

1 Air cleaning reduces incident infections in day care - an interventional crossover study

2

3 Ville Vartiainen^{1*}, Inga Ehder-Gahm², Johanna Hela³, Anni Luoto^{4,5}, Jussi-Pekka Juvela⁶, Petra
4 Nikuri¹, Aimo Taipale², Natalia Lastovets⁴, Sampo Saari⁶, Ilpo Kulmala², Arto Säämänen², Enni
5 Sanmark^{7,†}, Piia Sormunen^{4,5,†}

6 1. Heart and lung center, Helsinki University Hospital and Faculty of Medicine, University of
7 Helsinki, Finland

8 2. VTT Technical Research Centre of Finland Ltd, Finland

9 3. Children and Adolescents, Helsinki University Hospital and Faculty of Social Sciences,
10 University of Helsinki, Finland.

11 4. Granlund Oy, Finland

12 5. Tampere University, Faculty of Built Environment, Civil Engineering

13 6. Tampere University of Applied Sciences, Finland

14 7. Department of Otorhinolaryngology and Phoniatics - Head and Neck Surgery, University
15 of Helsinki and Helsinki University Hospital, Helsinki, Finland.

16

17 † contributed equally

18 *corresponding author

19 ville.vartiainen@helsinki.fi

20 **Abstract**

21 **Background** While possibility of airborne transmission in the spread of common respiratory
22 infections, there is no consensus on the relative importance of airborne infection route in real-
23 life. This study aimed to investigate the significance of the airborne transmissions and the
24 effectiveness of air cleaning in reducing infections among children in daycare.

25 **Methods** A cross-over study was conducted in four daycare centers in Helsinki. All children
26 attending the daycare were invited to participate (n = 262) and the sole inclusion criterion was
27 that the children were expected to stay in the same day care center for the two-year duration of
28 the study. 51 subjects were included in the final analysis. Clean air flow rate was increased by
29 2.1-2.9 times compared to baseline mechanical ventilation of the premises. The effect of
30 intervention was assessed using negative binomial regression.

31 **Results** The intervention reduced incident infections from 0.95 to 0.78 infections per child per
32 month among the children (primary outcome) in daycare. The reduction attributed to intervention
33 in the statistical model was 18.0 % (95% CI 2.1-31.3 %, p = 0.028).

34 **Conclusions** We observed a significant decrease in incident infections without implementing
35 any other infection mitigation strategies but air cleaning. Our results challenge the current
36 paradigm which emphasizes fomite and contact transmission and infection control measures
37 that target these pathways. As ventilation and air cleaning can only affect particles able to float
38 in the air stream, our results support the significance of airborne transmission among common
39 respiratory pathogens as well as air cleaning as an infection control measure.

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

51 Introduction

52 Prior to the Covid-19 pandemic, it was generally accepted within the scientific community that
53 the predominant modes of transmission for common respiratory viruses were through droplets
54 or direct contact, while aerosol transmission was considered primarily associated with specific
55 pathogens such as tuberculosis or measles, or specific high risk conditions.¹ At that time,
56 droplets were simply defined as particles exceeding five micrometers in diameter and thought to
57 settle within a radius of less than one meter.² Conversely, airborne transmission was defined as
58 the dissemination of droplet nuclei that remain infectious and suspended in the air for extended
59 periods and over greater distances.² However, the surge in research during the Covid-19
60 pandemic significantly revised the prevailing understanding of aerosol classification and the
61 transmission mechanisms of respiratory infections.^{3,4} Correspondingly, the growing evidence
62 highlights the possibility of airborne transmission in the spread of common respiratory
63 infections.^{5,6} However, there is no consensus on the relative importance and role of airborne
64 infection in real-life. While WHO no longer promotes strict division between aerosols and
65 ballistic droplets or any specific size of infectious respiratory particles, it still does not
66 recommend adequate measures to control or prevent the spread of airborne.^{7,8} Instead it has
67 called for better evidence on transmission routes and mitigation strategies of common
68 respiratory pathogens.⁸

