low-noise generation costing \$400-\$500 each (with periodic

40 \$40-\$80 filter replacements) to achieve 4-6 ACH costing approximately \$1000-\$1500 per
41 classroom, outside the budget of many schools. Getting 15 ACH as in hospitals and passenger
42 aircraft would require proportionally more HEPA-purifiers putting it further out of reach.

43

44


45 Lower cost alternatives to HEPA-purifiers in use for a decade, were recently investigated for
46 both their air filtration properties and safety. A Minimum Efficiency Rating Value-13
47 (MERV-13) filter attached to a box fan (e.g. using duct tape, bungee cord, rubber band, clips)
48 was demonstrated to effectively filter wildfire PM_{2.5} and submicron particles.⁷ Ford Motor
49 Company sponsored “Scrappy Filtration” which donated 20,000 box-fan and air filters held
50 together with a cardboard structure for use in classrooms to underserved communities.⁸

51 ⁹ However, the published literature regarding these lower-cost box-fan-filters is lacking key
52 metrics such as filtration efficiency (%), air flow (CADR), and noise generation (dBA) and
53 does not use lower-cost, rapid test methods (e.g. that do not require a potentially more
54 expensive, sealed test chamber) which would more readily enable comparisons to a wider
55 range of HEPA-purifiers.

56

57 Below, we compare cost-effectiveness of aerosol filtration by best-in-class, portable HEPA-
58 purifiers and do-it-yourself (DIY) alternatives built from box fans and HVAC filters rated at
59 MERV-13, 14, 15 and 16. Comparison is based on three metrics: estimated clean air delivery
60 rate (CADR), the noise generated (dBA), and initial cost or affordability (\$). Measurement
61 devices include an ISO-certified, calibrated aerosol meter for input/output particle filtration
62 of sizes ranging from 0.3 μm to 10 μm , airspeed meter to measure airflow, and NIOSH sound
63 meter app to measure noise. Leveraging these test methods, we were able to evaluate and
64 compare three different HEPA-purifiers against common DIY fan-filter configurations.

65 Tested DIY configurations include 6 single-filter and three (quad and triple filter)
 66 configurations with box fans. We also evaluate DIY configurations involving quad filter
 67 design in a cube formation, popularly known on social media as the Corsi-Rosenthal box,
 68 proposed to enhance airflow and CADR over a single filter design. In order to examine how
 69 CADR is impacted by additional flow, the Corsi-Rosenthal DIY cube (4 filters and 1 fan) was
 70 compared to a cube design replacing one of the four filters with an additional fan (i.e., 3
 71 filters 2 fans). A preview of these results showing estimated CADR versus cost is shown in
 72 Figure 1 with examination of the multidimensional tradeoffs between filtration efficiency at
 73 different particle sizes, airflow, estimated CADR, noise generated, number of fans and filters,
 74 and unit cost in the Methods, Results, Discussion, and Limitations sections. Finally, the
 75 Discussion concludes with a comparative analysis of indoor air exchange rates needed to
 76 control SARS-CoV-2 transmission (super spreading) using data from passenger airplanes.
 77



78
 79
 80
 81 **Figure 1: comparison of est. CADR and cost of HEPA purifiers and DIY box fan-filters**
 82 **e.g., 3x2 means three filters were used with two box fans**
 83

84 **Safety Notes:** California Air Resource Board recommends never leaving box-fan air filters
85 unattended while turned on, and to use box fans sold in the US manufactured after 2012
86 because it is likely they have a fused plug to prevent electrical fires e.g. if the device is
87 inadvertently knocked over.¹⁰ Chemical Insights, a subsidiary of Underwriters Laboratories,
88 recently tested five different electric box fan models (approximately 20" × 20" in size) with
89 attached air filters and concluded that all measured temperatures fell below the maximum
90 acceptable thresholds defined by the market safety standard for electric fans (UL 507).¹¹ In
91 detail, in addition to assessing DIY fans with clean MERV 13s, DIYs were tested with filters
92 loaded with two types of particles (ASHRAE dust and smoke from biomass burning to
93 represent a loaded filter due to a wildfire), and test scenarios also included fully sealing the
94 box fans in plastic and running fans for over 7 hours face-down on the floor. Even under
95 those scenarios, the fans' surface components did not reach temperatures that would cause
96 minor burn/injury, and all fan models were able to operate continuously throughout all test
97 scenarios without reaching UL 507 thresholds. Commercially available HEPA-purifiers
98 typically have "smart" settings. Based on the presence of particulate matter in the air, they
99 use a built-in sensor to automatically adjust their fan speed. These built-in sensors are not
100 typically triggered by the respiratory aerosols that carry SARS-Cov-2 viruses. Although this
101 maybe acceptable if you're concerned only about smoke, if the goal is to reduce covid-19
102 risk, fan speed settings for HEPA-purifiers need to be set to operate at a constant speed to
103 continuously filter the air regardless of particular matter detected by the sensor, higher the
104 better. A best practice for shared spaces such as classrooms and offices where viral
105 transmission is a primary concern is to run the HEPA-purifier at its maximum fan speed or
106 the highest fan speed tolerable to the occupants of the room. The resources and information in
107 this article (the "Content") are for informational purposes only and should not be construed as
108 professional advice. The Content is intended to complement, not substitute, the advice of

109 your doctor. You should seek independent professional advice from a person who is licensed
110 and/or qualified in the applicable area. No action should be taken based upon any information
111 contained in this article. Use of the article is at your own risk. Patient Knowhow, Inc. takes
112 no responsibility and assumes no liability for any Content made available in this article.
113

114 Methods

115
116 Traditional methods that measure the effect of the air purifier (and its CADR) using the decay
117 rate of aerosols generated or injected into an isolated, unoccupied room require greater
118 investment of time, effort, risk of inhalation of the generated aerosols, and training/expertise
119 compared to the much simpler DIY test methods described here.^{78 79} We use ambient aerosols
120 to rapidly compare different filters, fans, and configurations with low-cost, measurement
121 tools available online (e.g. Amazon) also making these results easy to replicate and verify
122 with limited resources.

123
124 **HEPA-purifiers.** Three models evaluated include the Coway Airmega 300 (\$549, 285 cfm),
125 Coway AP-1512HH (\$229, 233 cfm), and Airthereal AHG550 (\$233, 324 cfm). Unit prices
126 are as listed on Amazon and “smoke” clean air delivery rate (CADR) in units of cubic feet
127 per minute (cfm) is as listed on manufacturer website. The HEPA air purifiers were chosen to
128 be a selection of models known to be most quiet or well-reviewed. Note: “smoke” in this
129 context of manufacturer-reported CADR typically refers to tobacco smoke not wildfire
130 smoke. The tests for the HEPA air purifiers were conducted on November 11, 2021.

131
132 **HVAC filters with box fan.** For DIY configurations, the box fans used are 20” Lasko Fan
133 (\$20) along with 20” x 20” HVAC filters made by Nordic Pure of width and rating 1”
134 MERV-14 (\$11), 2” MERV-13 (\$15), 4” MERV-14 (\$38), 4” MERV-15 (\$42), by 3M of
135 width and rating 1” MERV 14 (\$26), and by Lennox of width and rating 5” MERV-16 (\$99).
136 MERV stands for minimum efficiency reporting values. The single and quad filter designs
137 pictured in Figure 2 use one fan, and the triple filter design uses two fans with one fan
138 replacing one of the filters. The square-shaped 20” box fans tend to pull in air from their front
139 at their corners of the box^{80 81}, and a cardboard shroud of 14” diameter was attached to the

140 output side (front) of each fan to enhance airflow through the filter by reducing flow
141 recirculation (via the corners of the front of the box fan) and eddies at the fan blade tips. For
142 comparison, three methods of attaching the box fan to the air filters included vacuum (i.e. no
143 attachment just relying on airflow), duct tape, and velcro. Unit prices are as listed on Home
144 Depot, Amazon, or Walmart. The tests for the HVAC filters with box fans (DIY air purifiers)
145 were conducted in a January 10 to 13, 2022.

146 **Figure 2: Do-It-Yourself Box Fan and Filters (single, quad filter designs with one fan**
147 **and triple filter design with two fans). Blue arrows indicate direction of airflow**



148

149

150 **Aerosol filtration efficiency.** For each HEPA-purifier or box fan filter, counts at each
151 particle size bin (0.3, 0.5, 0.7, 1.0, 2.5, 5, and 10 μm) were tested using an ISO-certified,
152 particle counter (Temtop Particle Counter PMD 331 available on Amazon) with the each
153 device (its fan) turned 'on' and 'off' consecutively. The tests were conducted in a house near
154 an open window with fan blowing air through the window to allow for aerosols (particles)
155 from outdoors to continuously enter the room. Five counts were recorded and averaged on the
156 particle counter when its input was placed directly at the output of the air purifier/filter for 30
157 seconds. The filtration efficiency at each particle size was estimated by the formula,
158 $\text{efficiency} = 1 - \text{on} / \text{off}$. To compare each fan-filter configuration in this study, the filtration
159 efficiency depends only on the ratio of on to off, not on their absolute values. The five counts

160 were recorded individually over no more than 15 minutes, however the filtration efficiencies
161 were computed using consecutively recorded counts no more than 2 minutes apart.

162

163 **Air flow.** For each HEPA-purifier or DIY box fan filter, the airspeed was measured using an
164 anemometer (BTMETER BT-100 Handheld Anemometer available on Amazon) held at the
165 output perpendicular to the airflow. An average of three or more airspeed measurements (feet
166 per minute) were multiplied by area of output to estimate the airflow (cubic feet per minute).

