

Practical application of CO₂ as an indicator regarding the risk of infection

short title: CO₂ as an indicator for infection risk

Authors: Anne Hartmann¹, Yunus Emre Cetin¹, Petra Gastmeier², Martin Kriegel¹

¹...Technical University of Berlin, Hermann-Rietschel-Institute

²...Charité University Medicine, Berlin, Institute for Hygiene and Environmental Medicine

6

Address for correspondence:

Anne Hartmann

Hermann-Rietschel-Institut

TU Berlin

anne.hartmann@tu-berlin.de

7

Author Contributions:

A. H. and M. K. adapted and simplified their former model. A. H. performed the calculations. Y. E. C. performed the literature review and critically revised the calculations. A. H. and Y. E. C. drafted the manuscript. P. G. critically revised the paper from medical point of view. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

13

Abstract

The air quality of enclosed spaces has attracted great attention due to the ongoing Covid-19 pandemic. The infection risk in these spaces can be estimated for various scenarios with different methods so the important parameters and effective infection prevention measures can be

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice. compared. Previous studies showed that indoor CO₂ concentration could be considered a surrogate

for infection risk. In this regard, a generic relation can be established between the CO₂ levels and infection probability. Based on this consideration, some practical evaluations between CO₂ concentration and infection risk are conducted in this study. The effect of mask efficiency, viral emission rate, and duration of exposure are also included in the assessments. It is shown that continuous CO₂ monitoring can be helpful in the evaluation of possible preventive measures. Findings are expected to contribute to the understanding of the simple parameters related to the infection risk.

keywords

CO₂-concentration; infection risk; virus laden aerosol particles; preventive measures; ventilation effectiveness

Introduction

The ongoing COVID-19 pandemic has raised global interest on indoor air quality (IAQ) and ventilation, particularly in public spaces [2, 3]. The air quality of these spaces can be assessed with various parameters. Among these, the CO₂ concentration is considered an important indicator of adequate ventilation [4, 5, 6]. Today, indoor CO₂ concentrations can be monitored easily by various low-cost sensors with reasonable accuracy [6, 7, 8].

The idea of monitoring CO₂ concentration as an indication of efficient ventilation is based on the first discussions regarding ventilation in 1858 [9, 10]. In enclosed environments, high CO₂ concentrations can be reached due to occupants who are mostly the main source of gaseous emissions. Recent findings point out that high CO₂ levels in indoor spaces may cause detrimental outcomes on health and cognitive function [11, 12]. In relation to these concerns, some recommendations can be found from ASHRAE 62.1 [13], ISO 17772 [14], EN 16798 [15] and UBA [16, 17] regarding the maximum limits of indoor CO₂ concentrations. Related recommendations were generally calculated based on the minimum ventilation rates specified in these standards. So far, the recommended CO₂ values were often considered in regulating demand-controlled ventilation, especially for energy-efficient systems.

In addition to CO₂, viral aerosols can also be emitted during exhalation by occupants. However, detecting and measuring these virus-laden aerosols is not practical, in contrast to CO₂ measurement [18]. Since the infection risk is directly related to the rebreathed air, indoor CO₂ levels can be considered as a proxy of a possible infection risk [19, 20, 21, 22]. In this context, a correlation can be established between the indoor CO₂ concentration and infection probability.

There are different mathematical models used to evaluate the infection probability in indoor premises. One of these models is the well-known Wells-Riley model which is based on the quantum concept [23, 24, 25]. Several modifications of the Wells-Riley model (including the CO₂ consideration) were developed to calculate the infection risk under varying circumstances. Rudnick and Milton [22] developed a CO₂-based infection risk evaluation method that determines the

