1 Accuracy verification of low-cost CO₂ concentration measuring devices for

2 general use as a countermeasure against COVID-19

3 Yo Ishigaki¹⁾, Koji Enoki¹⁾, Shinji Yokogawa^{1,2)}

4

5 Affiliations:

- 6 1) Graduate School of Informatics and Engineering, The University of Electro-7 communications, Chofu, Tokyo, Japan.
- 8 2) Info-powered Energy System Research Center (iPERC), The University of
 9 Electro-communications, Chofu, Tokyo, Japan.
- 10

11 Corresponding author:

- Yo Ishigaki, <u>ishigaki@uec.ac.jp</u>, 1-5-1 Chofugaoka, Chofu, Tokyo 182-8585,
 Japan.
- 14
- 15 Declaration of competing financial interests (CFI):

16 The authors indicate no conflicts of interest.

17

18 Abstract:

19 Within the context of the COVID-19 pandemic, CO₂ sensors that measure ventilation conditions and thereby reduce the risk of airborne infection, are 20 21 gaining increasing attention. We investigated and verified the accuracy of 12 22 relatively low-cost sensor models that retail for less than \$45 and are advertised as infection control measures on a major e-commerce site. Our results indicate 23 24 that 25% of the tested sensors can be used to identify trends in CO₂ concentration, 25 if correctly calibrated. However, 67% of sensors did not respond to the presence 26 of CO₂, which suggests that a type of pseudo-technique is used to display the 27 CO₂ concentration. We recommend that these sensors are not suitable for 28 infection prevention purposes. Furthermore, 58% of the investigated sensors showed significant responses to the presence of alcohol. Owing to the 29 30 widespread use of alcohol in preventing the spread of infectious diseases.

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

31 sensors that react to alcohol can display inaccurate values, resulting in 32 inappropriate ventilation behavior. Therefore, we strongly recommended that 33 these sensors not be used. Based on our results, we offer practical 34 recommendations to the average consumer, who does not have special 35 measuring equipment, on how to identify inaccurate CO₂ sensors.

36

37 Introduction

In enclosed spaces with inadequate ventilation and air treatment, the airborne spread of SARS-CoV-2 can occur even at a distance of 6 feet or more from an infected person, especially as concentrations of very fine droplets and aerosol particles drift through the air [1]. Within this context, airborne transmission may have accounted for more than 50% of the disease transmission on the Diamond Princess, the cruise ship associated with the SARS-CoV-2 outbreak in Japan [2].

The concentration of indoor carbon dioxide (CO₂) has attracted attention as a proxy for infection risk [3]. While outdoor fresh air has a constant CO₂ concentration of approximately 400 ppm, human breath contains a much larger amount of CO₂ at 30,000–40,000 ppm. Therefore, by measuring indoor CO₂ concentration, it is possible to understand how much human breath is retained in the air.

51 The American Society of Health Engineers (ASHE) states that there is a 52 correlation between ventilation capacity and the risk of airborne infection from 53 tuberculosis, measles, chicken pox, influenza, smallpox, and SARS [4]. The

54 Wells-Riley equation (Equation 1) can be used to quantitatively evaluate the risk 55 of airborne infection by bacteria and viruses [5-6].

$$P = 1 - \exp\left[-\frac{lqpt}{Q}\left\{1 - \frac{V}{Q\theta}\left[1 - \exp\left(-\frac{Q\theta}{V}\right)\right]\right\}\right]$$
(1)

56

57 In this equation, P is the probability that an infected person will be infected, 58 *I* is the number of infected persons in the enclosed space, *p* is the respiratory 59 volume of one person (m^3/h) , q is the rate of infectious droplets (/h), t is the time spent by the infected person in the space (h), θ is the time spent by the infected 60 person in the space (h), V is the volume of the room (m^3) , and Q is the ventilation 61 rate (m³/h). Thus, the Wells-Riley equation models the probability of exposure to 62 63 infectious droplets emitted by an infected person and inhaled by an uninfected 64 person through respiration as the risk quantity. As infectious droplets are accompanied by a high concentration of CO₂, both of which are airborne, it is 65 66 beneficial to use CO₂ concentration as an indicator of the airborne infection risk.