167

168 **Noise.** Noise measurements were taken for each air purifier/filter using an iPhone app
169 maintained by National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH).¹² Three or
170 more noise measurements were taken at a 9" distance perpendicular to the direction of the
171 output airflow and averaged.

172

173 **CADR (estimated).** For each HEPA-purifier or DIY box fan filter, the Clean Air Delivery
174 Rate (CADR) was estimated as the product of the measured air flow (cfm) and aerosol
175 filtration efficiency (%) at 0.3 microns.

176 Results

177

178 Note: Measurements in each table below are shown as averages (standard deviation in
179 parentheses).

180

181 **HEPA-purifiers.** As shown in Table 1, the results for the HEPA-purifiers show particle
182 filtration efficiencies near or exceeding 95% at most particle sizes ranging from 0.3 to 10 μm
183 and higher in many cases. At their maximum fan speed (3), the noise generated by the Coway
184 Airmega 300 was lowest and most tolerable (subjectively to the author, without it feeling

185 stressful) of the three models. To achieve similar subjective tolerability levels both the
 186 Coway AP-1512 and the Airthereal AGH550 had to be set at fan speed 2 which cut their
 187 estimated airflow (CADR) roughly in half. As a verification of the estimation methodology,
 188 the estimated CADR using airflow (cfm) and filtration efficiency at 0.3 microns was within
 189 10% of the the smoke CADR rating from the manufacturer’s website. Based on this data it
 190 appears some HEPA air purifiers may have higher or lower rate of filtration at 0.3 microns
 191 than others (well below the 99.97% typically assumed) but still very effective at filtering
 192 these particles.

193

194

Table 1: Performance of HEPA-purifiers

Setup		Noise and Airflow			CADR (cfm)	Filtration Efficiency (%) avg of five measurements at each particle size bin (µm)						
	Price (est.)	Fan speed	Noise (dBA) avg. of three samples 9" away	Est. Airflow (output) cfm	Est. using airflow x filtration eff. @ 0.3 µm	0.3	0.5	0.7	1.0	2.5	5.0	10.0
Coway Airmega 300	\$549	3	59.3 (2.1)	282 (61)	265	94.1 (0.9)	94.5 (1.1)	97.0 (0.96)	97.4 (0.92)	98.3 (1.5)	98.3 (1.8)	98.0 (1.6)
Coway AP-1512	\$229	3	64.7 (0.57)	223 (3.7)	216	97.4 (0.3)	98.1 (0.4)	98.5 (0.6)	98.7 (0.8)	98.4 (1.7)	98.0 (3.0)	97.6 (5.5)
Coway AP-1512	\$229	2	46.0 (3.5)	97 (5.7)	94							
Airthereal AGH550	\$233	5	66.3 ± 0.6	410 (81)	354	86.5 (3.5)	89.5 (0.9)	90.6 (2.1)	92.7 (1.9)	93.9 (3.2)	96.0 (2.4)	98.6 (2.1)
Airthereal AGH550	\$233	2	47.3 ± 1.5	206 (42)	178							

195

196 **Single filter configurations with box fan.** The noise generated by the box fan was tolerable
 197 (subjectively to the author, without it feeling stressful) only at fan speed #1 (out of three)
 198 with a measured noise level of 54 dBA comparable to the Coway Airmega 300 at 59 dBA. As
 199 shown in Table 2, the filtration efficiency of the MERV-13, 14, 15, or 16 filters at the most
 200 penetrating particle size of 0.3 µm varied by thickness from approximately 60% to 85% with
 201 highest observed for MERV-16 filter and lowest for the MERV 13 filter, well below the

Nordic Pure	2" MERV-13	\$35	vacuum	1	52.3 (0.6)	437 (53)	293	67 (2.0)	69 (2.2)	74 (3.2)	77 (3.9)	78 (2.7)	78 (3.0)	79 (6.0)
3M (Filtrete)	1" MERV-14	\$46	vacuum	3		590 (60)	460	78 (1.4)	79 (1.3)	78 (0.9)	77 (1.4)	77 (4.0)	77 (6.2)	77 (6.7)
3M (Filtrete)	1" MERV-14	\$46	vacuum	1		381 (51)	298							
Nordic Pure	1" MERV-14	\$31	velcro	3	64 (2)	571 (36)	342	60 (1.1)	65 (1.3)	78 (1.5)	83 (1.6)	86 (1.7)	88 (1.4)	81 (6.0)
Nordic Pure	1" MERV-14	\$31	velcro	2	60.3 (1.5)									
Nordic Pure	1" MERV-14	\$31	velcro	1	55.3 (3.2)	381 (47)	244	64 (4.1)	67 (4.5)	74 (4.6)	77 (4.2)	78 (5.0)	81 (3.8)	77 (6.2)

212

213 **Cube configurations with box fan(s).** Using comparably rated filters and fan speeds, the
 214 quad filter design with one box fan (4x1), popularly known as the Corsi-Rosenthal box,
 215 showed significant improvement in airflow and filtration efficiency over single filters (Table
 216 3). Whereas results from attaching the filters were similar with duct tape (to seal up any gaps)
 217 or velcro (leaving small airgaps), suggesting any leaks created by a loose fit may not make
 218 much difference. Notably, the filtration efficiency of the quad filter design was marginally
 219 better than the corresponding single filter design possibly due to lower pressure across the
 220 filters. The three extra filters in the CR box (4x1) increased airflow by less than 50% over
 221 equivalently rated single filter configuration (1x1), whereas it took adding an extra fan and
 222 two extra filters in the cube formation (3x2) to double the airflow and estimated CADR.

223

224

Table 3: Performance of cube configurations (filters x fans: 4x1 and 3x2)

Setup						Noise and Airflow		CADR (cfm)	Filtration Efficiency (%) avg of five measurements at each particle size bin (µm)						
Filter Mfr.	Filter Type	filters x fans	Price (est.)	Seal	Fan speed	Noise (dBA) avg. of three samples 9" away	Est. Airflow (output) cfm	Est. using airflow x filtration eff. @ 0.3 µm	0.3	0.5	0.7	1.0	2.5	5.0	10.0
n/a	No filter	0x1	\$20	n/a	3		965 (30)	n/a	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

n/a	No filter	0x1	\$20	n/a	1		664 (24)	n/a							
Nordic Pure	2" MERV- 13	4x1	\$80	velcro	3		903 (36)	659	73 (2.0)	74 (2.1)	76 (4.0)	79 (4.5)	78 (5.1)	74 (8.4)	65 (17)
Nordic Pure	2" MERV- 13	4x1	\$80	velcr o	1		645 (27)	471							
Nordic Pure	2" MERV- 13	4x1	\$80	tape	3		851 (66)	570	67 (3.4)	67 (3.3)	74 (3.5)	79 (3.4)	80 (6.8)	87 (2.5)	86 (6.4)
Nordic Pure	2" MERV- 13	4x1	\$80	tape	1		543 (42)	364							
Nordic Pure	2" MERV- 13						Fan #1: 748 (27)	494	66 (3.0)	68 (2.8)	75 (2.6)	78 (2.4)	78 (5.3)	78 (7.3)	74 (10)
		3x2	\$85	velcro	3		Fan #2: 792 (35)	523							
Nordic Pure	2" MERV- 13						Fan #1: 524 (34)	346							
		3x2	\$85	velcr o	1		Fan #2: 476 (29)	314							
Nordic Pure	1" MERV- 14	4x1	\$64	tape	3		851 (66)	570	67 (3.4)	67 (3.3)	74 (3.5)	79 (3.4)	80 (6.8)	87 (2.5)	86 (6.4)
Nordic Pure	1" MERV- 14	4x1	\$64	tape	1		542 (42)	363							
Nordic Pure	1" MERV- 14	4x1	\$64	velcro	3		858 (44)	609	71 (1.5)	75 (1.1)	86 (1.2)	89 (1.3)	89 (1.5)	90 (1.7)	86 (8.3)
Nordic Pure	1" MERV- 14	4x1	\$64	velcr o	1		546 (24)	388							


225

226 Discussion

227 Accounting for reduced filtration efficiency of MERV-13,14,16 filters at the most penetrating
228 particle size of 0.3 μm compared to HEPA, the estimated clean air delivery rate (CADR) of a

229 do-it-yourself (DIY) setup using 2" MERV-13 (67%), 4" MERV-14 (66%), 5" MERV 16
 230 (85%) filters with a box fan running at fan speed 1 for tolerable noise was 293 cfm, 322 cfm,
 231 405 cfm. This is comparable or better than a best-in-class, low-noise generating HEPA-
 232 purifier running at maximum speed with at 282 cfm. Yet the upfront cost of the components
 233 of the DIY setup were approximately 5 to 10 times less (\$35-\$58-\$120) than best-in-class
 234 HEPA-purifiers (\$549).

235 **Figure 3: Estimated CADR (cfm) for DIY Air Purifiers (filters x fans) @ speed #1 e.g., 3x2**
 236 **means three filters were used with 2 box fans**



237
 238

239
 240
 241

242 At least two studies have measured the CADR of cube configurations (popularly known as
 243 the Corsi-Rosenthal box or CR box) by observing the decay rates of generated aerosols. The
 244 first study is by UC-Davis⁷⁸ measured 600 cfm at lowest fan speed to 850 cfm at highest fan
 245 speed. The second study is by Illinois Institute of Technology⁷⁹ (IIT), measured below 300
 246 cfm in the range of 0.5 to 3 μm (dust) at the highest fan speed but above 450 cfm in the range

247 of 5-11 μm (pollen). Both used five 2" MERV-13 filters (instead of four in our study) of
248 similar dimensions so it is unclear why the studies by UC-Davis and IIT differ by a factor of
249 two. Our results were in between these two studies but more consistent with the UC-Davis
250 study. The estimated CADR of cube configurations with four 2" MERV 13 filters was 471
251 cfm at lowest fan speed 1 and 659 cfm at the highest fan speed 3 using 73% filtration
252 efficiency at 0.3 μm (most penetrating particle size). It is possible that greater filtration
253 efficiencies at larger particle sizes may account for this difference with UC-Davis results
254 which is based on generated salt aerosols. Other differences that may account for it are the
255 number of filters (4 vs 5), fans, differences in estimation methodology, box fans from
256 different manufacturers may differ substantially in terms of their flowrate at "free flow" (i.e.
257 without any pressure drops from filters) and when installed in DIY air cleaners with filters,
258 and differences in particles generated and measured at different aerodynamic particle sizes.
259 Further investigation would be required to fully understand why there is such a range.