rebreathed fraction using CO₂ concentration as a marker for exhaled breath exposure. By using this method, infection probability of different diseases including measles, influenza, and rhinovirus was assessed. They also showed that the infection risk can be calculated using CO₂-based evaluation without steady-state concentration assumption and measuring the outdoor air supply rate. Issarow et al. [26] established a similar mathematical model that predicts the risk of airborne infectious diseases, under steady-state and non-steady-state conditions by monitoring exhaled air from infectors. They used the rebreathed air rate concept to directly determine the average volume fraction of exhaled air in a given space. Hartmann and Kriegel [27] suggested a method to assess the infection risk in enclosed environments based on CO₂ concentration. It was shown that CO₂ is a good indicator of the efficiency of the ventilation system to eliminate respiratory viruses and is related to the outdoor air supply. Burrige et al. [28] presented a method to determine the relative risk of airborne transmission that depends on CO₂ data and occupancy levels within an indoor space. It was shown that well-ventilated rooms are unlikely to contribute to airborne infection, while moderate changes in the boundary conditions or new variants may worsen the infection risk. Peng and Jimenez [29] derived analytical expressions of CO₂-based risk proxies and applied them to different indoor cases. It was disclosed that the relative infection risk can be estimated with CO₂ concentration and protection can be provided by keeping low CO₂ rates by ventilation.

In this study, a risk assessment model offered previously by Kriegel et al. [1] is modified considering the relation between infection probability and CO₂ concentration. In this respect, different cases are scrutinized, and practical outputs are presented in detail. Results are expected to contribute to comprehension of the indoor infection risk and effective parameters on it based on the CO₂ concentration.

Material and methods

In the course of a transmission of pathogens, two different categories of risk have to be separated. First, the risk of one specific person in the room to get infected has to be considered. This individual risk can also be seen as an indicator for the percentage of persons in a given situation getting infected. Secondly, the number of persons to which the infection is transferred to by one index case is important to make statements regarding the progress of the pandemic. In case one infected person infects one other person, the number of infected persons remain constant, in case of zero persons it declines and in case of more persons it increases. In the aforementioned model (Kriegel et al [1]) for the situational predicted attack rate (PAR_s), the percentage of persons within one room/situation getting infected, the virus related factor is expressed as the viral emission rate S_v divided by the critical dose N_0 . Since this factor is often not known, especially in the beginning of a pandemic, it will be expressed as the combined factor V_F in this study. In addition, a room-related factor (C_R), the inhalation flow rate of the susceptible persons ($Q_{b,in}$) and the mask efficiency (f_M) are considered. The complete equation can be seen in equation (1).

$$PAR_s = 1 - e^{(-V_F \cdot C_R \cdot Q_{b,in} \cdot f_M)} \quad (1)$$

Ideal mixing of the room air is considered for this equation. A first approach to implement different concentrations within the room can be the ventilation effectiveness regarding the German technical norm DIN EN 16798-3:2017-11 [30]. The ventilation effectiveness is defined as the ratio of the difference in concentration between exhaust air (C_e) and supply air (C_s) and the difference in concentration between indoor air (C_i) and supply air. The equation can be seen in (2).

$$\varepsilon_v = \frac{C_e - C_s}{C_i - C_s} \quad (2)$$

In case of virus laden particles, it is assumed that the outdoor air concentration of these particles is nearly 0 and therefore, if no recirculation or recirculation with high efficient particulate air (HEPA) filter is used, the supply air concentration is 0 as well. Equation (2) can then be transferred into the ratio of exhaust air concentration to indoor air concentration (3).

$$\varepsilon_v = \frac{C_e}{C_i} \quad (3)$$

The concentration in the breathing zone of a person is therefore by the ventilation effectiveness higher than the average room concentration used in equation (1), wherefore equation (4) can be set up.

$$PAR_s = 1 - e^{\left(-V_F \cdot \frac{C_R \cdot Q_{b, in} \cdot f_M}{\varepsilon_v}\right)} \quad (4)$$

The local ventilation effectiveness can be measured or simulated, but depends on many boundary conditions (e.g. distribution of heat sources (persons) in the room, position of the particle source, ...), whereas for a general approach typical values can be used. VDI 3804:2009-03 [31] (VDI means Verein Deutscher Ingenieure, translation: The Association of German Engineers) offers values for situations which deviate from ideal mixing ventilation:

