

Indoor Air quality at a French university

1 **Indoor air quality at a French university: a participatory CO₂**
2 ***measurement campaign highlights the wide gap between reality and***
3 ***the law***

4 Philippe Cinquin¹

5 ¹Univ. Grenoble Alpes, CNRS, UMR 5525, VetAgro Sup, Grenoble INP, CHU Grenoble
6 Alpes, TIMC, UMR5525, 38000 Grenoble, France.

7

8 Correspondence should be addressed to Philippe.Cinquin@univ-grenoble-alpes.fr

9 **Abstract**

10 Poor indoor air quality has been demonstrated to increase the risk of transmitting infectious
11 agents and to expose individuals to the phenomenon of sick building syndrome. In light of
12 these findings, most countries have established specific guidelines regarding indoor air quality
13 in university rooms. In France, for instance, the maximum permissible concentration of carbon
14 dioxide (CO₂) in university rooms without mechanical ventilation is set at 1,300 parts per
15 million (ppm), and the minimum volume per occupant is 15 m³. For rooms with mechanical
16 ventilation, the minimum clean air flow rate is 25 m³/h/occupant.

17 The primary objective of this study was to design and demonstrate the feasibility of a simple,
18 cost-effective method for comparing the reality of indoor air quality in all university rooms
19 with legal requirements. The secondary objectives of the present study were to demonstrate the
20 efficacy of the proposed method in identifying and reporting problematic situations, and in
21 issuing practical recommendations.

22 Mobile CO₂ sensors (Aranet4) were provided to volunteer lecturers to measure the CO₂
23 concentration during and after classes. The number of occupants and the condition of openings
24 were also recorded. These data were supplemented by measurements from 117 fixed Carbon
25 Nexelec sensors. The data were then fitted to a model, which enabled the characterization of
26 air quality and the estimation of the gauge reduction required to comply with the law.

27 None of the 14 rooms without mechanical ventilation complied with the legal minimum of 15
28 m³/occupant. 75% of the third quartiles of CO₂ concentrations during classes exceeded 2692
29 ppm. In rooms with mechanical ventilation, median clean air flow was 15 m³/h/occupant at
30 100% occupancy (9 m³/h/occupant for the first quartile). In 32 out of 41 rooms with
31 mechanical ventilation (78%), the clean air flow was estimated to be below the legal minimum
32 of 25 m³/h/occupant at 100% occupancy. Concentrations in excess of 5,000 ppm were observed
33 in 23 of the 101 rooms equipped with fixed sensors.

34 The proposed method has demonstrated its feasibility in real-life conditions. For the purpose
35 of evaluating the air quality of all rooms affiliated with universities, it is recommended that
36 this method be used in a systematic manner. The findings of this study indicate that a significant
37 proportion of the examined rooms may not be in accordance with the relevant legislation,

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

Indoor Air quality at a French university

38 thereby jeopardizing the health of the occupants. In order to comply with the law, the method
39 proposed here to estimate gauge reduction should be applied.

40

41 **1. Introduction**

42 The Corona Virus Disease 2019 (CoViD-19) pandemic has drawn attention to the risk of
43 airborne transmission of infectious agents, particularly in enclosed environments. Indeed, as
44 early as 2020, several studies highlighted the airborne transmission of the severe acute
45 respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2, SARS-CoV-2 [1] [2]. It therefore immediately became
46 clear that the quality of ventilation in the workplace was an essential factor in limiting the
47 spread of the pandemic. Indeed, several studies had confirmed that the incidence rate of
48 airborne infectious diseases is higher in poorly ventilated premises than in well-ventilated
49 premises [3] [4]. Since then, studies have confirmed that the installation of effective
50 mechanical ventilation in school classrooms significantly reduces the risk of SARS-CoV-2
51 contamination [5].

52 However, it has long been recognized that carbon dioxide (CO₂) concentration can be used to
53 assess the quality of ventilation in a room [6]. More specifically, a link has been established
54 between a high CO₂ concentration and an increased risk of transmission of airborne viruses
55 such as SARS-CoV-2 [7]. Furthermore, physico-chemical mechanisms explaining the effect
56 on SARS-CoV-2 infectivity of even a moderate increase in CO₂ concentration are beginning
57 to be elucidated [8].

58 Moreover, independently of the increased risk of transmission of airborne infections, various
59 studies report a correlation between high CO₂ concentrations and various psycho-cognitive
60 disorders, including headaches, fatigue, nausea and even dizziness. Sick Building Syndrome
61 [9], a nosological entity recognized by the World Health Organization since 1982, brings
62 together the various symptoms experienced by occupants of poorly ventilated buildings. These
63 symptoms may be linked to CO₂ itself or to various chemical pollutants present in the
64 atmosphere of public buildings, particularly Volatile Organic Compounds exhaled by building
65 occupants [10], [11], [12].

66 For all these reasons, legislation in many countries sets maximum CO₂ concentration
67 thresholds not to be exceeded, as well as minimum ventilation rates in rooms with mechanical
68 ventilation, compatible with the recommendations of the American Society of Heating,
69 Refrigerating and Air-Conditioning Engineers [6]. This is the case in France, where the
70 following thresholds apply in universities. In university rooms with mechanical ventilation, the
71 legal maximum CO₂ concentration is 1,000 parts per million (ppm), with a tolerance of up to
72 1,300 ppm, and the minimum clean air flow per occupant is 25 m³/h/occupant. In university
73 rooms without mechanical ventilation, there is no legal maximum CO₂ concentration, however
74 a minimum volume per occupant of 15 m³/occupant is required. In two opinions [13] [14],
75 France's highest public health authority, the HCSP (High Council for Public Health), has set a
76 "rapid action threshold" of 1,500 ppm "*indicating unacceptable air confinement in the light of*
77 *the scientific literature, and requiring corrective action (lowering the occupancy gauge or*
78 *evacuating the room, modifying the technical means of aeration and ventilation)*". In a recent
79 opinion [15], it set a maximum CO₂ concentration target of 800 ppm and a minimum clean air
80 flow per occupant in mechanically ventilated rooms of 50 m³/h/occupant.

Indoor Air quality at a French university

81 The public health benefits of working in good-quality air have therefore been demonstrated,
82 and the legal framework guaranteeing air quality in buildings open to the public, particularly
83 universities, is clear. However, to the best of our knowledge, no study has proposed a method
84 for measuring indoor air quality in universities that is designed to check the compatibility of
85 all university classrooms with the relevant legal requirements. A number of one-off studies
86 have been carried out to characterize CO₂ concentrations or fresh-air ventilation rates in
87 selected university or school classrooms (see, for example, [3] [4] [5] [16] [17]). [17]
88 delineates three classes of methods applicable to estimating fresh air ventilation rates: direct
89 measurement of flow, study of the decay of marker gases diffused in a controlled manner, and
90 study of markers -in particular CO₂- spontaneously emitted when rooms are used by humans.
91 [17] characterized the ventilation of 214 rooms in seven universities or schools, most of which
92 had mechanical ventilation. However, the majority of the estimates of ventilation performance
93 in this study were derived from the study of the decay of marker gases, which would be
94 incompatible with the systematic and regular estimation of all ventilation rates.

95 The primary objective of the present study was to demonstrate the feasibility of a method
96 designed to ascertain the compatibility of all university rooms with legal requirements in terms
97 of CO₂ concentration and fresh air ventilation rate. The implementation of this method on a
98 broad scale would facilitate the determination of the CO₂ concentration levels attained when
99 university rooms are utilized under real-life conditions, as well as the estimation of the
100 performance of both natural and mechanical ventilation systems. The proposed method is
101 sufficiently simple and inexpensive to be implemented on a very regular basis (at least once a
102 year) in all rooms with mechanical ventilation. The air quality in these rooms is contingent on
103 the performance of the air handling units, which exhibits variability over time due to the
104 effectiveness of the maintenance procedures employed. This necessitates regular verification
105 to ensure optimal functioning.

106 In order to achieve this objective, the present study applied a methodological approach to the
107 analysis of the compatibility between the actual conditions of use of rooms in a French
108 university, Univ. Grenoble Alpes (UGA), and the legal requirements and recommendations of
109 the HCSP in terms of CO₂ levels and ventilation performance. This entailed the
110 characterization of the distributions of CO₂ concentrations in all the rooms under study,
111 contingent on their actual conditions of use, as well as the mechanical ventilation performance
112 of the rooms that had it or the volume per occupant in rooms lacking mechanical ventilation.
113 A secondary objective was to demonstrate that our method enables detection of situations likely
114 to endanger the health of users and alert the administrators of the universities. The third
115 objective was to demonstrate the feasibility of using the proposed method to provide practical
116 recommendations to university administrators regarding indoor air quality.

