

# 1 Ozone Generation from a Germicidal Ultraviolet Lamp with Peak 2 Emission at 222 nm

3 Michael F. Link<sup>1,\*</sup>, Andrew Shore<sup>1</sup>, Behrang H. Hamadani<sup>1</sup>, Dustin Poppendieck<sup>1,\*</sup>

4 <sup>1</sup> National Institute of Standards and Technology, Gaithersburg, USA

5 *\*Corresponding authors emails: michael.f.link@nist.gov; dustin.poppendieck@nist.gov*

## 6 Abstract


7 Recent interest in commercial devices containing germicidal ultraviolet lamps with a peak  
8 emission wavelength at 222 nm (GUV222) has focused on mitigating virus transmission indoors  
9 and disinfecting indoor spaces while posing minimum risk to human tissue. However, 222 nm  
10 light can produce ozone (O<sub>3</sub>) in air. O<sub>3</sub> is an undesirable component of indoor air because of  
11 health impacts from acute to chronic exposure and its ability to degrade indoor air quality  
12 through oxidation chemistry. We measured the total irradiance of one GUV222 lamp at a  
13 distance of  
14 5 cm away from the source to be  $27.0 \text{ W m}^{-2} \pm 4.6 \text{ W m}^{-2}$  in the spectral range of 210 nm to 230  
15 nm, with peak emission centered at 222 nm and evaluated the potential for the lamp to generate  
16 O<sub>3</sub> in a 31.5 m<sup>3</sup> stainless steel chamber. In seven four-hour experiments average O<sub>3</sub> mixing  
17 ratios increased from levels near the detection limit of the instrument to  $48 \text{ ppb}_v \pm 1 \text{ ppb}_v$  ( $94 \mu\text{g}$   
18  $\text{m}^{-3} \pm 2 \mu\text{g m}^{-3}$ ). We determined an average constant O<sub>3</sub> generation rate for this lamp to be  $1.10$   
19  $\text{mg h}^{-1} \pm 0.15 \text{ mg h}^{-1}$ . Using a radiometric method and chemical actinometry, we estimate  
20 effective lamp fluences that allow prediction of O<sub>3</sub> generation by the GUV222 lamp, at best,  
21 within 10 % of the measured mixing ratios. Because O<sub>3</sub> can react with gases and surfaces indoors

22 leading to the formation of other potential by-products, future studies should evaluate the  
23 production of O<sub>3</sub> from GUV222 air cleaning devices.

## 24 Keywords

25 Air cleaning, germicidal ultraviolet light, ozone, indoor air quality

## 26 TOC





27

## 28 Introduction

29 The on-going COVID-19 pandemic has highlighted the need for effective, in room, low energy  
30 air cleaning devices to enable safer in-person interactions in indoor environments.<sup>1,2,3</sup> Portable  
31 cleaning devices use a range of technologies that may have uncharacterized impacts on indoor air  
32 quality.<sup>4</sup> These impacts could result in human exposure to pollutants that are at odds with the  
33 intended benefit of the technology.<sup>5</sup> One such technology is germicidal ultraviolet lamps that  
34 operate with a peak emission wavelength at 222 nm (GUV222). This wavelength is appealing as

35 research to date indicates it does not significantly penetrate human skin and is effective at  
36 inactivating pathogens.<sup>6,7,8</sup>

37 Air cleaning devices equipped with GUV222 lamps are of particular importance when  
38 considering the potential for ozone (O<sub>3</sub>) formation. In the range of 175 nm to 242 nm, molecular  
39 oxygen (O<sub>2</sub>) will absorb light and dissociate with a quantum yield of unity to produce two  
40 ground state oxygen atoms (O), via reaction 1, that can then go on to recombine with O<sub>2</sub>, in a  
41 termolecular reaction involving a collisional body (M = N<sub>2</sub> or O<sub>2</sub>), to form O<sub>3</sub> via reaction 2.<sup>9</sup>  
42 <sup>10,11</sup>



45 Reactions 1 and 2 are two of the four reactions comprising The Chapman mechanism which  
46 describes the production of O<sub>3</sub> in the stratosphere.<sup>12</sup> Characterization of spectral output and  
47 potential for O<sub>3</sub> production is necessary when considering the application of GUV222 devices  
48 for mitigating virus transmission while maintaining good air quality in indoor environments.