260
261 However at all fan speeds the quad filter design, CR box, did not achieve gains in CADR of
262 more than 80% over a single filter design which is in contrast to the 200-250% gains also
263 reported by UC-Davis (also with shroud and 20" Lasko box fan),¹³ separate from the UC-
264 Davis study in the prior paragraph. CR boxes are unlikely to exceed the airflow with no
265 filters. At fan speed 1, the airflow of quad 1" MERV 14 filter design (546 cfm) was within
266 25% of that with no filters (646 cfm), and the airflow of the single 1" MERV 14 (381 cfm)
267 was within 50% of no filters. This suggests the quad 1" design is close to optimal but cannot
268 be improved by a factor of 200% over the single 1" filter. At fan speed 1, the airflow with no
269 filter (646 cfm) was measured to be 70% more than the airflow with a single 1" filter (381
270 cfm), 47% more than 2" MERV-13 filter (437 cfm), and only 32% more than the 4" MERV-
271 14 filter (488 cfm). The cost and extra setup effort from the quad filters (CR box) can be

272 alternatively expended on more simply replicating a new box fan filter (+ 100% gain) so that
273 the airflow is then distributed to different locations in the room or classroom. To illustrate
274 this, replacing one of the 2” MERV-13 filters in the quad filter configuration with a second
275 fan resulted in gains of approximately 125%-150% in estimated CADR (at fan speeds 1 and
276 3) which is notably better than 100% possibly due to improved filtration efficiency.

277
278 Regardless, our results suggest a sweet spot between speed of setup, simplicity, size, and cost
279 is a single 20” box fan with 2” MERV-13 (\$35), 4” MERV-14 filter (\$58) of 20” length and
280 width. Single filter is easier and simpler to setup than multi-filter designs which is an
281 advantage for scaling up DIY approaches. A second box fan and single filter provide more air
282 cleaning than one CR box with the possibility of benefits for air cleaner placement.

283 Alternatively, if higher filtration efficiency is desired a 5” MERV-16 filter can be used
284 (\$120). Given the simplicity and low-cost of the box-fan design using single 2” or 4” MERV-
285 13/14 filters, form-factor improvements at a marginal cost may include a more stable,
286 cardboard box frame so it is not so easy to knock over with printed designs to make it
287 aesthetically pleasing. An aluminum mosquito screen fixed to the shroud in front of the fan
288 can help keep small objects (e.g. fingers or pencils) from contacting the fan blade which may
289 be especially important for classroom⁷⁰ and home applications when young children are
290 present.

291

292 **Limitations**

293

294 The research on which are the most common COVID transmission modes (aerosol, droplet,
295 or surfaces) what is the most common aerosol particle sizes by which it is transmitted
296 continues to evolve as new variants emerge. However, multiple studies demonstrate SARS-

297 CoV-2 in micron and submicron aerosols from the exhaled breath of infected people^{1 2 3} in
298 one study, most of the live virus from human subjects was observed in submicron respiratory
299 aerosols.³

300

301 The filtration efficiencies and airflow results for box fan used a certain set of filters and fans
302 made by certain manufacturers, but they vary widely among different manufacturers of
303 comparably rated MERV 13, 14, 15, 16 filters. Hence filter selection is critical to achieving
304 the results desired. There may also be variability in filter performance due to manufacturing
305 defects or variations among fans and filters from the same manufacturer. The long-term
306 durability of filtration efficiency and airflow of these filters after extended use with box fans
307 is also uncharacterized unlike HEPA-purifiers which have well-understood operational
308 history.

309

310 Since measurements of particle concentration were made by placing the inlet of the particle
311 counter towards the outlet of the air purifier, there could be some re-entrainment in the
312 shearing flow leaving the air cleaners that differs as a function of the design of each air
313 cleaner which may impact the measurements.

314

315 The aerosol measurements were conducted with a device which is an optical particle counter
316 (OPC) called the PMD 311 manufactured by Temtop. The OPC counts particles in 7 bins
317 (0.3, 0.5, 0.7, 1.0, 2.5, 5, and 10 microns). Possible sources of uncertainty in an OPC based
318 are extremes of relative humidity and differences between optical properties of the aerosol
319 particles measured in this study versus those particles used to calibrate the sensor by the
320 manufacturer.⁸² Extreme relative humidity appears unlikely to be a source uncertainty based
321 on the environmental conditions under which this study was conducted. However, the

322 manufacturer used polystyrene aerosols to calibrate the sensor of the measurement device
323 within 10% at each particle size. However, the choice of polystyrene material may have some
324 systematic impact on the accuracy of the absolute counts when measuring aerosols made of
325 other materials. The principle of operation of the OPC has a sensor which measures laser
326 light scattered from each particle to estimate its size, with larger (smaller) particles having a
327 greater (lower) scattering cross section which is used to differentiate the size of each particle
328 counted. If some fraction of the particles that are part of the ambient aerosols measured in our
329 study were much more or much less absorptive than polystyrene, such as black carbon, it is
330 possible these particles could have a lower or higher scattering cross section than the
331 calibration aerosol of same size, respectively. If so they could be counted as part of smaller or
332 larger bins than their actual size. The measurements of the OPC in each bin will vary to some
333 extent based on the distribution of absorptive and scattering properties of ambient aerosols
334 relative to the polystyrene aerosol used to calibrate the OPC. However, any such systematic
335 differences between the ambient aerosols and the calibration aerosols might be expected to
336 apply uniformly to both the ‘in’ and ‘out’ measurements and therefore would not necessarily
337 affect the computed filtration efficiency for the particles actually counted (measured) in each
338 bin by the OPC, just that their size distribution might be shifted over by one or more bins
339 based on how each particle’s individual optical properties differs from the calibration aerosol.
340
341 For each HEPA-purifier or DIY box fan filter, the Clean Air Delivery Rate (CADR) was
342 estimated as the product of the measured air flow (cfm) and aerosol filtration efficiency (%)
343 at 0.3 microns. Strictly speaking, the CADR estimate would apply to the particles that are
344 counted by the measurement device in the 0.3 micron bin of the Temtop PMD 331 subject to
345 the differences described between calibration and ambient aerosols in the prior paragraph,
346 and therefore may not apply for other particle sizes.

347
348 **Would the pandemic be under control if air in most rooms was filtered as rapidly as a**
349 **passenger airplane cabin?**

350 Best practices recommended by the state of California in the US are only 4 to 6 air exchanges
351 per hour (ACH).⁵⁸ A recent study from Italy suggests infection rates were cut by over 80% in
352 classrooms that implemented mechanical ventilation of 6 ACH. A UK study in a hospital
353 setting found differences in viral load of indoor air in rooms with Covid positive subjects
354 when air is filtered less than 4.5 ACH versus faster than 9 ACH.⁸⁵ Yet to date there is no
355 large-scale, real-world data to validate a minimum threshold of ACH to control SARS-Cov-2
356 transmission in a room. The SARS-CoV-2 pandemic is sustained largely by superspreading
357 events: approximately 80% of cases are transmitted by only 10% to 20% of the infected
358 (super spreaders)^{1 14 15} and if so controlling superspreading can potentially control the
359 pandemic. As described in detail below, we find that documented super spreading events
360 aboard passenger aircraft appear to be much fewer than would be expected from community
361 prevalence estimates or preflight passenger testing. This is remarkable^{40 41} considering
362 thousands of daily flights carried millions of passengers⁴² in densely packed seating
363 arrangements with non-uniform implementation and inconsistent or imperfect passenger
364 adherence to control measures such as preflight testing and masking. Our analysis below of
365 alternative hypotheses for the primary way the virus transmits (droplet, fomite, aerosol) does
366 not prove, but suggests that the rapid air filtration often exceeding 15 air exchanges per hour
367 in airplane cabins is perhaps the reason why.

368
369 Disclaimer: In general, there are many unknown factors that impact the transmission of
370 SARS-CoV-2 and this section of the paper is conjectural, somewhat speculative. The
371 resources and information in this section of the article (the “Section”) are for informational

372 purposes only and should not be construed as professional advice. The Section is intended to
373 complement, not substitute, the advice of your doctor. You should seek independent
374 professional advice from a person who is licensed and/or qualified in the applicable area. No
375 action should be taken based upon any information contained in this Section. Use of the
376 Section is at your own risk. Patient Knowhow, Inc. takes no responsibility and assumes no
377 liability for any information made available in this Section and in the article.

378

379 A typical Boeing 737 carries 160 passengers in a cabin of approximately 7000 cubic feet (83'
380 x 7' x 12'). With such dense occupancy, how much super spreading would we expect to
381 occur aboard the thousands of such daily flights? Back-of-the-envelope estimates suggest
382 often 1% or higher of those who could board an airplane are infected according to point-
383 prevalence estimates (typically higher for symptomatic or unvaccinated individuals).^{47 48} If
384 only 1% of passengers who board airplanes are positive and at least 10% of them are super
385 spreaders we expect approximately one super spreader to board every 5 flights for a 200
386 passenger flight ($200 \times 1\% \times 10\% = 1/5$) yet paradoxically this is well above the published
387 rate of superspreading events aboard these aircraft.