117 It swiftly became evident that to accomplish our objectives, it was imperative to collect not
118 only CO₂ values, but also data regarding actual room occupancy conditions (particularly the
119 number of occupants and the state of door and window openings). These data are not readily
120 available in the information systems of universities. While room reservation systems at
121 universities facilitate the identification of rooms allocated for specific classes, the accuracy of
122 predicting student attendance remains a challenge. While a network of fixed CO₂ sensors offers
123 valuable insights, it is not sufficient for the study's objectives.

124 The collection of information necessary to achieve our objectives necessitates the commitment
125 of teaching staff. This necessity led to the formulation of the original concept of a "participatory
126 CO₂ measurement campaign". This concept is predicated on the principle of involving UGA

Indoor Air quality at a French university

127 staff in measuring CO₂ (using portable sensors) and collecting data on actual classroom
128 occupancy conditions.

129 **2. Materials and Methods**

130 **2.1 Launch of a “participatory CO₂ measurement campaign”**

131 On October 23, 2023, the SNESUP-FSU union used its electronic mailing list for UGA staff
132 to invite them to take part in a campaign to study CO₂ under real conditions in UGA rooms.
133 The pdf document to which they were directed presented the interest and objectives of the
134 study, the commitments to be made in order to participate, how the results would be shared,
135 and described the information to be gathered on the measurement conditions, as well as the
136 method for implementing the sensor and sharing the measurements. Each participant had
137 access to a personal section of the UGA cloud, where they could upload their CO₂ measurement
138 files for each session, as well as the file describing the measurement conditions. A reservation
139 file accessible to all participants made it possible to reserve a sensor and to contact the
140 colleague who had reserved it before and the colleague who had reserved it afterwards (so that
141 participants could transmit sensors to each other, without centralized intervention). In the final
142 part of the study, those who could were asked to leave the sensor in place for at least an hour
143 after the end of the human presence in the room, with all openings closed.

144 **2.2 Collecting room usage conditions as part of the “participatory campaign”**

145 For each measurement session, each participant was asked to record the conditions of use of
146 the room in a pre-determined format set out in an Excel template. This file asked for the
147 following information: name of building, name of room, room gauge J , existence of mechanical
148 ventilation, position of sensor, date, start time, end time, number of people in the room (as a
149 function of time), state of opening of doors and windows (as a function of time), and if possible,
150 room dimensions. Free-format observations could be added. For some rooms, measurements
151 of room dimensions were taken using a Dexter laser rangefinder (accuracy ± 2 mm), enabling
152 the area A and volume V of the room to be estimated.

153 **2.3 CO₂ measurements**

154 **2.3.1 CO₂ measurements using the “participatory campaign”**

155 Four Aranet4 sensors were made available to participants. These sensors complied with the
156 recommendations of the French Environment Code [18] for CO₂ measurements (measurement
157 by non-dispersive infrared absorption spectrometry, measurement range 0 to 5,000 ppm;
158 measurement uncertainty $\pm [30 \text{ ppm} + 3\% \text{ of reading}]$). They measure CO₂ concentrations in
159 ppm. They had been calibrated in accordance with the manufacturer's recommended procedure.
160 This procedure consists of installing the sensor in a place where the CO₂ concentration is close
161 to 420 ppm. In order to be as close as possible to this value, the calibration was performed
162 outdoors in an environment with adequate wind exposure, sparsely built-up, far from industrial
163 activities and car traffic, with the sensor positioned at a distance from plants. The procedure is
164 initiated from the application installed on a mobile phone and requires no intervention other
165 than starting the calibration and waiting for it to complete (which takes about 15 minutes).
166 Regular calibration checks were carried out, verifying that at certain times of the day they
167 measured outdoor concentrations between 420 and 470 ppm. No recalibration was necessary.
168 These lightweight, portable sensors record one measurement per minute, and digitally transfer

Indoor Air quality at a French university

169 the data in .csv format to a smartphone via an app that can be downloaded from any app store.
170 Spot measurements were taken outside teaching buildings by some participants.

171 **2.3.2 Access to data collected by fixed UGA sensors**

172 CO₂ measurements from the “participatory campaign” were enriched by data captured by 117
173 Carbon Nexelec sensors deployed by the UGA. These sensors take a reading every 10 minutes
174 and transmit their data over a private wireless long-range wide area network. The UGA makes
175 all these measurements available to its staff, via its intranet, on a Grafana® platform.

176 **2.4 Transfer of measurement conditions and measurements**

177 The app downloaded by each participant onto their smartphone enabled them to transfer the
178 measurement file to their personal computer via the application of their choice. For each
179 measurement session, the participant uploaded two files to the personal section of the UGA
180 cloud assigned to him/her: the CO₂ measurement file, in .csv format; and the Excel file
181 containing the measurement conditions.

182 **2.5 Processing data from the “participatory campaign”**

183 **2.5.1 Processing data measured during room occupancy**

184 For each measurement session, an Excel interpretation file was created, containing both the
185 measurement conditions and the measurements themselves. A graph of the CO₂ curve versus
186 time was generated, also showing the HCSP target values (800 and 1,500 ppm), the legal value
187 (1,300 ppm), and the thresholds of 2,500 and 4,000 ppm. The following parameters were
188 systematically calculated for each session, when the necessary information was available:
189 gauge J , median N of the number of occupants, occupancy rate $R_{Occ} = N/J$, volume per occupant
190 when $R_{Occ} = 100\%$ $V_J = V/J$, median of CO₂, Q_3 value of the third quartile of CO₂, portion of
191 the duration of the session spent with CO₂ > 1,500 ppm and with CO₂ > 2,500 ppm, clean air
192 flow per occupant D_N when N occupants are present in the room (so D_J is the clean air flow per
193 occupant when $R_{Occ} = 100\%$), total clean air flow D in the room.

194 In order to estimate D_N , the classical model of CO₂ concentration in a well-mixed space was
195 utilized [19]. This model states that, in a room with N occupants,

$$196 \quad (1) \quad c(t) = \left(\frac{D_{exp}}{D_N} + c_{ext} \right) (1 - e^{-kt}) + c(0)e^{-kt}$$

197 where $c(t)$ is the concentration of CO₂ at time t , D_{exp} is the average CO₂ generation rate by
198 human beings, c_{ext} is the concentration of CO₂ outside the building, and $k = \frac{D}{V}$ is the air
199 renewal rate. As a consequence, when $c(t)$ reaches a steady state c_{limit}

$$200 \quad (2) \quad c_{limit} = \frac{D_{exp}}{D_N} + c_{ext}$$

201 hence

Indoor Air quality at a French university

202 (3)
$$D_N = \frac{D_{exp}}{c_{limit} - c_{ext}}$$

203

204 This model requires an estimation of D_{exp} , the average CO₂ generation rate by human beings.
205 This rate has been determined to be 20.2 L/h [20]. We propose to estimate c_{limit} by Q_3 . The
206 reasons for these choices of the estimations of D_{exp} and of Q_3 are discussed in section 4.1.2. As
207 a consequence, if c_{ext} is expressed in ppm, D_N (m³/h) was estimated by

208 (4)
$$D_N = \frac{20,200}{Q_3 - c_{ext}}$$

209 As a consequence,

210 (5)
$$D = ND_N = N \frac{20,200}{Q_3 - c_{ext}}$$

211

212 (6)
$$D_J = \frac{D}{J} = \frac{N}{J} \frac{20,200}{Q_3 - c_{ext}}$$

213 For university rooms without mechanical ventilation, French law imposes $V_J \geq 15$ m³/occupant.
214 Accordingly, the legal gauge can be defined as $J_{Legal} = \min [J ; J V_J / 15]$. Although there is no
215 legal maximal value of CO₂ in university rooms in France, the HCSP Gauge J_{HCSP} can be
216 defined as the maximal number of occupants not to overpass the 1,500 ppm threshold
217 recommended by HCSP. The previously mentioned model of CO₂ concentration in a well-
218 mixed space implies that, if the CO₂ limit concentration is 1,500 ppm, the minimum flow of
219 clean air per occupant D_{HCSP} satisfies $D_{HCSP} = 20,200 / (1,500 - c_{ext})$, where c_{ext} is the outdoor
220 concentration. From this it can be deduced that $J_{HCSP} = \min [J ; J D_J / D_{HCSP}]$.

221 Since the true value of the outdoor CO₂ concentration was rarely available, we opted to
222 overestimate D by using the maximum value of CO₂ measured outdoors (500 ppm), and to
223 underestimate D_{HCSP} by using the minimum possible value (417 ppm, world average CO₂
224 concentration [21]). These choices all maximize the estimate of the J_{HCSP} gauge. The reasons
225 for this choice will be discussed in section 4.1.2.

