Price-performance comparison of HEPA air purifiers and lower-cost MERV 13/14 filters with box fans for filtering out SARS-Cov-2 and other particulate aerosols in indoor community settings

Devabhaktuni Srikrishna, Patient Knowhow, Inc.
sri.devabhaktuni@gmail.com, www.patientknowhow.com

Background: SARS-Cov-2 aerosols have potential to accumulate in airspaces of poorly ventilated, indoor spaces such as classrooms, offices, homes, restaurants, and bars. Separately, toxic aerosol pollution (e.g. wildfires, wood burning) is frequently encountered in these locations with ventilation relying on outside air. Portable high efficiency particulate air (HEPA) air purifiers are useful to remove both types of aerosols without relying on outside ventilation. To meet or exceed recommended 4 to 6 air exchanges per hour (ACH), high price-points for select HEPA air purifier models without incurring excessive noise generation make them unaffordable for many households and communities. Do-it-yourself (DIY) alternatives with box-fans and HVAC filters can be much lower cost but their clean air delivery rate (CADR) and noise generation varies greatly depending on choices of filters, number of filters, and fan speeds.

Objective: To compare cost-effectiveness and noise-generation of aerosol filtration by commercially available, portable HEPA air purifiers and do-it-yourself (DIY) alternatives built from box fans and HVAC filters rated at MERV 13 or 14 using single and quad filter designs.

Methods: The comparison is based on three metrics: clean air delivery rate (CADR), the noise generated (dBA), and affordability ($$) using an ISO-certified aerosol measurement device to measure input/output particle filtration of particles sizes ranging from 0.3 microns to 10 microns, airspeed meter to measure airflow, and NIOSH sound meter app to measure noise.

Results: Accounting for reduced filtration efficiency of MERV 13/14 filters compared to HEPA, estimated clean air delivery rate (CADR) of a do-it-yourself (DIY) setup using 2” and 4” filters with a box fan running at fan speed 1 for tolerable noise was 243 cfm ($35) to 323 cfm ($58), comparable or better than a best-in-class, commercial HEPA air purifiers running at maximum speed with low noise generation at 282 cfm ($549). However the quad filter designs, popularly known as the Corsi-Rosenthal box, achieved gains in CADR of only 50% over a single filter design but in contrast to 200-250% gains reported by UC-Davis.

Conclusions: DIY alternatives using single 1”, 2” and 4” MERV 13/14 filters compare favorably to best-in-class, commercially available systems in terms of estimated CADR and noise but at approximately ten times lower cost. Compared to use of one filter, an improvement in CADR (air flow) was observed with a popular DIY configuration involving quad filter design, popularly known as the Corsi-Rosenthal box, not as high as reported by a recent study by UC-Davis.

Introduction

Recent studies have demonstrated the presence of live SARS-Cov-2 in micron [1] [2] and submicron [3] aerosols from the exhaled breath of infected people. Virus-carrying aerosols have the potential to accumulate in the airspace of poorly ventilated, indoor spaces such as classrooms, offices, homes, restaurants, and bars and other community settings, and if inhaled may result in COVID-19 infections [4]. Separately, toxic aerosol pollution such as from wildfires, wood burning, and other sources can be encountered in these same locations with ventilation using unfiltered, outdoor air. Portable air filtration in the form of high efficiency particulate air (HEPA) air purifiers is useful to remove both types of aerosols without relying on ventilation from outside the room.

Although in healthcare settings there are minimum specifications for ventilation and air filtration up to 15 air exchange per hour (ACH), in community settings the US-CDC does not specify a target but recommends increasing air filtration as high as possible [5]. Whereas experts recommend 4 to 6 ACH in community settings [6].



Classroom dimensions (length x width x height)

For example, in a typical classroom of size 30' x 30' classroom with 8’ foot ceilings, a HEPA air purifier rated at a CADR of 300 cubic feet per minute needs 24 minutes to cycle the air once (2.5 ACH) under ideal mixing conditions [7] [8]. This classroom would therefore require two to three such air HEPA purifiers with sufficiently low noise generation typically costing $400-$500 each (with periodic $40-$80 filter replacements) to achieve the target ACH exceeding 4 to 6 ACH. For an upfront cost of approximately $1000-$1500 per classroom, this level of air filtration may be outside the budget of many schools in the US and worldwide. Approaching 15 ACH as in hospitals and passenger aircraft [9] would require many more HEPA units putting it further out of reach. If portable HEPA air purifiers of sufficiently low noise generation with sufficiently high

clean air delivery rate (CADR) are unaffordable for many communities, how else can they achieve target ACH while addressing [10] [11] both cost and noise generation concerns?