67 A number of researchers have suggested that the threshold ventilation rate for maintaining the effective reproduction rate of tuberculosis (the ratio of new 68 69 secondary infected persons to the source of infection) below 1 corresponds to a 70 CO₂ concentration of 1,000 ppm. Specifically, Du et al. found that by improving the ventilation system in a poorly ventilated university building, where an outbreak 71 72 of tuberculosis occurred (27 tuberculosis patients and 1,665 contacts), and by 73 reducing the maximum CO_2 concentration from 3204 ± 50 to 591-603 ppm, the 74 secondary infection rate among new contacts could be reduced to zero (mean 75 follow-up, 5.9 years). Furthermore, the incidence of tuberculosis among contacts

could be reduced by 97% (95% CI: 50–99.9%) when the CO₂ concentration
remained below 1,000 ppm [7].

After comprehensively considering laws and regulations concerning CO₂ concentration, the Occupational Hygiene and Ergonomics Subcommittee of the Japan Society for Occupational Health (JSOH) established classifications for estimating ventilation status according to CO₂ concentrations (Table 1), and recommended measures according to each classification [8].

83

Table 1 Ventilation criteria based on CO₂ concentrations, established by The
 Occupational Hygiene and Ergonomics Subcommittee of the Japan Society for
 Occupational Health (JSOH).

CO ₂ concentration	Classification	Description
Less than 1,000	Good	High quality air. The status should
ppm or less		be maintained.
1,000 to 1,500 ppm	Moderately good	Acceptable limits. Occasional
or less		opening of a number of windows is
		recommended (for a few minutes
		per hour).
1,500 to 2,500 ppm	Poor	Open windows for at least a few
or less		minutes every half hour (fully open)
		and do not use the room.
2,500 to 3,500 ppm	Very poor	Open the windows all the time (fully
or less		open) and do not use the room.

3,500	ppm	or	Extremely poor	Do not use the room.
greater				

87

Like those of other countries, the Japanese Building Standard Law (revised 88 and implemented in 2003), requires the installation of a 24-hour ventilation 89 system in all living rooms to prevent the development of the sick building 90 91 syndrome, and requires an air change rate per hour (ACPH) of 0.5 times/h or more inside houses. With an ACPH of 0.5 times/h, for example, in a 70 m² space 92 93 with a standard activity level, the CO₂ concentration at saturation is 800 ppm with 94 two people in the room, 1,000 ppm with three people in the room, and 1,200 ppm 95 with four people in the room.

While the Building Standard Law specifies the amount of ventilation, Japan's Building Management Law (enacted in 1970) specifies CO_2 concentration standards. These laws specify that in buildings used as entertainment venues, department stores, restaurants, shops, offices, and schools, where the enclosed area used for specific purposes is 3,000 m² or more, defined as "specified buildings" (> 8,000 m² for schools), the CO₂ concentration should be 1,000 ppm or less.

Against this background, the monitoring of CO₂ concentration by sensors is currently being advocated to reduce the risk of COVID-19 in indoor environments. In many instances, especially in the context of a pandemics, it is recommended to maintain indoor CO₂ concentrations below 800 ppm (e.g., Minnesota Department of Health, Federation of European Heating Ventilation and Air Conditioning Associations, UK Scientific Advisory Group for Emergency, US

109 Centers for Disease Control and Prevention) [9]. In Japan, a widespread system 110 is used, in which local government supports the cost of installing CO₂ sensors in 111 restaurants to prevent the spread of COVID-19. For example, the Tokyo 112 Metropolitan Government, Kyoto Prefecture, and Osaka City support the 113 purchase of infection prevention devices, including CO₂ sensors, up to 100,000– 114 300,000 yen. In addition, Shibuya Ward in Tokyo distributes free CO₂ sensors to 115 restaurants located in the ward.

116 In response to this sudden increase in demand, low-cost CO₂ sensors have 117 rapidly become available on e-commerce sites such as Amazon, and are 118 advertised as being effective in preventing the spread of infectious diseases. 119 Many of these sensors have vague descriptions of their measurement principles, 120 with several consumers questioning the CO₂ measuring ability of these sensors. 121 In addition, there is a lack of guidelines for the use of CO₂ sensors in Japan, and 122 a lack of laws or regulations regarding their accuracy and reliability. In response 123 to this research need, we purchased several low-cost CO₂ sensors, to verify their 124 accuracy and investigate the related measurement principles.