226 For rooms with mechanical ventilation, French law imposes $D_J \geq 25$ m³/occupant in
227 universities. The legal gauge can then be defined as $J_{Legal} = \min [J ; J D_J / 25]$.

228 2.5.2 Processing data measured after room occupancy, with openings closed

229 The participant had to leave the CO₂ sensor in the room for at least 1 hour, after the room had
230 been used and CO₂ had risen above the concentration outside the building. Equation (1) can be
231 written as $c(t) = ae^{-kt} + c_{ext}$. When c_{ext} had been measured, this value was used. Otherwise,
232 c_{ext} was assumed to be 500 ppm (this leads to a limited overestimation of k , that will be
233 discussed in section 4.1.2). To estimate parameters a and k , Excel's SLOPE and INTERCEPT
234 functions were used, on data $\{t_i ; \ln(c(t_i) - c_{ext})\}$. Quality of fit was estimated by the

Indoor Air quality at a French university

235 correlation coefficient between measurements and model predictions, obtained by Excel's
236 CORREL function. Time being expressed in minutes, when the volume V of the room and its
237 gauge J were known, the clean air flow per occupant at 100% occupancy was obtained by the
238 formula $D_J=60 kV/J$. The legal gauge J_{Legal} is here also estimated by $J_{Legal} = \min [J ; J D_J/25]$.

239 **2.6 Comparison of the results of the participatory campaign with data from sensors** 240 **deployed by the UGA**

241 In order to corroborate the results obtained by the participatory campaign, the measurements
242 taken by the UGA sensors from September 2022 to June 2023 were utilized. The study was
243 conducted in rooms where at least one measurement exceeded 5,000 ppm. Grafana® software
244 was used to represent the CO₂ concentration in these rooms over this period. From March 26
245 to April 16, 2024, the investigation's primary focus was on analyzing rooms with CO₂ levels
246 exceeding 5,000 ppm. For these cases, Grafana's .csv export function was employed, and the
247 corresponding data were then exported to Excel. It was hypothesized that the human presence
248 in these rooms would be characterized by a CO₂ concentration exceeding 550 ppm. For each
249 of these rooms, a summary plot was produced, displaying the CO₂ concentrations above 550
250 ppm as a function of time. It was hypothesized that a quasi-linear decrease of $\log (C_{measured} -$
251 $C_{ext})$ over more than an hour after a CO₂ peak would indicate that the room was empty. To
252 this end, the aforementioned method was employed to estimate the clean air renewal rate and
253 the clean air flow per occupant at 100% occupancy. It is noteworthy that UGA's Carbon Next
254 sensors have an upper measurement limit of 5,000 ppm. The utilization of the model was
255 undertaken for the purpose of predicting the maximum CO₂ value in the room during the
256 "plateau" measured by the sensor. To this end, if time $t = 0$ corresponds to the start of decay,
257 the model $C(t) = ae^{-kt} + C_{ext}$ was employed with negative t times. The value of time
258 corresponding to the actual end of room use was estimated using UGA's room reservation
259 management software. In this situation, it is interesting to plot not only the mean value of the
260 model, but also its 95% confidence interval. The 95% confidence intervals for coefficients a
261 and k were estimated using Excel's "Data Analysis / Linear Regression" function. The
262 production of two curves—low and high predictions—allowed the delineation of the 95%
263 confidence interval for the predictions.

264 **3 Results**

265 **3.1 Involvement in the participatory campaign**

266 The participatory campaign involved 20 UGA staff, mainly from October 19, 2023 to
267 December 21, 2023, with some additional measures in 2024. Three “participatory campaign
268 letters” were distributed to participants, on November 1 and December 8, 2023, and February
269 21, 2024. CO₂ was measured in 77 room-use sessions, in a total of 56 rooms in 21 buildings.

270 **3.2 Conditions of the measurements of the participatory campaign**

271 Most of the measurements were taken during a relatively cold period (midday temperature:
272 October = 16°C; November = 6°C; December = 7°C). As a consequence, the heating was
273 working, and the occupants were rather reluctant to open the windows. None of the rooms
274 studied had air conditioning. The CO₂ sensor was switched on by the teacher just before the
275 course (by insertion of the batteries in the device). It was systematically placed on the teacher's
276 desk, at a distance of at least one meter from the teacher. At the end of the course, the teacher

Indoor Air quality at a French university

277 uploaded the CO₂ measurement on his or her mobile phone, then on his or her personal section
278 of the UGA cloud. Then the CO₂ sensor was switched off by removing batteries.

279 **3.3 Compliance with legal requirements and HCSP recommendations in rooms without** 280 **mechanical ventilation surveyed by the participatory campaign**

281 CO₂ concentrations were studied in 20 classroom sessions in 15 rooms without mechanical
282 ventilations, in 9 buildings of UGA. The volume was known for 14 of these 15 rooms. Table 1
283 summarizes the data recorded to estimate J_{Legal} (legal gauge to meet the legal minimum of 15
284 m³/occupant). As can be seen from Table 1, none of these 14 rooms complied with the legal
285 minimum of 15 m³/occupant.

286 Table SM.1 from the supplementary material summarizes the CO₂ measurements made during
287 the participatory campaign in the 15 rooms without mechanical ventilation, and the estimations
288 of J_{HCSP} (recommended gauge not to overpass the 1,500 ppm threshold recommended by
289 HCSP).

Building	Room	Gauge	Area (m²)	Volume (m³)	Volume / Gauge (m³)	% of the legal threshold of 15 m³/occupant	<i>J_{Legal}</i> <i>(Legal Gauge to comply with the legal threshold of 15 m³/occupant)</i>	% of Gauge reduction <i>(to comply with the legal threshold of 15 m³/occupant)</i>
G	f	59	61	153	2.6	17%	10	83%
G	b	44	54	135	3.1	20%	9	80%
F	a	24	29	82	3.4	23%	5	77%
G	a	41	58	144	3.5	23%	10	77%
I	a	17	25	68	4	27%	5	73%
B	a	45	66	199	4.4	29%	13	71%
G	d	42	77	191	4.5	30%	13	70%
E	a	31	56	153	4.9	33%	10	67%
G	e	70	144	360	5.1	34%	24	66%
H	a	30	60	180	6	40%	12	60%
C	a	35	79	249	7.1	47%	17	53%
G	c	37	90	270	7.3	49%	18	51%

Indoor Air quality at a French university

A	a	48	140	420	8.8	58%	28	42%
J	a	22	80	240	10.9	73%	16	27%

291 **Table 1.** Summary of volume per occupant for the 14 rooms without mechanical ventilation for which the volume was known (sorted by the
292 Volume / Gauge ratio), enabling estimation of the legal gauge required to respect the legal threshold of 15 m³/occupant.


Indoor Air quality at a French university

293 The main parameters characterizing CO₂ distribution in these rooms are synthesized in Table
 294 2. In particular, 75% of the third quartiles of CO₂ concentrations measured during room
 295 occupancy sessions were above 2,692 ppm.

Parameter of CO ₂ distribution in the observed sessions	Minimum	Q ₁	Q ₂	Q ₃	Maximum
3rd quartile CO ₂ (ppm)	861	1675	2175	2692	3988
max CO ₂ (ppm)	886	2194	2660	2871	4393
portion of time above 800 ppm	85%	97%	100%	100%	100%
portion of time above 1,300 ppm	0%	52%	87%	98%	100%
portion of time above 1,500 ppm	0%	42%	79%	97%	100%

296 **Table 2.** Synthetic description of the main parameters characterizing the distribution of CO₂
 297 measurements in the 15 rooms without mechanical ventilation.

298 Typical examples of the effect of ventilation are shown in Figures 1 and 2.




299

Indoor Air quality at a French university

300 **Figure 1.** Typical example of CO₂ growth in room Aa, a room of 420 m³ (14 m x 10 m x 3 m),
301 with a gauge of 48, without mechanical ventilation. All three doors and 5 windows were closed
302 during the two sessions. 21 students and one teacher were present (19 m³/occupant, 46% of
303 gauge). During the 15 minutes break, one door and two windows were opened, and 11 students
304 left the room.

305



306

307

308 **Figure 2.** Illustration of the importance of a draught, even when windows are open. Room Ia is
309 67.5 m³ (5 m x 5 m x 2.7 m), with a gauge of 17. 20 persons were present (118 % of the gauge).
310 The volume per occupant is 3.4 m³/occupant, which is 23% of the legal minimum of 15
311 m³/occupant. The only door is closed during the sessions, and the 4 windows are open. The
312 opening of the windows keeps CO₂ at a plateau (which is however above the HCSP
313 recommendation of 1,500 ppm). During the break, the installation of a draught by opening of
314 the door significantly reduces the CO₂ concentration.

