

# Ventilation rate assessment by carbon dioxide levels in dental treatment rooms

Qirong Huang, Tamer Marzouk, Razvan Cirligeanu, Hans Malmstrom, Eli Eliav, Yan-Fang Ren\*

Drs. Huang, Marzouk and Cirligeanu are research fellows and residents in Advanced Education in General Dentistry; Dr. Malmstrom is Professor and Chair, Dept. of General Dentistry; Dr. Eliav is Professor and Director, Eastman Institute for Oral Health; Dr. Ren is Professor and Director, Howitt Dental Urgent Care at Eastman Institute for Oral Health, University of Rochester Medical Center.

\*Correspondence to Dr. Ren [Yanfang\\_ren@urmc.rochester.edu](mailto:Yanfang_ren@urmc.rochester.edu)

## Abstract:

**Objectives:** The purpose of the present study was to monitor and evaluate CO<sub>2</sub> levels in dental operatories using a consumer-grade CO<sub>2</sub> sensor and determine the utility and accuracy of various methods using CO<sub>2</sub> levels to assess ventilation rate in dental clinics. We aim to find a practical tool for dental practitioners to conveniently and accurately monitor CO<sub>2</sub> levels and assess the ventilation rates in their office in order to devise a pragmatic and effective strategy for ventilation improvement in their work environment.

**Methods:** Mechanical ventilation rate in air change per hour (ACH<sub>VENT</sub>) of 10 dental operatories was first measured with an air velocity sensor and air flow balancing hood. CO<sub>2</sub> levels were measured in these rooms to analyze the effects of ventilation rate and number of persons in the room on CO<sub>2</sub> accumulation. Ventilation rates were estimated using natural steady state CO<sub>2</sub> levels during dental treatments and experimental CO<sub>2</sub> concentration decays by dry ice or mixing baking soda and vinegar. We compared the differences and assessed the correlations between ACH<sub>VENT</sub> and ventilation rates estimated by steady states CO<sub>2</sub> model with low (0.3 L/min, ACH<sub>SS30</sub>) or high (0.46 L/min, ACH<sub>SS46</sub>) CO<sub>2</sub> generation rates, by CO<sub>2</sub> decay constants using dry ice (ACH<sub>DI</sub>) or baking soda (ACH<sub>BV</sub>), and by time needed to remove 63% of excess CO<sub>2</sub> generated by dry ice (ACH<sub>DI63%</sub>) or baking soda (ACH<sub>BV63%</sub>).

**Results:** ACH<sub>VENT</sub> varied from 3.9 to 35.0 with a mean of 13.2 (±10.6) in the 10 dental operatories. CO<sub>2</sub> accumulation occurred in rooms with low ventilation (ACH<sub>VENT</sub>≤6) and more persons (n>3) but not in those with higher ventilation and less persons. ACH<sub>SS30</sub> and ACH<sub>SS46</sub> correlated well with ACH<sub>VENT</sub> (r=0.83, p=0.003), but ACH<sub>SS30</sub> was more accurate for rooms with low ACH<sub>VENT</sub>. Ventilation rates could be reliably estimated using CO<sub>2</sub> released from dry ice or baking soda. ACH<sub>VENT</sub> was highly correlated with ACH<sub>DI</sub> (r=0.99), ACH<sub>BV</sub> (r=0.98), ACH<sub>DI63%</sub> (r=0.98), and ACH<sub>BV63%</sub> (r=0.98). There were no statistically significant differences between ACH<sub>VENT</sub> and ACH<sub>DI63%</sub> or ACH<sub>BV63%</sub>.

**Conclusions:** Dental operatories with low ventilation rates and overcrowding facilitate CO<sub>2</sub> accumulations. Ventilation rates could be reliably calculated by observing the changes in CO<sub>2</sub> levels after a simple mixing of household baking soda and vinegar in dental settings. Time needed to remove 63% of excess CO<sub>2</sub> generated by baking soda could be used to accurately assess the ventilation rates using a consumer-grade CO<sub>2</sub> sensor and a basic calculator.

Key words: ventilation rate, carbon dioxide, baking soda, dentistry, COVID-19

## Introduction:

Risks of disease transmission in healthcare settings during infectious disease pandemics have consistently challenged dental care professionals (DCPs) in their efforts to maintain a safe environment for their staffs and patients. DCPs have gained tremendous experiences in infection control from the ongoing HIV/AIDS pandemic by implementing universal or standard precautions against contact and droplet transmissions, but we are less confident in dealing with an infectious respiratory disease that may be transmitted through aerosol particles emitted by patients who have no overt symptoms. With mounting evidence that COVID-19 is transmissible through aerosols in an indoor environment [1, 2], additional preventive measures beyond the standard care using personal protective equipment (PPE) are essential to minimize risks and alleviate anxieties experienced by staff and patients due to uncertainties associated with a novel infectious respiratory disease pandemic.

Engineering controls through mechanical ventilation are important mechanisms to reduce the risks of airborne disease transmission in an indoor environment such as the dental offices. Though CDC recommends improving ventilation and air filtration in its guidance for dental settings during the COVID-19 pandemic [3], few information is available on how to assess the ventilation condition and what measures to take to achieve more effective engineering control of disease transmission in dental offices.

Carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>) level is an important indicator of ventilation in occupied indoor environments. CO<sub>2</sub> is a byproduct of human metabolism and exists in high levels in exhaled air. Atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> level is at approximately 400 parts per million (ppm) in most outdoor environments, but CO<sub>2</sub> in human exhaled air reaches on average 40,000 ppm in concentration [4]. CO<sub>2</sub> levels is therefore often used as a proxy for indoor air quality as well as a risk marker for transmission of airborne diseases since it is inert, its indoor emission source (human) is known, and its measurement is inexpensive and accurate [5]. Accumulation of CO<sub>2</sub> may occur in indoor spaces with poor ventilation and overcrowding, and consequentially increase the risks of disease transmission, which is of particular significance under the current COVID-19 pandemic. High levels of CO<sub>2</sub> in indoor environments have been associated with the transmission of infectious respiratory diseases such as tuberculosis, influenza and rhinovirus infections [6-8]. Indoor CO<sub>2</sub> levels have therefore been widely used to model the risks of airborne infectious disease transmission [4, 9, 10], including that of coronavirus infection transmission in dental offices [11].

CO<sub>2</sub> levels is directly associated with ventilation rate in an occupied space. A clinical space with good ventilation should have a CO<sub>2</sub> level close to that of outside air at approximately 400 ppm in most areas [4, 12]. Higher indoor CO<sub>2</sub> levels indicate poor ventilation, accumulation of exhaled air, and increase in the fraction of “rebreathed air” or “shared air” in the indoor environment, which is proven to be a risk factor for transmissions of respiratory infectious diseases [4, 7, 8, 10]. CO<sub>2</sub> levels have been used to estimate ventilation rates in dental offices through mathematic modeling [13-15]. Godwin and colleagues reported that the ventilation rate was 1.12 air change per hour (ACH) in a typical dental clinic in the US [13], and Helmis and colleagues found that it was on average 5 ACH in a dental school clinic in Greece where the doors and windows were opened for cross ventilation [15]. Both studies used natural build-up of CO<sub>2</sub> levels in the dental clinic to estimate the ventilation rate through mathematic models, but none of them actually verified the ventilation estimates using conventional methodologies such as a high-precision airflow sensor [16]. It is not known if these estimates were accurate as both methods require mathematical modeling based on several assumptions related to CO<sub>2</sub> generation, build-up and dispersion over a relatively lengthy period of time, which may result in erroneous estimates if any of the assumed conditions are not met [5]. A simpler and more reliable method is needed if CO<sub>2</sub> level is to be used by dental practitioners to assess the ventilation rate of their treatment rooms.

The purpose of the present study was two-folds: 1) to monitor and evaluate CO<sub>2</sub> level and its associated factors in dental operatories using a consumer-grade CO<sub>2</sub> sensor, and 2) to determine the utility and accuracy of various methods that use CO<sub>2</sub> levels to assess ventilation rate in dental clinics. Our aim was to find a practical tool that will enable all dental practitioners to conveniently and accurately monitor CO<sub>2</sub> levels and assess the ventilation rates in their treatment rooms in order to devise a pragmatic and effective strategy for ventilation improvement in their work environment.