Although several studies have already evaluated low-cost gas sensors [10, 126 11], including CO₂ sensors, the global outbreak of COVID-19 has led to a 127 proliferation of new products on the market for the control of infectious diseases 128 that have not been tested for efficacy and accuracy. Therefore, we conducted this 129 study to investigate the accuracy and reliability of these sensors and to offer 130 advice on these sensors to the general consumer, who does not have access to 131 specialized inspection equipment.

132

133 Methodology

134 In this study, we purchased and investigated 12 relatively low-cost CO₂ sensors (1–12; Table 2), within a price range of 2,900–4,999 JPY (approximately 135 26-45 USD, at the exchange rate in July 28, 2021) from the Amazon Japan 136 137 website, and installed them according to instructions. The sensors were 138 advertised as being effective in preventing COVID-19 infections. In addition to the 139 12 sensors, we purchased two relatively expensive CO₂ sensors, (A and B) that 140 are widely used for industrial and experimental purposes as reference devices. 141 Sensor A is manufactured by the T&D corporation TR-76Ui (54,780 JPY, 142 approximately 500 USD), with a zero and 1500 ppm span calibration, while 143 Sensor B is manufactured and factory calibrated by the C.H.C. System 144 corporation NMA-PR-R (47,500 JPY, approximately 430 USD). Both sensors A 145 and B are based on the non-dispersive infrared (NDIR) method. 146 All 14 sensors (1 to 12, A and B) were activated simultaneously and placed 147 in a chamber (Fig. 1). The following protocol was used for the experiment: 148

149 **1.** Open the chamber lid.

150 **2.** Turn on the fan.

151 3. Ventilate the chamber with room air (adjusted to 25°C) for 5 min.

- 152 **4**. Close the chamber lid.
- 153 **5**. Turn off the fan.

6. <FRESH AIR> Record the displayed values of each measuring
 instrument. However, if a value outside the measurement range is
 displayed, it is not recorded.

157 **7**. Turn on the fan.

158	8.	<injection></injection>	Inject	(additional)	CO ₂ gas,	(additional)	room a	air and/or

alcohol into the chamber to change the gas concentration in the chamber.

- 160 9. Wait for 5 min until the inner air and gas are evenly mixed in the chamber.
- 161 **10**. Turn off the fan.
- 162 11. <CONTROLLED ATMOSPHERE> Record the displayed values of each

163 measuring instrument. However, if a value outside the measurement

- range is displayed, it is not recorded.
- 165 **12.** Return to step 7 (or terminate the experiment).
- 166
- 167

Table 2 List of CO₂ sensors used in the experiment.

	Manufacturer		Claimed specifications				
חו	and/or product	Price	on the purchase page				
U	name indicated on	(JPY)	Sensor	Measurement	Accuracy		
	the purchase page		type	range	information		
1	Kecheer	3,589	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown		
					$\pm 50 \text{ ppm}$		
2	Walfront	4,909	Unknown	0–9,999	\pm 5% rdg		
					(0-5000 ppm)		
					0.05% FSO		
Q	ROOMMATE	3 /80	Unknown	400–5,000	Unknown		
5	Tokyo Deco	3,400			Onknown		
Δ	Sign Kingdom	3 680	NDIR	Unknown	Unknown		
-	Xmonitor-r1	0,000	NBIX	Childrewit	Onknown		
5	KKmoon	4,899	Unknown	350–2,000	Unknown		
6	Elikliv-10	2,900	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown		
7	Atmonas	4,999	NDIR	400–5,000	Unknown		

8	Seawardi	3,009	Unknown	Unknown	Error variation 3 to 30%
9	Rain Queen	4,700	Unknown	400–6,000	$\pm 50 \ \pm 5\%$
10	Lnicez	4,298	NDIR	400–5,000	Unknown
11	IUGGAN	4,800	Unknown	400–5,000	Unknown
12	YC22	4,599	Unknown	400–5,000	Unknown
А	T&D TR-76Ui	54,780	NDIR	0–9,999	CO2 \pm 50 ppm or \pm 5% of reading at \leq 5000 ppm
В	C.H.C.System NMA-PR-R	47,500	NDIR	0–3,000	±75 ppm or ±5% (whichever is greater)

168

169



170

Figure 1. Image of experimental equipment and setup used for an investigation
 of the accuracy of 12 CO₂ sensors.