315 3.4 Compliance with legal requirements and HCSP recommendations in the mechanically 316 ventilated rooms surveyed by the participatory campaign

317 3.4.1 Study of data collected during room use

Indoor Air quality at a French university

318 CO₂ concentrations were studied during 57 classroom sessions in 41 mechanically ventilated
 319 rooms in 15 UGA buildings. The main parameters describing characteristics and room
 320 occupancy, CO₂ distribution and mechanical ventilation performance in these rooms are
 321 synthesized in Table 3.


322

	Minimum	Q_1	Q_2	Q_3	Maximum
Characteristics of the measurement sessions					
Room volume (m ³)	62	126	178	900	1360
Room area (m ²)	21	50	70	215	323
Gauge	15	32	41	180	300
Occupancy (median number of occupants / Gauge)	21 %	32 %	40 %	63%	102 %
Session duration (min)	75	90	120	120	240
Parameter of CO₂ distribution in the observed sessions					
3rd quartile CO ₂ (ppm)	571	955	1188	1434	2152
max CO ₂ (ppm)	658	1056	1292	1697	2344
Mechanical ventilation performance in the observed sessions					
clean air flow per occupant at 100% occupancy (m ³ / h / occupant)	3	9	15	24	91
Percentage of clean air flow per occupant at 100% occupancy, with respect to the legal airflow of 25 m ³ / h / occupant	13 %	35 %	60 %	94 %	363%

323 **Table 3.** Synthetic description of room characteristics and occupancy, CO₂ distribution and
 324 mechanical ventilation, in 57 classroom sessions in 41 rooms with mechanical ventilation, in
 325 15 UGA buildings.

326 In 47 out of the 57 classroom sessions (82%), the clean air flow at 100% occupancy was
 327 estimated below the legal threshold of 25 m³/h/occupant at 100% occupancy. In 32 out of the
 328 41 rooms (78%), at least one session led to an estimation of a clean air flow at 100% occupancy
 329 below 25 m³/h/occupant. Figure 3 shows a typical measurement in a 300-seat, 1,360 m³
 330 amphitheatre, occupied to 32% of gauge.

Indoor Air quality at a French university



331
332
333
334
335
336
337

Figure 3. Typical CO₂ profile in room Ta, a room of 1,360 m³ occupied by 95 people for a gauge of 300 (32% occupancy). 3rd quartile of CO₂ = 1071 ppm. Clean air flow during session = 35 m³/h/occupant. Clean air flow at 100% occupancy = 11 m³/h/occupant. Percentage of gauge reduction required to meet legal airflow of 25 m³ / hour / occupant at 100% occupancy = 55% (78% to reach the 50 m³/h/occupant target of HCSP).

338 3.4.2 Study of CO₂ decay data after room use

339 The decay of the CO₂ concentration was studied subsequent to the cessation of room use and
340 the closure of all apertures in nine rooms (including one, the Ne amphitheatre, before and after
341 repair of the air handling unit). The results obtained are presented in Table 4. Figures 4 and 5
342 show the decay curves for amphitheatre Ne, before and after repair of the air handling unit.


343

Build ing	Ro om	Ga uge	Volu me (m ³)	Correl ation coeffici ent	Renewal rate (volume / hour)	clean air flow (m ³ / hour / occupant) at 100% occupancy	portion of legal airflow per occupant at 100% occupancy
N	e	240	1040	0.994	0.04	0.2	1%

Indoor Air quality at a French university


T	b	125	377	0.976	0.3	0.9	4%
N	b	240	1040	0.990	0.84	3.6	14%
L	f	176	900	0.995	0.73	3.7	15%
G	f	122	390	0.982	1.4	4.5	18%
T	a	300	1360	0.990	1.1	5.0	20%
T	c	125	434	0.990	2.2	7.6	30%
P	a	72	470	0.985	1.8	11.8	47%
N	e	240	1040	0.996	4.6	19.9	80%
W	a	120	710	0.991	3.5	20.7	83%

344 **Table 4.** Summary of ventilation performance estimates (sorted by portion of legal airflow per
345 occupant at 100% occupancy) based on analysis of CO₂ decay after evacuation of the
346 amphitheatres and closure of openings.



347
348 **Figure 4.** Model of CO₂ removal in room Ne, a room of 1,040 m³ with a gauge of 240 (room
349 emptied after use, all doors and windows closed) during one night (800 minutes). $r = 0.994$.
350 Renewal rate = 0.04 volume/h. Clean air flow per occupant at 100% occupancy = 0.2
351 m³/h/occupant (< 1% of the regulatory floor).

Indoor Air quality at a French university



352


353 **Figure 5.** Model of CO₂ removal in room Ne, a room of 1,040 m³ with a gauge of 240 (room
354 emptied after use, all doors and windows closed) during 45 minutes. $r = 0.996$. Renewal rate =
355 4.6 volume/h. Clean air flow per occupant at 100% occupancy = 20 m³/h/occupant (80% of the
356 lower legal limit). *Note: This measurement was made after the air handling unit was repaired.*

357 **3.5 Compliance with legal requirements and HCSP recommendations in the rooms** 358 **surveyed by the UGA sensors**

359 Over the period from September 2022 to June 2023, the UGA deployed 117 CO₂ sensors in 101
360 rooms. Of these 101 rooms, 23 had concentrations greater than 5,000 ppm (15 in rooms without
361 mechanical ventilation, 8 in rooms with mechanical ventilation). Figure 6 shows the peaks of
362 CO₂ above 2,500 ppm observed in one of these rooms.

363

364




365

366 **Figure 6.** 94 CO₂ peaks above 2,500 ppm (28 of which above 5,000 ppm) were observed between September 2022 and June 2023, in one of the
367 23 UGA classroom (out of 101 monitored) where peaks above 5,000 ppm were measured (only values above 2,500 ppm were plotted in this graph).
368 This room has a gauge of 44 occupants, an area of 51.8 m², and a volume of 140 m³ (3.2 m³/occupant).

Indoor Air quality at a French university

369 Over the period from 26 March to 16 April 2024 (3 weeks), 5 lecture theatres (i.e. 31% of the
370 16 lecture theatres with more than 100 seats where the UGA had installed sensors) had CO₂
371 peaks above 2,500 ppm. Room Xa was a room where very high CO₂ concentrations were
372 observed most frequently and was therefore monitored more carefully. Figure 7 summarizes
373 the CO₂ peaks observed during the occupation of room Xa in a 4 days week, from April 29 to
374 May 2 (May 1st is a holiday in France).



375

376 **Figure 7.** Summary of the 6 CO₂ peaks above 2,500 ppm observed in room Xa in a 4 working
377 days week (from March 29 to May 2, 2024). Only values above 2,500 ppm were plotted in this
378 graph. This room has a gauge of 154 occupants, an area of 128 m², and a volume of 434 m³
379 (2.8 m³/occupant). See photos of this room in Figure SM.1.

380 By studying the decrease in CO₂ levels after the CO₂ peak, it was possible to estimate their
381 clean air renewal rates, and where the volume could be estimated, their clean air flow per
382 occupant at 100% occupancy (Table 5).


Indoor Air quality at a French university

Building	Room	Gauge	Volume (m ³)	Renewal rate (volume / hour)	clean air flow (m ³ / hour / occupant) at 100% occupancy	portion of legal airflow per occupant at 100% occupancy
V	C	335	900	0,12	0,32	1%
O	B	108	337	0,15	0,47	2%
V	B	348	900	0,2	0,52	2%
X	a	154	434	0,5	1,41	6%
W	A	124	631	1,4	7,12	28%

383 **Table 5.** Clean air renewal rate and clean air flow per occupant at 100% occupancy in 5 lecture theatres with more than 100 seats where the UGA
 384 had installed sensors and where peaks above 2,500 ppm were observed. Clean air flow was estimated by modelling the decay of CO₂ concentrations.

Indoor Air quality at a French university

385 In one particular case, a long CO₂ plateau at over 5,000 ppm was observed. In this case, it was
386 possible to use the CO₂ decay model to estimate that the maximum concentration of CO₂ to
387 which the occupants of this lecture theatre were exposed was between 8,840 ppm and 10,608
388 ppm, depending on the actual end time of the examination, which was scheduled for 4:30 pm,
389 but may have been delayed (Figure 8).