- ideal mixing ventilation: $\varepsilon_v = 1,0$
- mixture of mixing and displacement ventilation: $\varepsilon_v \approx 1,2$
- displacement ventilation: $\varepsilon_v \approx 2,0$

To calculate the room-related factor (C_R) regarding Kriegel et al. [1] the supply air volume flow is necessary. The equations can be seen in (5) for the steady and in (6) for the unsteady situation. It implements the time of stay (t), the virus free supply air volume flow (Q) and the decay rate (λ_g , consisting of air change, sedimentation and inactivation).

$$C_{R,s} = \frac{t}{Q} \quad (5)$$

$$C_R = \frac{1}{Q \cdot \lambda_g} \cdot [e^{(-\lambda_g \cdot t)} + \lambda_g \cdot t - 1] \quad (6)$$

In cases with mechanical ventilation systems, the supply air volume flow is in general designed to reach a certain level, but might still be unknown to the room users. It is also hard to find in rooms, which are ventilated by windows. In cases of window ventilation, the supply air volume flow depends on the outdoor conditions (especially temperature and wind) and can therefore not be assumed to

be constant. For a known or measured outdoor CO₂-concentration (C_{ODA}), the supply air volume flow per person only depends on the activity of the persons and can be calculated from the CO₂-concentration in the room (C_{CO2}). This method can be used for window ventilation as well as mechanically ventilated rooms with unknown supply air volume flow. The activity is thereby expressed as the breathing volume flow (Q_b). The average CO₂-concentration in the exhaled breath of a person is 40,000 ppm.

$$q_{pers} = \frac{\frac{40,000ppm}{Per} \cdot Q_b}{C_{CO2} - C_{ODA}} \quad (7)$$

The current limits regarding CO₂-concentrations e.g. 1000 ppm by Pettenkofer [32] only consider the air quality, but lack an important piece of information, the time of exposure. In a study of Good et al. [33] the emission of CO₂ was correlated to the emission of particles, which may, in case of an infection carry virus. They showed that an increase in the CO₂ emission is correlated with an increased particle emission rate, which is for example based on the age and sex of the emitting person. So the CO₂-emission of the room users is a helpful indicator regarding the risk of infection, but a CO₂-threshold alone is not useful in description of ventilation regarding infection prevention, but the dose has to be used.

For a practical application of these considerations, three different cases can be considered.

1. A CO₂-concentration is measured after a certain time of use without a significant change in boundary conditions. The situation in the room can be assumed to be quasi-steady.
2. A CO₂ threshold is looked for to limit the risk of infection to a certain level.
3. The CO₂-concentration in the room is constantly monitored and the risk of infection over the time of stay shall be estimated.

1. Quasi-steady assumption

With the assumption that critical situations either occur in small rooms or after a long time of stay, a quasi - steady state situation can be assumed. In case of an unsteady situation, this may

overestimate the risk. In Kriegel et al. [1] a simplification for equation (4) is derived (see equation (8)).

$$PAR_S = V_F \cdot \frac{t}{q_{Pers} \cdot N_{Pers}} \cdot Q_{b,in} \cdot f_M \quad (8)$$

In addition to the steady state, this simplification also assumes that in rooms with intensive ventilation, the discharge of virus laden particles resulting from the air flow will be much higher than the discharge because of sedimentation or inactivation of the potentially virus laden particles, whereas sedimentation and inactivation can be neglected.