49 While O<sub>3</sub> itself can be a harmful by-product of air cleaner operation<sup>13</sup>, it can also react with gases  
50 and surfaces indoors<sup>14</sup>—including human skin<sup>15</sup>—leading to the formation of other potentially  
51 concerning by-products such as gas-phase aldehydes and ultra-fine particulate matter.<sup>16</sup> Of  
52 particular concern is the exposure to O<sub>3</sub> and O<sub>3</sub>-generated indoor pollutant by-products from  
53 application of multiple GUV222 units in small and/or poorly ventilated indoor spaces.<sup>17</sup> Here we  
54 present measurements of O<sub>3</sub> generation from a commercial GUV222 lamp in a stainless-steel  
55 laboratory chamber, support our O<sub>3</sub> formation observations with a chemical kinetic model, and

56 determine O<sub>3</sub> generation rates for this GUV222 lamp that can be used in future evaluations of  
57 GUV222 technologies in indoor spaces.

## 58 **Methods**

59 **Measurement of the GUV222 Lamp Emission Spectrum.** Spectral irradiance measurements of  
60 a krypton chloride (KrCl) excimer GUV222 lamp were performed with a commercial UV  
61 spectrometer (Mightex Systems model: HRS-UV1-025) with detection sensitivity in the spectral  
62 range of 200 nm to 415 nm. GUV222 emission light was collected by an integrating sphere  
63 detector that was connected to the spectrometer by a UV-transmitting optical fiber patch cable.  
64 Wavelength calibration of the spectrometer was achieved by use of spectral calibration lamps  
65 with well-defined emission peaks. For the spectral irradiance calibration, an internal FEL lamp  
66 setup was used to establish the absolute scale in the 300 nm to 400 nm range, and this scale was  
67 tied (tie point at 310 nm) to an unscaled spectral calibration factor that was obtained from a  
68 deuterium lamp in the 200 nm to 340 nm range. This process yielded a continuous absolute  
69 spectral calibration factor from 210 nm to 415 nm for the UV spectrometer. We estimate the  
70 uncertainty (k=2) of the spectral irradiance measurements at 222 nm to be 17 %.


71 **Operation of Chamber and Experiment Design.** We operated the commercial GUV222 lamp  
72 in a 31.5 m<sup>3</sup> environmentally controlled walk-in chamber instrumented to measure O<sub>3</sub> (Thermo  
73 49iq O<sub>3</sub> monitor) and sulfur hexafluoride (SF<sub>6</sub>; proton-transfer mass spectrometry) to measure  
74 the chamber air change rate (Figure S8). The O<sub>3</sub> monitor was calibrated to the NIST Standard  
75 Reference Photometer prior to the study.<sup>18</sup> A series of seven experiments were conducted to  
76 measure O<sub>3</sub> production from the GUV222 lamp. Prior to the experimental series the chamber  
77 was passivated with 100 ppbv of O<sub>3</sub> for ten hours. A metal fan was placed in the chamber to

78 facilitate mixing. The GUV222 lamp was positioned in the upper corner of the chamber pointed  
79 down and towards the center of the chamber opposite of the fan (Figure S4).

80 Prior to each experiment we operated the chamber to achieve a temperature of 20 °C and 50 %  
81 relative humidity. At the beginning of each experiment temperature and humidity control was  
82 stopped and the vents controlling the recirculation of air were closed. The average temperature  
83 during the experiments was  $22.5\text{ °C} \pm 1.3\text{ °C}$ , and the average relative humidity was  $42.8\% \pm$   
84  $6.0\%$ . The GUV222 lamp was then turned on for four hours over which O<sub>3</sub> concentration was  
85 measured. SF<sub>6</sub> was injected into the chamber at the start of each experiment and air change was  
86 determined from the first order loss constant (Figure S8). Tetrachloroethylene was vaporized and  
87 introduced to the chamber at the beginning of four of the experiments to measure the effective  
88 photon flux via actinometry (e.g., Peng, et al. 2023)<sup>19</sup>.

## 89 **Results**

90 **GUV222 Lamp Emission Spectrum.** Figure 1a shows the spectral irradiance versus wavelength  
91 of the GUV222 lamp measured directly under and at several distances from the lamp.