388

389 Actual passenger data from preflight testing also points to a very low rate of super spreading
390 aboard flights. Unlike many other parts of the world, Hong Kong,^{44 45} Australia and New
391 Zealand conduct testing, tracing, and isolation of arriving passengers from abroad, publish
392 case studies of inflight super spreading, and approximately 10%-20% of the passengers who
393 are positive on these flights would be estimated to be potential super spreaders^{14 43}. As of
394 October 20, 2020, out of 62,698 arriving passengers, New Zealand identified 215 who tested
395 positive²⁷ from which there would be expected 21 super spreaders ($215 \times 10\%$). Among
396 6,570 arriving passengers on Australia-bound flights, 112 tested positive from which there

397 would be expected 11 super spreaders (112 x 10%). Between December 2020 and March
398 2021 in Australia, wastewater from 24 (64.9%) of the 37 repatriation flights tested positive.⁴⁶
399 An airline Vistara reported that of 29 flights arriving in Hong Kong potentially up to 1% of
400 their passengers tested positive.⁷² Indeed, based on testing of arriving passengers, infrequent
401 reporting or publications aside from exceptional case studies also suggests lower incidence of
402 superspreading than expected from the number of super spreaders who would be expected to
403 be aboard these flights.

404

405 Why is there such a low rate of published super spreading aboard passenger aircraft? Some
406 initially credited institution of mandatory masking for reduction in super spreading aboard
407 flights.^{30 31} Prior to mandatory mask usage on passenger flights, inflight transmission was
408 observationally confirmed with genomic sequencing^{27 28 29} which appears to validate the
409 utility of droplet precautions³² to reduce transmission within a short distance (e.g. 6 feet).
410 However, even prior to mandatory masking aboard aircraft there were relatively few
411 published documented superspreading (mass-transmission) events.^{31 33 34 35}

412

413 Table 4 lists three alternate hypotheses for why there have been relatively few published
414 superspreading events on flights along with reasons for or against them: mandatory masking,
415 passenger mixing patterns, and rapid HEPA filtration. Applying Occam's Razor, perhaps the
416 most plausible, explanation of the three is rapid HEPA air filtration (often exceeding 15 air
417 exchanges per hour) because it is the greatest differentiator between passenger airplanes and
418 community settings in which masking and mixing are not dissimilar to airplanes, but rapid
419 HEPA air filtration is uncommon in community settings. In a short time that Omicron variant
420 has spread around the world, there have already been case studies published of large super
421 spreading events⁷⁴ and cross hallway transmission in quarantine hotels in Hong Kong⁷⁵

422 suggesting aerosol transmission, yet it is remarkable that considering the passenger density
423 on airplanes there have been no similar case studies published of super spreading of Omicron
424 aboard passenger airplanes inflight.

425

426 **Table 4:** Possible explanations for lower than expected inflight super spreading.

Mandatory masking	One possible explanation for lower than expected inflight superspreading is that passenger adherence to masking, once it became mandatory, was higher than in the community settings due to enforcement by airlines. Transmission aboard flights (and across rows) was also observed in three flights when masks were worn by most infected passengers ^{27 36 37} and in one flight when masks were worn by all passengers for the flight duration. ³⁸ Transmission has also been observed and confirmed with genome sequencing in healthcare settings despite both parties being masked maintaining a distance of 3 feet. ³⁹
Passenger mixing patterns	Another possible explanation for low incidence of multiple transmission (superspreading) aboard flights maybe reduced passenger mixing patterns involving close-contact relative to community settings mixed because passengers are confined to their seats most of the time. Greater transmission is predicted ⁴⁹ and observed retrospectively ³⁵ for passengers who sit nearby aboard flights. Observational studies aboard ten transcontinental flights showed there are ample opportunities for mixed, close-contact aboard these aircraft (perhaps not as many as in a bar) because passengers not only share bathrooms but frequently walk around inflight (e.g. queuing at bathrooms for multiple minutes) especially by aisle-seated passengers on longer flights. ⁵⁰ They appear to be higher in number and shorter in duration than community. ^{51 52}

Rapid, HEPA air filtration	The level of ventilation or air filtration is measured by the number of air exchanges per hour (ACH). Passenger aircraft typically use rapid HEPA air filtration as high as 15 air changes per hour (ACH) ⁵³ which itself has been insufficient to completely stop all multiple transmission (superspreading), but still much higher than typical indoor community settings.
----------------------------	---

427

428 Table 5 summarizes differing views of public health agencies and academics on the
 429 transmission modes of SARS-CoV-2. Large-scale, real-world evidence of limited super
 430 spreading events aboard passenger airplanes (inflight) may help settle this debate in favor
 431 aerosols playing a primary important role in inter-household, superspreading of SARS-CoV-2
 432 than other transmission modes as the White House⁸² has recently concluded but other US-
 433 federal agencies such as CDC have yet to.⁴

434

435 **Table 5: Differing Views on Transmission Modes of SARS-CoV-2. Although in general**
 436 **the views of each community/agency are not easily summarized, the table below aims to**
 437 **expose differences in their views for context.**

The Aerosol-Droplet-Fomite Debate	Numerous superspreading events in community settings have been attributed to aerosol inhalation ⁹ although, conversely, confusion persists about what is the most important transmission mode (for superspreading): aerosol (airborne), droplet, or surface (fomite). Theoretically at least, superspreading of SARS-CoV-2 without aerosols (e.g. droplet deposition onto mucous membranes, direct contact with an infected person or indirectly via surfaces or fomites) cannot be ruled out because superspreading is also observed with viruses thought to be spread primarily by direct physical contact such as ebola. During the West African Ebola epidemic superspreading was observed
--	---

	<p>in hospitals (nosocomial), funerals (gatherings), and even taxis (transportation). Conversely, aerosol spread of Ebola has also not been completely ruled out either and continues to be debated decades after its discovery.¹⁶</p>
WHO	<p>In August, 2020 the WHO Infection Prevention and Control Research and Development Expert Group for COVID-19 wrote that the predominant route of transmission of SARS-CoV-2 is consistent with the droplet/contact route. As recently as December 21, 2021 Dr. Mike Ryan, Executive Director, WHO Health Emergencies Programme, emphasized¹⁷ the role of multiple modes of transmission¹⁸ including aerosols, droplets, and surfaces (fomites). In environments with extended, close-contacts such as households (or social bubbles), aerosols, droplets, and fomites may all have ample opportunity for transmission but the pandemic cannot be sustained without inter-household spread which maybe have a different mix of transmission routes than in households.¹⁹</p>
CDC	<p>US-CDC opinion is that fomite transmission of SARS-CoV-2 is unlikely²⁴ and people are primarily infected through exposure to respiratory fluids carrying the SARS-CoV-2, but these could be droplets or aerosols.⁴</p>
California	<p>On June 17, 2021, California (Cal-OSHA) declared COVID-19 an airborne disease and required employers to provide respirators (e.g. N95) upon request to unvaccinated employees²⁵ but the US (federal OSHA) only requires face coverings.²⁶</p>
White House	<p>In contrast to the CDC, on March 23, 2022 the White House Office of Science and Technology Policy declared the aerosol route to be the most common way the virus is transmitted, “The most common way COVID-19 is</p>

	transmitted from one person to another is through tiny airborne particles of the virus hanging in indoor air for minutes or hours after an infected person has been there.” ⁸²
Academics	Some academics ^{20 21} have countered the WHO’s position stating that SARS-CoV-2 is primarily airborne. In 2021, other academics have in turn characterized the position that airborne is the primary transmission route as exaggerated ²² and instead it primarily transmits respiratory droplets and, to a lesser extent, via aerosols. ²³

438

439 Besides rapid air filtration, what precautions can be implanted if aerosols are the primary
440 route of SARS-CoV-2 transmission? The combination of N95 masks with rapid HEPA
441 filtration onboard the aircraft was utilized for a repatriation flight to South Korea.⁶¹ Public
442 health agencies should also consider recommending a broader range of masks options based
443 on breathability, fit, cost, and reusability that provide minimum specifications for protection
444 against aerosols carrying viruses such as CDC-NIOSH approved N95, N99, or P100
445 respirators and their equivalents. Breathability is often raised as a concern with respirators
446 compared to ordinary face coverings or double masking. N95 respirators have been
447 characterized by the directors of CDC and NIAID as difficult to breathe,^{62 63} but there is a
448 great deal of variation in breathability among N95 models (disposable and reusable). One
449 laboratory study found N95 more breathable than two masks consisting of a surgical mask
450 beneath a cloth mask.⁶⁴ Effective filtration depends on how well the respirator fits and seals
451 to the face. Another concern with community use of respirators is fit-failure i.e. whether
452 adequate fit is achieved without fit-testing. Further studies are needed to validate the fit of
453 respirators worn by community participants without fit testing. A limited number of trials

454 with small numbers of participants indicate high filtration using N95 respirators even with
455 suboptimal fit or in the absence of fit testing and training.^{65 66 67 68 69}

456 Conclusions

457
458 Fundamentally, the rate of aerosol (particulate) removal by air filters (HEPA, DIY, etc.) in a
459 room as measured by clean air delivery rate (CADR) must exceed the rate of introduction of
460 these aerosols by a significant margin in order to avoid accumulation of aerosols and achieve
461 rapid clearance (e.g. when introduced by an infected person or smoky source). Outdoor
462 ventilation is generally complementary or beneficial to indoor air filtration (in terms of ACH)
463 except on days when the outdoor air is polluted with wildfire or smoky particulates (e.g. PM
464 2.5) in which case outdoor air ventilation would introduce additional aerosol further
465 increasing the need for indoor air filtration. Experts at Boston School of Public Health⁵⁷ and
466 the California Department of Public Health⁵⁸ recommend 4 to 6 ACH in community settings
467 to prevent COVID-19. Researchers measuring traces of the SARS-CoV2 coronavirus in the
468 air of a COVID-19 ward of a UK hospital reported they were undetectable once air filtration
469 machines filtered the air in each room every 6 to 12 minutes.⁷³ To achieve these ACH targets,
470 cost and noise generation concerns with portable air filtration or ventilation upgrades need to
471 be addressed.^{59 60}

472

473 Unlike healthcare facilities where there are minimum specifications⁵⁴ for ventilation and air
474 filtration in many cases exceeding 15 air exchange per hour (ACH), in community settings⁵⁵
475 and schools⁵⁶ the CDC (US) recommends increasing air filtration “as high as possible.”
476 Specific targets for ACH in community settings are needed.