From an epidemiological point of view, it should be aimed for that an infected person does not infect more than one additional person. Because only one situation is considered in this investigation, it is impossible to reach this goal, but to avoid more than one infection in the given situation should be aimed for. Equation (8) can therefore be transformed into equation (9) (individual risk) and (10) (number of persons getting infected in the considered situation).

$$PAR_S = \frac{R_s}{N_{pers}} = V_F \cdot \frac{t}{q_{Pers} \cdot N_{Pers}} \cdot Q_{b,in} \cdot f_M \quad (9)$$

$$R_s = V_F \cdot \frac{t}{q_{Pers}} \cdot Q_{b,in} \cdot f_M = V_F \cdot \frac{t \cdot (C_{CO2} - C_{ODA})}{\frac{40,000ppm}{Per}} \cdot f_M \quad (10)$$

2. CO₂-threshold for a certain infection risk

If R_s is limited to 1 to avoid a spread of the infection, the CO₂ threshold in this situation can be calculated as:

$$C_{CO2} = \frac{40,000ppm \cdot Q_b}{V_F \cdot t \cdot Q_{b,in} \cdot f_M} + C_{ODA} \quad (11)$$

With the further assumption that the breathing activity of all persons in the room is the same it further simplifies into:

$$C_{CO2} = \frac{40,000ppm}{V_F \cdot t \cdot f_M} + C_{ODA} \quad (12)$$

3. CO₂-monitoring

If the CO₂-concentration in the room is constantly monitored, the inhaled dose of CO₂ (above outdoor concentration, C_{ODA}) as well as the situational R-value can be calculated using equation (13). Instead of the integral, an approximation with the sum of the measured CO₂-concentration can be used.

$$R_s = V_F \frac{\int_{t=0}^{t^*} (C_{CO2}(t) - C_{ODA}) \cdot f_M}{40000ppm} \approx V_F \frac{\sum_{t=0}^{t^*} (C_{CO2}(t) - C_{ODA}) \cdot f_M}{40000ppm} \quad (13)$$

These equations can be used to set up tools for evaluating the infection risk in different situations.

Results

For an exemplary viral emission of $V_F=47$ 1/h (mask efficiency $f_M=0.5$ (surgical mask), outdoor air concentration 450 ppm), the different approaches should be applied. Figure 1 uses the mask type, the CO₂-concentration and the time of stay as input parameters to calculate the risk of infection regarding equation (10). Besides measured CO₂-concentrations, values for very good (600-800 ppm), good (900-1,100 ppm), moderate (1,400-1,600 ppm) and poor ventilation (1,900-2,100 ppm) are visualized. These ranges are based on the German national appendix of DIN EN 16798-1:2022-03 [15]. Three different mask types are visualized in Figure 1. No mask with a mask efficiency of $f_M=1.0$, a surgical mask with a mask efficiency ranging from $f_M=0.3$ to 0.7 (orange lines), but typical values of $f_M=0.4$ to 0.6 (bar) and a FFP2 mask with a maximum range from $f_M=0.05$ to 0.5 (lines), but a typical range of $f_M=0.12$ to 0.20 (bar).

Figure 1: Prediction of the situational R-value for a viral emission rate (viral load & particle production) $V_F=47$ h⁻¹. Considers a quasi-steady CO₂-concentration and a given mask-type for all attending persons. Very good ventilation (600-800 ppm), good ventilation (900-1,100 ppm), moderate ventilation (1,400-1,600 ppm), poor ventilation (1,900-2,100 ppm). No mask ($f_M=1.0$), surgical mask (lines $f_M=0.3-0.7$, bar $f_M=0.4-0.6$), FFP2-mask (lines $f_M=0.05-0.5$, bar $f_M=0.12-0.2$). Low Risk (green) for an $R_s<1$, medium risk for $1<R_s<2$, increased risk for $2<R_s<3$ and high risk for $R_s>3$

182

183 In the appendix of this study, further diagrams for $V_F=150 \text{ h}^{-1}$ (Figure 5) and $V_F=500 \text{ h}^{-1}$ (Figure 6) can
184 be found. A low risk is seen if less than one person will probably get infected in this situation (green),
185 an average risk for one to two persons (yellow), an increased risk for two to three persons (orange)
186 and a high risk for more than three persons (red).

187 For the exemplary boundary conditions ($f_M=0.5$, $C_{ODA}=450 \text{ ppm}$, $C_{CO_2}=1500 \text{ ppm}$), the risk is low for a
188 stay of 0.5 h, but high for 8 h (violet line). With these diagrams, different measures (e.g. change in
189 CO_2 -concentration, mask type, time of stay) can easily be compared. So a decrease in the CO_2 -
190 concentration by 500 ppm (good ventilation) with otherwise unchanged boundary conditions would
191 result in a reduction of the risk for the long stay down to an increased risk (brown line), which could
192 be further reduced by the use of an FFP2 mask.