92

93 **Figure 1.** (a) GU222 lamp emission spectra showing peak emission at 222 nm measured at six  
94 different distances. (b) The total irradiance versus distance showing a drop-off proportional to  
95  $1/d^{1.52}$ .

96

97 The main emission peak is at 222 nm, as reported by other studies examining emission spectra of  
98 KrCl lamps<sup>20</sup>, accompanied by a lower-wavelength tail distribution.<sup>21</sup> By integrating under the  
99 spectral irradiance curve over the entire emission range, the total irradiance can be calculated and  
100 plotted as a function of distance from the lamp (Figure 1b). The total irradiance in the immediate  
101 vicinity of the lamp is high (105  $\text{W m}^{-2}$  at 0 cm and 27  $\text{W m}^{-2}$  at 5 cm) but drops very quickly  
102 with distance. This drop-off follows the relationship,  $E \sim 1/d^{1.52}$ , where  $E$  is irradiance and  $d$  the  
103 distance from the lamp.

104 **Measurement and Modeling of O<sub>3</sub> Production from the GU222 Lamp.** We measured  
105 elevated levels of O<sub>3</sub> in our chamber after four hours of GU222 lamp operation as shown in  
106 Figure 2.



107

108 **Figure 2.** The average O<sub>3</sub> mixing ratio from seven GUV222 lamp experiments is shown as the  
109 solid black line with the variability (2σ) shown by the gray shaded area. The average and  
110 standard deviation of seven modeled O<sub>3</sub> mixing ratios is shown as determined by the irradiance  
111 method in dark red and actinometry method in light red. The O<sub>3</sub> measured from the experiment  
112 where the light was blocked is shown in purple.

113

114 Four hours after turning the GUV222 lamp on, we observed 48 ppbv ± 1 ppbv (94 µg m<sup>-3</sup> ± 2 µg  
115 m<sup>-3</sup>) of O<sub>3</sub> in the chamber. To rule out the influence of other physical phenomena related to  
116 operation of the GUV222 lamp (e.g., electrical arcing<sup>13</sup>) being responsible for O<sub>3</sub> production we  
117 operated the lamp, for one experiment, with the output of the lamp covered to prevent light from  
118 illuminating the chamber. No O<sub>3</sub> generation was observed in that experiment (Figure 2, purple  
119 trace) providing evidence that photolysis of O<sub>2</sub> at 222 nm was responsible for production of O<sub>3</sub>.

120 At the end of each experiment the lamp was turned off and the decay of O<sub>3</sub> was measured

121 (Figure S6). We assume that O<sub>3</sub> is lost to stainless steel chamber surfaces and homogeneous gas-

122 phase reactions via a first order process. Additionally, some O<sub>3</sub> is lost via air change which was  
123 quantified from SF<sub>6</sub> decay measurements ( $\approx 6\%$ ; Figure S8). We determine the rate constant  
124 from a linear fit of the natural log of O<sub>3</sub> mixing ratio versus time (equation 3).

$$125 \ln([O_3]) = -(k_{\dot{V}} + k_{decay})t \quad (3)$$

126 In equation 3,  $k_{decay}$  is the first order rate constant for loss of O<sub>3</sub> to the chamber surfaces and  
127 homogeneous gas-phase reaction,  $k_{\dot{V}}$  is the air change rate (h<sup>-1</sup>), and  $t$  is time. Rates of O<sub>3</sub> decay  
128 ( $k_{decay}$ ) remained relatively constant throughout the experiments only varying by 2 %.

129 We calculate theoretical O<sub>3</sub> production from the GUV222 using chemical production and loss  
130 and physical loss terms in equation 4.

$$131 \frac{d[O_3]}{dt} = 2j_{O_2}[O_2] - \frac{2k_1j_{O_3}[O_3]^2}{k_2[O_2][M]} - (k_{\dot{V}} + k_{decay})[O_3] \quad (4)$$

132 The first term on the right hand side of the equation is the O<sub>3</sub> production from photolysis of O<sub>2</sub> at  
133 222 nm, the second term accounts for loss of ozone through the odd-oxygen (O<sub>x</sub> = O<sub>3</sub> + O)  
134 steady-state ( $k_1 = 7.96 \times 10^{-15} \text{ cm}^3 \text{ molecule}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1}$ ;  $k_2 = 6.10 \times 10^{-34} \text{ cm}^6 \text{ molecule}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$ ), and  
135 depositional loss to chamber walls and homogeneous gas-phase reactions is accounted for in the  
136 measured  $k_{decay}$ . The odd-oxygen steady-state is established from the rapid production of oxygen  
137 atoms (O) from both O<sub>2</sub> and O<sub>3</sub> photolysis ( $j_{O_3}$  is the photolysis rate constant for O<sub>3</sub>) and the  
138 recombining of O with O<sub>2</sub> to form O<sub>3</sub>.