DIY box-fan filters with single and quad filter designs

Lower cost alternatives to HEPA air purifiers have been in use for at least a decade and investigated for both their air filtration properties and fire safety. For example, a Minimum Efficiency Rating Value-13 (MERV-13) filter attached to a box fan using duct tape (or a bungee cord) has been demonstrated to effectively filter wildfire PM2.5 and submicron particles [12]. Ford Motor Company sponsored a project called “Scrappy Filtration” which reportedly donated 20,000 box-fan and air filters held together with a cardboard structure for use in classrooms to underserved communities [20] [21].

These lower-cost box-fan-filter alternatives have not yet been directly compared to commercially available HEPA air purifiers in terms of filtration efficiency (%), air flow and clean air delivery rate (CADR), and noise generation (dBA). Below, we compare the cost-effectiveness of aerosol filtration by commercially available, portable air cleaning devices with HEPA filters and do-it-yourself (DIY) alternatives built from box fans and HVAC filters rated at MERV 13 or 14. The comparison is based on three metrics: clean air delivery rate (CADR), the noise generated (dBA), and initial cost or affordability ($$). The test devices include an ISO-certified aerosol measurement device to measure input/output particle filtration of particles sizes ranging from 0.3 microns to 10 microns, airspeed meter to measure airflow, and NIOSH sound meter app to measure noise. We also evaluate a DIY configuration involving quad filter design, popularly known as the Corsi-Rosenthal box, that has been in use to enhance the airflow and CADR over a single filter design.

Safety Notes: California Air Resource Board recommends never leaving such box-fan air filters unattended while turned on, and for box fans in the US those manufactured after 2012 because these fans will have a fused plug to prevent electrical fires if the device is inadvertently knocked over [13]. Chemical Insights, a subsidiary of Underwriter Laboratories, recently tested five different electric box fan models (approximately 20” × 20” in size) with attached air filters and concluded that all measured temperatures fell below the maximum acceptable thresholds defined by the market safety standard for electric fans (UL 507) [14]. The resources and

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

Methods

Commercially available HEPA air purifiers. Three models evaluated include the Coway Airmega 300, Coway AP-1512HH, and Airthereal AHG550.

Commercial Air Purifier	Price (Amazon)	CADR (cubic feet per minute)
Coway Airmega 300	$549	285 [16]
Coway AP-1512HH	$229	233 [17]
Airthereal AHG550	$233	324 [18]

HVAC filters with box fan. For DIY configurations, the box fan used is a 20” Lasko Fan which costs $20 (Home Depot) along with the following HVAC filters made by Nordic Pure. A shroud made of cardboard of 14” diameter was attached to the output side (front) of the fan to improve airflow. For comparison, two methods of attaching the box fan to the air filters included vacuum (no attachment just relying on airflow), duct tape, and velcro.

HVAC Filter size	MERV rating	Unit Price (Amazon)
20” x 20” x 1”	14	$11
20” x 20” x 2”	13	$15
20” x 20” x 4	14	$38

Aerosol filtration efficiency. For each HEPA air purifier or box fan filter, counts at each particle size (0.3, 0.5, 0.7, 1.0, 2.5, 5, and 10 in microns) were tested using an ISO-certified particle counter (Temtop Particle Counter PMD 331 available on Amazon) with the filter turned ‘on’ and ‘off’ consecutively. Five counts were recorded and averaged on the particle counter when its input was placed directly at the output of the air purifier/filter for 30 seconds. The efficiency at each particle size was estimated by the formula, efficiency = 1 - on / off.

Air flow. For each HEPA air purifier or box fan filter, the airspeed was measured using an anemometer (BTMETER BT-100 Handheld Anemometer available on Amazon) held at the output and also input (if possible). An average of four or more airspeed measurements (feet per minute) were multiplied by area of input or output to estimate the airflow (cubic feet per minute).

Noise. Noise measurements were taken for each air purifier/filter using an iPhone app maintained by National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH) [15]. Three or more noise measurements were taken at a 9” distance perpendicular to the direction of the output airflow and averaged.