193 Equation (12) can be used to calculate the maximum allowed (average) CO_2 -concentration. For a stay
194 of half an hour, a CO_2 -concentration of approximately 3850 ppm can be allowed (see Figure 2), but
195 for 8 h the allowed CO_2 -concentration (660 ppm) is just slightly above the outdoor concentration
196 (450 ppm). For the longer stay heavy ventilation is necessary, which might be difficult to reach in
197 uncomfortable outdoor conditions (cold, rainy, ...) as well as unfavorable conditions (little wind, little
198 temperature difference between indoor and outdoor). In these cases, further measures, e.g. better
199 masks, testing, reducing number of persons, ... have to be applied to meet the criteria of no more
200 than one newly infected person after the considered situation.

201 *Figure 2: Allowed CO_2 -concentration in the room over time of stay for a viral emission of $V_F=47 \text{ l/h}$*

202 From these calculations a critical CO_2 -dose above outdoor level can be found regarding equation
203 (14), but it heavily depends on the viral emission of the infectious person as it can be seen in Figure
204 3. In Figure 3 no mask ($f_M=1$) is considered, but it can be easily integrated by dividing the read value
205 by the mask efficiency.

Figure 3: inhaled CO₂-dose above outdoor level per hour of stay of the suspicious person depending on the viral emission of the infectious person without mask

$$(C_{CO2} - C_{ODA}) \cdot t = \frac{40,000 ppm}{V_F \cdot f_M} \quad (14)$$

In Figure 4 the theoretical progress of the CO₂-concentration in an exemplary classroom is displayed (blue line). A classroom with a volume of 150m³, 20 persons and window ventilation every 20 min was used to set up this theoretical progress of the CO₂-concentration. The progress of the situational R-value is calculated regarding equation (13). After a double lesson of 2 x 45 min with a break of 10 min in between, one person would be infected in this example. A decrease of the CO₂-concentration during window ventilation can also be seen in the course of the situational R-value as a flatter curve.

Figure 4: Exemplary Progress of the CO₂-concentration during a school lesson (blue line) and resulting situational R-value over time (orange line)

Discussion/Limitations

The considerations presented in this paper are based on a model set up by Kriegel et. al. [1]. This model, like many comparable models, is based on the model by Riley [24] and Wells [25], but is applied to the current pandemic virus SARS-CoV-2. All these models improved during the course of the pandemic as more and more knowledge regarding virus specific parameters (e.g. viral emission rate, virus activity in air, ...) was gained. Still, the models are mainly based on known outbreaks and therefore tend to overestimate the real risk, especially if mainly large outbreaks are documented as occurred in the beginning of the pandemic. But even if the calculated risk is somewhat higher than the real risk, a comparison of different situations or different intervention measures is possible with the use of these models. Furthermore, the assumptions were slightly corrected by medical investigations and may therefore be more accurate now.

This study now focusses on the implementation of the CO₂-concentration into this model. Whereas the CO₂-concentration within a room depends on the ventilation rate, the room size and the activity of the room users, it is a useful indicator for the ventilation rate in a steady state situation. For these calculations, a steady state situation is therefore assumed. This assumption is appropriate for long stays or small rooms, which are both cases with a potentially higher risk of infection, and therefore these cases which would more likely be considered by such models. Furthermore, for short stays or large rooms, the model may overestimate risk. In most cases the risk is not that high anyway so an overestimation is not considered critical, because it will probably not result in cost-intensive intervention measures which might not have been necessary.