477

478 Indoor ventilation upgrades, portable HEPA purifiers, and respirators (e.g. N95) can remove
479 SARS-CoV-2 particles and its variants, other airborne viruses that cause natural or artificial
480 pandemics (e.g. respiratory RNA viruses⁷⁶), aerosolized bacteria such as anthrax⁷⁷, and
481 particulate pollution. However, these can be unaffordable to much of the US and world
482 population.

483
484 As we discovered in the test results, DIY air filtration by combining off-the-shelf components
485 (box fans with heating, ventilation and cooling or HVAC filters) compares favorably in
486 performance (clean air delivery rate, noise) to HEPA air purifiers but at approximately five to
487 ten times lower cost, and can be an affordable option for rapid aerosol removal indoors in
488 homes, clinics, schools, and offices.

489
490 If rapid air filtration the main reason why super spreading is infrequent aboard passenger
491 airplanes, then as the rate of indoor air filtration (in buildings) approaches the rapid rate of air
492 filtration aboard aircraft cabins often exceeding 15 air exchanges per hour (ACH) it has
493 potential to control the pandemic by drastically reducing the chances of super spreading.

494

495 References

496

497 1. Coleman KK, Tay DJW, Sen Tan K, Ong SWX, Son TT, Koh MH, Chin YQ, Nasir H,
498 Mak TM, Chu JJH, Milton DK, Chow VTK, Tambyah PA, Chen M, Wai TK. Viral Load of
499 SARS-CoV-2 in Respiratory Aerosols Emitted by COVID-19 Patients while Breathing,
500 Talking, and Singing. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2021 Aug 6:ciab691. doi: 10.1093/cid/ciab691. Epub
501 ahead of print. PMID: 34358292; PMCID: PMC8436389.

502

503 2. Adenaiye OO, Lai J, de Mesquita PJB, Hong F, Youssefi S, German J, Tai SS, Albert B,
504 Schanz M, Weston S, Hang J, Fung C, Chung HK, Coleman KK, Sapoval N, Treangen T,
505 Berry IM, Mullins K, Frieman M, Ma T, Milton DK; University of Maryland StopCOVID
506 Research Group. Infectious SARS-CoV-2 in Exhaled Aerosols and Efficacy of Masks During
507 Early Mild Infection. Clin Infect Dis. 2021 Sep 14:ciab797. doi: 10.1093/cid/ciab797. Epub
508 ahead of print. PMID: 34519774; PMCID: PMC8522431.

509

510 3. Santarpia JL, Herrera VL, Rivera DN, Ratnesar-Shumate S, Reid SP, Ackerman DN,
511 Denton PW, Martens JWS, Fang Y, Conoan N, Callahan MV, Lawler JV, Brett-Major DM,
512 Lowe JJ. The size and culturability of patient-generated SARS-CoV-2 aerosol. J Expo Sci
513 Environ Epidemiol. 2021 Aug 18:1–6. doi: 10.1038/s41370-021-00376-8. Epub ahead of
514 print. PMID: 34408261; PMCID: PMC8372686.

515

516 4. Scientific Brief: SARS-CoV-2 Transmission. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.
517 May 7, 2021. [https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/science/science-briefs/sars-cov-2-](https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/science/science-briefs/sars-cov-2-transmission.html)
518 [transmission.html](https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/science/science-briefs/sars-cov-2-transmission.html)

519

520 5. Patient Knowhow, “AIR PURIFIERS (HEPA FILTERS) FOR YOUR CLASSROOM,
521 OFFICE, OR HOME” <https://www.patientknowhow.com/hepacalculator.html>

522

523 6. [https://www.hsph.harvard.edu/news/hsph-in-the-news/experts-offer-advice-on-air-](https://www.hsph.harvard.edu/news/hsph-in-the-news/experts-offer-advice-on-air-purifiers-for-classrooms/)
524 [purifiers-for-classrooms/](https://www.hsph.harvard.edu/news/hsph-in-the-news/experts-offer-advice-on-air-purifiers-for-classrooms/)

525

- 526 7. May, N.W., Dixon, C., Jaffe, D.A. (2021). Impact of Wildfire Smoke Events on Indoor Air
527 Quality and Evaluation of a Low-cost Filtration Method. *Aerosol Air Qual. Res.* 21, 210046.
528 <https://doi.org/10.4209/aaqr.210046>
529
- 530 8. Ford Media Center, May 12, 2021. “FORD DIY AIR FILTRATION KIT THAT
531 REDUCES COVID-19 IN THE AIR VALIDATED BY PEER-REVIEWED SCIENTIFIC
532 RESEARCH JOURNAL”
533 [https://media.ford.com/content/fordmedia/fna/us/en/news/2021/05/12/ford-diy-air-filtration-](https://media.ford.com/content/fordmedia/fna/us/en/news/2021/05/12/ford-diy-air-filtration-kit-covid-19-validated.html)
534 [kit-covid-19-validated.html](https://media.ford.com/content/fordmedia/fna/us/en/news/2021/05/12/ford-diy-air-filtration-kit-covid-19-validated.html)
535
- 536 9. Ruichen He, Wanjiao Liu, John Elson, Rainer Vogt, Clay Maranville, and Jiarong Hong,
537 "Airborne transmission of COVID-19 and mitigation using box fan air cleaners in a poorly
538 ventilated classroom", *Physics of Fluids* 33, 057107 (2021)
539 <https://doi.org/10.1063/5.0050058>
540
- 541 10. California Air Resources Board. “Protecting Yourself from Wildfire Smoke”
542 <https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/protecting-yourself-wildfire-smoke>
543
- 544 11. Aika Davis, Marilyn Black. Chemical Insights. An Evaluation of DIY Air Filtration.
545 <https://chemicalinsights.org/wp-content/uploads/DIY-Box-Fan-Report-2021.pdf>
546
- 547 12. The National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH). “NIOSH Sound
548 Level Meter App” <https://www.cdc.gov/niosh/topics/noise/app.html>
549

- 550 13. UC-Davis Western Cooling Efficiency Center. August, 2021. “TESTING DIFFERENT
551 CONFIGURATIONS OF DO-IT-YOURSELF PORTABLE AIR CLEANERS”
552 [https://energy.ucdavis.edu/wp-content/uploads/Case-Study_DIY-Portable-Air-Cleaners-](https://energy.ucdavis.edu/wp-content/uploads/Case-Study_DIY-Portable-Air-Cleaners-083121.pdf)
553 [083121.pdf](https://energy.ucdavis.edu/wp-content/uploads/Case-Study_DIY-Portable-Air-Cleaners-083121.pdf)
554
- 555 14. Chen PZ, Koopmans M, Fisman DN, Gu FX. Understanding why superspreading drives
556 the COVID-19 pandemic but not the H1N1 pandemic. *Lancet Infect Dis*. 2021
557 Sep;21(9):1203-1204. doi: 10.1016/S1473-3099(21)00406-0. Epub 2021 Aug 2. PMID:
558 34352224; PMCID: PMC8328407.
559
- 560 15. Sun K, Wang W, Gao L, Wang Y, Luo K, Ren L, Zhan Z, Chen X, Zhao S, Huang Y, Sun
561 Q, Liu Z, Litvinova M, Vespignani A, Ajelli M, Viboud C, Yu H. Transmission
562 heterogeneities, kinetics, and controllability of SARS-CoV-2. *Science*. 2021 Jan
563 15;371(6526):eabe2424. doi: 10.1126/science.abe2424. Epub 2020 Nov 24. PMID:
564 33234698; PMCID: PMC7857413.
565
- 566 16. Osterholm MT, Moore KA, Kelley NS, Brosseau LM, Wong G, Murphy FA, Peters CJ,
567 LeDuc JW, Russell PK, Van Herp M, Kapetshi J, Muyembe JJ, Ilunga BK, Strong JE, Grolla
568 A, Wolz A, Kargbo B, Kargbo DK, Sanders DA, Kobinger GP. Transmission of Ebola
569 viruses: what we know and what we do not know. *mBio*. 2015 Feb 19;6(2):e00137. doi:
570 10.1128/mBio.00137-15. Erratum in: *MBio*. 2015;6(4):e01154. Formenty, Pierre [Deleted].
571 PMID: 25698835; PMCID: PMC4358015.
572

573 17. “How does #COVID19 spread? What are some modes of transmission? What can you do
574 to protect yourself? @DrMikeRyan explains.”