## **Methods:**

Study settings: We conducted the CO<sub>2</sub> concentration and ventilation rate assessments in 10 treatment rooms ranging from 667 to 1221 cubic feet (ft<sup>3</sup>) in sizes. Mechanical ventilations of the treatment rooms are provided by three separate air handlers that drew 30%, 50% and 50% outside air to the ventilation systems. The outside air percentage were later increased to 60% for all three air handlers as part of our institutional response to COVID-19.

Determining room airflow and mechanical ventilation rates: The mechanical ventilation of the 10 selected dental treatment rooms was measured with an air velocity sensor integrated in an air

flow balancing hood (ADM-850L Airdata Multimeter with CFM-850L FlowHood, Shortridge Instruments Inc., Scottsdale, AZ) as described elsewhere [17]. Briefly, the volumetric airflow rates of the dental treatment rooms were measured in cubic feet per minute (CFM, or ft<sup>3</sup>/min) at both the air supply inlets and air exhaust returns using the air flow balancing hood. The mechanical ventilation rates of each space in number of ACH was calculated based on supply and exhaust airflow rates for each room. The larger value between ACH from supply air and ACH from return air was used as the room's mechanical ventilation rate (ACH<sub>VENT</sub>) [18].

Assessing CO<sub>2</sub> levels during dental treatment procedures: We measured CO<sub>2</sub> levels in two dental treatment rooms when dental procedures were performed. The two rooms represented two extremes in ventilation rates, with one at the lowest at 3.9 ACH, and the other at the highest at 35 ACH. The number of persons in the rooms were recorded in real time when a person was entering and leaving the room. One of the two rooms were used for dental implant therapy and may often have more than one graduate students observing the procedures in addition to the treating dentist, the dental assistant and the patient in the room.

24-hour Continuous monitoring CO<sub>2</sub> in dental treatment rooms: To further explore the dynamics of CO<sub>2</sub> levels in dental treatment rooms throughout the work day and assess of accuracies of the steady state models of CO<sub>2</sub> for ventilation assessments, we continuously measured the CO<sub>2</sub> levels in the 10 selected dental treatment rooms for 24 hours and recorded the procedures performed and number of persons in the room.

Assessing ventilate rate by natural CO<sub>2</sub> level modeling in dental treatment rooms: We used the steady state model described by Batterman [5] to calculate the ACH of the treatment rooms and compared the outcomes with ACH<sub>VENT</sub> determined by mechanical ventilation.

The steady state air change rate (ACH<sub>SS</sub>) is calculated as follows [5]:

$$ACH_{SS} = 6 \times 10^4 n G_P / [V(C_{SS}-C_R)] \quad (\#1)$$

Where n = number of persons in the room; G<sub>P</sub> = average CO<sub>2</sub> generation rate; V = volume of the room in cubic meters (m<sup>3</sup>); C<sub>SS</sub> = steady state indoor CO<sub>2</sub> level in ppm; and C<sub>R</sub> = CO<sub>2</sub> level in outdoor air in ppm.

The CO<sub>2</sub> generation rate G<sub>P</sub> is affected by many factors and may vary by human activity, physical size, sex and race [19, 20]. G<sub>P</sub> values of 0.46 L/min and 0.30 L/min have been used in previous studies to represent CO<sub>2</sub> generation by moderately active adults [5], [13]). As the CO<sub>2</sub> generation rates and activity levels by dental care providers and their patients are unknown and may not be constant, we decided to use both values to calculate the steady state air change

rate  $ACH_{SS}$  and assess the correlations between  $ACH_{SS}$  and  $ACH_{VENT}$  at two  $G_P$  levels (0.46 and 0.30 L/min, respectively).


Assessing ventilation rates by CO<sub>2</sub> decays using dry ice: Ventilation rates were also measured in the 10 dental treatment rooms using the CO<sub>2</sub> decay method [5]. Outside air CO<sub>2</sub> level was first measured for 5 minutes near the air intake of the ventilation system outside the building before each experiment. To raise the peak CO<sub>2</sub> levels inside the dental treatment rooms to approximately 2000 ppm, 250g of dry ice were placed in a water bath and left in the room for two minutes. A small oscillating fan was used to keep the CO<sub>2</sub> well mixed in the room. CO<sub>2</sub> level was then measured at one-minute interval using an Aranet4 CO<sub>2</sub> sensor (range 0-9999ppm, accuracy  $\pm 50$ ppm, SAF Tehnika, Riga, Latvia) for up to two hours. The ventilation rate by CO<sub>2</sub> clearance using dry ice ( $ACH_{DI}$ ) were determined as described by Batterman [5] using the CO<sub>2</sub> concentration decays :

$$ACH_{DI} = 1/\Delta t \ln[(C_1 - C_R)/(C_0 - C_R)] \quad (\#2)$$

where  $\Delta t$  = period between measurements;  $C_0$  and  $C_1$  = CO<sub>2</sub> levels measured at the beginning and the end of the decay period (ppm), and  $C_R$  = CO<sub>2</sub> level in outdoor air (ppm).

The consumer-grade Aranet4 CO<sub>2</sub> sensor used in the current study was purchased at amazon.com in the US. It was recommended by the Federation of European Heating, Ventilation and Air Conditioning Associations (REHVA) for monitoring CO<sub>2</sub> levels in schools during the COVID-19 pandemic [21], and was found to be comparable to a research-grade LI-COR CO<sub>2</sub> sensor in accuracy and suitable for the time-response assessment in this study [22].

Assessing ventilation rates by CO<sub>2</sub> decays using baking soda: Considering that dental practitioners in private practices may not have ready access to dry ice, we developed a method to rapidly generate CO<sub>2</sub> in dental treatment rooms using household baking soda (Arm & Hammer Pure baking soda, Church & Dwight Co., Inc., Ewing, NJ, USA) and vinegar (Heinz all-natural distilled white vinegar, Pittsburgh, PA, USA). Mixing baking soda (NaHCO<sub>3</sub>) with vinegar containing 5% acetic acid (CH<sub>3</sub>COOH) will generate CO<sub>2</sub> as follows:



We tested peak CO<sub>2</sub> values in the 10 treatment rooms using a weight (g):volume (ml) ratio of 1:15 based on the molar masses of the reagents. We aimed at a peak level range of 1500 to 2000 ppm in rooms with various mechanical ventilation rates and with doors closed. We determined that adding about 125g of baking soda (approximately 3/5 cup measure) to 1893 ml (a 64-oz bottle) of vinegar containing 5% acetic acid will elevate the CO<sub>2</sub> level in a typical dental

treatment room (10 x 11 ft in area, 8 ft in ceiling height, or 880 ft<sup>3</sup> in volume) with a moderate ventilation rate ( $ACH_{VENT} = 4$ ) to above 1500 ppm. For rooms that are significantly larger or having very high ventilation rates, one full cup measure (about 8 oz or 227g) of baking soda may be used with 3785 ml (a one-gallon jar) of vinegar containing 5% acetic acid.

Before the baking soda experiment, outdoor CO<sub>2</sub> level was first measured for 5 minutes near the air intake of the ventilation system outside the building. To generate CO<sub>2</sub> inside the dental treatment rooms, we first poured vinegar into a large container and added the baking soda powder. The mixture was vigorously shaken or stirred with a large spatula for two minutes and then removed from the room. A small oscillating fan was used to keep the CO<sub>2</sub> well mixed in the room with doors closed. CO<sub>2</sub> level was then measured at one-minute interval using the CO<sub>2</sub> sensor as described above. The length of the CO<sub>2</sub> measurement period is dependent on the ventilation rates of the room. For rooms with excellent ventilation, CO<sub>2</sub> level decays rapidly and a measurement period of 30 minutes may be adequate. For rooms with very poor ventilation, CO<sub>2</sub> measurements may need to continue for several hours or overnight to allow a sufficient level of CO<sub>2</sub> clearance for calculating the ventilation rate using the baking soda and vinegar method ( $ACH_{BV}$ ) based on equation #2 described above.