In most cases, the exact viral emission rate is unknown and therefore the most important uncertainty within the method to set up non-medical interventions for different indoor environments. So the uncertainty of other parameters (e.g. the measured CO₂-concentration in the room and outdoor) may also influence the outcome, but not as much as the viral emission rate itself. In addition, it is assumed that the air flow is the only mechanism that transports virus laden particles out of the room. In rooms with either appropriate working mechanical ventilation or regular window ventilation this might be reasonable, but it might be critical if an increased CO₂-concentration is measured in the room. But once more this will overestimate the risk of infection in such critical cases. As it can be seen in Figure 1, without a FFP2 mask the risk in these cases will be evaluated as increased or high after a very short stay (not more than 30 min) even with an average viral emission rate, so an implementation of this discharge mode will increase the possible stay a little bit, but not significantly. For a first estimation of the effectiveness of different preventive measures, the use of the simplified model may therefore be appropriate.

Besides the aforementioned limitations regarding the simplifications of the model, the dynamics of the pandemic and especially the spread of new variants may heavily influence the input parameters of the model and therefore the significance of the results presented within this paper. Still the equations can easily be adapted to the new boundary conditions, if necessary.

Conclusions

CO₂ has been used as an indicator for indoor air quality for many years. In general, it is used as an instantaneous value and therefore reaches its limits if the dose is important, such as for the inhalation of potentially virus laden particles. Still, in this paper it is shown that continuously monitoring CO₂ may be helpful to evaluate the amount of fresh air supplied to the room and therefore, besides improving the indoor air quality, will reduce the inhaled dose of potentially virus laden particles. The diagrams set up for different viral emission rates can be useful in comparing different non-medical measures and can easily be adapted to new variants or even new viruses if they are transmitted by aerosol particles as well, and the important values (e.g. viral emission rate) are known.

Literature:

- [1] M. Kriegel, A. Hartmann, U. Buchholz, J. Seifried, S. Baumgarte and P. Gastmeier, "SARS-CoV-2 Aerosol Transmission Indoors: A Closer Look at Viral Load, Infectivity, the Effectiveness of Preventive Measures and a Simple Approach for Practical Recommendations," *Preprint MedRxiv*, DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.11.04.21265910>, 2021.
- [2] E. Ding, D. Zhang and P. M. Bluyssen, "Ventilation regimes of school classrooms against airborne transmission of infectious respiratory droplets: A review," *Build. Environ.* 207, 108484, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.buildenv.2021.108484>, 2022.
- [3] C. Sun and Z. Zhai, "The efficiency of social distance and ventilation effectiveness in preventing COVID-19 transmission," *Sustain. Cities Soc.* 62, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scs.2020.102390>, 2020.

- [4] L. Chatzidiakou, D. Mumovic and A. Summerfield, "Is CO₂ a good proxy for indoor air quality in classrooms? Part 1.: The interrelationships between thermal conditions, CO₂ levels, ventilation rates and selected indoor pollutants," *Build. Sev. Eng. Res. Technol.* 26, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1177/0143624414566244>, pp. 129-161, 2015.
- [5] J. Bartyzel, D. Zięba, J. Nęcki and M. Zimnoch, "Assessment of Ventilation Efficiency in School Classrooms Based on Indoor-Outdoor Particle Matter and Carbon Dioxide Measurements," *Sustainability* 12, 5600, doi: <https://doi.org/10.3390/su12145600>, 2020.
- [6] S. Batterman, "Review and Extension of CO₂-Based Methods to Determine Ventilation Rates with Application to School Classrooms," *Int. J. Environ. Res. Public Health*, 14, 145, doi: <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph14020145>, 2017.
- [7] A. Kabirikopaei and J. Lau, "Uncertainty analysis of various CO₂-Based tracer-gas methods for estimating seasonal ventilation rates in classrooms with different mechanical systems," *Build. Environ.* 179, 107003, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.buildenv.2020.107003>, 2020.
- [8] L. Spinelle, M. Gerboles, M. G. Villani, M. Aleixandre and F. Bonavitacola, "Field calibration of a cluster of low-cost commercially available sensor for air quality monitoring. Part B: NO, CO and CO₂," *Sensors Actuators B Chem.* 238, pp. 706-715, 2017.
- [9] D. Olsson, "History of Ventilation Technology," *Swegon Air Acad.*, https://www.swegonairacademy.com/siteassets/_documents/history-of-ventilation-technology.pdf, 2015.
- [10] W. G. Locher, "Max von Petternkofer (1818-1901) as a pioneer of modern hygiene and preventive medicine," *Eviron. Health Prev. Med.* 12, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02898030>, pp. 238-245, 2007.