139 As shown in equation 4, the photolysis rate of O<sub>2</sub> drives O<sub>3</sub> production from the GUV222 lamp  
140 and the first-order photolysis rate constant ( $j_{O_2}$ ) is strongly dependent on the photon flux ( $F$ ;  
141 equation 5) from the lamp.

$$142 j_{O_2} = \int \sigma_{O_2} \Phi_{O_2} F d\lambda \quad (5)$$



143 Using the measured irradiance spectrum (Figure 1) from the lamp we calculate an effective O<sub>2</sub>  
144 absorption cross section ( $\sigma_{O_2}$ )<sup>9</sup> of  $4.30 \times 10^{-24} \text{ cm}^2$  across a wavelength ( $\lambda$ ) range between  
145 210 nm and 230 nm (compared to  $4.09 \times 10^{-24} \text{ cm}^2$  at 222 nm). The photolysis quantum yield of  
146 O<sub>2</sub> ( $\Phi_{O_2}$ ) between 210 nm and 230 nm is unity.<sup>22</sup> We estimate an effective photon flux (F) from  
147 the GUV222 lamp from two different methods: (1) by determining the average of the measured  
148 irradiance projected into a cone (irradiance method) and (2) following the method of Peng, et al.  
149 (2023)<sup>19</sup>, using chemical actinometry<sup>23</sup> with tetrachloroethylene (C<sub>2</sub>Cl<sub>4</sub>) as the actinometer  
150 (actinometry method).

151 Briefly, for the irradiance method, we generated an irradiance field within a 31.5 m<sup>3</sup> cone by  
152 expanding the GUV222 lamp irradiance point source axially following the relationship,  $E \sim$   
153  $1/d^1$ .<sup>52</sup>, and angularly following a relatively tight half-angle of  $\approx 55^\circ$  (equation S4). We then  
154 averaged the projected irradiance over the emission volume to get the effective photon flux. For  
155 the actinometry method, C<sub>2</sub>Cl<sub>4</sub> was introduced to the chamber and the GUV222 lamp was turned  
156 on for four hours to measure the C<sub>2</sub>Cl<sub>4</sub> photolysis rate. Using the measured C<sub>2</sub>Cl<sub>4</sub> photolysis rate,  
157 effective cross section ( $\sigma_{C_2Cl_4}$ ), and reported photolysis quantum yield ( $\Phi_{C_2Cl_4}$ ), we determined  
158 the effective photon flux (equation S8). Between 210 nm and 230 nm, effective GUV222 lamp  
159 powers of  $32.7 \text{ mW m}^{-2}$  and  $21.7 \text{ mW m}^{-2}$  were determined from the irradiance method and  
160 actinometry, respectively. Details of the effective photon flux determination methods are  
161 discussed in the supplemental information.

162 The models both show rapid production of O<sub>3</sub> early in the experiment and on the approach to  
163 steady-state conditions. This rapid rise in O<sub>3</sub> concentration is due to photolytic production and  
164 the relative lack of non-photolytic loss and is consistent with the measured data. For the

165 irradiance method, O<sub>3</sub> levels are over-predicted by  $\approx 33\%$ . We expect over-estimation of the  
166 effective photon flux using this irradiance method because we are not accounting for attenuation  
167 of the incident radiation by interactions with the chamber walls. Ma, et al. (2023) recently  
168 demonstrated that different types of stainless steel reflect 222 nm light reflect with an efficiency  
169 of  $\approx 20\%$ .<sup>24</sup> The 31.5 m<sup>3</sup> modeled conical irradiance field slightly extends beyond the chamber  
170 walls, but the lamp was positioned in a corner of the chamber such that a large volume of the  
171 chamber air was irradiated by the UV light, therefore, our model should be mostly valid. In  
172 reality, a majority of the ozone is created within 2 m of the lamp (Table S1), so the cone  
173 extending beyond the chamber walls results in small overestimation of ozone production.  
174 Accurately accounting for reflectance and exact chamber dimensions would decrease the  
175 effective photon flux and thus modeled O<sub>3</sub> production.