Estimating ventilation rate by time to 63% removal of excess CO<sub>2</sub>: Based on the commonly used formula for the rate of purging airborne contaminants, one complete air change will replace 63% of the airborne contaminants in the room with outdoor air [22-24]. Ventilation rate can therefore be simply calculated using the time needed to reach 63% reduction of excess CO<sub>2</sub> from its peak level:

$$ACH_{T63\%} = 60/(t_2 - t_1), \text{ with } t_1 = 0. \quad (\#4)$$

where  $t_1$  = initial timepoint in minutes with indoor CO<sub>2</sub> at peak level, and  $t_2$  = timepoint in minutes when excess CO<sub>2</sub> is reduced by 63%. Indoor CO<sub>2</sub> at peak level ( $C_S$ ) is the sum of outdoor CO<sub>2</sub> ( $C_R$ ) and excess CO<sub>2</sub> ( $C_E$ ) generated by dry ice or baking soda. As CO<sub>2</sub> measurement starts at peak level in this experiment,  $t_1$  is therefore always 0. Time needed to remove 63%  $C_E$ , or  $t_2$ , is the timepoint when indoor CO<sub>2</sub> level is at  $C_{63\%E} = C_S - 63\% C_E$ , where  $C_E = C_S - C_R$ .

Statistical analysis: To understand factors associated with CO<sub>2</sub> levels in dental treatment rooms, we performed multiple regression analysis using CO<sub>2</sub> levels as dependent variable and number of persons in the room, ventilation rate, room size and outdoor CO<sub>2</sub> level as independent variables. We analyzed the dynamics of CO<sub>2</sub> levels during dental treatment procedures using descriptive analysis and compared the differences in steady state CO<sub>2</sub> levels between rooms

with poor and good ventilations using t-tests.  $ACH_{VENT}$  was compared with ACH calculated with different methods based on  $CO_2$  levels to assess the correlation (Pearson's  $r$ ) between the two methods of ventilation rate assessments. As the primary goal of the present study was to determine the validity of pragmatic methodologies that could be used by dental practitioners who do not have access to sophisticated instruments to assess the ventilation rate of their clinic spaces, we focused the analysis on  $CO_2$  generation using baking soda and vinegar and ventilation rate calculation using time needed to achieve 63% reduction of peak  $CO_2$  levels ( $ACH_{BV63\%}$ ).

## Results:

Mechanical ventilation rate of the dental treatment rooms: The volumetric sizes, airflow rates and mechanical ventilation rates of dental treatment rooms are presented in Table 1. The 10 operatories are on average 882 ft<sup>3</sup> in volume (range 667 to 1221 ft<sup>3</sup>).  $ACH_{VENT}$  varied from 3.9 to 35.0 with a mean of 13.2 ( $\pm 10.6$ ). A majority (7/10) of the treatment rooms have greater supply than exhaust air flow rates with positive differentials between  $ACH_s$  and  $ACH_E$  at two or greater; and one room have significantly greater exhaust than supply airflow rates with a highly negative differential between  $ACH_s$  and  $ACH_E$ . A majority of the treatment rooms (7/10) have  $ACH_{VENT}$  at or greater than 6, and 4 of the 10 rooms had  $ACH_{VENT}$  greater than 10.

$CO_2$  levels during dental treatment procedures: As shown in Figure 1,  $CO_2$  levels were significantly higher in the room with low ventilation rate ( $ACH = 3.9$ ) and reached a peak of nearly 1600 ppm when 6 persons were in the room. The increased number of persons were related to teaching activities involving dental implant surgery where additional graduate students were allowed to observe the procedures. Comparing the two rooms with the same number of persons in the room for the same restorative procedures,  $CO_2$  levels reached 1100 ppm at the peak in the room with 3.9 ACH but stayed below 700 ppm in the room with 35 ACH ( $p < 0.0001$ ).  $CO_2$  accumulation appeared to be associated with crowding and low ventilation rate.

Continuous  $CO_2$  monitoring in dental treatment rooms: We continuously monitored the  $CO_2$  levels for 24 hours in 10 treatment rooms with various ventilation rates in different departments. The working hours were from 8:00am to 5:00pm with lunch breaks from 12:30pm to 1:30pm for some and 1:00pm to 2:00pm for other departments. The dental procedures included prophylaxis, extractions, restoratives, endodontics, dental implant surgery, periodontal surgery and exams. Number of persons in the rooms varied from 2 to 6, with more people in the room during dental implant surgeries. The  $CO_2$  levels in early morning (5:00 - 7:00am) were at an level of  $421 \pm 10$  ppm, similar to the outdoor levels ( $413 \pm 15$  ppm) (Table 2, Figure 2). The steady

state CO<sub>2</sub> level ( $C_{SS}$ ) during dental procedures, which was the mean concentrations of CO<sub>2</sub> at the plateau level when the number of persons in the room stays unchanged for at least 5 min, ranged from 543 ppm to 1,374 ppm ( $786 \pm 207$  ppm) in the 10 dental treatment rooms. Multiple regression analysis showed that steady state CO<sub>2</sub> levels in dental treatment rooms were statistically significantly correlated to number of persons in the room ( $\beta=90.2$ ,  $p=0.006$ ), mechanical ventilation rate ( $\beta=11.0$ ,  $p=0.001$ ) and the volumetric size of the room ( $\beta=-0.50$ ,  $p=0.049$ ), but not to outside air CO<sub>2</sub> levels ( $\beta=4.15$ ,  $p=0.160$ ). These findings confirmed that more people in smaller room with low ventilation rate facilitate CO<sub>2</sub> accumulation in dental treatment rooms.

As shown in Figure 2, CO<sub>2</sub> levels in rooms with ACH higher than 6 rarely reach 800 ppm. In rooms with ACH lower than 6, however, the CO<sub>2</sub> levels were consistently greater than 800 ppm and approached 1,400 ppm in a room with ACH 3.9 when number of persons in the room was as high as 6 during clinical teaching activities related to dental implant procedures.

Ventilation rates by steady state CO<sub>2</sub> level modeling in dental treatment rooms: Based on steady state CO<sub>2</sub> level ( $C_{SS}$ ) and outdoor CO<sub>2</sub> level ( $C_R$ ) presented in Table 2, ventilation rates with CO<sub>2</sub> generation at 0.30 L/min ( $ACH_{SS30}$ ) and 0.46 L/Min ( $ACH_{SS46}$ ) in the clinical space were calculated using equation #1 for two dental treatment procedures in each room. As expected,  $ACH_{SS30}$  values (Mean 8.3, SD 3.7) were significantly lower than  $ACH_{SS46}$  (Mean 12.6, SD 5.7) (mean difference = -4.5, paired  $t=-6.97$ ,  $p<0.0001$ ). Both  $ACH_{SS30}$  and  $ACH_{SS46}$  were similarly well correlated with  $ACH_{VENT}$  ( $r=0.83$ ,  $p=0.003$ ).  $ACH_{SS30}$  approximated closely to the mechanical ventilation rates in rooms with  $ACH_{VENT} \leq 6$  (mean difference=-0.6, paired  $t=-1.24$ ,  $p=0.304$ ), but significantly underestimated those in rooms with  $ACH_{VENT} > 6$  (mean difference=-8.7, paired  $t=-2.59$ ,  $p=0.049$ ). The opposite is true for  $ACH_{SS46}$ , it significantly overestimated the ventilation rates in rooms with  $ACH_{VENT} \leq 6$  (mean difference=3.7, paired  $t=6.78$ ,  $p=0.007$ ), but approximated closer to those in rooms with  $ACH_{VENT} > 6$  (mean difference=-3.5, paired  $t=-1.14$ ,  $p=0.307$ ) (Table 3).

As ventilation rate is likely below 6 ACH in most dental treatment rooms in private dental practices in small free-standing buildings in the US[13], CO<sub>2</sub> generation rate ( $G_P$ ) of 0.30 L/min is more appropriate for ventilation rate estimate using equation #1. We listed the corresponding steady state CO<sub>2</sub> levels and ventilation rates in rooms with various sizes with 8-ft ceiling height using  $n = 3$ ,  $G_P = 0.30$  L/min, and  $C_R = 400$  ppm (Supplemental Table 1). DCPs may use the steady state CO<sub>2</sub> levels measured in their dental treatment rooms to roughly estimate the ventilation rate using this table.