- [11] U. Satish, M. J. Mendell, K. Shekhar, T. Hotchi, D. Sullivan, S. Streufert and W. J. Fisk, "Is CO₂ an Indoor Pollutant? Direct Effects of LOw-to-Moderate CO₂ Concentration on Human Decision-Making Performance," *Environ. Health Perspect.* 120, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1289/ehp.1104789>, pp. 1671-1677, 2012.
- [12] B. Du, M. C. Tandoc, M. L. Lack and J. A. Siegel, "Indoor CO" concentration and cognitive function: A critical review," *Indoor Air* 20, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1111/ina.12706>, pp. 1067-1082, 2020.
- [13] ASHRAE, "ASHRAE Standard 62.1-2019 Ventilation for Acceptable Indoor Air Quality," https://ashrae.iwrapper.com/ViewOnline/Standard_62.1-2019, 2019.
- [14] ISO, "ISO 17772-1:2017 Energy performance of buildings - Indoor Environmental Quality - Part 1: Indoor Environmental Input Parameters for the Design and Assessment of Energy Performance of Buildings," 2017.
- [15] ISO, "DIN EN ISO 16798-1: Energy performance of building - Ventilation for Buildings," 2022.
- [16] Ad-hoc-Arbeitsgruppe Innenraumrichtwerte der Innenraumlufthygiene-Kommission des Umweltbundesamtes und der Obersten Landesgesundheitsbehörden, "Gesundheitliche Bewertung von Kohlendioxid in der Innenraumluft," *Bekanntmachung des Umweltbundesamtes*, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00103-008-0707-2>, 2008.
- [17] Kommission Innenraumlufthygiene am Umweltbundesamt, "Das Risiko einer Übertragung von SARS-CoV-2 in Innenräumen lässt sich durch geeignete Lüftungsmaßnahmen reduzieren," *Umweltbundesamt - Für Mensch und Umwelt*, 2020.
- [18] J. Bhardwaj, S. Hong, J. Jang, C. H. Han, J. Lee and J. Jang, "Recent advancements in the measurement of pathogenic airborne viruses," *J. Hazard. Mater.* 420, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hazmat.2021.126574>, 2021.

- [19] A. D. Gilio, J. Palmisani, M. Pulimeno, F. Cerino, M. Cacace, A. Miani and G. d. Gennaro, "CO₂ concentration monitoring inside educational buildings as a strategic tool to reduce the risk of Sars-CoV-2 airborne transmission," *Environ. Res.* 202, 101560, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envres.2021.111560>, 2021.
- [20] R. K. Bhagat, M. S. D. Wykes, S. B. Dalziel and P. F. Linden, "Effects of ventilation on the indoor spread of COVID-19," *J. Fluid Mech.* 903, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1017/jfm.2020.720>, 2020.
- [21] Z. Pang, P. Hu, X. Lu, Q. Wang, Z. O'Neill, M. J. Walker, M. O'Connor and A. McFerrin, "A smart CO₂-based ventilation control framework to minimize the infection risk of COVID-19 in public buildings," *Build. Simul. 2021 Conf.*, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/349121056_A_Smart_CO2-Based_Ventilation_Control_Framework_to_Minimize_the_Infection_Risk_of_COVID-19_In_Public_Buildings, 2021.
- [22] S. N. Rudnick and D. K. Milton, "Risk of indoor airborne infection transmission estimated from carbon dioxide concentration," *Indoor Air* 13, pp. 237-245, 2003.
- [23] H. Dai and B. Zhao, "Association of the infection probability of COVID-19 with the ventilation rates in confined spaces," *Build. Simul.* 13, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12273-020-0703-5>, 2020.
- [24] E. Riley, G. Murphy and R. Riley, "Airborne Spread of Measles in a Suburban Elementary School," *American Journal of Epidemiology*, vol. 107, no. 5, pp. 421-432, 1978.
- [25] W. Wells, *Airborne contagion and air hygiene: an ecological study of droplet infections*, 1955.
- [26] C. M. Issarow, N. Mulder and R. Wood, "Modelling the risk of airborne infectious disease using exhaled air," *J. Theor. Biol.* 372, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jtbi.2015.02.010>, 2015.