69 In natural settings, the significance of the airborne transmission can be demonstrated by
70 examining interventions that specifically limit only aerosol transmission such as ventilation and
71 air cleaning. Increased mechanical ventilation leads to greater dilution and removal of aerosols,
72 resulting in lower airborne pathogen concentrations. It is also shown that ventilation has only a
73 minimal effect on large ballistic droplets that do not remain suspended in the air stream.⁹ There
74 is also similar evidence for the effectiveness of air cleaners. They have been demonstrated to
75 significantly reduce particle numbers¹⁰ and air filters equipped with High Efficiency Particulate
76 Air (HEPA) filtration technology have been shown to decrease the presence of SARS-CoV-2
77 and other bioaerosols in air samples¹¹. Air cleaners are proposed as a quick solution for spaces
78 where the ventilation is insufficient. Although the effectiveness of ventilation and air cleaners in
79 reducing the risk of infectious diseases has been discussed¹²⁻¹⁴, high-quality controlled
80 intervention studies demonstrating the benefits of air cleaners or effective ventilation are
81 lacking.

82 Respiratory infections are the most prevalent among children in early childhood education, with
83 numerous episodes often occurring within a single year.¹ However, common prevention and
84 control measures such as masks, social distancing, and hand hygiene are implemented
85 inadequately or not at all among children. Thus, previously prevention and control have primarily
86 been based on absences during illness.¹⁵ For these reasons, daycare provides an excellent
87 platform for investigating the relative importance of airborne transmission of common infection
88 diseases in a real-life setting. Concurrently, illnesses among daycare children also have
89 significant health and economic impacts on society, necessitating effective infection control
90 measures.¹⁵

91 In this study, we present the results of a multidisciplinary effort by medical professionals,
92 aerosol physicists, and building system engineers aiming to assess the added benefit of air

93 cleaning on common respiratory infections in buildings with modern mechanical ventilation and
94 to explore its implications on the transmission routes of these diseases.

95 **Materials and Methods**

96 The study was conducted in four day care centers in Helsinki, Finland. Day care centers served
97 between 85 - 123 children each, all aged one to six years and the staff comprised 19 to 21
98 members. Due to nature of this study, randomization on an individual level was not possible but
99 the day care centers were randomized in two sequences with day cares A and B in Intervention-
100 Control sequence and day cares C and D in Control-Intervention sequence. The study included
101 two periods 11/22-4/23 and 11/23-4/24. Children expected to attend the whole duration of the
102 study were invited to participate and the recruitment was conducted during October 2022. There
103 were no exclusion criteria. Subjects who withdrew their consent or did not answer
104 questionnaires during both winters of the study were excluded from the final study population
105 (FIG 1). The sample size was calculated as described by Lui for AB/BA crossover using Poisson
106 regression with $\alpha = 0.05$ and $\beta = 0.80$.¹⁶ The number of infections in control group was assumed
107 to be 10 and RR 0.9. With estimated drop out rate of 20% the required sample size was
108 estimated to be $N = 188$.

109 The day care centers were built in 2001, 2002, 2009, and 2013 and were equipped with
110 modern mechanical ventilation systems meeting with current building code. The ventilation
111 systems of all buildings were examined and maintenance prior to the initiation of the study. The
112 ventilation systems air handling units were equipped with heat recovery (no recirculation air)
113 and were operated during working days from 4:00 am to 6:00 pm in all buildings. The day care
114 centers were located in the same district in the city of Helsinki.

115 The intervention consisted of a total of 45 portable room air cleaners (PAC) alongside the
116 existing ventilation systems. Most of the air cleaners were tested in the laboratory applying
117 ANSI/AHAM AC-1-2020 test standard to determine their particulate clean air delivery rates
118 (CADR). The CADR values are used as a proxy for clean air flow rate for PAC. The supply air
119 flow from ventilation, the occupancy rate and the usage of the room were investigated through a
120 survey when sizing air cleaning. The placement of PAC aimed to achieve the maximum benefit
121 in reducing infections.¹⁴ The used air cleaners are described in detail elsewhere.¹⁵ The used
122 CADR values per PAC varied between 125 and 1500 m³/h. All air cleaners were operated from
123 6:00 am to 4:00 pm, coinciding with the activities in the day care centers. The operation of the
124 devices was monitored with smart plugs. The air flow rates of each day care center are
125 presented in table 1.

