

1 **Air cleaners and respiratory infections in schools: A** 2 **modeling study using epidemiological, environmental,** 3 **and molecular data**

4 Nicolas Banholzer^{1,2}, Philipp Jent^{2,3}, Pascal Bittel^{2,4}, Kathrin Zürcher¹, Lavinia Furrer⁴, Simon
5 Bertschinger¹, Ernest Weingartner⁵, Alban Ramette^{2,4}, Matthias Egger^{1,6,7}, Tina Hascher^{2,8}, and
6 Lukas Fenner^{1*,2}

7
8 ¹Institute of Social and Preventive Medicine, University of Bern, Bern, Switzerland

9 ²Multidisciplinary Center for Infectious Diseases, University of Bern, Bern, Switzerland

10 ³Department of Infectious Diseases, Inselspital, Bern University Hospital, University of Bern, Bern,
11 Switzerland

12 ⁴Institute for Infectious Diseases, University of Bern, Bern, Switzerland

13 ⁵Institute for Sensors and Electronics, University of Applied Sciences and Arts Northwestern
14 Switzerland, Windisch, Switzerland

15 ⁶Population Health Sciences, University of Bristol, Bristol, UK

16 ⁷Centre for Infectious Disease Epidemiology and Research, University of Cape Town, Cape Town,
17 South Africa

18 ⁸Institute of Educational Science, University of Bern, Bern, Switzerland

19 *Corresponding author: lukas.fenner@unibe.ch

20

21

22 **Manuscript information**

23 **Summary:** Using a multiple-measurement approach in a school setting, we found that air cleaners
24 improved air quality, showed a potential benefit in reducing non-SARS-CoV-2 respiratory infections,
25 and were associated with less coughing in a crowded indoor environment.

26 **Word count:** Abstract 249 words, Main text 2,953 words, Summary: 36 words

27 **Display items:** Tables 2, Figures 3

28 **References:** 35

29 **Supporting information:** STROBE checklist, Supplementary Data with texts, tables, and figures.

30 **Abstract**

31 **Background:** Using a multiple-measurement approach, we examined the real-world effectiveness of
32 portable HEPA-air filtration devices (air cleaners) in a school setting.

33 **Methods:** We collected environmental (CO₂, particle concentrations), epidemiological (absences
34 related to respiratory infections), audio (coughing), and molecular data (bioaerosol and saliva
35 samples) over seven weeks during winter 2022/2023 in two Swiss secondary school classes. Using a
36 cross-over study design, we compared particle concentrations, coughing, and the risk of infection
37 with vs without air cleaners.

38 **Results:** All 38 students (age 13–15 years) participated. With air cleaners, mean particle con-
39 centration decreased by 77% (95% credible interval 63%–86%). There were no differences in CO₂
40 levels. Absences related to respiratory infections were 22 without vs 13 with air cleaners. Bayesian
41 modeling suggested a reduced risk of infection, with a posterior probability of 91% and a relative
42 risk of 0.73 (95% credible interval 0.44–1.18). Coughing also tended to be less frequent (posterior
43 probability 93%). Molecular analysis detected mainly non-SARS-CoV-2 viruses in saliva (50/448
44 positive), but not in bioaerosols (2/105 positive) or HEPA-filters (4/160). The detection rate was
45 similar with vs without air cleaners. Spatiotemporal analysis of positive saliva samples identified
46 several likely transmissions.

47 **Conclusions:** Air cleaners improved air quality, showed a potential benefit in reducing respiratory
48 infections, and were associated with less coughing. Airborne detection of non-SARS-CoV-2 viruses
49 was rare, suggesting that these viruses may be more difficult to detect in the air. Future studies should
50 examine the importance of close contact and long-range transmission, and the cost-effectiveness of
51 using air cleaners.

52
53 **Keywords:** schools, air cleaner, respiratory viruses, airborne transmission, molecular detection

54 **Introduction**

55 Transmission of respiratory infections such as SARS-CoV-2 and influenza are difficult to mitigate and
56 control. Person-to-person transmission occurs primarily through the release of respiratory particles
57 containing the viruses. Recently, the focus has been on small respiratory particles called aerosols,
58 which have been found to carry the majority of viruses during respiratory activities.¹ Unlike larger
59 respiratory droplets, which tend to settle quickly, aerosols can remain suspended in the air for several
60 hours and travel long distances.²