- [27] A. Hartmann and M. Kriegel, "Risk assessment of aerosols loaded with virus based on CO₂-concentration," *preprint deposit once*, doi: <https://doi.org/10.14279/depositonce-10362>, 2020.
- [28] H. C. Burridge, S. Fan, R. L. Jones, C. J. Noakes and P. F. Linden, "Predictive and retrospective modelling of airborne infection risk using monitored carbon monoxide," *Indoor Built Environ.*, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1177/1420326X211043564>, 2021.
- [29] Z. Peng and J. L. Jimenez, "Exhaled CO" as a COVID-19 Infection Risk Proxy for Different Indoor Environments and Activities," *Environ. Sci. Technol. Lett.* 8, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.estlett.1c00183>, 2021.
- [30] DIN, "DIN EN 16798-3: 2017-11 Energy performance of buildings - Ventilation for buildings - Part 3: For non-residential buildings - Performance requirements for ventilation and room-conditioning systems," 2017.
- [31] Verein Deutscher Ingenieure, "VDI 3804:2009-03 Raumluftechnik - Bürogebäude," 2009.
- [32] M. v. Pettenkofer, Ueber Luft in den Schulen und Ermittlung der Grenze zwischen guter und schlechter Zimmerluft, München, 1859.
- [33] N. Good, K. M. Fedak, D. Goble, A. Keisling, C. L'Orange, E. Morton, R. Phillips, K. Tamer and J. Volckens, "Respiratory Aerosol Emissions from Vocalization: Age and Sex Differences Are Explained by Volume and Exhaled CO₂," *Environmental Science & Technology*, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.estlett.1c00760>, 2021.

269

270

271

Figures in Appendix:

Figure 5: Prediction of the risk of infection for a viral emission rate (viral load & particle production) $V_F=150 \text{ h}^{-1}$. Considering a quasit-steady CO_2 -concentration and a given mask-type for all attending persons. Very good ventilation (600-800 ppm), good ventilation (900-1,100 ppm), moderate ventilation (1,400-1,600 ppm), poor ventilation (1,900-2,100 ppm). No mask ($f_M=1,0$), surgical mask (lines $f_M=0.3-0.7$, bar $f_M=0.4-0.6$), FFP2-mask (lines $f_M=0.05-0.5$, bar $f_M=0.12-0.2$). Low Risk (green) for an $R_s < 1$, medium risk for $1 < R_s < 2$, increased risk for $2 < R_s < 3$ and high risk for $R_s > 3$

Figure 6: Prediction of the risk of infection for a viral emission rate (viral load & particle production) $V_F=500 \text{ h}^{-1}$. Considers a quasit-steady CO_2 -concentration and a given mask-type for all attending persons. Very good ventilation (600-800 ppm), good ventilation (900-1,100 ppm), moderate ventilation (1,400-1,600 ppm), poor ventilation (1,900-2,100 ppm). No mask ($f_M=1,0$), surgical mask (lines $f_M=0.3-0.7$, bar $f_M=0.4-0.6$), FFP2-mask (lines $f_M=0.05-0.5$, bar $f_M=0.12-0.2$). Low Risk (green) for an $R_s < 1$, medium risk for $1 < R_s < 2$, increased risk for $2 < R_s < 3$ and high risk for $R_s > 3$




Figure 1





Figure 2



Figure




Figure 4




Figure 5




Figure 6