575 <https://twitter.com/WHO/status/1473387274159149063>

576

577 18. “Coronavirus disease (COVID-19): How is it transmitted?” [https://www.who.int/news-](https://www.who.int/news-room/questions-and-answers/item/coronavirus-disease-covid-19-how-is-it-transmitted)
578 [room/questions-and-answers/item/coronavirus-disease-covid-19-how-is-it-transmitted](https://www.who.int/news-room/questions-and-answers/item/coronavirus-disease-covid-19-how-is-it-transmitted)

579

580 19. Lee EC, Wada NI, Grabowski MK, Gurley ES, Lessler J. The engines of SARS-CoV-2
581 spread. *Science*. 2020 Oct 23;370(6515):406-407. doi: 10.1126/science.abd8755. PMID:
582 33093098.

583

584 20. Greenhalgh T, Jimenez JL, Prather KA, Tufekci Z, Fisman D, Schooley R. Ten scientific
585 reasons in support of airborne transmission of SARS-CoV-2. *Lancet*. 2021 May
586 1;397(10285):1603-1605. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(21)00869-2. Epub 2021 Apr 15. Erratum
587 in: *Lancet*. 2021 May 15;397(10287):1808. PMID: 33865497; PMCID: PMC8049599.

588

589 21. Robert T Schooley, Ferric C Fang, Reply to Meyerowitz and Richterman, *Clinical*
590 *Infectious Diseases*, Volume 73, Issue 7, 1 October 2021, Pages 1319–1320, [https://doi-](https://doi-org.eres.qnl.qa/10.1093/cid/ciab017)
591 [org.eres.qnl.qa/10.1093/cid/ciab017](https://doi-org.eres.qnl.qa/10.1093/cid/ciab017)

592

593 22. Escandón, K., Rasmussen, A.L., Bogoch, I.I. et al. COVID-19 false dichotomies and a
594 comprehensive review of the evidence regarding public health, COVID-19 symptomatology,
595 SARS-CoV-2 transmission, mask wearing, and reinfection. *BMC Infect Dis* 21, 710 (2021).
596 <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12879-021-06357-4>

597

- 598 23. Zhou, L., Ayeh, S.K., Chidambaram, V. et al. Modes of transmission of SARS-CoV-2
599 and evidence for preventive behavioral interventions. BMC Infect Dis 21, 496 (2021).
600 <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12879-021-06222-4>
601
- 602 24. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. SARS-CoV-2 and Surface (Fomite)
603 Transmission for Indoor Community Environments. [https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-
604 ncov/more/science-and-research/surface-transmission.html](https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/more/science-and-research/surface-transmission.html)
605
- 606 25. California Division of Occupational Safety and Health (Cal-OSHA). COVID-19
607 Prevention. <https://www.dir.ca.gov/title8/3205.html>
608
- 609 26. US Department of Labor Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA).
610 COVID-19 Vaccination and Testing; Emergency Temporary Standard.
611 <https://www.osha.gov/coronavirus/ets2>
612
- 613 27. Swadi T, Geoghegan JL, Devine T, McElnay C, Sherwood J, Shoemack P, Ren X, Storey
614 M, Jefferies S, Smit E, Hadfield J, Kenny A, Jelley L, Sporle A, McNeill A, Reynolds GE,
615 Mouldey K, Lowe L, Sonder G, Drummond AJ, Huang S, Welch D, Holmes EC, French N,
616 Simpson CR, de Ligt J. Genomic Evidence of In-Flight Transmission of SARS-CoV-2
617 Despite Predeparture Testing. Emerg Infect Dis. 2021 Mar;27(3):687-693. doi:
618 10.3201/eid2703.204714. Epub 2021 Jan 5. PMID: 33400642; PMCID: PMC7920679.
619
- 620 28. Khanh NC, Thai PQ, Quach HL, Thi NH, Dinh PC, Duong TN, Mai LTQ, Nghia ND, Tu
621 TA, Quang N, Quang TD, Nguyen TT, Vogt F, Anh DD. Transmission of SARS-CoV 2

- 622 During Long-Haul Flight. *Emerg Infect Dis.* 2020 Nov;26(11):2617-2624. doi:
623 10.3201/eid2611.203299. Epub 2020 Sep 18. PMID: 32946369; PMCID: PMC7588538.
624
- 625 29. Speake H, Phillips A, Chong T, Sikazwe C, Levy A, Lang J, Scalley B, Speers DJ, Smith
626 DW, Effler P, McEvoy SP. Flight-Associated Transmission of Severe Acute Respiratory
627 Syndrome Coronavirus 2 Corroborated by Whole-Genome Sequencing. *Emerg Infect Dis.*
628 2020 Dec;26(12):2872-2880. doi: 10.3201/eid2612.203910. Epub 2020 Sep 29. PMID:
629 32990563; PMCID: PMC7706937.
630
- 631 30. Nir-Paz R, Grotto I, Strolov I, Salmon A, Mandelboim M, Mendelson E, Regev-Yochay
632 G. Absence of in-flight transmission of SARS-CoV-2 likely due to use of face masks on
633 board. *J Travel Med.* 2020 Dec 23;27(8):taaa117. doi: 10.1093/jtm/taaa117. PMID:
634 32662832; PMCID: PMC7454758.
635
- 636 31. Freedman DO, Wilder-Smith A. In-flight transmission of SARS-CoV-2: a review of the
637 attack rates and available data on the efficacy of face masks. *J Travel Med.* 2020 Dec
638 23;27(8):taaa178. doi: 10.1093/jtm/taaa178. PMID: 32975554; PMCID: PMC7543400.
639
- 640 32. Eric A Meyerowitz, Aaron Richterman, A Defense of the Classical Model of
641 Transmission of Respiratory Pathogens, *Clinical Infectious Diseases*, Volume 73, Issue 7, 1
642 October 2021, Page 1318, <https://doi.org/10.1093/cid/ciab016>
643
- 644 33. Bielecki M, Patel D, Hinkelbein J, Komorowski M, Kester J, Ebrahim S, Rodriguez-
645 Morales AJ, Memish ZA, Schlagenhauf P. Air travel and COVID-19 prevention in the
646 pandemic and peri-pandemic period: A narrative review. *Travel Med Infect Dis.* 2021 Jan-

- 647 Feb;39:101915. doi: 10.1016/j.tmaid.2020.101915. Epub 2020 Nov 10. PMID: 33186687;
648 PMCID: PMC7655026.
649
- 650 34. Kelly D, Bambury N, Boland M. In-flight transmission of wild-type SARS-CoV-2 and
651 the outbreak potential of imported clusters of COVID-19: a review of published evidence.
652 Global Health. 2021 Aug 21;17(1):93. doi: 10.1186/s12992-021-00749-6. PMID: 34419084;
653 PMCID: PMC8379567.
654
- 655 35. Blomquist PB, Bolt H, Packer S, Schaefer U, Platt S, Dabrera G, Gobin M, Oliver I. Risk
656 of symptomatic COVID-19 due to aircraft transmission: a retrospective cohort study of
657 contact-traced flights during England's containment phase. Influenza Other Respir Viruses.
658 2021 May;15(3):336-344. doi: 10.1111/irv.12846. Epub 2021 Mar 1. PMID: 33650201;
659 PMCID: PMC8013760.
660
- 661 36. Murphy N, Boland M, Bambury N, Fitzgerald M, Comerford L, Dever N, O'Sullivan MB,
662 Petty-Saphon N, Kiernan R, Jensen M, O'Connor L. A large national outbreak of COVID-19
663 linked to air travel, Ireland, summer 2020. Euro Surveill. 2020 Oct;25(42):2001624. doi:
664 10.2807/1560-7917.ES.2020.25.42.2001624. PMID: 33094715; PMCID: PMC7651877.
665
- 666 37. Toyokawa T, Shimada T, Hayamizu T, Sekizuka T, Zukeyama Y, Yasuda M, Nakamura
667 Y, Okano S, Kudaka J, Kakita T, Kuroda M, Nakasone T. Transmission of SARS-CoV-2
668 during a 2-h domestic flight to Okinawa, Japan, March 2020. Influenza Other Respir Viruses.
669 2021 Oct 3. doi: 10.1111/irv.12913. Epub ahead of print. PMID: 34605181.
670

- 671 38. Eichler N, Thornley C, Swadi T, Devine T, McElnay C, Sherwood J, Brunton C,
672 Williamson F, Freeman J, Berger S, Ren X, Storey M, de Ligt J, Geoghegan JL.
673 Transmission of Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 during Border
674 Quarantine and Air Travel, New Zealand (Aotearoa). *Emerg Infect Dis*. 2021
675 May;27(5):1274-1278. doi: 10.3201/eid2705.210514. Epub 2021 Mar 18. PMID: 33734063;
676 PMCID: PMC8084504.
677
- 678 39. Klompas M, Baker MA, Griesbach D, Tucker R, Gallagher GR, Lang AS, Fink T,
679 Cumming M, Smole S, Madoff LC, Rhee C. Transmission of Severe Acute Respiratory
680 Syndrome Coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) From Asymptomatic and Presymptomatic
681 Individuals in Healthcare Settings Despite Medical Masks and Eye Protection. *Clin Infect*
682 *Dis*. 2021 Nov 2;73(9):1693-1695. doi: 10.1093/cid/ciab218. PMID: 33704451; PMCID:
683 PMC7989527.
684
- 685 40. John Paul Tasker. COVID-19 transmission on flights 'extremely rare,' Dr. Tam says. *CBC*
686 *News*. Nov 10, 2020. [https://www.cbc.ca/news/politics/covid-transmission-flights-extremely-](https://www.cbc.ca/news/politics/covid-transmission-flights-extremely-rare-1.5797065)
687 [rare-1.5797065](https://www.cbc.ca/news/politics/covid-transmission-flights-extremely-rare-1.5797065)
688
- 689 41. Harvard University. Assessment of Risks of SARS-CoV-2 Transmission During Air
690 Travel and Non-Pharmaceutical Interventions to Reduce Risk: Phase One Report: Gate-to-
691 Gate Travel Onboard Aircraft. 2020-10-27. [https://cdn1.sph.harvard.edu/wp-](https://cdn1.sph.harvard.edu/wp-content/uploads/sites/2443/2020/10/HSPH-APHI-Phase-I-Report.pdf)
692 [content/uploads/sites/2443/2020/10/HSPH-APHI-Phase-I-Report.pdf](https://cdn1.sph.harvard.edu/wp-content/uploads/sites/2443/2020/10/HSPH-APHI-Phase-I-Report.pdf)
693
- 694 42. Air Traffic By The Numbers. Federal Aviation Administration.
695 <https://www.faa.gov/air-traffic/by-the-numbers/>

696

697 43. Edwards DA, Ausiello D, Salzman J, Devlin T, Langer R, Beddingfield BJ, Fears AC,
698 Doyle-Meyers LA, Redmann RK, Killeen SZ, Maness NJ, Roy CJ. Exhaled aerosol increases
699 with COVID-19 infection, age, and obesity. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A. 2021 Feb
700 23;118(8):e2021830118. doi: 10.1073/pnas.2021830118. Erratum in: Proc Natl Acad Sci U S
701 A. 2021 Jul 6;118(27): PMID: 33563754; PMCID: PMC7923364.