390

391 **Figure 8.** Growth, then degrowth of CO₂ levels in room c of building V (area = 255 m², volume
392 = 990 m³, gauge = 335). The upper limit of the sensor is 5,000 ppm. Degrowth model is
393 estimated from 22:58 to 6:59 (43 measurements, $r = 0.997$). The dotted lines correspond to the
394 lower and upper limits of the 95% confidence interval.

395 **4 Discussion**

396 **4.1 Applicability of the proposed method to identify dangerous situations and to propose** 397 **practical recommendations**

398 **4.1.1 Involvement of the lecturers**

399 The involvement of the lecturers made it possible to collect precise data on the number of
400 occupants and the condition of the openings (all the measurement files sent were accompanied
401 by the required details on this point). The lecturers taking part in the study reported no
402 difficulties in collecting this information, which is a major advantage over processing data from
403 fixed sensors installed in the rooms, with no information on the number of occupants or the
404 state of the openings. Using the mobile CO₂ sensors made available to the teachers proved very
405 easy, with all of them having no difficulty installing the necessary application on their mobile
406 phones. Transferring the measurements and information about the measurement conditions to
407 the cloud made available to them posed no particular problem either. The study also raised
408 participants' awareness of the need for better ventilation in premises with insufficient natural
409 ventilation, and of the reality of the problem of insufficient mechanical ventilation in many
410 rooms.

411 **4.1.2 Uncertainty of the estimation of the indicators of air quality from our measurements**

412 As described in sections 2.5.1 and 2.5.2, the clean air flow is estimated on the basis of CO₂
413 measurements, using the classical model of CO₂ concentration in a well-mixed space [19]. CO₂
414 measurements are known with an uncertainty of $\pm (30 \text{ ppm} + 3\% \text{ of reading})$, which
415 corresponds to $\pm 5\% \text{ ppm}$ for a concentration of 1,500 ppm (and between 3 and 5% for higher
416 concentrations).

417 For estimations of air flow based on CO₂ measurements while the room is occupied, the CO₂
418 growth model operates under the assumption of homogeneous mixing of the air within the
419 room. However, it is well known that CO₂ concentrations can vary from one point of the room
420 to another, depending on natural convective air movements [22], especially when an air current
421 is established after opening windows or doors, or on the proximity of room occupants [23].
422 These differences can reach 10% of measurements [24]. Therefore, the optimal scenario would
423 involve the strategic placement of multiple CO₂ sensors throughout the room, whereas only a
424 single sensor was utilized per session of measurements. Given the utilization of a single sensor
425 in each session, the total uncertainty in the CO₂ measurements was considered to be $\pm 15\%$
426 (5% due to the sensor uncertainty, 10% due to the inhomogeneity).

427 In order to estimate the limit concentration of CO₂, that was reached at steady state, the third
428 quartile Q_3 of CO₂ measurements obtained during a session of room use was utilized in
429 Equation (4) – rather than the maximum – for two reasons. Firstly, this approach excluded
430 potential outliers. Secondly, this deliberate overestimation of the clean air flow ensured that
431 rooms considered incompatible with the law truly were. This approach was also adopted to
432 determine the outdoor concentration of CO₂, which was set at 500 ppm, representing the

433 highest concentration measured. The utilization of Q_3 as opposed to the maximum of CO_2
434 offers a distinct advantage, namely the fact that the associated uncertainty is considerably less
435 pronounced in comparison to the uncertainty inherent in discrete CO_2 measurements.
436 Nonetheless, the estimation of the uncertainty on Q_3 will be maintained at 15%. Given that
437 Equation (4) utilized to estimate the clean air flow we use model is $D_N = 20,200/(Q_3 - 500)$, an
438 uncertainty of $\pm 15\%$ in Q_3 yields an uncertainty of D_N inferior to 22.5% when $Q_3 \geq 1,500$ ppm.

439 Another source of uncertainty comes from estimating the average CO_2 generation rate by the
440 human beings present in the room. The value of 5.6 mL/s (or 20.2 L/h) was utilized, as proposed
441 by the Air Infiltration and Ventilation Centre [20]. This value is compatible with the inhalation
442 rates used by [25] for different activity levels (0.49 m³/h for resting, 0.54 m³/h for standing),
443 which, taking into account an average CO_2 concentration of 4% [26] correspond to 19.6 L/h
444 and 21.6 L/h, respectively. However, other publications suggest lower CO_2 generation rates.
445 For example, [27] suggests an average value of 16.2 L/h for a classroom of 64 students and
446 one teacher, and [28] considers that an activity of “sitting reading, writing, typing” corresponds
447 to a metabolism of 1.3 times the basal metabolism, corresponding to an average value of 18.0
448 L/h. Once more, we elected to overestimate the clean air flow, which consequently guided our
449 decision to utilize the estimate proposed by [20].

450 The variability of estimates of average human CO_2 production rates underscores the importance
451 of preferring the CO_2 decay method. In addition, during decay measurements, the risk of
452 mixture inhomogeneity is reduced because all openings are closed and the room is empty, so
453 the uncertainty is also reduced with this method. Finally, the fact that the model is fitted to all
454 measurements also reduces the uncertainty. This explains why the confidence interval of the
455 decay model is small, as can be seen in Figure 8. For all these reasons, this method should be
456 used whenever possible.

457 **4.1.3 Reliability of the estimation of the indicators used to characterize violations of legal** 458 **requirements for air quality**

459 Analysis of the estimated clean air flows shows that an underestimation of 22.5% of the clean
460 air flow would lead to classifying 24 instead of 32 (59% instead of 78%) of the 41 rooms with
461 mechanical ventilation as uncompliant with the legal minimum of 25 m³/h/occupant. Such an
462 error would have no practical consequences. In fact, universities do not have the resources to
463 immediately address all air handling unit deficiencies in more than half of their mechanically
464 ventilated rooms, so an error in the classification of 20% of the rooms will not have major
465 consequences: university administrators will have to work first on improving their worst rooms
466 in terms of air quality.

467 **4.1.4 Comparison of flow estimates during room occupancy and CO_2 decay**

468 In rooms with mechanical ventilation, where the clean air flow per occupant could be estimated
469 both by estimating the limit concentration of CO_2 at steady state and by modelling the decay
470 of CO_2 after evacuation of the room and closure of the openings, the estimate obtained by the
471 first method was systematically higher than that obtained by the second. The first reason for
472 this difference is that steady state is often not reached before the end of the session. A second
473 reason is the deliberate choice of the 3rd quartile of CO_2 concentrations as the limit value, which
474 was justified in the previous section. Finally, in certain circumstances, opening of doors and
475 windows provides more clean air than mechanical ventilation. It is therefore not surprising that
476 the estimate obtained after evacuating the room and closing the openings is systematically

477 lower than that obtained in real conditions, where the openings can be opened. This is
478 illustrated by the example of room Ne, where the clean air flow was estimated during 6
479 classroom sessions. The 6 estimates of clean air flow (in m³/h/occupant at 100% occupancy)
480 for this room are 3.5, 4.0, 4.3, 4.6, 5.4, 8.1. The relative homogeneity of the first 5 estimates
481 should be noted, with the estimate of 8.1 m³/h/occupant appearing to be an outlier. These
482 measurements were obtained when the mechanical ventilation in this 240-seat auditorium was
483 not operational. This auditorium has the unusual feature of having 3 doors, which were open
484 (two main doors at the bottom of the amphitheatre, opening onto a patio where a large number
485 of students may walk, and where the CO₂ concentration can therefore vary significantly, and a
486 third at the very top, opening onto a corridor). A slight draught was felt by the lecturer at the
487 bottom of the amphitheatre. The estimated clean air flow per occupant for this same room using
488 the decay method (Figure 4) is 0.2 m³/h/per occupant at 100% occupancy. It can be seen that
489 opening the doors provides a significant flow of clean air, although it is far from sufficient.

490 Estimating the flow of clean air at 100% occupancy using the CO₂ decay method after
491 evacuating the room and closing the doors proved particularly simple to implement. The first
492 tests of this method were carried out on the Ne room, when its mechanical ventilation was
493 down. As a result, the sensor had to be left in place overnight to observe a sufficient drop in
494 CO₂, which posed practical constraints when it came to retrieving it the following morning.
495 But when the mechanical ventilation is working more or less correctly, measurements over an
496 hour or so after the doors have been closed are sufficient. However, it is difficult to ask a
497 lecturer to stay for an hour after the end of the lesson. Extending this method to all classrooms
498 would therefore require institutional mobilisation, with the involvement of the building
499 maintenance staff.