Ventilation rates by CO<sub>2</sub> decays using dry ice or baking soda: Results of ventilation estimates by CO<sub>2</sub> decay using dry ice or baking soda and vinegar are shown in Table 3. Both methods appeared to be reliable in assessing the ventilation rates of dental treatment rooms. The CO<sub>2</sub> decay curves demonstrate that CO<sub>2</sub> levels decreased faster over time in rooms with high ACH<sub>VENT</sub> (Figure 3 A, B). ACH<sub>DI</sub> values ranged from 3.6 to 28.5 (11.2±8.4) and were highly correlated with the mechanical ventilation rates ACH<sub>VENT</sub> (r=0.99, p<0.0001) (Figure 3 C). ACH<sub>DI</sub> was lower than ACH<sub>VENT</sub> (mean difference = 2.0, paired t=2.32, p=0.046). Similarly, ACH<sub>BV</sub> ranged from 4.7 to 27.0 (11.8±8.1) and also correlated highly with ACH<sub>VENT</sub> (r=0.98, p<0.0001) (Figure 3 D). There was no statistically significant difference between ACH<sub>BV</sub> and ACH<sub>VENT</sub> (mean difference = 1.4, paired t=1.48, p=0.174), or between ACH<sub>BV</sub> and ACH<sub>DI</sub> (mean difference = 0.59, paired t=1.26, p=0.239).

Ventilation rates by time to 63% removal of excess CO<sub>2</sub> generated by dry ice or baking soda: Ventilation rates calculated by time needed to remove 63% of excess CO<sub>2</sub> generated by dry ice or baking soda are presented in Table 3. ACH<sub>DI63</sub> values ranged from 4.1 to 30.8 (11.5±8.6) and were highly correlated with the mechanical ventilation rates ACH<sub>VENT</sub> (r=0.98, p<0.0001) (Figure 4 A). There was no statistically significant difference between ACH<sub>DI63</sub> and ACH<sub>VENT</sub> (mean difference = 1.8, paired t=1.93, p=0.086).

Similarly, ACH<sub>BV63</sub> ranged from 4.6 to 27.3 (11.9±8.1) and correlated highly with ACH<sub>VENT</sub> (r=0.98, p<0.0001) (Figure 4 B). There was no statistically significant difference between ACH<sub>BV63</sub> and ACH<sub>VENT</sub> (mean difference = 1.3, paired t=1.34, p=0.213), or between ACH<sub>BV63</sub> and ACH<sub>DI63</sub> (mean difference = 0.50, paired t=0.76, p=0.467).

A Microsoft Excel template is provided in Supplemental Table 2 that will allow DCPs to calculate the ventilation rate of their offices by inputting the values of peak CO<sub>2</sub> level (C<sub>S</sub>), outdoor CO<sub>2</sub> level (C<sub>R</sub>) and time (min) needed to reach 63% removal of excess CO<sub>2</sub> generated by dry ice or baking soda.

## **Discussion:**

The findings of the present study indicate that dental operatories with low mechanical ventilation rates and overcrowding facilitate CO<sub>2</sub> accumulations. Ventilation rates could be measured by assessing natural or experimental build-up of CO<sub>2</sub> levels in dental treatment rooms using a consumer-grade CO<sub>2</sub> sensor. We found that ventilation rates in ACH could be accurately assessed by observing the changes in CO<sub>2</sub> levels after a simple mixing of household baking soda and vinegar in dental settings. Time needed to remove 63% of excess CO<sub>2</sub> generated by

baking soda could be used to accurately calculate the ventilation rates with the help of a basic calculator.

Our findings show that CO<sub>2</sub> level may consistently stay above 800 ppm in rooms with ventilation rates below 6 ACH, especially when three or more persons (including the patient who was not wearing a mask) are in the room during dental treatments. We observed that CO<sub>2</sub> level stayed above 1000 ppm and approached 1600 ppm when 3 to 6 persons were in a room with 3.9 ACH in clinical teaching scenarios involving dental implant treatment. High levels of CO<sub>2</sub> indicate high concentrations of respiratory aerosols in the room. It is possible that these aerosols contain pathogens if the patient is not wearing a mask and is infected but asymptomatic or pre-symptomatic. Effective mitigation measures will be required in these rooms to improve the air quality even without the ongoing infectious disease pandemic. Overcrowding should be avoided in rooms with poor ventilation. In dental operatories with ventilation rates higher than 10 ACH, the CO<sub>2</sub> levels stayed consistently below 700 ppm in most cases with 3 persons in the room. Our data demonstrated a clear dependency of CO<sub>2</sub> levels on number of persons in the room and the mechanical ventilation rate. CO<sub>2</sub> level is a proxy for indoor air quality as it represents the fraction of rebreathed air, or the proportion of inhaled air that was exhaled by others in the same indoor environment. Though numerous epidemiological studies indicate CO<sub>2</sub> begins to have negative health effects at 700 ppm and respiratory symptoms may occur when indoor CO<sub>2</sub> concentration is above 1000 ppm [25], our main concern is the concurrent accumulation of respiratory aerosols that may contain infectious disease pathogens. Numerous studies have shown that exhaled air from infected patients contains respiratory disease pathogens, including rhinovirus, influenza virus and Mycobacterium tuberculosis [4, 26-28]. Patients with early stages of COVID-19 may release millions of SARS CoV-2 viral copies per hour in exhaled air [29]. In a recent study that modeled factors associated with the spread of respiratory infectious disease in dental offices, CO<sub>2</sub> levels were found to play the most important role on the risk of infectious disease transmission [11]. CO<sub>2</sub> levels at 774 ppm was considered as low risk but those at or above 1135 ppm may increase the risk of disease transmission in dental offices [11].

It is important to point out that the setting for the current study is a postdoctoral dental training institution affiliated with an academic medical center, which may differ significantly in ventilation conditions from private dental practices that have a solo or a few dental practitioners. Ventilation conditions in different dental settings are largely unknown as the ventilation design of dental offices is not regulated as other outpatient healthcare facilities that are required to have 6 to 15 ACH by ASHRAE and CDC [30, 31]. Godwin and colleagues reported that ventilation rate was

1.12 ACH in dental operatories of a small dental clinic (2400 ft<sup>2</sup>) [13], which is significantly lower than the mean of 13 ACH in the present study but resembles more closely to the mean of 1.09 ACH in typical residential households in the US [32].

Accurate and reliable measurements of ventilation rate in various dental settings are important for risk assessment and for risk mitigation planning in an era of frequent infectious disease pandemics. Mechanical ventilation rate is assessed by quantifying the amount of outdoor air flowing into and out of an indoor space using highly sophisticated instruments operated by trained professionals [16]. Technical barriers may have contributed to the scarcity of information regarding ventilation in dental settings. Besides direct air flow measurements, ventilation rate could be estimated using CO<sub>2</sub> as a tracer gas. CO<sub>2</sub> in an indoor space could be built up to a significantly higher level than in outdoor air, either through natural generation by the occupants or through experimental release of the gas in the indoor spaces [5, 33, 34]. Analysis of the steady state CO<sub>2</sub> levels or the rate of CO<sub>2</sub> concentration decays, which is directly dependent on the outdoor air flow rate from the ventilation system, will allow an estimate of the ventilation rate of the indoor space. We found that modeling the steady state CO<sub>2</sub> levels using equation #1 correlated reasonably well with the mechanical ventilation rate, but may either under- or overestimate the ventilation rate based on different assumptions of human CO<sub>2</sub> generation rates. In comparison, the CO<sub>2</sub> concentration decay method relied on actual CO<sub>2</sub> levels measured at the beginning and the end of a decay period (equation #2) and provided more accurate assessments and better approximation to the mechanical ventilation rates. CO<sub>2</sub> concentrations in dental operatories could be built up to a level of about 1500 to 2500 ppm in 2 minutes using either dry ice or baking soda and vinegar. CO<sub>2</sub> decays could then be monitored using a CO<sub>2</sub> sensor that logs data in one-minute intervals. There are many affordable consumer-grade CO<sub>2</sub> sensors readily available and suitable for the purpose of observing CO<sub>2</sub> level changes over a period of time, from several minutes to several hours depending on the mechanical ventilation rates. The CO<sub>2</sub> sensor used in the present study was purchased online for \$159 and appeared to be a reliable tool for monitoring indoor CO<sub>2</sub> levels in dental settings.