176 In contrast, for the actinometry method, the model underpredicts O<sub>3</sub> levels by  $\approx 11\%$ . An  
177 effective lamp power of 23 mW m<sup>-2</sup> ( $k_{\text{decay}} = 0.17 \text{ h}^{-1}$ ) would be needed to reconcile the 11%  
178 deficit in modeled O<sub>3</sub> production, which is captured by the measured variability of the effective  
179 photon flux determined from actinometry ( $21.7 \pm 1.7 \text{ W m}^{-2}$ ). Despite some discrepancies  
180 between modeled and measured O<sub>3</sub>, our calculations provide evidence to suggest the mechanism  
181 of O<sub>3</sub> production from GUV222 lamps is likely photolysis of O<sub>2</sub> from 222 nm light, and not from  
182 other physical phenomena.

183 **Determination of O<sub>3</sub> Generation Rates from GUV222 Lamps.** In the chamber experiments O<sub>3</sub>  
184 was generated from the GUV222 lamp while simultaneously being lost through air change, gas-  
185 phase reactions, and deposition to surfaces. Thus, the O<sub>3</sub> production rate from the lamp can be  
186 determined by solving for the generation rate (GR) in the transient solution to the mass balance  
187 equation presented in equation 5.

188 
$$[O_3]_t = [O_3]_i e^{-(k_V+k_{decay})t} + \frac{GR}{(k_V+k_{decay})(1-e^{-(k_V+k_{decay})t})} \quad (6)$$

189 Where  $[O_3]_i$  and  $[O_3]_t$  are the initial and time  $t$   $O_3$  mixing ratios,  $V$  is the volume of the chamber  
190 ( $31.5 \text{ m}^3$ ), and  $GR$  is the  $O_3$  generation rate ( $\mu\text{g m}^{-3}$ ).

191 Calculated  $O_3$  production rates from the GUV222 lamp, presented in Table 1, varied within 2%.

192 **Table 1.** Summary of  $O_3$  decay constants, air change rates, and  $O_3$  generation rates.

Experiment	$k_{decay} (\text{h}^{-1})$	$k\dot{V} (\text{h}^{-1})$	GR, $O_3$ generation rate ( $\mu\text{g h}^{-1}$ )
1	0.172	0.010	1126
2	0.176	0.014	1101
3	0.169	0.010	1087
4	0.168	0.011	1087
5	0.167	0.012	1084
6	0.167	0.014	1084
7	0.171	0.012	1104
<b>Average (<math>\pm 2\sigma</math>)</b>	$0.170 \pm 0.003$	$0.012 \pm 0.002$	$1096 \pm 15$

193

194 From an average of seven experiments, the  $O_3$  generation rate from the 222 nm lamp was  
195 measured to be  $1096 \mu\text{g h}^{-1} \pm 15 \mu\text{g h}^{-1}$ .

196 **Conclusions**

197 We measured the spectral irradiance of a commercial GUV222 lamp from 210 nm to 230 nm  
198 showing a peak emission at 222 nm. Results from seven replicate experiments of the single  
199 222 nm commercial GUV222 lamp used in this study yielded a mean O<sub>3</sub> generation rate of  
200 1096 μg h<sup>-1</sup>. O<sub>3</sub> generation rates determined in this study could be used to predict O<sub>3</sub> production  
201 and accumulation in indoor spaces from commercial GUV222 lamps like the one used in this  
202 study. The results observed in this study apply to this lamp and may vary between unit,  
203 manufacturer, and test conditions. For instance, a recent study<sup>24</sup> measured an O<sub>3</sub> generation rate  
204 from an unfiltered GUV222 lamp nearly ten times lower than the average value reported in this  
205 study however that study did not account for the dynamic deposition of O<sub>3</sub> to chamber walls  
206 which likely resulted in lower measured O<sub>3</sub> generation rates. Like the losses of O<sub>3</sub> to chamber  
207 walls and gas-phase reactions observed in this study, similar reactive losses of O<sub>3</sub> generated from  
208 GUV222 devices would be expected in real indoor environments with potential impacts for by-  
209 product formation that would affect indoor air quality.<sup>25</sup> Based on the results from this study we  
210 suggest more measurements of O<sub>3</sub> production should be made from commercial air cleaning  
211 devices employing GUV222 lamps in both real indoor and laboratory settings.