126

127

128

129

130 Table 1. Clean air flow rates in day care centers.

Day care center	Number of persons	Clean air flow rate (l/s/person)		Multiplication factor in clean air flow rate
		Control sequence (Mechanical ventilation only)	Intervention sequence (Mechanical ventilation + PAC)	
A	123	12.8	27.5	2.2
B	110	11.9	29.1	2.4
C	105	19.0	40.6	2.1
D	105	14.5	42.3	2.9
Average		14.5	34.9	2.4

131 Clean air flow rates of all day care centers during the control sequence (existing mechanical ventilation only) and
 132 intervention sequence (portable air cleaners (PAC) alongside the existing mechanical ventilation). Day care center
 133 averages are based on occupancy weighted means of the spaces in the day care.

134 Children's illnesses were the primary outcome and parents' absence from work the secondary
 135 outcome of the study. The information was collected through weekly electronic surveys
 136 answered by parents. The analyzed questions in the diary were "Has your child been ill during
 137 the previous week? (yes/no)" and "Did the child's illness cause work absences to the adults?"
 138 Negative binomial regression models were constructed to study the effect of the intervention.
 139 Incidence infections and adult's absences were included as counts, age as continuous, and sex
 140 and period as categorial variables. Subject ID was included for random effects. Statistical
 141 analyses were done using R version 4.3.3.

142 The study was registered at clinicaltrials.gov (NCT05569330). It was approved by the ethical
 143 committee of Helsinki and Uusimaa (HUS/14231/2022) and was conducted according to the
 144 Declaration of Helsinki.

145 *The role of funding*


146 The funders of this study did not have any role in planning the study, interpretation of the results
 147 or writing of this manuscript.

148 **Results**

149 25 females and 26 males of age between 1-5.9 (mean 3.9) years were included in the final
 150 study population (fig. 1). Mean response rate to the surveys was 63.2% (range 45.8-80.6%). In
 151 addition to intervention, age and sex of the subject and intervention period were also included in
 152 the analysis. The effect of age or sex were not statistically significant, nor did they affect the
 153 other estimates and were, therefore, left out of the models. The effect of period was statistically

154 significant but its absence or presence in the model did not alter the estimate for the
155 intervention.

156 In the statistical model the estimate for the effect of the intervention on incident infections
157 among the children in daycare (primary outcome) was 0.199 (95% CI 0.02-0.37, $p = 0.02$)
158 resulting in 18.0 % (95% CI 2.1-31.3 %, $p = 0.028$) reduction of infections. The estimate for the
159 period was -0.229 (95% CI -0.406–0.052, $p = 0.011$). The number of incident infections during
160 intervention and non-intervention periods is presented in figure 2. The total number of recorded
161 absences was 239 during intervention periods and 292 during non-intervention periods resulting
162 in 0.78 and 0.95 incident infections per child per month during intervention and non-intervention
163 periods, respectively. The secondary outcome was work absences of the parents due to these
164 infections. While we observed a decrease of 15.8 % it did not reach statistical significance (95%
165 CI -0.29 – 0.64, $p = 0.46$).



166

167 Figure 1: Cumulative incident infections during the intervention and non-intervention periods of
168 the study.

169 Discussion

170 Daycares are notorious for compromised hand hygiene, high exposure to ballistic droplets due
171 to poor coughing etiquette and maximized fomite transmission routes for infections.
172 Consequently, protection against infections has traditionally relied on absence during illness and
173 building immunity through exposure.¹⁶ In this study, we demonstrated a clinically and statistically
174 significant reduction in incident infections in daycares due to significant increase in clean air flow
175 rate without limiting any other transmission route. The intervention was effective even though
176 the subjects spend only part of their time in the day care and there are numerous other sites for
177 infections to transmit. Our results strongly suggest that contrary to the previous paradigm of the
178 role airborne transmission it plays an important role in transmission of common infections.⁸ As a
179 result, the importance of ventilation and air cleaning in the prevention and control of common
180 infections should be emphasized in guidelines and recommendations. The secondary outcome
181 of adults' absences did not reach statistical significance. This may be confounded by the fact
182 that many children in day care commonly have younger siblings in home care and thus, the
183 illness does not cause parent to be absent from work. Our results are in line with previous
184 literature as the trend between the child's illness and parent's absences generally follow the
185 same trend, but there were fewer parental absences from work than sick days taken by
186 children.^{17,18}