500 For rooms with mechanical ventilation, this method of modelling CO₂ decay seems the simplest
501 to implement, for rapidly characterising all the rooms with mechanical ventilation in a
502 university. By simply taking this measurement after the end of the last lesson of each day, it is
503 possible with one sensor to characterise 20 rooms in one month, i.e. around 20 working days.
504 For an investment of around €2,000, or 10 sensors, 200 rooms could be characterised each
505 month, at the cost of a moderate human investment (a maximum of ten minutes to transmit and
506 process each series of measurements characterising a room). However, this requires
507 institutional mobilisation and political will.

508 **4.2 Detecting situations likely to endanger the health of users and alerting the university** 509 **administration**

510 Well before the launch of the participatory campaign, several warnings about the poor quality
511 of the air in the university had been issued, including warnings about risks to the health of staff
512 and students, without any solutions to the problems identified being implemented. The
513 participatory campaign was launched to assess the scale of the problem across the whole
514 university.

515 **4.2.1 Risk situations in rooms without mechanical ventilation**

516 Table 1 shows that none of the studied rooms meets the legal limit of at least 15 m³/occupant.
517 Of the 14 rooms without mechanical ventilation in our study, where the volume was known, to
518 meet this minimum:

519 - 2 rooms (14%) should reduce their gauge by less than 50%,

520 - 6 rooms (43%) should reduce their gauge by between 50 and 70%,

521 - 6 rooms (43%) should reduce their gauge by more than 70%.

522 As early as December 2023, the participatory campaign demonstrated that failure to comply
523 with the minimum volume per occupant in rooms without mechanical ventilation led very
524 quickly (typically within 15 minutes), when the openings (doors and windows) were closed, to
525 the threshold of 1,300 ppm being exceeded, with regular measurements of over 4,000 ppm, and
526 even 5,000 ppm, as Table SM.1, Table 2, and Figures 1, 2 and 6 amply demonstrate. Figure 7
527 illustrates the frequency with which 2,500 ppm concentrations are exceeded in a 154-seat
528 amphitheatre (2.8 m³/occupant) without mechanical ventilation.

529 Of course, the method used in no way allows us to claim that the 15 rooms without mechanical
530 ventilation studied by the participatory measurement campaign are representative of the
531 situation in all the university's rooms. They were not chosen at random; these were the rooms
532 where the campaign volunteers taught. However, the observations of the participatory
533 campaign are compatible with the analysis of the data from the fixed CO₂ sensors. It is very
534 worrying to note that, as table 2 shows, in 52% of cases, the first quartile of CO₂ concentrations
535 measured in these rooms exceeded the threshold of 1,300 ppm (and 97% of this first quartile
536 exceeded the threshold of 800 ppm recommended by the HCSP). These rooms, which have no
537 mechanical ventilation, are usually of relatively limited gauge (typically designed for 30 to 40
538 occupants, and are usually classrooms for tutorials or practical work). However, there is at least
539 one case where a 154-seat lecture theatre has no mechanical ventilation. This is room Xa, where
540 the volume per occupant is 2.8 m³/occupant, or 19% of the legal minimum threshold of 15
541 m³/occupant (see Figure SM.1 for photos and plans of this room). Under these conditions, it is
542 not surprising that plateaus of over 5,000 ppm for more than an hour are regularly recorded
543 there, even with an occupancy rate of less than 50%. Such levels have been observed in
544 particular during examination periods. This is particularly problematic in view of publications
545 showing a decline in psychomotor and cognitive abilities at concentrations above 1,000 ppm,
546 and especially above 2,500 ppm [29] [10], as well as an increase in the rate of headaches [10]
547 [12].

548 Our campaign therefore suggests that any room without mechanical ventilation that does not
549 meet the threshold of 15 m³/occupant should be considered hazardous to the health of
550 occupants, as long as the openings cannot be permanently opened when the room is in use.

551 **4.2.2 Risk situations in rooms with mechanical ventilation**

552 Here again, our methodology cannot guarantee that all 41 rooms in 15 of the university's
553 buildings are representative. However, it is noteworthy that if the legal minimum of clean air
554 flow of 25 m³/h/occupant is considered the objective, a mere nine of the 41 rooms examined
555 (22%) would not necessitate a reduction in gauge. Conversely, if the objective is to adhere to
556 the most recent HCSP recommendation (a minimum clean air flow of 50 m³/h/occupant,
557 corresponding to a maximum CO₂ concentration of approximately 800 ppm), it is observed
558 that merely two of the 41 rooms meet this criterion (with doors of these two rooms open to the
559 outside during the session). Consequently, in order to adhere to the recommendations outlined
560 by the HCSP, it is imperative that at least 39 of the 41 rooms under consideration undergo a
561 reduction in gauge, with 35 of these rooms required to undergo a reduction greater than 70%.
562 It should also be remembered that the estimates of clean air flow during classroom sessions are
563 deliberately "optimistic" for the reasons discussed in section 4.1.2, and that measuring the flow

564 of clean air per occupant using the CO₂ decay method would certainly give even more drastic
565 estimates of the reduction in gauge.

566 **4.2.3 The university's ability to respond to air quality alerts**

567 The university has two levers at its disposal to reduce the risk to which its staff and students
568 are exposed as a result of poor indoor air quality. The first of these levers is technical, and can
569 be activated when the problem arises from a malfunction in the air handling units. This was the
570 case for the Ne amphitheatre. When the relevant university departments intervened, it was
571 found that the air handling unit in this amphitheatre had stopped working. Simply restarting it
572 brought about a considerable improvement in the flow of clean air per occupant, which rose
573 overnight from 0.2 m³/h/occupant to 20 m³/h/occupant (80% of the legal minimum of 25
574 m³/h/occupant, and 40% of the HCSP recommendation of 50 m³/h/occupant).

575 The second lever is political and organisational. The university needs to become aware of the
576 seriousness of the public health problem posed by the quality of its indoor air. In reality, despite
577 explicit advice from the country's highest public health authority, the HCSP, the message is
578 struggling to get through. Such awareness would provide the means to detect malfunctions in
579 the air handling units and correct them where possible, as well as defining a policy for adapting
580 the use of rooms, which could be used to improve indoor air quality.

581 The fixed sensors deployed by the university have the advantage of constantly monitoring the
582 CO₂ concentration in the rooms equipped with them. This is very useful for detecting
583 malfunctions in the air handling units. However, during the course of our study, no one was
584 responsible for sounding the alarm if the thresholds were exceeded. Thus, it was within the
585 framework of the study described here that analysis of the CO₂ signal recorded continuously
586 in the Vc amphitheater (see Figure SM.2 for photos and plans of this room) made it possible to
587 detect the shutdown of the air handling unit in this building, the consequences of which are
588 summarized in Figure 8. This shutdown during an examination led to considerable exceedances
589 of the legal thresholds, with probably a peak of CO₂ concentration around 10,000 ppm. Such
590 levels are utterly unacceptable, particularly during an examination period when students are
591 mobilizing all their cognitive capacities. It has previously been noted that these capacities are
592 diminished above 1,000 ppm, and more specifically above 2,500 ppm. At 10,000 ppm, the risk
593 of contamination by airborne infectious agents is considerably increased (21% of the air
594 breathed in comes from the occupants' lungs). But direct toxicity must also be considered. This
595 is characterized by the Occupational Exposure Limit (OEL), which must not be exceeded for
596 8 hours (OEL 8h) or for 15 minutes (Short Term OEL). The 8h OEL for CO₂ is 5,000 ppm
597 [30]. Short Term OEL values vary from country to country (10,000 ppm in Germany, 30,000
598 ppm in the USA, France has not defined one). The concentrations shown in Figure 8 are
599 therefore particularly problematic.

600 It should also be possible to put in place a suitable organisation to prevent the recurring risks
601 of CO₂ limits being exceeded. Once again, the example of the Vc amphitheatre is typical. In
602 building V, the air handling unit stopped working due to a malfunction in the dialogue between
603 this unit and the fire detection system. This dialogue regularly leads to the air handling unit
604 shutting down, which can only be restarted by the intervention of a member of staff. Despite
605 repeated warnings, it has not been possible to arrange for the CO₂ concentration in the two
606 lecture theatres in Building V with fixed CO₂ sensors to be read at least daily. This is how the
607 incident summarised in Figure 8 occurred, even though reading the signals from these sensors
608 several days before the examination summarised in Figure 8 would have made it possible to

609 detect the shutdown of the air handling unit and therefore to restart it before the examination
610 that led to the 10,000 ppm peak. Several weeks before the incident summarised in Figure 8, the
611 authorities had been asked to put in place a procedure to ensure that the CO₂ sensors in this
612 building were checked twice a day and that action was taken immediately to restart the air
613 handling unit in the event of an unexpected shutdown. The alert had even been given 48 hours
614 before the examination summarised in Figure 8. No measures were taken to protect the
615 occupants. Worse still, although a specific alert had been filed following this incident on the
616 official register, a new similar incident occurred a few weeks later, with the 5,000 ppm limit
617 value again being exceeded during an examination.

