

1 TITLE:

2

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

5

6 AUTHORS:

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

10 ¹Inspirotec Inc, North Chicago, IL

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

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

13

14 KEY WORDS

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

16

17 ABSTRACT

18

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

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

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

42

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

45

46

47 INTRODUCTION

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

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

58 transmission was via fine droplets in the air [6]. This was based on identification of
59 spreader events from the origin in Hunan, China and subsequent global spread.
60 However, direct measurements of the airborne coronavirus have been limited.
61 Heneghan et al placed online a comprehensive review of work on airborne SARS-CoV-
62 2 and showed the need for a standardized validated procedure [7]. All work thus far has
63 been based on limited numbers of observations and no formal validation of methods.
64 Methods that have been applied to attempts to detect airborne SARS-CoV-2 include
65 glass fiber filter [8], gelatin filters [9] various other kinds of filters [10], condensate
66 capture [11-14], NIOSH vortex sampler[15-17] electrostatic aerosol to hydrosol [18],
67 SKC Impinger [19], personal environmental monitor [20], Sioutas Cascade Impactor
68 [21].or bubbling through triazole [22]. One study made use of the AirAnswers® to show
69 presence of airborne SARS-CoV-2 associated with the choir in a high school [5]. Here
70 the measurement is validated in a controlled environmental chamber.

71 After being canceled in 2020, amid the COVID-19 pandemic, the trade show returned in
72 2021, and AirAnswers® devices were placed at five locations within the exhibit area.
73 The facility had been unoccupied for two years, and only one other convention had
74 been held immediately preceding this one. We analyzed air samples for biological
75 agents that included allergens, mold, and SARS-CoV-2 virus.

76

77


78 METHODS

79 1. Description of venue.

80 At the request of the trade show organizers, identifiers to the actual congress have been
81 kept anonymous. Air samples were taken at the positions indicated as 1-5 in Fig 1. The
82 location was in a ballroom in a conference center during a four-day trade show for
83 environmental remediation and cleaning professionals. The ballroom is 85,204 sq. ft,
84 358 ft width, 238 ft length and 30–34 ft high. The foyer was separated from the ballroom
85 by full height walls and is 15,670 sq. ft. Positions of doorways into the ballroom area are
86 indicated in Fig. 1.

87

88 Fig. 1. Layout of tradeshow.



89 Exhibit area and locations of individual exhibits are shown. Dispositions of samplers are
90 numbered locations in yellow boxes. Registration area is in a foyer outside of general
91 exhibit area.
92

93

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

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

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

109 2. Test methods.

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

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

124

125

126

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

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

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

141

142

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

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

145

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

161

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

167

168 RESULTS.

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

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

176

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

178

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

179

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

182

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

185

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

187

188 All (1→3)-β-D-Glucan results were elevated above the measuring range of the assay
189 (>100 pg/M³: Table 2). This suggests the extensive presence of mold or residues of

190

191

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

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

192

193

194

195

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

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

211
212 The RMI primer-probe sets are well-established for mold species. Possible mold
213 species may be missed by not being included in the RMI list. We, therefore, designed
214 genus-specific probes and primers that may lead to results with more generality. The
215 genus tests were done on total extract from the electrodes, so that, in addition to
216 spores, any airborne fragments of fungus that included amplifiable DNA or DNA
217 fragments would be included, if present. Results in Table 2 show *Aspergillus* was
218 detected in the registration desk area, even though no species of aspergillus spores
219 was found. *Penicillium* was detected at all 5 locations, even though no *Penicillium*
220 spores had been detected at the species level. This suggests that some undefined
221 *Penicillium* species spore or fragments was in the air of the entire facility, and that was
222 not included in the RMI 23. *Memnionella* was detected at three locations of the facility,
223 even though no *Memnionella* spores had been detected at the species level. Not
224 unexpectedly, the fungal-generic 18S primer and probe set confirmed the presence of
225 fungal material in the air throughout.