Although ventilation rate in ACH could be calculated by fitting a linear regression line over time into the natural log scale of time-varying concentrations of CO<sub>2</sub> levels (equation #2), we found that a simplified method (equation #4) provided equally if not more accurate estimate of ventilation rate. As it is known that one complete air change will replace 63% of the airborne contaminants in the room with outdoor air [22-24], ventilation rate could be easily calculated using the time needed to remove 63% of excess CO<sub>2</sub> as a contaminant. For example, assuming

CO<sub>2</sub> level in outdoor air is 400 ppm, and peak CO<sub>2</sub> level is 1500 ppm after placing dry ice or baking soda inside the dental office for 2 minutes, excess CO<sub>2</sub> inside the dental office will be  $1500 - 400 = 1100$  ppm at peak. The CO<sub>2</sub> level that represents 63% removal of excess CO<sub>2</sub> is therefore  $1500 - 63\% \times 1100 = 807$  ppm. If it takes 15 min for the CO<sub>2</sub> level to reach 807 ppm from the peak of 1500 ppm, ventilation rate in ACH will be  $60/15 = 4$ ; and if it takes 2 hours for the CO<sub>2</sub> level to reach 807 ppm, ACH will be  $60/120 = 0.5$ . This method will allow dental practitioners to accurately estimate the ventilation rate in ACH using a simple calculator.

Ventilation rates measured by the CO<sub>2</sub> decay methods were approximately 15% lower on average than those measured by air flow sensors at the air supply inlets or exhaust returns of the ventilation system. This discrepancy is expected as indoor CO<sub>2</sub> could only be removed by fresh outdoor air brought in by the ventilation system or by outdoor air infiltrated through leaky doors and windows [35]. As the mechanically ventilated air was not composed of 100%, but 60% outdoor air at the time of this study, the CO<sub>2</sub> removal rate was understandably lower than the total air flow rate. In practical sense, ventilation rates measured by CO<sub>2</sub> decay methods are better indicators of outdoor air flow, which is more important than the recycled indoor air flow measured by airflow sensors in terms of air contaminant removal efficiencies.

Our data showed that household baking soda (NaHCO<sub>3</sub>) and vinegar (5% acetic acid) could be used to generate CO<sub>2</sub> in dental office to assess the ventilation rate by observing the CO<sub>2</sub> concentration decays using a CO<sub>2</sub> sensor and a basic calculator. This method will allow dental practitioners to reliably estimate the ventilation rate in their dental offices without expensive equipment and advanced technical skills. The test could be completed within 30 minutes in spaces with ventilation rate higher than 2 ACH but may take longer time if the ventilation is significantly below 1 ACH. We recommend to plan a two-hour observation time during off-hours with the building ventilation system operating in its normal setting.

We consider that it is very important for every dental practitioner to be able to accurately assess the ventilation rate in their working environments. Epidemiological data showed that transmission of COVID-19 is almost exclusively an indoor phenomenon, with 99.97% of the transmissions occurring in an indoor environment [29]. Airborne transmission through respiratory aerosols is increasingly recognized as a major driver for the COVID-19 pandemic [36-38]. As essential healthcare providers, dental professionals work in the frontline during the pandemic and need to adopt measures to mitigate the risk of aerosol transmission in addition to droplet and contact precautions that have been the standard of infection control in dental offices [39].


We recommend that mitigation measures be taken for dental treatment rooms that have a ventilation rate below 15 ACH, which is required for procedure rooms in outpatient healthcare facilities by CDC guidelines [30]. While in theory the most effective measure for air quality improvement in dental offices is to increase outdoor air flow rate through the mechanical ventilation system or through natural ventilation by opening doors and windows, such measure is severely limited by the weather or climate conditions and often impractical or impossible to realize in practice. An effective alternative is to improve air filtration using upgraded filters in the ventilation system and portable air cleaners (PAC) equipped with high efficiency particulate air (HEPA) filters. We showed that a PAC with a HEPA filter and a clean air delivery rate of 250 cubic feet per minute could add an equivalent of 17 ACH to an average sized dental operatory (10 ft L, 11ft W, 8 ft H) [17]. The PAC was especially effective in removing aerosols from rooms with low mechanical ventilation rate because of the lack of disturbance from the high air flow of the ventilation system [17]. For larger spaces where PAC is not practical or effective, upper room ultraviolet germicidal irradiation (UVGI) system may be considered as it has been shown to be effective in healthcare settings [40-42]. The upper room UVGI system requires professional installation and maintenance to ensure its safe operation.

In summary, we found that dental operatories with low ventilation rates ( $ACH_{VENT} \leq 6$ ) facilitate  $CO_2$  accumulations. Crowding inside the room contributed to elevated  $CO_2$  levels. Ventilation rates could be reliably calculated by observing the changes in  $CO_2$  levels after a simple mixing of household baking soda and vinegar in dental settings. Time needed to remove 63% of excess  $CO_2$  generated by baking soda could be used to accurately assess the ventilation rates using a consumer-grade  $CO_2$  sensor and a basic calculator. For rooms with ventilation rate below 15 ACH, we suggest the addition of a PAC with HEPA filter and proper clean air delivery rate to facilitate air quality improvement in dental treatment rooms.


### **Acknowledgement:**

The authors declare no conflict of interests. This study is supported in part by the Eastman Institute for Oral Health Foundation, Rochester, New York. We thank building engineers Dan Mateer and Kevin McLellan at Johnson Control Inc. and mechanical engineers Ray Richard and Karen Pembroke at Facility Operations, University of Rochester Medical Center for their technical expertise and assistance with the present study.


### **Figures:**




**Figure 1:** CO<sub>2</sub> levels during dental treatment procedures in operatories with low and high mechanical ventilation. A: Significant CO<sub>2</sub> accumulation occurred in a room with low ventilation (ACH = 3.9) and multiple persons in the room during clinical teaching activities for dental implant surgery. E, F: CO<sub>2</sub> level is associated with ventilation rate in rooms with the same number of persons. Peak CO<sub>2</sub> level reached 1100 ppm in the room with 3.9 ACH (B) but stayed under 700 ppm in the rooms with 35 ACH (C).



**Figure 2:** 24-hour continuous measurements of CO<sub>2</sub> levels in 10 dental treatment rooms with various ventilation rates. CO<sub>2</sub> accumulation occurred in rooms with lower ventilation rates (ACH ≤ 6). CO<sub>2</sub> levels stayed under 800 ppm in rooms with higher ventilation rate and lower number of persons. CO<sub>2</sub> level in nonworking hours is close to that of outdoor at 400 ppm in all the rooms.



**Figure 3.** A: CO<sub>2</sub> decay constants by dry ice, B: CO<sub>2</sub> decay constants by baking soda and vinegar; C and D: association between mechanical ventilation rates measure by air flow (ACH<sub>VENT</sub>) and ventilation rates measured by CO<sub>2</sub> decay using dry ice (ACH<sub>DI</sub>) and baking soda and vinegar (ACH<sub>BV</sub>) in dental treatment rooms. Rooms with high mechanical ventilation rates showed rapid decrease of CO<sub>2</sub> concentrations over time (A, B). Both ACH<sub>DI</sub> and ACH<sub>BV</sub> are linearly correlated with ACH<sub>VENT</sub> (C, D).



**Figure 4.** A: Correlations between ventilation rate by air flow ( $ACH_{VENT}$ ) and ventilation rates by time needed to reach 63% of excess  $CO_2$  generated using A: dry ice ( $ACH_{DI63}$ ) and B: baking soda and vinegar ( $ACH_{BV63}$ ).