## 212 **Disclaimer**

213 Certain equipment, instruments, or materials, commercial or non-commercial, are identified in  
214 this paper in to specify the experimental procedure adequately. Such identification is not  
215 intended to imply recommendation or endorsement of any product or service by NIST, nor is it  
216 intended to imply that the materials or equipment identified are necessarily the best available for  
217 the purpose.

## 218 **Acknowledgments**

219 We would like to acknowledge James Norris and Peter Trask for calibration of the ozone  
220 instrument used in this study. We would like to thank Howard Yoon and Cameron Miller for  
221 assistance with irradiance calibrations of our UV spectroradiometers. We thank and acknowledge  
222 Jose Jimenez for providing recommendations for experimental design.

## 223 **References**

- 224 (1) Guettari, M.; Gharbi, I.; Hamza, S. UVC disinfection robot. *Environmental Science and Pollution*  
225 *Research* **2021**, *28*, 40394-40399.
- 226 (2) Mousavi, E. S.; Kananizadeh, N.; Martinello, R. A.; Sherman, J. D. COVID-19 outbreak and hospital air  
227 quality: a systematic review of evidence on air filtration and recirculation. *Environmental science &*  
228 *technology* **2020**, *55* (7), 4134-4147.
- 229 (3) Lindsley, W. G.; Derk, R. C.; Coyle, J. P.; Martin Jr, S. B.; Mead, K. R.; Blachere, F. M.; Beezhold, D. H.;  
230 Brooks, J. T.; Boots, T.; Noti, J. D. Efficacy of portable air cleaners and masking for reducing indoor  
231 exposure to simulated exhaled SARS-CoV-2 aerosols—United States, 2021. *Morbidity and Mortality*  
232 *Weekly Report* **2021**, *70* (27), 972.
- 233 (4) Collins, D. B.; Farmer, D. K. Unintended consequences of air cleaning chemistry. *Environmental*  
234 *Science & Technology* **2021**, *55* (18), 12172-12179.
- 235 (5) Cheek, E.; Guercio, V.; Shrubsole, C.; Dimitroulopoulou, S. Portable air purification: Review of impacts  
236 on indoor air quality and health. *Science of the total environment* **2021**, *766*, 142585.
- 237 (6) Narita, K.; Asano, K.; Morimoto, Y.; Igarashi, T.; Nakane, A. Chronic irradiation with 222-nm UVC light  
238 induces neither DNA damage nor epidermal lesions in mouse skin, even at high doses. *PLoS one* **2018**, *13*  
239 (7), e0201259.
- 240 (7) Buonanno, M.; Welch, D.; Shuryak, I.; Brenner, D. J. Far-UVC light (222 nm) efficiently and safely  
241 inactivates airborne human coronaviruses. *Scientific Reports* **2020**, *10* (1), 1-8.
- 242 (8) Ma, B.; Gundy, P. M.; Gerba, C. P.; Sobsey, M. D.; Linden, K. G. UV inactivation of SARS-CoV-2 across  
243 the UVC spectrum: KrCl\* excimer, mercury-vapor, and light-emitting-diode (LED) sources. *Applied and*  
244 *Environmental Microbiology* **2021**, *87* (22), e01532-01521.
- 245 (9) Yoshino, K.; Cheung, A.-C.; Esmond, J.; Parkinson, W.; Freeman, D.; Guberman, S.; Jenouvrier, A.;  
246 Coquart, B.; Merienne, M. Improved absorption cross-sections of oxygen in the wavelength region 205–  
247 240 nm of the Herzberg continuum. *Planetary and space science* **1988**, *36* (12), 1469-1475.
- 248 (10) Yoshino, K.; Esmond, J.; Cheung, A.-C.; Freeman, D.; Parkinson, W. High resolution absorption cross  
249 sections in the transmission window region of the Schumann-Runge bands and Herzberg continuum of  
250 O<sub>2</sub>. *Planetary and Space Science* **1992**, *40* (2-3), 185-192.
- 251 (11) Nicolet, M.; Peetermans, W. Atmospheric absorption in the O<sub>2</sub> Schumann-Runge band spectral  
252 range and photodissociation rates in the stratosphere and mesosphere. *Planetary and Space Science*  
253 **1980**, *28* (1), 85-103.
- 254 (12) Chapman, S. XXXV. On ozone and atomic oxygen in the upper atmosphere. *The London, Edinburgh,*  
255 *and Dublin Philosophical Magazine and Journal of Science* **1930**, *10* (64), 369-383.
- 256 (13) Claus, H. Ozone generation by ultraviolet lamps. *Photochemistry and photobiology* **2021**, *97* (3),  
257 471-476.
- 258 (14) Poppendieck, D.; Hubbard, H.; Ward, M.; Weschler, C.; Corsi, R. Ozone reactions with indoor  
259 materials during building disinfection. *Atmospheric Environment* **2007**, *41* (15), 3166-3176.