Results

Commercial HEPA air purifiers. The results for best-in-class, commercial air purifiers show particle filtration efficiencies near or exceeding 90% at all particle sizes ranging from 0.3 to 10 microns. At their maximum fan speed, the noise generated by the Coway Airmega 300 was lowest and most (subjectively) tolerable of the three models. To achieve similar tolerability levels both the Coway AP-1512 and the Airthereal AGH550 had to be set at fan speed 2 which cut their estimated airflow (CADR) roughly in half.

		Coway Airmega 300	Coway AP-1512	Coway AP-1512	Airthereal AGH550	Airthereal AGH550
	Price (est.)	$549	$229	$229	$233	$233
	Fan speed	3	3	2	5	2
	Noise (dBA) avg of three measurements 9" away	59	64	46	66	47
	Estimated Airflow (output) cfm	282	222	97	410	206
Filtration Efficiency (%) avg of five measurements	0.3 microns	94.00%	97.00%		87.00%	
	0.5 microns	95.00%	98.00%		90.00%	
	0.7 microns	97.00%	99.00%		91.00%	
	1.0 microns	97.00%	99.00%		93.00%	
	2.5 microns	98.00%	98.00%		94.00%	
	5 microns	98.00%	98.00%		96.00%	
	10 microns	98.00%	98.00%		98.00%	

Box fan plus single MERV 13/14 filter. The filtration efficiency of the MERV 13/14 filters varied by thickness with highest observed for 4” filters compared to 1” filters, and also at higher particle sizes above 1 micron exceeding 90%. The box fan was (subjectively) tolerable only at fan speed one (out of three). Compared to 282 cfm for the Coway Airmega 300 ($375) at fan speed 3, at fan speed 1, the box fan has estimated CADR of 371 cfm at for 70% filtration efficiency with the 4” MERV 14 filter ($58) and 278 cfm at 60% efficiency for the 2” MERV 13 filter ($38).

		4” MERV 14	4” MERV 14	4” MERV 14	2" MERV 13	2" MERV 13	2" MERV 13	1" MERV 14	1" MERV 14	1" MERV 14	1" MERV 14	1" MERV 14	1" MERV 14
	Price (est.)	$58	$58	$58	$35	$35	**$35**	$31	$31	**$31**	$31	$31	**$31**
	Seal	vacuum	vacuum	vacuum	vacuum	vacuum	vacuum	vacuum	vacuum	vacuum	tape	tape	tape
	Fan speed	3	2	**1**	3	2	**1**	3	2	**1**	3	2	**1**
	Noise (dBA) avg of three measurements 9" away	63	60	**54**	62	58	**52**	64	60	**55**			
	Estimated Airflow (input) cfm	997	709	**556**	644	491	**382**	545	361	**228**			
	Estimated Airflow (output) cfm	611	567	**462**	576	513	**405**	539	469	**337**			
Filtration Efficiency (%) avg of five measurements	0.3 microns	70.00%			61.00%			56.00%		**60.00%**	59%		63%
	0.5 microns	75.00%			65.00%			60%		62.00%	62%		65%
	0.7 microns	88.00%			79.00%			69.00%		63.00%	73%		70%
	1.0 microns	92.00%			83.00%			69.00%		64.00%	74%		69%
	2.5 microns	95.00%			84.00%			71.00%		66.00%	75%		63%
	5 microns	96.00%			88.00%			54.00%		71.00%	64%		61%
	10 microns	96.00%			90.00%			34.00%		61.00%	41%		29%

Box fan plus quad MERV 13/14 filters. The quad filter design, popularly known as the Corsi-Rosenthal box, showed significant improvement over single filters with using comparably rated filters and fan speeds. With the quad 1” MERV 14 filters at fan speed 1, the output airflow was 617 cfm versus 386 cfm with a single filter at that fan speed for an improvement of 60%. Similarly with 2” MERV 13 filters the improvement was only 35%. These results are in contrast to approximately 200%-250% improvement between single filter and quad filter designs (also with shroud and 20” Lasko box fan) reported in a study by UC-Davis [19]. Notably, there was almost no difference in output airflow when the 1” air filters were attached with duct tape (sealed airtight) or velcro (loose fitting) suggesting any leaks created by a loose fit are likely insignificant.