187 The air cleaning has been earlier observed to decrease the number of colony-forming units in
188 intensive care units. Additionally, a correlation has been reported between pathogens detected
189 in the air of intensive care units and hospital-acquired infections.¹⁹ In contrast, Falkenberg et al
190 did not observe the effect of HEPA filters on COVID-19 incidence during the Omicron wave in
191 day care units in Germany.²⁰ The study, however, has several methodological limitations: part of
192 the data was collected retrospectively, the study lasted only one year and no cross-over
193 methodology was used, children's demographic data were not considered, and any information
194 on dimensioning, positioning or even running the air cleaning equipment were not reported.

195 Particles are generated in all respiratory activities including tidal breathing and speaking.²¹
196 Since respiratory infectious particles originate from the fluid lining the mucosa, any viruses
197 replicating at the site of aerosol generation can be contained within the emitted aerosols. For
198 example, in the case of SARS-CoV-2, even tidal breathing has been shown to generate aerosol
199 particles that carry viable viruses and copies of SARS-CoV-2 RNA.²² Therefore, it is not
200 surprising that also the common respiratory pathogens transmit through the air. However, the
201 association between airborne transmission and illness has not been previously demonstrated,
202 and for example, in recent challenge studies, study subjects have been infected with nasal
203 drops.^{23,24} Since air cleaning has shown only a minimal effect on the presence of ballistic
204 droplets and fomite route cannot be controlled in the interaction of children under 6 years old in
205 daycare our study demonstrates a strong association between air cleaning and reduced
206 infections, highlighting the significant role of airborne transmission in common infections.^{9,16}

207 Air flow rates of mechanical ventilation are typically designed for good indoor air quality under
208 normal conditions and fresh, outdoor air flow rates of 8–10 l/s/person are common. However,
209 with the increase in the number of infectious particles these rates may be inadequate for

210 controlling airborne infection transmission. Recommendations for improved ventilation during
211 COVID-19 suggest significantly higher air flow rates, ranging from 14 l/s/person to 20-25
212 l/s/person.^{25,26} In this study, the control case outdoor air flow rates varied between 11.9
213 l/s/person to 19.0 l/s/person. During the intervention, additional portable air cleaners increased
214 the clean air flow rates up to 27.5 - 42.3 l/s/person multiplying them 2.1-2.9 times. It is, however,
215 important to note that this study was conducted in buildings with modern mechanical ventilation
216 meeting the current building code requirements. Still a significant decrease in incident infections
217 was observed due to the air cleaning. This emphasizes the crucial role of indoor air purity in
218 infection prevention also in modern buildings in the future.

219 It is important to acknowledge several limitations in this work. In this study the intervention was
220 aimed to the environment rather than directly to the participants. Therefore, randomization
221 within the day care centers was not possible and had to be done on day care center level rather
222 than individual level. We were unable to find a solution to adequately implement placebo control
223 in this study. Using only fans to move the air still causes significant mixing and potential dilution
224 of the pathogen concentration in air possibly affecting the infection risk.¹³ As all cross-over trials
225 this one is also subject to carry over effects. Although unlikely, it is possible that the participants
226 in intervention-control sequence did not develop similar immunity to common respiratory
227 pathogens as participants in the control-intervention sequence due to reduced infection rate and
228 thus had more infections during the control period. The two periods included in the study were
229 different in terms of infections most likely due to natural variation of seasonal epidemics which is
230 demonstrated e.g., in national sewage surveillances.²⁸ However, as controlling for period effect
231 in the statistical model did not alter the effect of intervention, we concluded the possible bias
232 was adequately controlled. While cross over design is well controlled for confounding factors,
233 we did fall short from our recruitment goal which prevented us from conducting subgroup
234 analysis. The effect size was higher than originally anticipated and therefore, statistical power
235 was sufficient despite the problems in recruitment. We also had a significant number of dropouts
236 during the study, but they were distributed evenly between the groups and are not likely to bias
237 the results. As the day care units in this study were deemed to be typical and the buildings had
238 modern mechanical ventilation, we expect the results to generalize well. However, in buildings
239 with outdated ventilation systems the relative effect of PACs is likely to be bigger.