226

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

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

240

241 DISCUSSION.

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

261

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

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

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

294

295 ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

296

297 This work was funded by Inspirotec Inc.

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

300

301 REFERENCES

- 302 1. Gordon, J., et al., *A new patient-operated sampling device for measurement of aeroallergens*.
303 *Annals of Allergy Asthma & Immunology*, 2016. **116**(5): p. 475-476.
- 304 2. Gordon, J., et al., *A simple novel device for air sampling by electrokinetic capture*. *Microbiome*,
305 2015. **3**.
- 306 3. Gordon, J., et al., *Validation of a novel sampling technology for airborne allergens in low-income*
307 *urban homes*. *Annals of Allergy Asthma & Immunology*, 2018. **120**(1): p. 96+.
- 308 4. Richardson, M., et al., *Concurrent measurement of microbiome and allergens in the air of*
309 *bedrooms of allergy disease patients in the Chicago area*. *Microbiome*, 2019. **7**(1): p. 82.
- 310 5. Crowe, J., et al., *Assessment of a Program for SARS-CoV-2 Screening and Environmental*
311 *Monitoring in an Urban Public School District*. *Jama Network Open*, 2021. **4**(9).
- 312 6. Morawska, L. and D.K. Milton, *It Is Time to Address Airborne Transmission of Coronavirus*
313 *Disease 2019 (COVID-19)*. *Clinical Infectious Diseases*, 2020. **71**(9): p. 2311-2313.
- 314 7. Heneghan, C., et al., *SARS-CoV-2 and the Role of Airborne Transmission: Systematic review*.
315 Figshare. <http://dx.doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.14248055.v2>, 2021. **Last accessed nov 17,**
316 **2021**.
- 317 8. Pivato, A., et al., *Evaluating the presence of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in the particulate matters during*
318 *the peak of COVID-19 in Padua, northern Italy*. *Science of the Total Environment*, 2021. **784**.
- 319 9. Santarpia, J.L., et al., *Aerosol and surface contamination of SARS-CoV-2 observed in quarantine*
320 *and isolation care (vol 10, 12732, 2020)*. *Scientific Reports*, 2020. **10**(1).
- 321 10. Passos, R.G., M.B. Silveira, and J.S. Abrahao, *Exploratory assessment of the occurrence of SARS-*
322 *CoV-2 in aerosols in hospital facilities and public spaces of a metropolitan center in Brazil*.
323 *Environmental Research*, 2021. **195**.
- 324 11. Coleman, K.K., et al., *Viral Load of SARS-CoV-2 in Respiratory Aerosols Emitted by COVID-19*
325 *Patients while Breathing, Talking, and Singing*. *Clinical infectious diseases*, 2021. **In Press**.
- 326 12. Zverzhinetsky, M., V. Krivitsky, and F. Patolsky, *Direct whole blood analysis by the antigen -*
327 *antibody chemically-delayed dissociation from nanosensors arrays*. *Biosensors & Bioelectronics*,
328 2020. **170**.
- 329 13. Lednickya, J.A., et al., *Viable SARS-CoV-2 in the air of a hospital room with COVID-19 patients*.
330 *International Journal of Infectious Diseases*, 2020. **100**: p. 476-482.
- 331 14. Moitra, P., et al., *Rapid and low-cost sampling for detection of airborne SARS-CoV-2 in*
332 *dehumidifier condensate*. *Biotechnology and Bioengineering*, 2021. **118**(8): p. 3029-3036.
- 333 15. Lane, M.A., et al., *Bioaerosol Sampling for Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2*
334 *(SARS-CoV-2) in a Referral Center with Critically Ill Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) Patients*
335 *March-May 2020*. *Clinical Infectious Diseases*, 2021. **73**(7): p. E1790-E1794.
- 336 16. Lane, M.A., et al., *Bioaerosol sampling for SARS-CoV-2 in a referral center with critically ill*
337 *COVID-19 patients March-May 2020*. *Clinical infectious diseases : an official publication of the*
338 *Infectious Diseases Society of America*, 2021.
- 339 17. Santarpia, J.L., et al., *The size and culturability of patient-generated SARS-CoV-2 aerosol*. *Journal*
340 *of Exposure Science and Environmental Epidemiology*, 2021.
- 341 18. Piri, A., et al., *Increased survivability of coronavirus and H1N1 influenza virus under electrostatic*
342 *aerosol-to-hydrosol sampling*. *Journal of Hazardous Materials*, 2021. **413**.
- 343 19. Vosoughi, M., et al., *Investigation of SARS-CoV-2 in hospital indoor air of COVID-19 patients'*
344 *ward with impinger method*. *Environmental Science and Pollution Research*, 2021. **28**(36): p.
345 50480-50488.
- 346 20. Moreno, T., et al., *Tracing surface and airborne SARS-CoV-2 RNA inside public buses and subway*
347 *trains*. *Environment International*, 2021. **147**.

- 348 21. Lednicky, J.A., et al., *Isolation of SARS-CoV-2 from the air in a car driven by a COVID patient with*
349 *mild illness*. International Journal of Infectious Diseases, 2021. **108**: p. 212-216.
- 350 22. Habibi N, et al., *A safe and effective sample collection method for assessment of SARSCoV2 in*
351 *aerosol samples*. In: Ramanathan AL, Chidambaram S, Jonathan MP, Munoz-Arriola F, Prasanna
352 MV, Kumar P. ed. Environmental resilience and transformation in times of COVID-19. Elsevier;
353 2021. pp173-178.
- 354 23. Vesper, S., *Traditional mould analysis compared to a DNA-based method of mould analysis*.
355 Critical Reviews in Microbiology, 2011. **37**(1): p. 15-24.
- 356 24. Vesper, S., et al., *Development of an environmental relative moldiness index for US homes*.
357 Journal of Occupational and Environmental Medicine, 2007. **49**(8): p. 829-833.
- 358 25. Haugland, R. and S. Vesper, *Method of Identifying and Quantifying Specific Fungi and Bacteria*.
359 "Method of Identifying and Quantifying Specific Fungi and Bacteria". U.S. Patent 6,387,652,
360 2002.
- 361 26. <https://www.fda.gov/media/134922/download>., *CDC 2019-Novel Coronavirus (2019-nCoV) Real-*
362 *Time RT-PCR Diagnostic Panel*. Last accessed November 17, 2021, 2021.
- 363 27. Zhou, L., et al., *ACE2 and TMPRSS2 are expressed on the human ocular surface, suggesting*
364 *susceptibility to SARS-CoV-2 infection*. Ocular Surface, 2020. **18**(4): p. 537-544.
- 365 28. Yu, L., et al., *Catching and killing of airborne SARS-CoV-2 to control spread of COVID-19 by a*
366 *heated air disinfection system*. Materials Today Physics, 2020. **15**.
- 367 29. Karimzadeh, S., R. Bhopal, and H.N. Tien, *Review of infective dose, routes of transmission and*
368 *outcome of COVID-19 caused by the SARS-COV-2: comparison with other respiratory viruses*.
369 Epidemiology and Infection, 2021. **149**.

370

371

372 SUPPLEMENTARY DATA

373

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

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

375

376

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

378

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

379

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