## Tables:

**Table 1:** Volumetric sizes and mechanical ventilation rates of dental operatories

Rm #	Volume ft <sup>3</sup>	SAF ft <sup>3</sup> /min	EAF ft <sup>3</sup> /min	ACH <sub>s</sub>	ACH <sub>E</sub>	ACH <sub>VENT</sub>	Floor
002	815	82	27	6.0	2.0	6.0	0
003	787	69	27	5.3	2.1	5.3	0
008	1221	149	103	7.3	5.1	7.3	2
012	1015	152	64	9.0	3.8	9.0	2
019	686	59	400	5.2	35.0	35.0	1
021	861	75	51	5.3	3.6	5.3	1
022	833	55	46	3.9	3.3	3.9	1
031	962	337	210	21.0	13.1	21.0	2
032	667	289	220	26.0	19.8	26.0	2
033	970	211	220	13.1	13.6	13.6	2
<b>Mean</b>	882	148	137	10.2	10.1	13.2	-
<b>SD</b>	166	101	122	7.6	10.6	10.6	-

SAF: supply airflow rate in cubic feet per minute. EAF: exhaust airflow rate in cubic feet per minute. ACH<sub>s</sub>: air change per hour based on supply airflow rate. ACH<sub>E</sub>: air change per hour based on exhaust airflow rate. ACH<sub>VENT</sub>: air change per hour based on mechanical ventilation. OA%: outside air percentage drawn by the air handlers.

**Table 2:** Steady state CO<sub>2</sub> levels during treatment procedures and ventilation rate estimates based on low (0.3 L/min) and high (0.46 L/min) assumptions of human CO<sub>2</sub> generation rates

Rm #	Procedure	n persons	C <sub>ss</sub> ppm	C <sub>R</sub> Ppm	ACH <sub>ss30</sub>	ACH <sub>ss46</sub>
002	Exam	4	1014	410	5.2	7.9
	Extraction	4	978	410	5.5	8.4
003	Extraction	4	960	410	5.9	9.0
	Extraction	4	923	410	6.3	9.7
008	Hygiene	2	673	435	4.4	6.7
	Hygiene	2	629	435	5.4	8.2
012	Hygiene	2	649	434	5.8	8.9
	Hygiene	2	632	434	6.3	9.7
019	Extraction	4	823	403	8.8	13.5
	Restorative	3	616	403	13.1	20.1
021	Implant	4	905	410	6.0	9.1
	Endo	4	926	410	5.7	8.8
022	Implant	6	1269	428	5.4	8.3
	Implant	5	1089	428	5.8	8.8
031	Hygiene	2	544	405	9.5	14.6
	Surgery	4	611	405	12.9	19.7
032	Surgery	3	584	404	15.8	24.2
	Exam	4	633	404	16.7	25.5
033	Exam	3	595	392	9.7	14.8
	Surgery	4	662	392	10.6	16.2
<b>Mean</b>	-	3.5	785.8	413.1	8.2	12.6
<b>SD</b>	-	1.1	206.8	14.0	3.8	5.8

Based on ventilation rate  $ACH = 6 \times 10^4 n G_P / [V(C_{ss}-C_R)]$ ; C<sub>ss</sub>: steady state CO<sub>2</sub> level; C<sub>R</sub>: outdoor CO<sub>2</sub> level; ACH<sub>ss30</sub>: ventilation estimate based on CO<sub>2</sub> generation rate G<sub>P</sub>=0.3L/min per person; ACH<sub>ss46</sub>: ventilation estimate based on CO<sub>2</sub> generation rate G<sub>P</sub>=0.46L/min per person;

**Table 3:** Comparisons between mechanical ventilation rates and ventilation rates estimated from natural CO<sub>2</sub> levels and CO<sub>2</sub> released by dry ice and baking soda

Rm #	ACH <sub>VENT</sub>	ACH <sub>SS30</sub>	ACH <sub>SS46</sub>	ACH <sub>DI</sub>	ACH <sub>BV</sub>	ACH <sub>DI63</sub>	ACH <sub>BV63</sub>
002	6.0	5.4	8.2	5.6	6.1	5.6	6.1
003	5.3	6.1	9.5	4.8	4.7	4.9	4.9
008	7.3	4.9	7.5	5.2	6.9	6.7	6.8
012	9.0	6.1	9.3	9.2	9.2	9.2	9.4
019	35.0	11.0	16.8	28.5	27.0	30.8	27.3
021	5.3	5.9	9.0	4.4	4.8	4.4	5.3
022	3.9	5.6	8.6	3.6	4.8	4.1	4.6
031	21.0	11.2	17.2	17.6	16.3	17.2	16.7
031	26.0	16.3	24.9	19.0	22.5	17.3	22.2
033	13.6	10.2	15.5	14.3	15.8	14.3	16.2
Mean	13.2	12.6	8.3	11.2	11.8	11.5	11.9
SD	10.6	5.7	3.7	8.4	8.1	8.2	8.1

ACH<sub>VENT</sub>: mechanical ventilation rate; ACH<sub>SS30</sub>: ventilation estimate by steady state CO<sub>2</sub> level with CO<sub>2</sub> generation at 0.3L/min per person; ACH<sub>SS46</sub>: ventilation estimate by steady state CO<sub>2</sub> level with CO<sub>2</sub> generation at 0.46L/min per person; ACH<sub>DI</sub>: ventilation rate estimate by CO<sub>2</sub> decay constants using dry ice; ACH<sub>BV</sub>: ventilation rate estimate by CO<sub>2</sub> decay constants using baking soda and vinegar; ACH<sub>DI63</sub>: ventilation rate estimate by time needed to remove 63% excess CO<sub>2</sub> by dry ice; ACH<sub>BV63</sub>: ventilation rate estimate by time needed to remove 63% excess CO<sub>2</sub> by baking soda and vinegar

**Table 4:** Ventilation rate estimates by time needed to remove 63% excess CO<sub>2</sub> released by dry ice or baking soda and vinegar

RM#	Method	C <sub>R</sub> ppm	C <sub>S</sub> ppm	C <sub>E</sub> ppm	C <sub>63%E</sub> ppm	t <sub>2</sub> min	ACH <sub>T63%</sub> 60/t <sub>2</sub>
002	DI	403	3956	3553	1718	10.7	5.6
	BV	410	2800	2390	1294	9.9	6.1
003	DI	416	3552	3136	1576	12.3	4.9
	BV	412	1901	1489	963	12.3	4.9
008	DI	434	2459	2025	1183	9.0	6.7
	BV	399	2290	1891	1099	8.8	6.8
012	DI	427	3064	2637	1403	6.5	9.2
	BV	410	2340	1930	1124	6.4	9.4
019	DI	434	2901	2467	1347	2.0	30.8
	BV	399	1112	713	663	2.2	27.3
021	DI	434	4265	3831	1852	13.5	4.4
	BV	410	1782	1372	917	10.6	5.7
022	DI	427	4103	3676	1787	14.7	4.1
	BV	399	2474	2075	1167	13.0	4.6
031	DI	427	2066	1639	1033	3.5	17.2
	BV	416	2006	1590	1004	3.6	16.7
032	DI	427	2703	2276	1269	3.5	17.3
	BV	410	2139	1729	1049	2.7	22.2
033	DI	434	2530	2096	1210	4.2	14.3
	BV	432	1291	859	750	3.7	16.2

DI: dry ice. BV: baking soda and vinegar. C<sub>R</sub>: outdoor CO<sub>2</sub> level. C<sub>S</sub>: peak CO<sub>2</sub> level after CO<sub>2</sub> generation by dry ice or baking soda. C<sub>E</sub>: excess CO<sub>2</sub> generated by dry ice or baking soda (C<sub>S</sub> - C<sub>R</sub>). C<sub>63%E</sub>: CO<sub>2</sub> level after 63% excess CO<sub>2</sub> is removed (C<sub>S</sub>-63%C<sub>E</sub>). t<sub>2</sub>: time (min) needed to reach C<sub>63%E</sub>. ACH<sub>T63%</sub>: ventilation rate in air change per air based on t<sub>2</sub>

## Supplemental materials:

**Using steady state CO<sub>2</sub> level during dental treatments to estimate ventilation rates:** The following table could be used to roughly estimate the ventilation rate of the dental treatment rooms in 3 steps. First, measure the length and width of the room to get the area in square feet (ft<sup>2</sup>). Second, determine the steady state CO<sub>2</sub> level during a dental treatment procedure that lasts more than 10 minutes as follows: with the dentist, dental assistant and the patient together in the room and without any person entering or leaving the room, read the CO<sub>2</sub> sensor readings 10 minutes into the procedure and record the next 5 readings at 1 min interval, add the 5 readings to get the sum and divide the sum by 5, the result is the steady state CO<sub>2</sub> level. Third, match the steady state CO<sub>2</sub> level to the closest number under the area column of your room size, the number in the ACH column in the same row is the ventilation rate estimate. For example, if the CO<sub>2</sub> level reaches a steady state level of about 1062 ppm during a dental treatment that lasted longer than 5 minutes with 3 persons in a room that is 110 ft<sup>2</sup> (10-ft W x11-ft L) in area, the ventilation rate is about 3 ACH. It will be about 6 ACH if the CO<sub>2</sub> level stays at about 761 ppm (Supplemental Table 1).