- 260 (15) Morrison, G. C.; Eftekhari, A.; Majluf, F.; Krechmer, J. E. Yields and variability of ozone reaction  
261 products from human skin. *Environmental Science & Technology* **2020**, *55* (1), 179-187.
- 262 (16) Nazaroff, W. W.; Weschler, C. J. Indoor ozone: Concentrations and influencing factors. *Indoor air*  
263 **2022**, *32* (1), e12942.
- 264 (17) Peng, Z.; Miller, S. L.; Jimenez, J. L. Model Evaluation of Secondary Chemistry due to Disinfection of  
265 Indoor Air with Germicidal Ultraviolet Lamps. *Environmental Science & Technology Letters* **2022**, *10* (1),  
266 6-13.
- 267 (18) Paur, R. J.; Bass, A. M.; Norris, J. E.; Buckley, T. J. Standard reference photometer for the assay of  
268 ozone in calibration atmospheres. **2021**.
- 269 (19) Peng, Z.; Day D, D.; Symonds, G.; Jenks, O.; Handschy, A. V.; de Gouw, J.; Jimenez, J. L. Significant  
270 Production of Ozone from Germicidal UV Lights at 222 nm. *Environmental Science & Technology Letters*  
271 **2023**, (submitted).
- 272 (20) Blatchley III, E. R.; Brenner, D. J.; Claus, H.; Cowan, T. E.; Linden, K. G.; Liu, Y.; Mao, T.; Park, S.-J.;  
273 Piper, P. J.; Simons, R. M. Far UV-C radiation: An emerging tool for pandemic control. *Critical Reviews in*  
274 *Environmental Science and Technology* **2023**, *53* (6), 733-753.
- 275 (21) Fukui, T.; Niikura, T.; Oda, T.; Kumabe, Y.; Ohashi, H.; Sasaki, M.; Igarashi, T.; Kunisada, M.; Yamano,  
276 N.; Oe, K. Exploratory clinical trial on the safety and bactericidal effect of 222-nm ultraviolet C irradiation  
277 in healthy humans. *PLoS One* **2020**, *15* (8), e0235948.
- 278 (22) Burkholder, J.; Sander, S.; Abbatt, J.; Barker, J.; Cappa, C.; Crouse, J.; Dibble, T.; Huie, R.; Kolb, C.;  
279 Kurylo, M. *Chemical kinetics and photochemical data for use in atmospheric studies; evaluation number*  
280 *19*; Pasadena, CA: Jet Propulsion Laboratory, National Aeronautics and Space ..., 2020.
- 281 (23) Zhang, J.-Y.; Boyd, I.; Esrom, H. UV intensity measurement for a novel 222 nm excimer lamp using  
282 chemical actinometer. *Applied surface science* **1997**, *109*, 482-486.
- 283 (24) Ma, B.; Burke-Bevis, S.; Tiefel, L.; Rosen, J.; Feeney, B.; Linden, K. G. Reflection of UVC wavelengths  
284 from common materials during surface UV disinfection: Assessment of human UV exposure and ozone  
285 generation. *Science of The Total Environment* **2023**, *869*, 161848.
- 286 (25) Graeffe, F.; Luo, Y.; Guo, Y.; Ehn, M. Unwanted Indoor Air Quality Effects from Using Ultraviolet C  
287 Lamps for Disinfection. *Environmental Science & Technology Letters* **2023**.

288