702

703 44. Choi EM, Chu DKW, Cheng PKC, Tsang DNC, Peiris M, Bausch DG, Poon LLM,
704 Watson-Jones D. In-Flight Transmission of SARS-CoV-2. Emerg Infect Dis. 2020
705 Nov;26(11):2713-2716. doi: 10.3201/eid2611.203254. Epub 2020 Sep 18. PMID: 32946370;
706 PMCID: PMC7588512.

707

708 45. Dhanasekaran V, Edwards KM, Xie R, Gu H, Adam DC, Chang LDJ, Cheuk SSY,
709 Gurung S, Krishnan P, Ng DYM, Liu GYZ, Wan CKC, Cheng SSM, Tsang DNC, Cowling
710 BJ, Peiris M, Poon LLM. Air travel-related outbreak of multiple SARS-CoV-2 variants. J
711 Travel Med. 2021 Sep 20:taab149. doi: 10.1093/jtm/taab149. Epub ahead of print. PMID:
712 34542623.

713

714 46. Warish Ahmed, Aaron Bivins, Stuart L. Simpson, Paul M. Bertsch, John Ehret, Ian
715 Hosegood, Suzanne Metcalfe, Wendy J.M. Smith, Kevin V. Thomas, Josh Tynan, Jochen F.
716 Mueller, Wastewater surveillance demonstrates high predictive value for COVID-19
717 infection on board repatriation flights to Australia, Environment International, 2021, 106938,
718 ISSN 0160-4120, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envint.2021.106938>.

719

- 720 47. Elliott P, Haw D, Wang H, et al; COVID-19 Genomics UK (COG-UK) Consortium11.
721 Exponential growth, high prevalence of SARS-CoV-2, and vaccine effectiveness associated
722 with the Delta variant. *Science*. 2021;eabl9551. Published online November 2, 2021.
723 doi:10.1126/science.abl9551
724
- 725 48. El Sahly HM, Baden LR, Essink B, et al; COVE Study Group. Efficacy of the mRNA-
726 1273 SARS-CoV-2 vaccine at completion of blinded phase. *N Engl J Med*. Published online
727 September 22, 2021. doi:10.1056/NEJMoa2113017
728
- 729 49. Dietrich WL, Bennett JS, Jones BW, Hosni MH. Laboratory Modeling of SARS-CoV-2
730 Exposure Reduction Through Physically Distanced Seating in Aircraft Cabins Using
731 Bacteriophage Aerosol - November 2020. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep*. 2021 Apr
732 23;70(16):595-599. doi: 10.15585/mmwr.mm7016e1. PMID: 33886531; PMCID:
733 PMC8061797.
734
- 735 50. Hertzberg VS, Weiss H, Elon L, Si W, Norris SL; FlyHealthy Research Team. Behaviors,
736 movements, and transmission of droplet-mediated respiratory diseases during
737 transcontinental airline flights. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*. 2018 Apr 3;115(14):3623-3627.
738 doi: 10.1073/pnas.1711611115. Epub 2018 Mar 19. PMID: 29555754; PMCID:
739 PMC5889623.
740
- 741 51. Mossong J, Hens N, Jit M, Beutels P, Auranen K, Mikolajczyk R, Massari M, Salmaso S,
742 Tomba GS, Wallinga J, Heijne J, Sadkowska-Todys M, Rosinska M, Edmunds WJ. Social
743 contacts and mixing patterns relevant to the spread of infectious diseases. *PLoS Med*. 2008

744 Mar 25;5(3):e74. doi: 10.1371/journal.pmed.0050074. PMID: 18366252; PMCID:
745 PMC2270306.
746
747 52. Leung K, Jit M, Lau EHY, Wu JT. Social contact patterns relevant to the spread of
748 respiratory infectious diseases in Hong Kong. Sci Rep. 2017 Aug 11;7(1):7974. doi:
749 10.1038/s41598-017-08241-1. PMID: 28801623; PMCID: PMC5554254.
750
751 53. Bhuvan KC, Shrestha R, Leggat PA, Ravi Shankar P, Shrestha S. Safety of air travel
752 during the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic. Travel Med Infect Dis. 2021 Sep-Oct;43:102103.
753 doi: 10.1016/j.tmaid.2021.102103. Epub 2021 Jun 7. PMID: 34111566; PMCID:
754 PMC8180446.
755
756 54. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Infection Control Guidelines for
757 Environmental Infection Control in Health-Care Facilities (2003): Ventilation Specifications
758 for Health-Care Facilities.
759 <https://www.cdc.gov/infectioncontrol/guidelines/environmental/appendix/air.html>
760
761 55. Ventilation in Buildings. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. June 2, 2021.
762 <https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/community/ventilation.html>
763
764 56. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. “Ventilation in Schools and Childcare
765 Programs” [https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/community/schools-](https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/community/schools-childcare/ventilation.html)
766 [childcare/ventilation.html](https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/community/schools-childcare/ventilation.html)
767

- 768 57. Allen JG, Ibrahim AM. Indoor Air Changes and Potential Implications for SARS-CoV-2
769 Transmission. JAMA. 2021;325(20):2112–2113. doi:10.1001/jama.2021.5053
770
- 771 58. Tomas Aragon, California Department of Public Health, “Interim Guidance for
772 Ventilation, Filtration, and Air Quality in Indoor Environments”
773 [https://www.cdph.ca.gov/Programs/CID/DCDC/Pages/COVID-19/Interim-Guidance-for-](https://www.cdph.ca.gov/Programs/CID/DCDC/Pages/COVID-19/Interim-Guidance-for-Ventilation-Filtration-and-Air-Quality-in-Indoor-Environments.aspx)
774 [Ventilation-Filtration-and-Air-Quality-in-Indoor-Environments.aspx](https://www.cdph.ca.gov/Programs/CID/DCDC/Pages/COVID-19/Interim-Guidance-for-Ventilation-Filtration-and-Air-Quality-in-Indoor-Environments.aspx)
775
- 776 59. Duill FF, Schulz F, Jain A, Krieger L, van Wachem B, Beyrau F. The Impact of Large
777 Mobile Air Purifiers on Aerosol Concentration in Classrooms and the Reduction of Airborne
778 Transmission of SARS-CoV-2. Int J Environ Res Public Health. 2021 Nov 2;18(21):11523.
779 doi: 10.3390/ijerph182111523. PMID: 34770037.
780
- 781 60. Bluysen PM, Ortiz M, Zhang D. The effect of a mobile HEPA filter system on
782 'infectious' aerosols, sound and air velocity in the SenseLab. Build Environ. 2021 Jan
783 15;188:107475. doi: 10.1016/j.buildenv.2020.107475. Epub 2020 Dec 3. PMID: 33293755;
784 PMCID: PMC7711180.
785
- 786 61. Bae SH, Shin H, Koo HY, Lee SW, Yang JM, Yon DK. Asymptomatic Transmission of
787 SARS-CoV-2 on Evacuation Flight. Emerg Infect Dis. 2020 Nov;26(11):2705-2708. doi:
788 10.3201/eid2611.203353. Epub 2020 Aug 21. PMID: 32822289; PMCID: PMC7588520.
789
- 790 62. Abraar Karan, Ranu Dhillon and Devabhaktuni Srikrishna. America needs better masks to
791 fight Covid-19. CNN Opinion. February 1, 2021.

792 [https://www.cnn.com/2021/01/29/opinions/covid-19-n95-masks-availability-karan-dhillon-](https://www.cnn.com/2021/01/29/opinions/covid-19-n95-masks-availability-karan-dhillon-srikrishna/index.html)
793 [srikrishna/index.html](https://www.cnn.com/2021/01/29/opinions/covid-19-n95-masks-availability-karan-dhillon-srikrishna/index.html)

794

795 63. David Ignatius. Transcript: Coronavirus: Leadership During Crisis with Anthony S.
796 Fauci. Washington Post Live. February 2, 2021.

797 [https://www.washingtonpost.com/washington-post-live/2021/02/02/transcript-coronavirus-](https://www.washingtonpost.com/washington-post-live/2021/02/02/transcript-coronavirus-leadership-during-crisis-with-anthony-s-fauci/)
798 [leadership-during-crisis-with-anthony-s-fauci/](https://www.washingtonpost.com/washington-post-live/2021/02/02/transcript-coronavirus-leadership-during-crisis-with-anthony-s-fauci/)

799

800 64. Arumuru V, Samantaray SS, Pasa J. Double masking protection vs. comfort-A
801 quantitative assessment. Phys Fluids (1994). 2021 Jul;33(7):077120. doi: 10.1063/5.0058571.
802 Epub 2021 Jul 21. PMID: 34335010; PMCID: PMC8320463.