**Supplemental Table 1:** Steady state CO<sub>2</sub> levels and ventilation rate in air change per hour (ACH)\*

Area (ft <sup>2</sup> ) \ ACH	100	110	120	130	140	150	160	170	180	190	200
1	2784	2567	2386	2234	2103	1989	1890	1802	1724	1655	1592
2	1592	1484	1393	1317	1251	1195	1145	1101	1062	1027	996
3	1195	1122	1062	1011	968	930	897	867	841	818	797
4	996	942	897	858	826	797	772	751	731	714	698
5	877	833	797	767	741	718	698	680	665	651	638
6	797	761	731	706	684	665	648	634	621	609	599
7	741	710	684	662	643	627	613	600	589	579	570
8	698	671	648	629	613	599	586	575	566	557	549
9	665	641	621	604	589	577	566	556	547	539	532
10	638	617	599	583	570	559	549	540	532	525	519
11	617	597	581	567	555	544	535	527	520	514	508
12	599	581	566	553	542	532	524	517	510	505	499
13	583	567	553	541	531	522	515	508	502	497	492
14	570	555	542	531	522	514	506	500	495	490	485
15	559	544	532	522	514	506	499	493	488	484	479

\*Based on ventilation rate  $ACH = 6 \times 10^4 n G_P / [V(C_{SS}-C_R)]$ , where number of persons in the room  $n=3$ , CO<sub>2</sub> generation rate per person  $G_P=0.3L/min$ , outdoor CO<sub>2</sub> level  $C_R=400$  ppm, and  $V$  is the volumetric size of the room with ceiling height = 8-ft.

## Calculating ventilation rate using CO<sub>2</sub> level change after mixing baking soda and vinegar:

Supplemental Table 2 is a dynamic template that will allow you to enter 3 values to get the ventilation rate in air change per hour (ACH) for your treatment rooms: 1, the peak CO<sub>2</sub> level (C<sub>s</sub>), 2, the outdoor CO<sub>2</sub> level, and 3. Time needed to reach 63% removal of excess CO<sub>2</sub>.

**Supplemental Table 2:** Ventilation rate estimate using time needed to remove 63% excess CO<sub>2</sub> generated by baking soda and vinegar

CO <sub>2</sub> at peak	2800	ppm	B1. C <sub>s</sub> = Peak CO <sub>2</sub> level C <sub>s</sub>
CO <sub>2</sub> outdoors	400	ppm	B2. C <sub>R</sub> = Outdoor CO <sub>2</sub> level C <sub>R</sub>
Excess CO <sub>2</sub>	2400	ppm	B3. C <sub>E</sub> = Excess CO <sub>2</sub> . C <sub>E</sub> = C <sub>s</sub> - C <sub>R</sub>
After removal of 63% excess CO <sub>2</sub>	1288	ppm	B4. C <sub>63%</sub> = CO <sub>2</sub> level after removal of 63% excess CO <sub>2</sub>
Time needed to remove 63% excess CO <sub>2</sub>	15.0	min	B5. Time to reach C <sub>63%</sub> (Value in minutes)
Ventilation rate	4.0	h <sup>-1</sup>	B6. Air change per hour, or ACH

To calculate air change per hour, 3 values need to be entered into the above template:

1. C<sub>s</sub>: this is the CO<sub>2</sub> level when the measurement starts after CO<sub>2</sub> generation by mixing baking soda and vinegar.
2. Outdoor CO<sub>2</sub> level. You could use 400 ppm as an estimate for this value.
3. Time needed to reach 63% removal of excess CO<sub>2</sub>.

You need to read the value in B5 and check the CO<sub>2</sub> sensor readings to get the time needed to reach 63% removal of excess CO<sub>2</sub>.

## References:

1. S. Batterman, Review and Extension of CO<sub>2</sub>-Based Methods to Determine Ventilation Rates with Application to School Classrooms, Int J Environ Res Public Health 14(2) (2017).
2. J.-L. Jimenez, How to quantify the ventilation rate of an indoor space using an affordable CO<sub>2</sub> monitor, Medium, 2020. Available at: [https://medium.com/@jjose\\_19945/how-to-quantify-the-ventilation-rate-of-an-indoor-space-using-a-cheap-co2-monitor-4d8b6d4dab44](https://medium.com/@jjose_19945/how-to-quantify-the-ventilation-rate-of-an-indoor-space-using-a-cheap-co2-monitor-4d8b6d4dab44)
3. A. Fernstrom, M. Goldblatt, Aerobiology and its role in the transmission of infectious diseases, J Pathog 2013 (2013) 493960-493960.
4. E.A. Nardell, J. Keegan, S.A. Cheney, S.C. Etkind, Airborne infection. Theoretical limits of protection achievable by building ventilation, Am Rev Respir Dis 144(2) (1991) 302-6.

## References:

- [1] CDC, How COVID-19 spreads, 2020. <https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/prevent-getting-sick/how-covid-spreads.html>. (Accessed Feb. 4 2021).
- [2] CDC, Scientific Brief: SARS-CoV-2 and Potential Airborne Transmission, 2020. <https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/more/scientific-brief-sars-cov-2.html>. (Accessed Feb. 4 2021).
- [3] CDC, Guidance for Dental Settings - Interim Infection Prevention and Control Guidance for Dental Settings During the COVID-19 Pandemic, 2020. <https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/hcp/dental-settings.html>. (Accessed Feb. 4 2021).
- [4] C.M. Issarow, N. Mulder, R. Wood, Modelling the risk of airborne infectious disease using exhaled air, *J Theor Biol* 372 (2015) 100-6.
- [5] S. Batterman, Review and Extension of CO<sub>2</sub>-Based Methods to Determine Ventilation Rates with Application to School Classrooms, *Int J Environ Res Public Health* 14(2) (2017).
- [6] T.A. Myatt, S.L. Johnston, Z. Zuo, M. Wand, T. Keadze, S. Rudnick, D.K. Milton, Detection of airborne rhinovirus and its relation to outdoor air supply in office environments, *Am J Respir Crit Care Med* 169(11) (2004) 1187-90.
- [7] E.T. Richardson, C.D. Morrow, D.B. Kalil, S. Ginsberg, L.G. Bekker, R. Wood, Shared air: a renewed focus on ventilation for the prevention of tuberculosis transmission, *PLoS One* 9(5) (2014) e96334.
- [8] R. Wood, C. Morrow, S. Ginsberg, E. Piccoli, D. Kalil, A. Sassi, R.P. Walensky, J.R. Andrews, Quantification of Shared Air: A Social and Environmental Determinant of Airborne Disease Transmission, *PLOS ONE* 9(9) (2014) e106622.
- [9] A. Harrichandra, A.M. Ierardi, B. Pavilonis, An estimation of airborne SARS-CoV-2 infection transmission risk in New York City nail salons, *Toxicol Ind Health* 36(9) (2020) 634-643.
- [10] S.N. Rudnick, D.K. Milton, Risk of indoor airborne infection transmission estimated from carbon dioxide concentration, *Indoor Air* 13(3) (2003) 237-45.
- [11] C. Zemouri, S.F. Awad, C.M.C. Volgenant, W. Crielaard, A.M.G.A. Laheij, J.J. de Soet, Modeling of the Transmission of Coronaviruses, Measles Virus, Influenza Virus, Mycobacterium tuberculosis, and Legionella pneumophila in Dental Clinics, *Journal of Dental Research* 99(10) (2020) 1192-1198.
- [12] A. STANDARD, Ventilation for Acceptable Indoor Air Quality. ANSI/ASHRAE Standard 62.1-2007., 2007, pp. 1-48.
- [13] C.C. Godwin, S.A. Batterman, S.P. Sahni, C.Y. Peng, Indoor environment quality in dental clinics: potential concerns from particulate matter, *Am J Dent* 16(4) (2003) 260-6.
- [14] C.G. Helmis, J. Tzoutzas, H.A. Flocas, C.H. Halios, V.D. Assimakopoulos, O.I. Stathopoulou, V. Panis, M. Apostolatou, Emissions of total volatile organic compounds and indoor environment assessment in dental clinics in Athens, Greece, *Int Dent J* 58(5) (2008) 269-78.
- [15] C.G. Helmis, J. Tzoutzas, H.A. Flocas, C.H. Halios, O.I. Stathopoulou, V.D. Assimakopoulos, V. Panis, M. Apostolatou, G. Sgouros, E. Adam, Indoor air quality in a dentistry clinic, *Sci Total Environ* 377(2-3) (2007) 349-65.
- [16] ASHRAE, ASHRAE/ANSI Standard 111- 2008 (RA 2017) Measurement, Testing, Adjusting and Balancing of Building HVAC Systems., ASHRAE, Atlanta, GA. , 2017.