61 Improved ventilation systems are critical for a healthy indoor environment and can reduce the risk
62 of respiratory transmission,^{3, 4} especially in schools where students spend most of their time indoors
63 during the week. Portable HEPA-air filtration devices (air cleaners) may be another cost-effective
64 alternative to upgrading ventilation systems, but their impact on respiratory viral transmission is
65 less clear. A population-level study reported a lower incidence of SARS-CoV-2 in US elementary
66 schools using different ventilation strategies, including air filtration devices.⁵ While several studies
67 showed that air cleaners reduce particle concentrations,⁶⁻⁸ an association with viral RNA load in
68 airborne samples could not be found,^{9, 10} although recent studies showed that air cleaners effectively
69 removed SARS-CoV-2 bioaerosols in hospitals and other indoor settings.¹¹⁻¹³ Simulation studies
70 have further demonstrated the efficacy of air cleaners in reducing the risk of indoor transmission
71 of SARS-CoV-2,¹⁴ and other respiratory viruses.¹⁵ However, most simulation studies assume that
72 the detection of RNA equals transmissible virus, despite recent data showing a relevant loss of viral
73 infectivity in respiratory particles over time.¹⁶ To date, it remains unclear whether reducing particle
74 concentrations and removing bioaerosols will reduce indoor transmission of respiratory infections.

75 We used a multiple-measurement approach to study transmission of respiratory viruses under
76 non-pandemic conditions and the effect of air cleaners in a school setting with a cross-over study
77 design in the winter of 2022/2023. We collected environmental data (CO₂, particle concentrations),
78 epidemiological data (absences likely related to respiratory infections), audio recordings (coughing),
79 and molecular data (detection of viruses in bioaerosol and saliva samples) during a seven-week study
80 period from January to March 2023 in two Swiss secondary school classes. We determined changes in
81 particle concentrations, absences related to respiratory infections, coughing, and the rate of positive
82 saliva samples.

83 **Methods**

84 This study is reported as per the Strengthening the Reporting of Observational Studies in
85 Epidemiology guideline (see STROBE checklist).

86 **Study setting and design**

87 We collected data in two classrooms of a secondary school (age of students 14-17 years) in the canton
88 of Solothurn, Switzerland, for seven weeks from January 16 to March 11, 2023. Figure 1 shows the
89 schematic study setup.

90 **Study intervention**

91 We used a cross-over design to study the effectiveness of air cleaners (Table 1). Air cleaners refer
92 to commercially available portable HEPA-filtration devices (Xiaomi Mi Air Pro 70m2, Shenzhen,
93 China). According to the manufacturer, these air cleaners run at clean air delivery rates of 2×600
94 m^3/h . When testing the devices in an empty classroom with sub-micrometer sized particles, we
95 measured a lower effective clean air delivery rate of $2 \times 420 \text{ m}^3/\text{h}$ (Supplementary Text A).

96 **Data collection**

97 An overview of the collected data is provided in Supplementary Text B and Supplementary Table S1.

98

99 **Environmental data**

100 An air quality device (AQ Guard, Palas GmbH, Karlsruhe, Germany) continuously measured
101 indoor CO_2 levels, aerosol number (particle diameter between 175 nm to $20 \mu\text{m}$) and particle mass
102 concentrations (PM; PM_1 , $\text{PM}_{2.5}$, PM_4 , PM_{10}) by minute.⁸

103 **Epidemiological data**

104 At study start, we collected aggregated data on age, sex, COVID-19 vaccination and recovery status
105 in the participating classes. Daily, we collected data on each absent student. For absences due to
106 illness, we recorded symptoms and the date of symptom onset. We defined a case of respiratory
107 infection as an absence in which the student reported an illness with at least one respiratory symptom
108 (Supplementary Text C). All absences are listed in Supplementary Table S2.

109 **Audio recordings and cough detection**

110 We installed portable audio recorders (ZOOM H6; New York, USA) to record sounds continuously.
111 We determined the number of coughs per minute using an AI algorithm.¹⁷ A recent study showed a
112 significant correlation between coughing and airborne viral detection.¹⁰

113 **Molecular data analyses**

114 Both classes participated in repetitive bi-weekly (Tuesdays and Thursdays) saliva testing. Samples
115 were transported to the laboratory and stored at -80°C until further processing.¹⁸ All positive
116 samples are listed in Supplementary Table S3 and Text D. Furthermore, we collected airborne
117 respiratory viruses in both classrooms with a cyclonic bioaerosol sampling device (Coriolis Micro
118 Air, Bertin Instruments Montigny-le-Bretonneux, France), running at 200 l/min and collecting
119 into 15 mL Phosphate-Buffered Saline. The Coriolis Micro Air ran shortly before and during
120 break times (approximately 60 min/day) to minimize noise. In one class, we also sampled with
121 the BioSpot- VIVAS condensation particle growth collection device (Aerosol Devices Inc., Ft. Collins,
122 CO, USA),¹⁹ which operated throughout lessons. The removable parts were regularly autoclaved.
123 At the end of the day, samples were transported to the Institute of Infectious Diseases and stored
124 at -80°C . Finally, we collected swabs from the air cleaners' HEPA filters after each intervention
125 phase (see Table 1). The HEPA filters were removed and divided into 20 fields. One sterile
126 Phosphate-Buffered Saline-moistened swab per field was then taken for a total of 20 swabs per
127 filter.