		quad 1” MERV 14	quad 1” MERV 14	quad 1” MERV 14	quad 1” MERV 14	quad 1” MERV 14	quad 1” MERV 14	quad 2” MERV 13	quad 2” MERV 13	quad 2” MERV 13
	Price (est.)	**$64**	**$64**	**$64**	**$64**	**$64**	**$64**	**$80**	**$80**	**$80**
	Seal	Velcro	Velcro	Velcro	Tape	Tape	Tape	Velcro	Velcro	Velcro
	Fan speed	3	2	1	3	2	1	3	2	1
	Noise (dBA) avg of three measurements 9" away									
	Estimated Airflow (input) cfm									
	Estimated Airflow (output) cfm	749	642	517	743	613	506	759	699	546
Filtration Efficiency (%) avg of five measurements	0.3 microns				77%	81%	81%	72%	78%	68%
	0.5 microns				80%	84%	84%	75%	80%	70%
	0.7 microns				87%	88%	88%	76%	82%	73%
	1.0 microns				88%	89%	88%	76%	84%	75%
	2.5 microns				89%	91%	90%	76%	84%	73%
	5 microns				90%	93%	93%	65%	81%	74%
	10 microns				87%	85%	95%	41%	73%	79%

Discussion

Accounting for reduced filtration efficiency of MERV 13/14 filters compared to HEPA, the estimated clean air delivery rate (CADR) of a do-it-yourself (DIY) setup using 2” and 4” filters with a box fan running at fan speed 1 for tolerable noise was 243 cfm to 343 cfm, comparable or better than a best-in-class, commercial HEPA air purifier running at maximum speed with low noise generation (Coway Airmega 300) at 282 cfm. Yet the upfront cost of the components of the DIY setup were approximately 10 times less ($35-$58) than a best-in-class, commercial HEPA air purifier ($549).

The DIY setups also did not require tape but could be assembled with loose-fitting velcro, bungee cord, or simply attached by the vacuum of the fan when turned on. The marginal difference in airflow between vacuum/velcro versus tape is not totally surprising. In the single filter design, the air filter clings to the fan without any extra adhesive tells suggesting much of the air is flowing through the filter already. In many home HVAC systems the air filter typically slides in and doesn't require an airtight seal but it still works.

However the quad filter design, popularly known as the Corsi-Rosenthal box, did not achieve gains in CADR of more than 50% over a single filter design which is in contrast to the 200-250% gains reported by UC-Davis [19]. The reason why there is a discrepancy between the results reported here and by UC-Davis remains to be reconciled. Anecdotally, we observed that the airflow was non-uniform across all four filters which may be responsible for this. The top filter closest to the fan had more airflow than either the side filters and especially compared to the filter furthest away from the fan in the back. This may be the cause for the gains not to be as high as expected. Why is the airflow across the four filters non-ideal? In an ideal gas a pressure differential from one side of the cube ought to apply equally across all four sides of the cube. However this is a dynamic situation with turbulence and all sorts of non-ideal effects. Maybe it has to do with airflow dynamics (aerodynamics). Subjectively, the quad filter design feels sturdy and stable but it also costs more. With 200-250% gains in CADR it would be appealing but if we were unable to replicate the expected gains, others are probably going to run into similar challenges as well. Practically, it's time and cost can be alternatively expended on replicating a new box fan filter (+ 100% gain) so that the airflow is then distributed to different locations in the room or classroom.

A sweet spot between speed of setup, simplicity, size, and cost seems to be a single 2” MERV 13 or 4” MERV 14 filter (20”x20”) with 20” box fan. It is harder to mess up which is needed for DIY designs. Given the simplicity and low-cost of the box-fan design using single 2” or 4” MERV 13/14 filters, form-factor improvements at a marginal cost may include a more stable, cardboard box frame so it is not so easy to knock over with wallpaper to make it aesthetically pleasing. A mosquito screen in front of the fan may help prevent curious fingers from contacting the fan

blade which may be especially important for classroom and home applications when young children are present.

Limitations

The filtration and airflow results for box fan used a certain set of filters and fans made by a certain manufacturers which may vary with other manufacturers. Although the cost was lower, the durability of filtration efficiency and airflow of these filters after extended use is unknown unlike HEPA-purifiers with operational history. There may also be variability in filter performance due to manufacturing or among manufacturers of similarly-rated filters.

Acknowledgements

We would like to sincerely thank Hugh Churchill, Amalavoyal Narsimha Chari, Robert Freedman, Stephanie Holm, and Dan Jaffe for helpful discussions and advice.