- [17] Y.-F. Ren, Q. Huang, T. Marzouk, R. Richard, K. Pembroke, P. Martone, T. Venner, H. Malmstrom, E. Eliav, Effects of mechanical ventilation and portable air cleaner on aerosol removal from dental treatment rooms, *Journal of Dentistry* 105 (2021) 103576.
- [18] Institutional Consultation Services, What does air change mean?, *Isolation Rooms: Design, Assessment, and Upgrade.*, Francis J Curry National Tuberculosis Center, 1999, pp. 43-44.
- [19] A. Persily, L. de Jonge, Carbon dioxide generation rates for building occupants, *Indoor Air* 27(5) (2017) 868-879.
- [20] M.W. Qi, X.F. Li, L.B. Weschler, J. Sundell, CO<sub>2</sub> generation rate in Chinese people, *Indoor Air* 24(6) (2014) 559-66.
- [21] REHVA - Federation of European Heating Ventilation and Air Conditioning Associations, How to operate HVAC and other building service systems to prevent the spread of the coronavirus disease (COVID-19) in workplaces, 2020, p. 42.
- [22] J.-L. Jimenez, How to quantify the ventilation rate of an indoor space using an affordable CO<sub>2</sub> monitor, 2020. [https://medium.com/@jjose\\_19945/how-to-quantify-the-ventilation-rate-of-an-indoor-space-using-a-cheap-co2-monitor-4d8b6d4dab44](https://medium.com/@jjose_19945/how-to-quantify-the-ventilation-rate-of-an-indoor-space-using-a-cheap-co2-monitor-4d8b6d4dab44).
- [23] A. Fernstrom, M. Goldblatt, Aerobiology and its role in the transmission of infectious diseases, *J Pathog* 2013 (2013) 493960-493960.
- [24] E.A. Nardell, J. Keegan, S.A. Cheney, S.C. Etkind, Airborne infection. Theoretical limits of protection achievable by building ventilation, *Am Rev Respir Dis* 144(2) (1991) 302-6.
- [25] K. Azuma, N. Kagi, U. Yanagi, H. Osawa, Effects of low-level inhalation exposure to carbon dioxide in indoor environments: A short review on human health and psychomotor performance, *Environment International* 121 (2018) 51-56.
- [26] P. Fabian, J.J. McDevitt, W.M. Lee, E.A. Houseman, D.K. Milton, An optimized method to detect influenza virus and human rhinovirus from exhaled breath and the airborne environment, *J Environ Monit* 11(2) (2009) 314-7.
- [27] W.G. Lindsley, F.M. Blachere, D.H. Beezhold, R.E. Thewlis, B. Noorbakhsh, S. Othumpangat, W.T. Goldsmith, C.M. McMillen, M.E. Andrew, C.N. Burrell, J.D. Noti, Viable influenza A virus in airborne particles expelled during coughs versus exhalations, *Influenza Other Respir Viruses* 10(5) (2016) 404-13.
- [28] L. Yip, M. Finn, A. Granados, K. Prost, A. McGeer, J.B. Gubbay, J. Scott, S. Mubareka, Influenza virus RNA recovered from droplets and droplet nuclei emitted by adults in an acute care setting, *J Occup Environ Hyg* 16(5) (2019) 341-348.
- [29] H. Qian, T. Miao, L. Liu, X. Zheng, D. Luo, Y. Li, Indoor transmission of SARS-CoV-2, *Indoor Air* (2020).
- [30] R.Y.W. Chinn, L. Sehulster, Guidelines for environmental infection control in health-care facilities; recommendations of CDC and Healthcare Infection Control Practices Advisory Committee (HICPAC), (2003).
- [31] P. Ninomura, J. Bartley, New Ventilation Guidelines for Health-Care Facilities, *ASHRAE Journal*, 43(6) (2001) 29-32.
- [32] M.H. Sherman, N. Matson, Residential ventilation and energy characteristics., *ASHRAE Trans.* 103 (1997) 717-730.
- [33] P.L. Cheng, X. Li, Air Change Rate Measurements using Tracer Gas Carbon Dioxide from Dry Ice, *International Journal of Ventilation* 13(3) (2014) 235-246.

- [34] R. Stuart, E. Sweet, A. Batchelder, Assessing general ventilation effectiveness in the laboratory, *Journal of Chemical Health & Safety* 22(2) (2015) 2-7.
- [35] R. Claude-Alain, F. Foradini, Simple and Cheap Air Change Rate Measurement Using CO<sub>2</sub> Concentration Decays, *International Journal of Ventilation* 1(1) (2002) 39-44.
- [36] L. Morawska, D.K. Milton, It Is Time to Address Airborne Transmission of Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19), *Clin Infect Dis* 71(9) (2020) 2311-2313.
- [37] Z. Noorimotlagh, N. Jaafarzadeh, S.S. Martínez, S.A. Mirzaee, A systematic review of possible airborne transmission of the COVID-19 virus (SARS-CoV-2) in the indoor air environment, *Environ Res* 193 (2020) 110612.
- [38] R. Zhang, Y. Li, A.L. Zhang, Y. Wang, M.J. Molina, Identifying airborne transmission as the dominant route for the spread of COVID-19, *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 117(26) (2020) 14857-14863.
- [39] J.A. Harte, Standard and transmission-based precautions: an update for dentistry, *J Am Dent Assoc* 141(5) (2010) 572-81.
- [40] P. Xu, E. Kujundzic, J. Peccia, M.P. Schafer, G. Moss, M. Hernandez, S.L. Miller, Impact of Environmental Factors on Efficacy of Upper-Room Air Ultraviolet Germicidal Irradiation for Inactivating Airborne Mycobacteria, *Environmental Science & Technology* 39(24) (2005) 9656-9664.
- [41] P. Xu, J. Peccia, P. Fabian, J.W. Martyny, K.P. Fennelly, M. Hernandez, S.L. Miller, Efficacy of ultraviolet germicidal irradiation of upper-room air in inactivating airborne bacterial spores and mycobacteria in full-scale studies, *Atmospheric Environment* 37(3) (2003) 405-419.
- [42] G. Ko, M.W. First, H.A. Burge, The characterization of upper-room ultraviolet germicidal irradiation in inactivating airborne microorganisms, *Environmental Health Perspectives* 110(1) (2002) 95-101.