128 Prior to the real-time (RT)-PCR analysis, daily bioaerosol samples were combined for each
129 sampling device and filtered using Amicon Ultra-15 Centrifugal Filters with Ultracel 10,000 Dalton
130 molecular weight cutoffs filters (UFC9010; MilliporeSigma, Burlington, USA) to a volume of 1 mL.
131 Saliva samples were analyzed directly without prior filtration. The Allplex RV Master Assay
132 (Seegene, Seoul, South Korea) detects a panel of 19 major respiratory viruses and viral subtypes,
133 including SARS-CoV-2, influenza, respiratory syncytial, metapneumovirus, adenovirus, rhinovirus,
134 and parainfluenza.

135 We also performed molecular genotyping for positive saliva, bioaerosol, and air filter samples of
136 adenovirus and influenza.²⁰

137 **Statistical analyses and modeling**

138 All statistical analyses were described in a statistical analysis plan²¹. Bioaerosol samples and viral
139 load concentrations could not be analyzed because there were too few positive samples. Further
140 minor deviations from the statistical analysis plan are documented in Supplementary Texts E–H,
141 including detailed descriptions of the models.

142 **Particle concentrations**

143 We compared daily mean particle concentrations between study conditions (Supplementary
144 Figure S1). We estimated the reduction in particle concentrations with air cleaners using
145 Bayesian log-linear regression models, adjusting for observed confounders (Supplementary Text
146 E).

147 **Risk of infection**

148 We estimated the relative risk of infection with air cleaners using a Bayesian latent variable regression
149 model (Supplementary Text F). The number of new respiratory cases C (observed absences related
150 to respiratory infections by date of symptom onset) on day t in class j are modeled with a Negative
151 Binomial distribution. The expected number of new cases is the weighted sum of the number of
152 new infections I_{js} (latent variable) in the previous days $s < t$, with the weights corresponding to the
153 probability distribution of the incubation period (Supplementary Figure S2). The number of new
154 infections is related to the presence of air cleaners as follows:

$$155 \log I_{js} = \log F_{js} - \log N_{js} + \beta_0 + \beta_1 \cdot \text{AirCleaner}_{js}, \quad (1)$$

157 where F_{js} is the number of infections in the previous week (a proxy for the number of infectious
158 students), N_{js} is the cumulative number of infections (a proxy for the number of susceptible students),
159 β_0 is the infection rate without air cleaners, and β_1 is the effect of air cleaners. Furthermore, the
160 effect of air cleaners is adjusted for class-specific effects, the number of students in class, the daily
161 air change rate, and the weekly positivity rate for COVID-19 and the consultations for influenza-like
162 illnesses in the canton.
163

164 **Coughing**

165 We estimated the reduction in the daily number of coughs with air cleaners using a Bayesian
166 Negative Binomial regression model, using time in class as the model offset and adjusting for

167 observed confounders (Supplementary Text G). In addition, we estimated the association between
168 the number of coughs and the virus-specific number of positive saliva samples, using only the days
169 when saliva samples were collected (Tuesdays and Thursdays, for a total of 27 days).

170 **Saliva samples**

171 We analyzed the number of positive saliva samples with a Bayesian Multinomial logistic regression
172 model (Supplementary Text H) and linked the expected number of positive samples to the presence
173 of air cleaners, adjusting for the cumulative number of positive tests.

174 **Software**

175 All analyses were performed in R software (version 4.2.0) and model parameters estimated in Stan
176 (version 2.21.0).^{22, 23} For each outcome, we report the posterior probability of a reduction with air
177 cleaners. The estimated reduction is reported with the posterior mean and 95% credible interval
178 (CrI).

179 **Ethics statement**

180 The Ethics Committee of the canton of Bern, Switzerland, approved the study (reference no. 2021-
181 02377). For the saliva samples, we included all students who were willing to participate and obtained
182 written informed consent from their caregivers.

183 **Results**

184 The study population consisted of 38 students (age 13–15 years, 19/19 female/male; Table 2).
185 Seven students had been vaccinated or recovered from a SARS-CoV-2 infection within the last four
186 months. During the seven-week study period (total of 1,330 student-days), students were absent
187 from school for 220 days (18% of the total) of which 129 days (59% of absences) were due to illness.

188 **Air quality**

189 The mean aerosol number concentration was 95 1/cm³ (standard deviation [SD] 81 1/cm³) without vs
190 27 1/cm³ (SD 34 1/cm³) with air cleaners (Figure 2a). The Bayesian regression model suggested a clear
191 reduction in the aerosol concentration with air cleaners, with a posterior probability of 100%. The
192 model-estimated decrease was 76% (95%-CrI 63% to 86%), which was greater for larger (PM₁₀) than
193 for smaller (PM₁₋₄) particles (Supplementary Figure S3, Supplementary Table S4). Daily mean
194 CO₂ levels were comparable between study conditions (1,636 ppm (SD 341 ppm) without vs
195 1,769 ppm (SD 391 ppm) with air cleaners). There was little change in other environmental
196 variables (Supplementary Figure S4).