173

174 **Results and Discussion**

We compared the CO₂ values of the 12 investigated sensors to those of the reference sensors (A and B; Fig. 2). The relatively expensive sensor B showed a narrower measurement range than sensor A, although both had very similar response characteristics. Sensor 10 generally displayed higher values than sensor A, while sensors 4 and 7 displayed lower values than sensor A. Although sensor 2 responded to CO₂, it seemed to malfunction, as it displayed very high

181 CO_2 values. Sensors 1, 3, 5, 6, 8, 9, and 12 did not seem to respond to CO_2 levels.

182 As these seven sensors are able to display total volatile organic compound

- 183 (tVOC) values, we conducted an additional experiment by applying approximately
- 184 5 ml of rubbing alcohol to the inside of the acrylic plate of the chamber.
- 185



Figure 2. Response characteristics of CO₂ sensors. Measured values of sensor A, the reference device, are plotted on the horizontal axis, and the measured values of sensors A, B, and 1 to 12 are plotted on the vertical axis, connected by spline curves.



Figure 3. Response characteristics of 14 CO₂ sensors to alcohol, including two
reference sensors (A and B). "1. Air" on the x-axis corresponds to the sixth step
(FRESH AIR) in the experimental protocol, while "2. Alcohol" refers to the
twelfth step of the protocol (CONTROLLED AIR), with 5 ml of alcohol added to
the chamber at the step 8 (INJECTION) instead of CO₂.

197

191

During this experiment, rather than adding CO₂ gas, 5 ml of alcohol was sprayed on the acrylic wall in the chamber (Fig. 3). To eliminate the crossrecruitment and contamination effect of alcohol, the experiment was performed independently to the previous experiment.

202 Our results (Fig. 3) indicate that the readings of sensors A, B, 2, 4, 6, 7, and 203 10 were not affected by the presence of alcohol. On the other hand, sensors 1,

3, 8, 9, 11, and 12 reacted strongly to alcohol. Furthermore, these six sensors were part of the group of seven sensors that did not respond to CO_2 (Fig. 2). The remaining sensor 6 appeared to respond neither to CO_2 nor to alcohol.

207 Of the 12 relatively low-cost sensors investigated in this study, three models 208 (sensors 4, 7, and 10; 25% of the total) can potentially be used to determine CO₂ 209 concentration levels, if correctly calibrated. However, the accuracy of the sensors 210 was not as good as that of the more expensive reference sensors. Machine 211 learning methods have been proposed for calibration of inexpensive sensors [12, 212 13]. Sensor 2 seemed to be malfunctioning (8% of the total), while eight sensor 213 models (67%) did not respond to CO_2 , and seven of these (58% of the total) 214 responded strongly to alcohol, suggesting that the sensors were equipped with 215 different sensors to the CO₂ sensing module.

216 To investigate the sensing module, we purchased and disassembled an extra 217 model of sensor 12 (Fig. 4). Notably, the NDIR sensor was not present. Based on 218 the model number of the sensing module and the manufacturer's specifications 219 [14], we identified that the sensor was not designed for CO₂ measurements, but 220 rather for the measurement of "ammonia, hydrogen, alcohol, carbon monoxide, 221 methane, propane, Gan, styrene, propylene glycol, alkyl phenol, toluene, ethylbenzene, xylene, formaldehyde, and other volatile organic gases, incense 222 223 smoke, wood, paper smoke burning out." This suggests that sensor 12 is 224 designed to display the concentration of CO₂ by a type of imitating algorithm 225 based on the value of the sensing module that detects miscellaneous gases, 226 excluding CO₂.

- Globally, several sensors display a very vaguely defined measurement
 called eCO₂ (equivalent CO₂). This is estimated from the tVOC value and has
 been shown to differ from the actual CO₂ concentration [15].
 Sensors 1, 3, 8, 9, 11, and 12, which responded strongly to alcohol (Fig. 3),
 all displayed tVOC values separately from the CO₂ concentration. Therefore, we
 suspected that these six sensor models were displaying eCO₂ values rather than
- actual CO₂ concentrations. However, the sales pages for these six sensors did
- not indicate that they used eCO_2 sensors.
- 235

236



237

238

239

240

Figure 4. Sensing module of Sensor 12. A cylindrical object was suspended in the air by four wire bonds, and inside it was a coil heater.