618 The university also needs to organize itself to react to a known systemic risk. Signals showing
619 the reality and seriousness of the problem in a large proportion of the rooms at UGA had been
620 available at the highest levels of the university since July 2022. The poor quality of the indoor
621 air was discussed on numerous occasions by the university's specialist risk management bodies,
622 without appropriate corrective or preventive action being systematically taken in line with the
623 HCSP recommendations for CO₂ levels in excess of 1,500 ppm. Figures similar to those in
624 Figure 6 have been discussed several times at the highest level, without the university's website
625 mentioning the existence of the problem, and without appropriate warning measures being
626 systematically taken (for example, during months, most of the rooms concerned did not display
627 a poster warning of the existence of a danger, encouraging users to open the openings as much
628 as possible, asking people entering the room to use a surgical mask at the slightest sign of
629 respiratory infection, and suggesting that immuno-compromised people protect themselves).
630 No decision was taken to reduce the gauge of the rooms, even in the face of major inadequacies.
631 Amphitheatre Xa, for example, continued to be used to accommodate students in conditions
632 that regularly led to considerable breaches of the legal thresholds (up to more than 5,000 ppm,
633 see Figure 7), even though the failure to comply with the minimum threshold of 15 m³/occupant
634 for this room without mechanical ventilation should have led to the 154-seat gauge being
635 reduced to 29.

636 Finally, when a malfunction is reported in a particular room, it is important to organise a rapid
637 response. The university has a specific register in which its staff can officially report any risk
638 to their health or that of their colleagues and students. In our experience, this register did not
639 allow for rapid reactions when exceedances of the legal CO₂ thresholds were reported. For
640 example, an initial informal alert following a CO₂ measurement in lecture theatre Ne was
641 issued in January 2022. As this alert did not lead to any action being taken, a second alert was
642 filed on the ad hoc register in January 2023, which was also not acted upon. A third alert was
643 filed in January 2024. This alert was initially closed by the administration, which considered
644 that the problem was already known. The staff member concerned had to challenge this
645 decision to close the alert before the university's health and safety committee. A specialist was
646 finally sent to check the operation of the air handling unit, found that it had been shut down,
647 and restarted it. This highlights how difficult it is for a university to listen to the alarm signals
648 it receives.

649 **4.3 Practical recommendations to the administrators of universities regarding indoor air** 650 **quality**

651 The findings of this study, delineated in the preceding subsections, can be extrapolated to
652 formulate recommendations for university administrators concerning indoor air quality. In
653 certain circumstances, the implementation of a constant air current throughout the duration of
654 room utilization can become impractical. These circumstances include instances where the

655 outside temperature is excessively low or high, or where there is an excessive amount of noise.
656 In such situations, all rooms lacking mechanical ventilation systems should be regarded as
657 potentially hazardous, as their air quality is likely to be substandard unless adequate ventilation
658 is ensured by opening doors and windows between classes. To address this concern, it is
659 recommended that each room be equipped with a sign instructing students and faculty to open
660 windows and doors for at least five minutes between classes. The volumes and dimensions of
661 all affected rooms should be documented for future reference. The university should define a
662 strategy to reorganize courses so that eventually no course will be held in a room with less than
663 $15 \text{ m}^3/\text{occupant}$.

664 The clean air flow of all rooms with mechanical ventilation should be estimated at least once a
665 year, preferably using the CO_2 decay model. This can be organized at relatively low cost by
666 applying the principles of the "participatory campaign" used in this study. All air handling units
667 that cannot guarantee at least $25 \text{ m}^3/\text{h}/\text{occupant}$ should be checked immediately and repaired if
668 possible. In a first phase, the university should define a strategy to reorganize courses in such
669 a way that eventually no course will be held in a room with a clean air flow of less than 25
670 $\text{m}^3/\text{h}/\text{occupant}$ (in a second phase, the target should be set at $50 \text{ m}^3/\text{h}/\text{occupant}$).

671 Defining these strategies to improve the indoor air quality in universities is all the more
672 important in countries where legislation is relatively less protective. French legislation is
673 currently one of the least protective in Europe in terms of minimum ventilation rates (25
674 $\text{m}^3/\text{h}/\text{occupant}$ in France, while the minimum legal value in Europe is $20 \text{ m}^3/\text{h}/\text{occupant}$ and
675 the maximal legal value is $90 \text{ m}^3/\text{h}/\text{occupant}$) [31]. As was already mentioned, HCSP
676 recommends to target a maximum concentration of CO_2 of 800 ppm (while the legal threshold
677 is $1,300 \text{ ppm}$), and a minimum flow of clean air of $50 \text{ m}^3/\text{h}/\text{occupant}$ (while the legal threshold
678 is $25 \text{ m}^3/\text{h}/\text{occupant}$). Universities should therefore prepare to upcoming more demanding legal
679 prescription in terms of Interior Air Quality.

680 **5 Conclusion**

681 This study has shown that it is useful and easy to mobilize teachers to measure CO_2
682 concentrations in the rooms of a university, in order to characterize risk situations. The study
683 shows that rooms without mechanical ventilation are hazardous to the health of their occupants
684 when they are used with openings closed and without complying with the legal minimum
685 volume of $15 \text{ m}^3/\text{occupant}$. For rooms without mechanical ventilation, the study confirms that
686 clean air flows below the legal threshold of $25 \text{ m}^3/\text{h}/\text{occupant}$ are insufficient to guarantee the
687 quality of indoor air, and therefore the health of their occupants. The finding that the majority
688 of the rooms under study did not comply with the legal requirements suggests that this
689 problematic situation may also be present in a significant proportion of rooms at the university
690 surveyed. Our study demonstrated the ease and simplicity of implementing the method for
691 characterizing the ventilation performance of an amphitheater, which consists of measuring the
692 decrease in CO_2 after the amphitheater has been evacuated and the doors closed. This method
693 could be implemented very quickly and easily to characterize the ventilation performance of
694 all the rooms in the university that have mechanical ventilation. With the political will of the
695 administration, it would be possible to characterize the ventilation in all these rooms in just a
696 few months. However, compliance with the legal threshold of $25 \text{ m}^3/\text{occupant}/\text{h}$, and even more
697 so with the target of $50 \text{ m}^3/\text{occupant}/\text{h}$, will necessarily involve substantial investment and will
698 take time. In the meantime, it will be necessary to work on the use of the most problematic
699 rooms, so as to be able to reduce their gauge. Given the university's shortage of rooms, this is

700 a considerable challenge. To address this issue, it is essential to quantify the problem precisely.
701 The method proposed here is a promising approach for achieving this objective.

702 **Data Availability**

703 The data used to support the findings of this study are available from the corresponding author
704 upon request.

705 **Conflicts of Interest**

706 The author declares that there is no conflict of interest regarding the publication of this paper.

707 **Funding Statement**

708 The 4 Aranet4 CO₂ sensors were funded by SNESUP-FSU union. The author is an employee
709 of University Grenoble Alpes (France).

710 **Acknowledgments**

711 This study would not have been possible without the involvement of the SNESUP-FSU union,
712 who funded the sensors and advertised the study, and without the involvement of 20 lecturers
713 and researchers from Grenoble Alpes University, who volunteered for the participatory
714 campaign described here: we would like to extend our warmest thanks to them. The author is
715 grateful to Romain Guichard (Laboratoire d'Aéraulique, VentilAtion, Thermique et qualité
716 d'AiR, INRS) for his advice on modelling CO₂ concentrations in rooms and for his careful
717 proofreading of the article, as well as to the members of the CO₂ project <https://projetco2.fr/>
718 (Pascal Morenton, Benoît Semin) for advice on CO₂ measurement methods and for certain
719 bibliographical references.