197 **Risk of infection**

198 Absences related to respiratory infections included 22 cases without vs 13 cases with air cleaners
199 (Figure 2b). The Bayesian latent variable hierarchical regression model suggested that air cleaners
200 reduced the risk of infection, with a posterior probability of 91%. The adjusted relative risk of
201 infection with air cleaners was 0.73 (95%-CrI 0.44 to 1.18). The estimated number of respiratory
202 infections in school would have been 19 (95%-CrI 9 to 37) if air cleaners had been installed throughout
203 the study period, compared to 36 (95%-CrI 12 to 92) infections if air cleaners had not been installed.
204 Detailed estimation results are provided in Supplementary Information (Supplementary Text J,
205 Supplementary Figure S5, Supplementary Table S5).

206 **Coughing**

207 On average, we detected 3.1 coughs/min (SD 1.2 coughs/min) without vs 2.6 coughs/min (SD
208 1.1 coughs/min) with air cleaners (Figure 2c). The Bayesian model suggested that coughing was less
209 frequent with air cleaners, with a posterior probability of 93%. The adjusted relative risk of coughing
210 with air cleaners was 0.93 (95%-CrI 0.85 to 1.02). Coughing was associated with virus-specific
211 transmission (Supplementary Figure S6).

212 **Saliva samples**

213 We analyzed a total of 448 saliva samples. We detected 15 influenza B, 15 rhinovirus, 14 adenovirus,
214 3 SARS-CoV-2, 2 metapneumovirus, and 1 parainfluenza virus, respectively (Figure 3a). There were
215 25 positive saliva samples in both study conditions (Figure 2d) and, based on the Bayesian model,
216 the posterior probability that air cleaners reduced the positivity rate was 65%, with an adjusted
217 relative risk of 0.93 (95%-CrI 0.49 to 1.61). The estimated relative risk was not sensitive to infection
218 to testing delays (Supplementary Figure S7).

219 **Transmission patterns**

220 The distribution of positive saliva samples varied between classes. For example, all but one sample
221 was positive for adenovirus in class A during the first three study weeks, while the vast majority
222 of positive influenza B samples were found in class B. To illustrate possible transmission chains
223 within classes, we linked positive saliva samples of the same virus that were less than one week apart.
224 Based on this spatiotemporal analysis, we identified 10 possible transmission chains (Figure 3b).
225 The longest potential transmission chains occurred in January, referring to a cluster of adenovirus
226 infections in class A and influenza B infections in class B. Molecular genotyping to verify the
227 proposed transmission network was unsuccessful because we could not amplify and sequence any
228 of the gene targets. We also analyzed 105 bioaerosol samples and detected in two of them viral
229 RNA (1 rhinovirus in class A and 1 adenovirus in class B). Similarly, we detected 1 influenza B,
230 1 rhinovirus, 1 adenovirus, and 1 SARS-CoV-2 in the 20 swabs taken from each filter of an air cleaner
231 after each intervention phase (160 swabs in total).

232 **Discussion**

233 We used a multiple-measurement approach within a cross-over study design to estimate the risk
234 of respiratory virus infection in a Swiss school and to assess the effectiveness of air cleaners. We
235 found a wide range of respiratory viruses in saliva samples, mainly adenovirus, influenza B, and
236 rhinovirus, but very few viral RNA was detected in bioaerosol samples and on the filters of the
237 air cleaners. Particle mass concentrations decreased significantly with air cleaners, and Bayesian
238 modeling based on epidemiological data indicated a reduction in the relative risk of infection with
239 air cleaners. Coughing was reduced, compatible with air cleaners preventing some symptomatic
240 infections.

241 We detected a range of respiratory virus in students' saliva, mainly adenovirus, influenza B
242 and rhinovirus, with only three positive SARS-CoV-2 saliva samples. In a previous, similar study
243 in the same setting, we estimated the effectiveness of mask wearing and air cleaners during the
244 SARS-CoV-2 omicron wave in the winter of 2021/2022 and detected almost exclusively SARS-CoV-2
245 in the students' saliva.⁸ A similar shift in the pattern of respiratory viruses has been observed in
246 other studies.^{24, 25} We found a reduction in the risk of SARS-CoV-2 infection for mask wearing, but
247 not for air cleaners, possibly because the air cleaners were introduced only at the end of the study,
248 when most students were already infected with SARS-CoV-2.