803

804 65. Sickbert-Bennett EE, Samet JM, Clapp PW, Chen H, Berntsen J, Zeman KL, Tong H,
805 Weber DJ, Bennett WD. Filtration Efficiency of Hospital Face Mask Alternatives Available
806 for Use During the COVID-19 Pandemic. JAMA Intern Med. 2020 Dec 1;180(12):1607-
807 1612. doi: 10.1001/jamainternmed.2020.4221. PMID: 32780113; PMCID: PMC7420816.

808

809 66. Brosseau LM. Fit testing respirators for public health medical emergencies. J Occup
810 Environ Hyg. 2010 Nov;7(11):628-32. doi: 10.1080/15459624.2010.514782. PMID:
811 20853203.

812

813 67. Steinle S, Sleenwenhoek A, Mueller W, Horwell CJ, Apsley A, Davis A, Cherrie JW,
814 Galea KS. The effectiveness of respiratory protection worn by communities to protect from
815 volcanic ash inhalation. Part II: Total inward leakage tests. Int J Hyg Environ Health. 2018
816 Jul;221(6):977-984. doi: 10.1016/j.ijheh.2018.03.011. Epub 2018 Mar 28. PMID: 29861400.

- 817
- 818 68. McMahon K, Jeanmonod D, Check R, Rivard L, Balakrishnan V, Kelly B, Pester J,
819 Jeanmonod R. The pragmatic use of industrial elastomeric facemasks in health care practice
820 during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Am J Emerg Med*. 2021 Oct;48:273-275. doi:
821 10.1016/j.ajem.2021.05.025. Epub 2021 May 13. PMID: 34022633; PMCID: PMC8116120.
822
- 823 69. Prince SE, Chen H, Tong H, Berntsen J, Masood S, Zeman KL, Clapp PW, Bennett WD,
824 Samet JM. Assessing the effect of beard hair lengths on face masks used as personal
825 protective equipment during the COVID-19 pandemic. *J Expo Sci Environ Epidemiol*. 2021
826 Nov;31(6):953-960. doi: 10.1038/s41370-021-00337-1. Epub 2021 May 18. PMID:
827 34006963; PMCID: PMC8130778.
828
- 829 70. Lam-Hine T, McCurdy SA, Santora L, Duncan L, Corbett-Detig R, Kapusinszky B,
830 Willis M. Outbreak Associated with SARS-CoV-2 B.1.617.2 (Delta) Variant in an
831 Elementary School - Marin County, California, May-June 2021. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly*
832 *Rep*. 2021 Sep 3;70(35):1214-1219. doi: 10.15585/mmwr.mm7035e2. PMID: 34473683;
833 PMCID: PMC8422870.
834
- 835 71. Dancer SJ, Bluysen PM, Li Y, Tang JW. Why don't we just open the windows? *BMJ*.
836 2021 Nov 26;375:n2895. doi: 10.1136/bmj.n2895. PMID: 34836876.
837
- 838 72. Natasha Khan. Covid-19 Case Cluster Linked to One Flight Stirs Debate Among Health
839 Experts. *Wall Street Journal*. April 24, 2021.
840

- 841 73. Andrew Conway Morris, Katherine Sharrocks, Rachel Bousfield, Leanne Kermack,
842 Mailis Maes, Ellen Higginson, Sally Forrest, Joana Pereira-Dias, Claire Cormie, Tim Old,
843 Sophie Brooks, Islam Hamed, Alicia Koenig, Andrew Turner, Paul White, R Andres Floto,
844 Gordon Dougan, Effrossyni Gkrania-Klotsas, Theodore Gouliouris, Stephen Baker, Vilas
845 Navapurkar, The Removal of Airborne Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2
846 (SARS-CoV-2) and Other Microbial Bioaerosols by Air Filtration on Coronavirus Disease
847 2019 (COVID-19) Surge Units, *Clinical Infectious Diseases*, 2021;:, ciab933,
848 <https://doi.org/10.1093/cid/ciab933>
849
- 850 74. Brandal Lin T., MacDonald Emily, Veneti Lamprini, Ravlo Tine, Lange Heidi, Naseer
851 Umaer, Feruglio Siri, Bragstad Karoline, Hungnes Olav, Ødeskaug Liz E., Hagen Frode,
852 Hanch-Hansen Kristian E., Lind Andreas, Watle Sara Viksmoen, Taxt Arne M., Johansen
853 Mia, Vold Line, Aavitsland Preben, Nygård Karin, Madslie Elisabeth H.. Outbreak caused
854 by the SARS-CoV-2 Omicron variant in Norway, November to December 2021. *Euro*
855 *Surveill.* 2021;26(50):pii=2101147. [https://doi.org/10.2807/1560-](https://doi.org/10.2807/1560-7917.ES.2021.26.50.2101147)
856 [7917.ES.2021.26.50.2101147](https://doi.org/10.2807/1560-7917.ES.2021.26.50.2101147)
857
- 858 75. Gu H, Krishnan P, Ng DYM, Chang LDJ, Liu GYZ, Cheng SSM, Hui MMY, Fan MCY,
859 Wan JHL, Lau LHK, Cowling BJ, Peiris M, Poon LLM. Probable Transmission of SARS-
860 CoV-2 Omicron Variant in Quarantine Hotel, Hong Kong, China, November 2021. *Emerg*
861 *Infect Dis.* 2021 Dec 3;28(2). doi: 10.3201/eid2802.212422. Epub ahead of print. PMID:
862 34860154.
863
- 864 76. Chapter 18, Gottlieb, S. *Uncontrolled Spread: Why COVID-19 Crushed Us and How We*
865 *Can Defeat the Next Pandemic.* Harper. September 21, 2021.

866

867 77. Pile JC, Malone JD, Eitzen EM, Friedlander AM. Anthrax as a Potential Biological
868 Warfare Agent. Arch Intern Med. 1998;158(5):429–434. doi:10.1001/archinte.158.5.429

869

870 78. Rachael Dal Porto, Monet N. Kunz, Theresa Pistochini, Richard L. Corsi & Christopher
871 D. Cappa (2022) Characterizing the performance of a do-it-yourself (DIY) box fan air filter,
872 Aerosol Science and Technology, DOI: 10.1080/02786826.2022.2054674

873

874 79. Yicheng Zeng, Mohammad Heidarinejad, PhD, and Brent Stephens, PhD, “Portable Air
875 Cleaner Test Report ‘Corsi-Rosenthal’ Box Fan Air Cleaner w/ MERV 13 Filters”

876 [https://www.built-envi.com/wp-content/uploads/IIT-CADR-Testing-C-R-Box-September-](https://www.built-envi.com/wp-content/uploads/IIT-CADR-Testing-C-R-Box-September-2021.pdf)
877 [2021.pdf](https://www.built-envi.com/wp-content/uploads/IIT-CADR-Testing-C-R-Box-September-2021.pdf)

878

879 80. Elfstrom, D. “Effect of shroud size on outlet flow.”

880 <https://twitter.com/DavidElfstrom/status/1457390757703208966>

881

882 81. Rosenthal, J. “How to Improve the Efficiency of the “Box Fan and MERV 13 Filter” Air
883 Cleaner” [https://www.texairfilters.com/how-to-improve-the-efficiency-of-the-box-fan-and-](https://www.texairfilters.com/how-to-improve-the-efficiency-of-the-box-fan-and-merv-13-filter-air-cleaner/)
884 [merv-13-filter-air-cleaner/](https://www.texairfilters.com/how-to-improve-the-efficiency-of-the-box-fan-and-merv-13-filter-air-cleaner/)

885

886 82. Hagan DH, Kroll JH. Assessing the accuracy of low-cost optical particle sensors using a
887 physics-based approach. Atmos Meas Tech. 2020;13(11):6343-6355. doi: 10.5194/amt-13-
888 6343-2020. Epub 2020 Nov 26. PMID: 33777248; PMCID: PMC7995643.

889

890 83. Alondra Nelson, “Let’s Clear The Air On COVID”, White House Office of Science
891 Technology and Policy, [https://www.whitehouse.gov/ostp/news-updates/2022/03/23/lets-](https://www.whitehouse.gov/ostp/news-updates/2022/03/23/lets-clear-the-air-on-covid/)
892 [clear-the-air-on-covid/](https://www.whitehouse.gov/ostp/news-updates/2022/03/23/lets-clear-the-air-on-covid/)

893

894 84. “Italian study shows ventilation can cut school COVID cases by 82%” Reuters

895 [https://www.reuters.com/world/europe/italian-study-shows-ventilation-can-cut-school-covid-](https://www.reuters.com/world/europe/italian-study-shows-ventilation-can-cut-school-covid-cases-by-82-2022-03-22/)
896 [cases-by-82-2022-03-22/](https://www.reuters.com/world/europe/italian-study-shows-ventilation-can-cut-school-covid-cases-by-82-2022-03-22/)

897

898 85. Hooman Parhizkar, Leslie Dietz, Andreas Olsen-Martinez, Patrick F Horve, Liliana
899 Barnatan, Dale Northcutt, Kevin G Van Den Wymelenberg, Quantifying Environmental
900 Mitigation of Aerosol Viral Load in a Controlled Chamber With Participants Diagnosed With
901 Coronavirus Disease 2019, Clinical Infectious Diseases, 2022;, ciac006,

902 <https://doi.org/10.1093/cid/ciac006>

903

904 86. “The effectiveness of stand alone air cleaners for shelter-in-place”

905 <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/15737155/>

906