720 **References**

721

- [1] C. Wang, K. A. Prather, J. Sznitman and al., "Airborne transmission of respiratory viruses," *Science*, vol. 373, no. 6558, doi:10.1126/science.abd9149, 2021.
- [2] T. Greenhalgh, J. L. Jimenez, K. A. Prather and al., "Ten scientific reasons in support of airborne transmission of SARS-CoV-2," *Lancet*, vol. 397, no. 10285, doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(21)00869-2, 2021.
- [3] C. R. Du, S. C. Wang, M. C. Yu and al., "Effect of ventilation improvement during a tuberculosis outbreak in underventilated university buildings," *Indoor Air*, vol. 3, pp. 422-432, doi:10.1111/ina.12639, 2020.
- [4] S. Zhu, S. Jenkins, K. Addo and al., "Ventilation and laboratory confirmed acute respiratory infection (ARI) rates in college residence halls in College Park, Maryland," *Environment International*, vol. 137 doi:10.1016/j.envint.2020.105537, 2020.
- [5] G. Buonanno, L. Ricolfi, L. Morawska and al., "Increasing ventilation reduces SARS-CoV-2 airborne transmission in schools: A retrospective cohort study in Italy's Marche region," *Front Public Health*, vol. 10, no. 1087087, doi: 10.3389/fpubh.2022.1087087, 2022.

- [6] A. Persily, W. P. Bahnfleth, H. Kipen, H. and al., "ASHRAE position document on Indoor Carbon Dioxide," 2 February 2022. [Online]. Available: https://www.ashrae.org/file%20library/about/position%20documents/pd_indoorcarbon_dioxide_2022.pdf.
- [7] Z. Peng and J. L. Jimenez, "Exhaled CO₂ as a COVID-19 Infection Risk Proxy for Different Indoor Environments and Activities," *Environmental Science & Technology Letters*, vol. 8, no. 5, pp. 392-397, doi: 10.1021/acs.estlett.1c00183, 2021.
- [8] A. Haddrell, H. Oswin, M. Otero-Fernandez and al., "Ambient carbon dioxide concentration correlates with SARS-CoV-2 aerostability and infection risk," *Nat Commun*, vol. 15, no. 3487, doi:10.1038/s41467-024-47777-5, 2024.
- [9] C. A. Redlich, J. Sparer and M. R. Cullen, "Sick-building syndrome," *Lancet*, vol. 1013, no. 1, doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(96)07220-0, 1997.
- [10] X. Zhang, P. Wargocki, Z. Lian and al., "Effects of Exposure to Carbon Dioxide and Bioeffluents on Perceived Air Quality, Self- assessed Acute Health Symptoms and Cognitive Performance," *Indoor Air*, vol. 27, no. 1, doi: 10.1111/ina.12284, 2017.
- [11] K. Azuma, N. Kagi, U. Yanagi and al., "Effects of low-level inhalation exposure to carbon dioxide in indoor T environments: A short review on human health and psychomotor performance," *Environment International*, vol. 121, pp. 51–56, doi:10.1016/j, 2018.
- [12] J. Palacios, K. Steele, Z. Tan and al., "Human health and productivity outcomes of office workers associated with indoor air quality: A systematic review," *MIT Center for Real Estate Research Paper*, vol. 21, no. 14, doi:10.2139/ssrn.3881998, 2021.
- [13] (France), High Council for Public Health, "Covid-19: aeration, ventilation and CO₂ measurement in buildings open to the public," <https://www.hcsp.fr/Explore.cgi/AvisRapportsDomaine?clefr=1009>, 2021.
- [14] (France), High Council for Public Health, "Notice concerning the measurement of carbon dioxide in indoor air in buildings open to the public," <https://www.hcsp.fr/explore.cgi/avisrapportsdomaine?clefr=1154>, 2022.
- [15] (France), High Council for Public Health, "Notice concerning the aeration, ventilation, hygiene and use of premises to prevent infectious risks in exceptional epidemic situations," <https://www.hcsp.fr/explore.cgi/avisrapportsdomaine?clefr=13>, 2023.
- [16] A. Mundackal and V. M. Ngole-Jeme, "Evaluation of indoor and outdoor air quality in university academic buildings and associated health risk," *International Journal of Environmental Health Research*, vol. 32, no. 5, doi: 10.1080/09603123.2020.1828304, pp. 1-19, 2022.
- [17] V. Faye McNeill, R. Corsi, J. A. Huffman et al., «Room-level ventilation in schools and universities,» *Atmospheric Environment X*, vol. 100152, doi: 10.1016/j.aeaoa.2022.100152, 2022.
- [18] (France), French Ministry of the Environment,, "Decree setting the conditions for carrying out direct-reading measurements of carbon dioxide concentration in indoor air as part of the annual assessment of ventilation systems," <https://www.legifrance.gouv.fr/jorf/id/JORFTEXT000046830005>, 2022.
- [19] N. Ma, D. Aviv, H. Guo and al., "Measuring the right factors: A review of variables and models for thermal comfort and indoor air quality," *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, Vols. 135, doi:10.1016/j.rser.2020.110436, 2021.
- [20] W. F. de Gid, «CO₂ as indicator for the indoor air quality. General principles,» Ventilation Information Paper n° 33, Air Infiltration and Ventilation Centre,

https://www.aivc.org/sites/default/files/members_area/medias/pdf/VIP/VIP%2033_CO2%20General.pdf, 2010.

- [21] J. Blunden, T. Boyer and E. Bartow-Gillies, "State of the Climate in 2022," *Bull. Amer. Meteor. Soc.*, vol. 104, no. 9, pp. Si–S501, doi:10.1175/2023BAMSStateoftheClimate.1, 2023.
- [22] G. Pei, D. Rim, S. Schiavon and al., "Effect of sensor position on the performance of CO₂-based demand controlled ventilation," *Energy and Buildings*, vol. 202, doi:10.1016/j.enbuild.2019.109358, 2019.
- [23] E. Bjorn and P. V. Nielsen, "Dispersal of exhaled air and personal exposure in displacement ventilated rooms," *Indoor Air*, vol. 12, pp. 147–164, doi:10.1034/j.1600-0668.2002.08126.x, 2002.
- [24] A. Bulinska, Z. Popiolek and Z. Bulinski, "Experimentally validated CFD analysis on sampling region determination of average indoor carbon dioxide concentration in occupied space," *Building and Environment*, vol. 71, pp. 319–331, doi:10.1016/j.2014.
- [25] G. Buonanno, L. Stabile and L. Morawska, "Estimation of airborne viral emission: Quanta emission rate of SARS-CoV-2 for infection risk assessment," *Environment International*, doi:10.1016/j.envint.2020.105794, 2020.
- [26] B. Moseley, J. Archer, C. M. Orton and al., "Relationship between Exhaled Aerosol and Carbon Dioxide Emission Across Respiratory Activities," *Environmental Science & Technology*, vol. 58, no. 34, doi:10.1021/acs.est.4c01717, 2024.
- [27] A. Persily and L. de Jonge, "Carbon dioxide generation rates for building occupants," *Indoor Air*, Vols. 27, doi: 10.1111/ina.12383, p. 868–879, 2017.
- [28] «Standard Guide on the Relationship of Indoor Carbon Dioxide Concentrations to Indoor Air Quality and Ventilation. ASTM D6245-24,» Grenoble <https://www.astm.org/standards/d6245/>, 2024.
- [29] U. Satish, M. Mendell, S. J and al., "Is CO₂ an Indoor Pollutant? Direct Effects of Low-to-Moderate CO₂ Concentrations on Human Decision-Making Performance," *Environmental Health Perspectives*, vol. 120, no. 12, doi: 10.1289/ehp.1104789, 2012.
- [30] Occupational Safety and Health Administration, "Permissible Exposure Limits – Annotated Tables," <https://www.osha.gov/annotated-pels/table-z-1>, 2021.
- [31] N. Brelih, "Ventilation rates and IAQ in national regulations," *REHVA Journal*, https://www.rehva.eu/fileadmin/hvac-dictio/01-2012/ventilation-rates-and-iaq-in-national-regulations_rj1201.pdf, 2012.

722

723

724

725

726

Concise description of Supplementary figures and tables

727 **Table SM.1.** Summary of measurements in the 15 rooms without mechanical ventilation.

728

729 **Figure SM.1** Photos from the front and rear, and dimensions, of room Xa. This is a room
730 without mechanical ventilation where CO₂ concentrations above 5,000 ppm were frequently
731 recorded. This room has a gauge of 154 occupants, an area of 128 m², and a volume of 434 m³


Indoor Air quality at a French university


732 (2.8 m³/occupant). The lower windows cannot be opened. The upper windows can only be
733 partially opened, so that the maximum opening area of the windows is 2.7 m².

734


735

736 **Figure SM.2** Photos from the front and rear, and dimensions, of room Vc. This room with
737 mechanical ventilation had problems with its air handling unit, leading to concentrations of
738 CO₂ above 10,000 ppm. This room has a gauge of 335 occupants, an area of 255 m², and a
739 volume of 990 m³.







— CO2 ●●●● 800 ppm ●●●● 1300 ppm ●●●● 1500 ppm





— CO2 ●●●● 800 ppm ●●●● 1300 ppm





• CO2 — CO2 model





Time