249 It is well documented that air cleaners improve indoor air quality.⁶⁻⁸ There are several reasons
250 why the effect of air cleaners is probably smaller than universal mask wearing, which has been
251 shown to be a very effective infection control measure.^{5, 8, 26, 27} Unlike masks, air cleaners cannot
252 prevent transmission outside the classroom or transmission due to close range, high particle density.
253 Prolonged and close contact may be necessary for transmission of some respiratory viruses,^{26, 28}
254 or make transmission more likely despite prior vaccination or infection.²⁹ Our results further
255 suggests that air cleaners are more effective at removing larger particles ($> 5\mu\text{m}$), which also explains
256 the difference between our measured and the manufacturer's reported clean air delivery rate (see
257 Supplementary Text A). However, many respiratory viruses are carried in smaller particles, which
258 are more relevant for transmission ($\leq 5\mu\text{m}$).¹ Finally, classroom activity, airflow and other unobserved,
259 confounding factors make it challenging to evaluate the effects of air cleaners on transmission in
260 real-world settings.

261 The beneficial effects of air cleaners on indoor air quality and transmission come at a reasonable
262 cost. The portable air cleaners used in our study cost approximately USD 250 per unit. Their
263 operating cost-effectiveness in providing clean air could be even higher than that of a ventilation
264 system when compared in parallel using the same air delivery ratings.³⁰ Therefore, air cleaners could
265 be a cost-effective public health measure, particularly during pandemics or epidemics when there is
266 greater exposure to respiratory infections, and greater concern of becoming infected.³¹ However,
267 their acceptance may be hindered by noise, space limitations, technical issues, and maintenance
268 requirements.³² Therefore, investments in professional building ventilation systems are still preferred
269 in the long run.³³

270 We detected only few respiratory viruses in bioaerosol samples (1 sample of adenovirus and
271 1 sample of rhinovirus) and on the filters of the air cleaners (4 positive samples). The low rate of
272 positive bioaerosol samples may indicate that it is unlikely that airborne transmission occurred in
273 classrooms. It may be possible that students had relatively little exposure to respiratory viruses at
274 school and acquired their infections elsewhere. However, the distribution of positive saliva samples
275 markedly differed between classes. Adenovirus spread in class A during the first three study weeks,
276 with only two infections of influenza B over the study period. In contrast, influenza B spread
277 throughout the study in class B, and adenovirus infections were detected only in the last week of
278 the study. Furthermore, adenovirus infections tend to be mild,³⁴ and less frequently associated with
279 cough than influenza,³⁵ consistent with the comparatively lower frequency of coughing in class B.
280 Taken together, the class-specific, spatiotemporal patterns indicate that transmission of respiratory
281 infections may have occurred within the classrooms.

282 Our study has limitations. Aerosol measurements and molecular detection of viruses in bioaerosol
283 samples document exposure, but not transmission and the direction of transmission (person to air,
284 air to person) cannot be determined. Further, the reasons for school absences were self-reported
285 by students and some absences may have been incorrectly attributed to respiratory infections. In
286 addition, we could only approximate the incubation period for each epidemiological case. Finally,
287 although the study results are likely to apply to many settings in Switzerland and other European
288 countries, they will not be applicable to settings in the global South.

289 In conclusion, a wide range of respiratory viruses, but rarely SARS-CoV-2, was detected in
290 students under non-pandemic conditions when public health measures were lifted. Airborne detection

291 was rare, suggesting that respiratory viruses other than SARS-CoV-2 may be more difficult to detect
292 and that prolonged close contact may be required for transmission. The risk reduction of respiratory
293 infections conferred by air cleaners may be modest at the individual level, but the benefit at the
294 population level in terms of illness and absences prevented is likely to be important. Future studies
295 should examine the cost-effectiveness of using air cleaners in congregate settings.

296 **Acknowledgements**

297 We would like to thank the schools, teachers, and students participating in the study. We are
298 grateful to the Educational Department of the canton of Solothurn for their support throughout the
299 study. We would also like to thank Ronald Dijkman for the influenza molecular genotyping and the
300 biosecurity team (Julia Feldmann, Monika Gsell, Kathrina Summermatter) from the Institute for
301 Infectious Diseases at the University of Bern for their assistance with the bioaerosol devices. Finally,
302 we are indebted to the student assistants (Khadija Ahmed, Marie-Joséphine Brancato, Michelle
303 Bürki, Santiago Martinez, Moric Toszeghi, Sylvain Wasmer) who helped with the data collection in
304 the schools.

305 **Data availability**

307 Preprocessed data and code are available from <https://osf.io/38j9g>.
308

309 **Funding**

310 This work was supported by the Multidisciplinary Center for Infectious Diseases, University of Bern,
311 Switzerland. NB, LF, and ME are supported by the National Institute of Allergy and Infectious
312 Diseases (NIAID) through cooperative agreement 5U01-AI069924-05. ME is supported by special
313 project funding from the Swiss National Science Foundation (grant 32FP30-189498). The funder of
314 the study had no role in study design, data collection, data analysis, data interpretation, or writing
315 of the report.