240 **Conclusions**

241 In this work we have presented the effect of air cleaning in reduction of common infections in
242 day care units. We observed a significant decrease in incident infections without intervention to
243 any other transmission routes or implementing other infection mitigation strategies. Our results
244 challenge the current paradigm which does not acknowledge the important role of airborne
245 transmission of common infections and emphasizes fomite and contact transmission
246 particularly in the case of prevention and control measures. As ventilation and air cleaning can
247 only affect airborne particles, our study demonstrates the significance of airborne transmission
248 of common respiratory pathogens and the crucial role of air cleaning in the prevention and
249 control of these infections.

250

251 **Acknowledgements**

252 Tero Vahlberg is acknowledged for expert statistical support. Riku Kivisaari is acknowledged for
253 the initial idea and stimulus for this work. We would like to thank all the participating families and
254 the staff of the day care centers for their participation and support for this study.

255

256 **Funding**

257 The study was a part of the E3 Excellence in Pandemic Response -project funded by Business
258 Finland [grant number 4793/31/2021], Helsinki University Hospital Coinnovation fund, Finnish
259 Medical Foundation (VV), FLS (ES).

260

261 **Conflicts of interests**

262

263 The portable air cleaning equipment were provided by the manufacturers and local commercial
264 agents. The companies lending the air cleaning equipment provided expert advice on the use of
265 the devices, but had no role in planning the study, interpretation of the results or writing of this
266 manuscript.

267

268 **Contributors**

269 Ville Vartiainen conceptualisation, data curation, formal analysis, funding acquisition,
270 investigation, supervision, validation, visualisation, writing – original draft, and writing– review &
271 editing, methodology, directly accessed the data

272 Inga Ehder-Gahm conceptualisation, methodology, investigation, writing – original draft

273 Johanna Hela investigation, data curation, directly accessed the data, writing– review & editing

274 Anni Luoto methodology, investigation, writing– review & editing

275 Jussi-Pekka Juvela methodology, investigation, writing– review & editing

276 Petra Nikuri investigation, writing– review & editing

277 Aimo Taipale methodology, conceptualisation, investigation, writing– review & editing

278 Natalia Lastovets methodology, investigation, writing– review & editing Sampo Saari

279 methodology, investigation, writing– review & editing

280 Ilpo Kulmala methodology, investigation, writing– review & editing

281 Arto Säämänen methodology, investigation, writing– review & editing

282 Enni Sanmark conceptualisation, funding acquisition, supervision, writing – original draft, and
283 writing– review & editing, methodology, project administration, resources

284 Piia Sormunen conceptualisation, funding acquisition, supervision, writing – original draft, and
285 writing– review & editing, methodology, project administration, resources

286

287 **Declaration of interests**

288 We declare no competing interests.

289

290 **Data sharing**

291 The data will not be publicly shared due to Finnish legislation on medical research and
292 statement of the ethics committee. Data, protocol, consent form, and all questionnaires are
293 available from corresponding author upon reasonable request.