Based on the results of our experiments, we developed a simple method for consumers to verify the quality of sensors on offer, without needing specialized equipment. Within this context, we recommend the following:

244

245	1.	Ensure that the sensor displays a value of approximately 400 ppm in
246		fresh air outdoors (this will allow for the detection of faulty sensors such
247		as sensor 2, with a large deviation in CO_2 values).

- 248
 2. Ensure that the CO₂ concentration rises significantly when breathing on
 249 the sensor (this will help identify sensors that do not respond to increases
 250 in CO₂, such as Sensors 1, 3, 5, 6, 8, 9, and 12).
- 251
 3. Ensure that the sensor does not react erroneously to alcohol by holding
 252
 a hand dipped in an alcohol disinfectant close to the sensor (this
 253
 eliminates low-quality sensors that pseudo-indicate CO₂ concentration
 254
 from tVOC concentrations such as alcohol).

255

256 Conclusions

257 Twenty-five percent of the relatively low-cost sensors investigated in this 258 study have the potential to be used for identifying trends in CO₂ concentration, if 259 correctly calibrated, although with a poor accuracy. Notably, 67% of the sensors 260 did not respond to changes in CO₂ levels, which suggests that various pseudo-261 masquerading techniques are being used to display CO₂ concentrations. These 262 sensors should not be used to prevent the spread of infectious diseases. In 263 addition, 58% of the sensors reacted strongly to alcohol. As alcohol is widely used 264 indoors to prevent the spread of COVID-19, sensors that respond to alcohol will 265 display inflated values, which can lead to incorrect ventilation behavior. Therefore, 266 we strongly recommended that these sensors not be used.

This study was conducted using a total of 14 commercially available sensor models. However, there are many models of CO2 sensors available in the market.

269 We suggest that future research focus on an exhaustive analysis of the sensors 270 available in the market as a basis for a discussion on the guidelines and regulations for CO₂ sensors. We are planning to use gas chromatography with 271 272 an accuracy of ±0.1 ppm to simultaneously detect the concentration of alcohol 273 and carbon dioxide for more accurate verification. With this method, we will be 274 able to measure both organic and inorganic gases, which was not possible before. 275 In addition, clarification of the electrical circuit, catalyst, semiconductor 276 composition, and solid-state properties of the sensing modules (Fig. 4) will assist 277 to pinpointing the purpose for which these sensors were developed. Furthermore, we suggest that future research focus on not only conducting exposure 278 279 experiments with pure CO₂ gas, but also include accurate measurements with human-derived CO₂ gases, including various volatile organic compounds. 280

281

282 Notes

The authors declare no conflicts of interest. This paper has been previously submitted to medRxiv, a preprint server for health sciences. This study was approved by the Ethics Committee on Experiments on Human Subjects (approval number of 21005), The University of Electro-communications, located at Chofugaoka 1-5-1, Chofu, Tokyo, Japan.

288

289 Acknowledgments

This work was supported by the Research Grant Program of the KDDI Foundation. In addition, some of the data acquisition technologies in this study are based on results obtained from a project commissioned by the New Energy and Industrial Technology Development Organization (NEDO).

294

295 Data availability

The raw data of the graphs are available on FigShare.

- 297 https://figshare.com/articles/figure/Accuracy_verification_of_low-
- 298 cost_CO2_concentration_measuring_devices_for_general_use_as_a_counterm
- 299 easure_against_infectious_diseases/15067557
- 300

301 References

- 3021)CDC (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention), SARS-CoV-2303Transmission, Summary of recent changes, Updated May 7, 2021
- 304
 Online:
 https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/science/science