316 **Author contributions**

318 Conception and design: NB, KZ, LF, PB, PJ, TS. Epidemiological and environmental data collection:
319 EW, NB, PJ, KZ, TS, LF. Laboratory data collection: PB, LFu. Additional data collection: TH.
320 Cough detection: SB. Molecular genotyping: AR, PB, LFu. Statistical analysis: NB. Paper draft:
321 NB, LF, ME. All authors reviewed and approved the final version of the manuscript.

322 **References**

- 323 1. Fennelly KP. Particle sizes of infectious aerosols: Implications for infection control. *Lancet*
324 *Respir Med.* 2020;8(9):914–924. doi:10.1016/S2213-2600(20)30323-4.
- 325 2. Wang C, Pan R, Wan X, Tan Y, Xu L, Ho CS, et al. Immediate psychological responses and
326 associated factors during the initial stage of the 2019 Coronavirus Disease (COVID-19) epidemic
327 among the general population in China. *Int J Environ Res Public Health.* 2020;17(5):E1729.
328 doi:10.3390/ijerph17051729.
- 329 3. Wang CC, Prather KA, Sznitman J, Jimenez JL, Lakdawala SS, Tufekci Z, et al. Airborne trans-
330 mission of respiratory viruses. *Science.* 2021;373(6558):eabd9149. doi:10.1126/science.abd9149.
- 331 4. Morawska L, Allen J, Bahnfleth W, Bluyssen PM, Boerstra A, Buonanno G, et al. A
332 paradigm shift to combat indoor respiratory infection. *Science.* 2021;372(6543):689–691.
333 doi:10.1126/science.abg2025.
- 334 5. Gettings J, Czarnik M, Morris E, Haller E, Thompson-Paul AM, Rasberry C, et al.
335 Mask use and ventilation improvements to reduce COVID-19 incidence in elementary
336 schools — Georgia, November 16–December 11, 2020. *MMWR.* 2021;70(21):779–784.
337 doi:10.15585/mmwr.mm7021e1.
- 338 6. Park JH, Lee TJ, Park MJ, Oh H, Jo YM. Effects of air cleaners and school characteristics
339 on classroom concentrations of particulate matter in 34 elementary schools in Korea. *Build*
340 *Environ.* 2020;167:106437. doi:10.1016/j.buildenv.2019.106437.
- 341 7. Buising KL, Schofield R, Irving L, Keywood M, Stevens A, Keogh N, et al. Use of portable
342 air cleaners to reduce aerosol transmission on a hospital coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19)
343 ward. *Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol.* 2022;43(8):987–992. doi:10.1017/ice.2021.284.
- 344 8. Banholzer N, Zürcher K, Jent P, Bittel P, Furrer L, Egger M, et al. SARS-CoV-2 transmission
345 with and without mask wearing or air cleaners in schools in Switzerland: A modeling study
346 of epidemiological, environmental, and molecular data. *PLOS Med.* 2023;20(5):e1004226.
347 doi:10.1371/journal.pmed.1004226.

- 348
- 349 **9.** Nor NSM, Yip CW, Ibrahim N, Jaafar MH, Rashid ZZ, Mustafa N, et al. Particulate matter
350 (PM_{2.5}) as a potential SARS-CoV-2 carrier. *Sci Rep.* 2021;11:2508. doi:10.1038/s41598-021-
351 81935-9.
- 352 **10.** Hanna F, Alameddine I, Zaraket H, Alkalamouni H, El-Fadel M. Airborne influenza virus
353 shedding by patients in health care units: Removal mechanisms affecting virus transmission.
354 *PLOS One.* 2023;18(10):e0290124. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0290124.
- 355 **11.** Conway Morris A, Sharrocks K, Bousfield R, Kermack L, Maes M, Higginson E, et al. The
356 removal of airborne Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) and
357 other microbial bioaerosols by air filtration on Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) surge
358 units. *Clin Infect Dis.* 2022;75(1):e97–e101. doi:10.1093/cid/ciab933.
- 359 **12.** Ueki H, Ujie M, Komori Y, Kato T, Imai M, Kawaoka Y. Effectiveness of HEPA fil-
360 ters at removing infectious SARS-CoV-2 from the air. *mSphere.* 2022;7(4):e00086–22.
361 doi:10.1128/msphere.00086-22.
- 362 **13.** Myers NT, Laumbach RJ, Black KG, Ohman-Strickland P, Alimokhtari S, Legard A, et al.
363 Portable air cleaners and residential exposure to SARS-CoV-2 aerosols: A real-world study.
364 *Indoor Air.* 2022;32(4):e13029. doi:10.1111/ina.13029.
- 365 **14.** Lindsley WG, Derk RC, Coyle JP, Martin SB, Mead KR, Blachere FM, et al. Efficacy of portable
366 air cleaners and masking for reducing indoor exposure to simulated exhaled SARS-CoV-2 aerosols
367 — United States, 2021. *MMWR.* 2021;70(27):972–976. doi:10.15585/mmwr.mm7027e1.
- 368
- 369 **15.** Cortellessa G, Canale C, Stabile L, Grossi G, Buonanno G, Arpino F. Effectiveness of a portable
370 personal air cleaner in reducing the airborne transmission of respiratory pathogens. *Build
371 Environ.* 2023;235:110222. doi:10.1016/j.buildenv.2023.110222.
- 372 **16.** Oswin HP, Haddrell AE, Otero-Fernandez M, Mann JFS, Cogan TA, Hilditch TG, et al. The
373 dynamics of SARS-CoV-2 infectivity with changes in aerosol microenvironment. *Proc Natl Acad
374 Sci.* 2022;119(27):e2200109119. doi:10.1073/pnas.2200109119.
- 375 **17.** Bertschinger S, Fenner L, Denecke K. Feasibility of Cough Detection and Classification Using
376 Artificial Intelligence in an Ambulatory Setting with a Ceiling Mounted Microphone. In: *IEEE*