294 References

- 295 1. WHO. Infection prevention and control of epidemic-and pandemic prone acute respiratory
296 infections in health care. Preprint at (2014).
- 297 2. WHO. Transmission of SARS-CoV-2: implications for infection prevention precautions.
298 Preprint at (2020).
- 299 3. Lewis, D. Is the coronavirus airborne? Experts can't agree. *Nature* **580**, 175–175 (2020).
- 300 4. Jimenez, J. L. *et al.* What were the historical reasons for the resistance to recognizing
301 airborne transmission during the COVID -19 pandemic? *Indoor Air* **32**, (2022).
- 302 5. Heneghan, C. J. *et al.* SARS-CoV-2 and the role of airborne transmission: a systematic
303 review. *F1000Res* **10**, 232 (2022).
- 304 6. Leung, N. H. L. Transmissibility and transmission of respiratory viruses. *Nat Rev*
305 *Microbiol* **19**, 528–545 (2021).
- 306 7. Greenhalgh, T., MacIntyre, C. R., Ungrin, M. & Wright, J. M. Airborne pathogens:
307 controlling words won't control transmission. *The Lancet* **403**, 1850–1851 (2024).
- 308 8. WHO. Global technical consultation report on proposed terminology for pathogens that
309 transmit through the air. (2024).
- 310 9. Qian, H. & Zheng, X. Ventilation control for airborne transmission of human exhaled bio-
311 aerosols in buildings. *J Thorac Dis* **10**, S2295–S2304 (2018).
- 312 10. Curtius, J., Granzin, M. & Schrod, J. Testing mobile air purifiers in a school classroom:
313 Reducing the airborne transmission risk for SARS-CoV-2. *Aerosol Science and*
314 *Technology* **55**, 586–599 (2021).
- 315 11. Conway Morris, A. *et al.* The Removal of Airborne Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome
316 Coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) and Other Microbial Bioaerosols by Air Filtration on
317 Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) Surge Units. *Clinical Infectious Diseases* **75**,
318 e97–e101 (2022).
- 319 12. Oksanen, L. *et al.* Combining Phi6 as a surrogate virus and computational large-eddy
320 simulations to study airborne transmission of SARS-CoV-2 in a restaurant. *Indoor Air* **32**,
321 (2022).
- 322 13. Auvinen, M., Kuula, J., Grönholm, T., Sühring, M. & Hellsten, A. High-resolution large-
323 eddy simulation of indoor turbulence and its effect on airborne transmission of respiratory
324 pathogens—Model validation and infection probability analysis. *Physics of Fluids* **34**,
325 (2022).
- 326 14. Kulmala, I. *et al.* Estimated relative potential for airborne SARS-CoV-2 transmission in a
327 day care centre. *Heliyon* **10**, e30724 (2024).
- 328 15. Vartiainen, V *et al.* The effect of room air cleaners on infection control in day care centres
329 *Indoor Environments* 2024 Mar; 1(1)
- 330 16. Churchill, R. B. & Pickering, L. K. INFECTION CONTROL CHALLENGES IN CHILD-
331 CARE CENTERS. *Infect Dis Clin North Am* **11**, 347–365 (1997).
- 332 17. Schuez-Havupalo, L *et al.* Daycare attendance and respiratory tract infections: a
333 prospective birth cohort study. *BMJ Open*. 2017; 7(9): e014635
- 334 18. Paalanne, M *et al.* Absence from day care or school and parental absence from work
335 during children's respiratory infections *Acta Paediatrica* 2023; 112(3) 333-572

- 336 19. Lui, K. Sample size determination for testing equality in Poisson frequency data under an
337 AB/BA crossover trial. *Pharm Stat* **12**, 74–81 (2013).
- 338 20. Arıkan, İ. *et al.* Effectiveness of air purifiers in intensive care units: an intervention study.
339 *Journal of Hospital Infection* **120**, 14–22 (2022).
- 340 21. Falkenberg, T., Wasser, F., Zacharias, N., Mutters, N. & Kistemann, T. Effect of portable
341 HEPA filters on COVID-19 period prevalence: an observational quasi-interventional study
342 in German kindergartens. *BMJ Open* **13**, e072284 (2023).
- 343 22. Bagheri, G. *et al.* Size, concentration, and origin of human exhaled particles and their
344 dependence on human factors with implications on infection transmission. *J Aerosol Sci*
345 **168**, (2023).
- 346 23. Lai, J. *et al.* Exhaled Breath Aerosol Shedding of Highly Transmissible Versus Prior
347 Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 Variants. *Clinical Infectious Diseases*
348 **76**, 786–794 (2023).
- 349 24. Zhou, J. *et al.* Viral emissions into the air and environment after SARS-CoV-2 human
350 challenge: a phase 1, open label, first-in-human study. *Lancet Microbe* **4**, e579–e590
351 (2023).
- 352 25. Killingley, B. *et al.* Safety, tolerability and viral kinetics during SARS-CoV-2 human
353 challenge in young adults. *Nat Med* **28**, 1031–1041 (2022).
- 354 26. The Lancet COVID-19 Commission Task Force on Safe Work, S. S. and S. T. *Proposed*
355 *Non-Infectious Air Delivery Rates (NADR) for Reducing Exposure to Airborne Respiratory*
356 *Infectious Diseases*. (2022).
- 357 27. ASHRAE Standard 241. Control of Infectious Aerosols.
- 358 28. Finnish Institute of Health and Welfare. Amount of SARS-CoV-2 in sewage.
359 <https://www.koronatilastot.fi/fi/jatevesi/>.

360