References

- [1] Coleman KK, Tay DJW, Sen Tan K, Ong SWX, Son TT, Koh MH, Chin YQ, Nasir H, Mak TM, Chu JJH, Milton DK, Chow VTK, Tambyah PA, Chen M, Wai TK. Viral Load of SARS-CoV-2 in Respiratory Aerosols Emitted by COVID-19 Patients while Breathing, Talking, and Singing. Clin Infect Dis. 2021 Aug 6:ciab691. doi: 10.1093/cid/ciab691. Epub ahead of print. PMID: 34358292; PMCID: PMC8436389.
- [2] Adenaiye OO, Lai J, de Mesquita PJB, Hong F, Youssefi S, German J, Tai SS, Albert B, Schanz M, Weston S, Hang J, Fung C, Chung HK, Coleman KK, Sapoval N, Treangen T, Berry IM, Mullins K, Frieman M, Ma T, Milton DK; University of Maryland StopCOVID Research Group. Infectious SARS-CoV-2 in Exhaled Aerosols and Efficacy of Masks During Early Mild Infection. Clin Infect Dis. 2021 Sep 14:ciab797. doi: 10.1093/cid/ciab797. Epub ahead of print. PMID: 34519774; PMCID: PMC8522431.
- [3] Santarpia JL, Herrera VL, Rivera DN, Ratnesar-Shumate S, Reid SP, Ackerman DN, Denton PW, Martens JWS, Fang Y, Conoan N, Callahan MV, Lawler JV, Brett-Major DM, Lowe JJ. The size and culturability of patient-generated SARS-CoV-2 aerosol. J Expo Sci Environ Epidemiol. 2021 Aug 18:1–6. doi: 10.1038/s41370-021-00376-8. Epub ahead of print. PMID: 34408261; PMCID: PMC8372686.
- [4] Scientific Brief: SARS-CoV-2 Transmission. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. May 7, 2021. https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/science/science-briefs/sars-cov-2-transmission.html
- [5] Ventilation in Buildings. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. June 2, 2021. https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/community/ventilation.html
- [6] Allen JG, Ibrahim AM. Indoor Air Changes and Potential Implications for SARS-CoV-2 Transmission. JAMA. 2021;325(20):2112–2113. doi:10.1001/jama.2021.5053
- [7] https://www.patientknowhow.com/hepacalculator.html

- [8] https://www.hsph.harvard.edu/news/hsph-in-the-news/experts-offer-advice-on-air-purifiers-for-classrooms/
- [9] Bhuvan KC, Shrestha R, Leggat PA, Ravi Shankar P, Shrestha S. Safety of air travel during the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic. Travel Med Infect Dis. 2021 Sep-Oct;43:102103. doi: 10.1016/j.tmaid.2021.102103. Epub 2021 Jun 7. PMID: 34111566; PMCID: PMC8180446.
- [10] Duill FF, Schulz F, Jain A, Krieger L, van Wachem B, Beyrau F. The Impact of Large Mobile Air Purifiers on Aerosol Concentration in Classrooms and the Reduction of Airborne Transmission of SARS-CoV-2. Int J Environ Res Public Health. 2021 Nov 2;18(21):11523. doi: 10.3390/ijerph182111523. PMID: 34770037
- [11] Bluyssen PM, Ortiz M, Zhang D. The effect of a mobile HEPA filter system on 'infectious' aerosols, sound and air velocity in the SenseLab. Build Environ. 2021 Jan 15;188:107475. doi: 10.1016/j.buildenv.2020.107475. Epub 2020 Dec 3. PMID: 33293755; PMCID: PMC7711180.
- [12] May, N.W., Dixon, C., Jaffe, D.A. (2021). Impact of Wildfire Smoke Events on Indoor Air Quality and Evaluation of a Low-cost Filtration Method. Aerosol Air Qual. Res. 21, 210046. https://doi.org/10.4209/aaqr.210046
- [13] https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/protecting-yourself-wildfire-smoke
- [14] https://chemicalinsights.org/wp-content/uploads/DIY-Box-Fan-Report-2021.pdf
- [15] https://www.cdc.gov/niosh/topics/noise/app.html
- [16] https://cowaymega.com/products/coway-airmega-300
- [17] https://cowaymega.com/products/coway-mighty-ap-1512hh
- [18] https://airthereal.com/products/open-box-airthereal-glory-days-agh550-hepa-air-purifier-up-to-750-sq-ft
- [19] https://energy.ucdavis.edu/wp-content/uploads/Case-Study_DIY-Portable-Air-Cleaners-083121.pdf
- [20] https://media.ford.com/content/fordmedia/fna/us/en/news/2021/05/12/ford-diy-air-filtration-kit-covid-19-validated.html
- [21] https://aip.scitation.org/doi/full/10.1063/5.0050058

Disclaimer