- 377
378 36th International Symposium on Computer-Based Medical Systems (CBMS); 2023. p. 660–665.
379 doi:10.1109/CBMS58004.2023.00296.
- 380 **18.** Huber M, Schreiber PW, Scheier T, Audigé A, Buonomano R, Rudiger A, et al. High efficacy
381 of saliva in detecting SARS-CoV-2 by RT-PCR in adults and children. *Microorganisms*.
382 2021;9(3):642. doi:10.3390/microorganisms9030642.
- 383 **19.** Lednicky J, Pan M, Loeb J, Hsieh H, Eiguren-Fernandez A, Hering S, et al. Highly efficient
384 collection of infectious pandemic influenza H1N1 virus (2009) through laminar-flow water based
385 condensation. *Aerosol Sci Tech*. 2016;50(7):i–iv. doi:10.1080/02786826.2016.1179254.
- 386 **20.** Kelly JN, Laloli L, V'kovski P, Holwerda M, Portmann J, Thiel V, et al. Comprehensive single
387 cell analysis of pandemic influenza A virus infection in the human airways uncovers cell-type
388 specific host transcriptional signatures relevant for disease progression and pathogenesis. *Front*
389 *Immunol*. 2022;13. doi:10.3389/fimmu.2022.978824.
- 390 **21.** Banholzer N, Jent P, Bittel P, Furrer L, Egger M, Hascher T, et al.. Transmission of airborne
391 respiratory infections with and without air cleaners in a school in Switzerland: A modeling
392 study of epidemiological, environmental, and molecular data – Statistical analysis plan (SAP);
393 2023. Available from: <https://osf.io/krcms> [last accessed 2023-05-24].
- 394 **22.** Carpenter B, Gelman A, Hoffman MD, Lee D, Goodrich B, Betancourt M, et al. Stan: A
395 probabilistic programming language. *J Stat Softw*. 2017;76:1–32. doi:10.18637/jss.v076.i01.
- 396 **23.** Hoffman MD, Gelman A. The No-U-Turn Sampler: Adaptively setting path lengths in Hamilto-
397 nian Monte Carlo. *J Mach Learn Res*. 2014;15:1593–1623. doi:10.5555/2627435.2638586.
- 398 **24.** Nygaard U, Hartling UB, Nielsen J, Vestergaard LS, Dungu KHS, Nielsen JSA, et al. Hospital
399 admissions and need for mechanical ventilation in children with respiratory syncytial virus
400 before and during the COVID-19 pandemic: A Danish nationwide cohort study. *Lancet Child*
401 *Adolesc*. 2023;7(3):171–179. doi:10.1016/S2352-4642(22)00371-6.
- 402 **25.** Sauteur PMM, Beeton ML, Uldum SA, Bossuyt N, Vermeulen M, Loens K, et al. *Mycoplasma*
403 *pneumoniae* detections before and during the COVID-19 pandemic: Results of a global survey,
404 2017 to 2021. *Euro Surveill*. 2022;27(19):2100746. doi:10.2807/1560-7917.ES.2022.27.19.2100746.