 305
 briefs/sars-cov-2-transmission.html (accessed 25 July 2021)
- Azimi P, Keshavarz Z, Laurent JGC, Stephens B, Allen JG. Mechanistic
 transmission modeling of COVID-19 on the Diamond Princess cruise ship
 demonstrates the importance of aerosol transmission. Proc Natl Acad Sci
 2021; 118(8) e2015482118; DOI: 10.1073/pnas.2015482118.
- 310 3) Memarzadeh F. Room Ventilation and Airborne Disease Transmission,
 311 American Hospital Association, Editor: The American Society for Healthcare
 312 Engineering; 2013.
- Wells WF. *Airborne contagion and air hygiene*. Harvard: Harvard University
 Press, 1955.
- 5) Riley EC, Murphy G, Riley RL. Airborne spread of measles in a suburban elementary school. Am J Epidemiol 1978; 107: 421-432.
- Buonanno G, Stabile L, Morawska L. Estimation of airborne viral emission;
 Quanta emission rate of SARS CoV-2 for infection risk assessment. Environ
 Int 2020; 141: 1–8.
- Du CR, Wang SC, Yu MC, Chiu TF, Wang JY, Chuang PC, Jou R, Chan PC,
 Fang CT. Effect of ventilation improvement during a tuberculosis outbreak in
 underventilated university buildings, Indoor Air 2019: 30(3); 422-432.
- 8) The Occupational Hygiene and Ergonomics Subcommittee of the Japan
 Society for Occupational Health (JSOH): Ventilation simulator for COVID-19
 countermeasures (COVID-19 Taisaku-you Kanki Simulator). Online:
 http://jsoh-
- 327 <u>ohe.umin.jp/covid_simulator/ventilation_simulator_manual_ver1.0.pdf</u>
- 328 (accessed 25 July 2021)
- 329 9) Eykelbosh, A. Indoor CO₂ Sensors for COVID-19 Risk Mitigation: Current
 330 Guidance and Limitations. Vancouver, BC: National Collaborating Centre for
 331 Environmental Health. 2021 May.

332	Online: https://ncceh.ca/documents/field-inquiry/indoor-co2-sensors-COVID-
333	19-risk-mitigation-current-guidance-and (accessed 25 July 2021).
334	10) Lewis AC, Lee JD, Edwards PM, Shaw MD, Evans MJ, Moller SJ, Smith KR,
335	Buckley JW, Ellis M, Gillot SR, Whited A. Evaluating the performance of low
336	cost chemical sensors for air pollution research. Faraday Discuss 2016; 189
337	Online: https://doi.org/10.1039/C5FD00201J (accessed 25 July 2021).
338	11) Castell N, Dauge FR, Schneider P, Vogt M, Lerner U, Fishbain B, Broday D,
339	Bartonova A. Can commercial low-cost sensor platforms contribute to air
340	quality monitoring and exposure estimates? Environ Int 2017; 99: 293-302,
341	ISSN 0160-4120, 2017.
342	Online: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envint.2016.12.007 (accessed 25 July 2021)
343	12) Zimmerman N, Presto AA, Kumar SPN, Gu J, Hauryliuk A, Robinson ES,
344	Robinson AL, Subramanian R. A machine learning calibration model using
345	random forests to improve sensor performance for lower-cost air quality
346	monitoring. Atmos Meas Tech, 2018; 11:291–313.
347	Online: https://doi.org/10.5194/amt-11-291-2018 (accessed 25 July 2021)
348	13) Zaidan MA, Motlagh NH, Fung PL, Lu D, Timonen H, Kuula J, Niemi JV,
349	Tarkoma S, Petäjä T, Kulmala M, Hussein T. Intelligent Calibration and Virtual
350	Sensing for Integrated Low-Cost Air Quality Sensors. IEEE Sensors Journal
351	2020; 20(22): 13638-13652 doi: 10.1109/JSEN.2020.3010316.
352	Online: https://ieeexplore.ieee.org/document/9144227 (accessed 25 July
353	2021)
354	14) TPM-300 Air Quality Module Intelligent Air Quality Monitoring Module Air
355	Sensor
356	Online: https://ardubotics.eu/en/sensors/1243-tpm-300-air-quality-module-
357	intelligent-air-quality-monitoring-module-air-sensor.html (accessed 25 July
358	2021)
359	15) Varzaru G, Zarnescu A, Ungurelu R, Secere M. Dismantling the confusion
360	between the equivalent CO_2 and CO_2 concentration levels. 11th International
361	Conference on Electronics, Computers and Artificial Intelligence (ECAI)
362	2019: pp. 1-4, doi: 10.1109/ECAI46879.2019.9042113.