- 405
- 406 **26.** Leung NHL, Chu DKW, Shiu EYC, Chan KH, McDevitt JJ, Hau BJP, et al. Respiratory
407 virus shedding in exhaled breath and efficacy of face masks. *Nat Med.* 2020;26(5):676–680.
408 doi:10.1038/s41591-020-0843-2.
- 409 **27.** Milton DK, Fabian MP, Cowling BJ, Grantham ML, McDevitt JJ. Influenza virus aerosols in
410 human exhaled breath: Particle size, culturability, and effect of surgical masks. *PLOS Pathog.*
411 2013;9(3):e1003205. doi:10.1371/journal.ppat.1003205.
- 412 **28.** Brankston G, Gitterman L, Hirji Z, Lemieux C, Gardam M. Transmission of influenza A in
413 human beings. *Lancet Infect Dis.* 2007;7(4):257–265. doi:10.1016/S1473-3099(07)70029-4.
- 414 **29.** Lind ML, Dorion M, Houde AJ, Lansing M, Lapidus S, Thomas R, et al. Evidence of leaky
415 protection following COVID-19 vaccination and SARS-CoV-2 infection in an incarcerated
416 population. *Nat Commun.* 2023;14:5055. doi:10.1038/s41467-023-40750-8.
- 417 **30.** Noh KC, Yook SJ. Evaluation of clean air delivery rates and operating cost effectiveness for
418 room air cleaner and ventilation system in a small lecture room. *Energy Build.* 2016;119:111–118.
419 doi:10.1016/j.enbuild.2016.03.027.
- 420 **31.** Yürekli H, Yiğit OE, Bulut O, Lu M, Öz E. Exploring factors that affected student well-being
421 during the COVID-19 pandemic: A comparison of data-mining approaches. *Int J Environ Res*
422 *Public Health.* 2022;19(18):11267. doi:10.3390/ijerph191811267.
- 423 **32.** Sanguinetti A, Outcault S, Pistochini T, Hoffacker M. Understanding teachers’ experiences of
424 ventilation in California K-12 classrooms and implications for supporting safe operation of schools
425 in the wake of the COVID-19 pandemic. *Indoor Air.* 2022;32(2):e12998. doi:10.1111/ina.12998.
- 426 **33.** Nardell EA. Transmission and institutional infection control of tuberculosis. *Cold Spring Harb*
427 *Perspect Med.* 2016;6(2):a018192. doi:10.1101/cshperspect.a018192.
- 428 **34.** Kunz AN, Ottolini M. The role of adenovirus in respiratory tract infections. *Curr Infect Dis*
429 *Rep.* 2010;12(2):81–87. doi:10.1007/s11908-010-0084-5.
- 430 **35.** Ma X, Conrad T, Alchikh M, Reiche J, Schweiger B, Rath B. Can we distinguish respiratory
431 viral infections based on clinical features? A prospective pediatric cohort compared to systematic
432 literature review. *Rev Med Virol.* 2018;28(5):e1997. doi:10.1002/rmv.1997.

433 **Table 1. Cross-over study design.** Description of when portable air cleaners (PAC) were installed in the
434 rooms of classes A and B during a seven-week study period from January 16 to March 11, 2023, excluding a
435 week of vacation from February 6 to 11.
436


	Week 1 Jan 16-21	Week 2 Jan 23-28	Week 3 Jan 30-Feb 3	Vacation Feb 6-11	Week 4 Feb 13-18	Week 5 Feb 20-25	Week 6 Feb 27-Mar 3	Week 7 Mar 6-11
A	PAC	PAC *	None		None	None	PAC	PAC *
B	None	None	PAC *		PAC	PAC *	None	None

441 * Swabs from the HEPA filters taken after each intervention phase and before the vacation.

442
443

Table 2. Overview of the study population and person-days of absences.

	Class A	Class B	Total
Students	20 (53%)	18 (47%)	38 (100%)
<i>Gender</i>			
- Female	11 (55%)	8 (44%)	19 (50%)
- Male	9 (45%)	10 (56%)	19 (50%)
<i>Immunity status</i>			
- Recently vaccinated (or recovered)	7 (39%)	0 (0%)	7 (18%)
- Not recently vaccinated (or recovered)	11 (61%)	20 (100%)	31 (82%)
Absent person-days	110 (50%)	110 (50%)	220 (100%)
- Sickness	52 (47%)	77 (70%)	129 (59%)
- Other	58 (53%)	33 (30%)	91 (41%)



444

445


446

447

448

449

Fig 1. Study setting. Schematic study setup of the classrooms. One air cleaner was placed in the front and one in the back of the classrooms. All devices were placed at the head level of the students when they were seated. Both classrooms lacked an active HVAC (Heating, Ventilation, Air conditioning) system, but they were ventilated naturally by opening windows at the discretion of the teachers.



450

451

452

453


454

455

456

457

Fig 2. Comparison of outcomes with vs without air cleaners. At the top of each plot, the posterior probability for a reduction with air cleaners is shown, based on the Bayesian model. **(a)** Daily average aerosol number concentrations as boxplots. **(b)** Number of respiratory cases. **(c)** Daily average number of detected coughs per minute as boxplots. **(d)** Number of positive saliva samples.



458

459

460

461

462

463

464

Fig 3. Molecular detection of respiratory viruses and transmission network based on spatiotemporal analysis of students' saliva samples. (a) Number of positive saliva samples by virus. **(b)** Daily number of positive saliva samples (colored circles) and possible transmission chains within classes (directed arrows). Positive samples are linked if they belong to the same virus and are less than 1 week apart. Positive samples from the air and filters as blank squares aligned. IFB: influenza B, HRV: human rhinovirus, AdV: adenovirus, CoV: SARS-CoV-2, MPV: human metapneumovirus, PIV: parainfluenza virus.