

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:

12 Yo Ishigaki, ishigaki@uec.ac.jp, 1-5-1 Chofugaoka, Chofu, Tokyo 182-8585,
13 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
20 ventilation conditions and thereby reduce the risk of airborne infection, are
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
23 as infection control measures on a major e-commerce site. Our results indicate
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
29 showed significant responses to the presence of alcohol. Owing to the
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NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.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**

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

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

51 The American Society of Health Engineers (ASHAE) 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].

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

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 ($/\text{h}$), t is the time
60 spent by the infected person in the space (h), θ is the time spent by the infected
61 person in the space (h), V is the volume of the room (m^3), and Q is the ventilation
62 rate (m^3/h). Thus, the Wells-Riley equation models the probability of exposure to
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
65 accompanied by a high concentration of CO_2 , both of which are airborne, it is
66 beneficial to use CO_2 concentration as an indicator of the airborne infection risk.

67 A number of researchers have suggested that the threshold ventilation rate
68 for maintaining the effective reproduction rate of tuberculosis (the ratio of new
69 secondary infected persons to the source of infection) below 1 corresponds to a
70 CO_2 concentration of 1,000 ppm. Specifically, Du et al. found that by improving
71 the ventilation system in a poorly ventilated university building, where an outbreak
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

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

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

83

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

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

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

87

88 Like those of other countries, the Japanese Building Standard Law (revised
89 and implemented in 2003), requires the installation of a 24-hour ventilation
90 system in all living rooms to prevent the development of the sick building
91 syndrome, and requires an air change rate per hour (ACPH) of 0.5 times/h or
92 more inside houses. With an ACPH of 0.5 times/h, for example, in a 70 m² space
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.

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

103 Against this background, the monitoring of CO₂ concentration by sensors is
104 currently being advocated to reduce the risk of COVID-19 in indoor environments.
105 In many instances, especially in the context of a pandemics, it is recommended
106 to maintain indoor CO₂ concentrations below 800 ppm (e.g., Minnesota
107 Department of Health, Federation of European Heating Ventilation and Air
108 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.

125 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
135 sensors (1–12; Table 2), within a price range of 2,900–4,999 JPY (approximately
136 26–45 USD, at the exchange rate in July 28, 2021) from the Amazon Japan
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.
- 154 6. <FRESH AIR> Record the displayed values of each measuring
155 instrument. However, if a value outside the measurement range is
156 displayed, it is not recorded.


- 157 7. Turn on the fan.
- 158 8. <INJECTION> Inject (additional) CO₂ gas, (additional) room air and/or
- 159 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
- 164 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.

ID	Manufacturer and/or product name indicated on the purchase page	Price (JPY)	Claimed specifications on the purchase page		
			Sensor type	Measurement range	Accuracy information
1	Kecheer	3,589	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
2	Walfront	4,909	Unknown	0–9,999	±50 ppm ± 5% rdg (0-5000 ppm) 0.05% FSO
3	ROOMMATE Tokyo Deco	3,480	Unknown	400–5,000	Unknown
4	Sign Kingdom Xmonitor-r1	3,680	NDIR	Unknown	Unknown
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
A	T&D TR-76Ui	54,780	NDIR	0–9,999	CO ₂ ± 50 ppm or $\pm 5\%$ of reading at ≤ 5000 ppm
B	C.H.C.System NMA-PR-R	47,500	NDIR	0–3,000	± 75 ppm or $\pm 5\%$ (whichever is greater)

169



170


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

173


174 Results and Discussion

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

181 CO₂ values. Sensors 1, 3, 5, 6, 8, 9, and 12 did not seem to respond to CO₂ 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



186
187 Figure 2. Response characteristics of CO₂ sensors. Measured values of sensor
188 A, the reference device, are plotted on the horizontal axis, and the measured
189 values of sensors A, B, and 1 to 12 are plotted on the vertical axis, connected
190 by spline curves.



191

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

197

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

202

203

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

204 3, 8, 9, 11, and 12 reacted strongly to alcohol. Furthermore, these six sensors
205 were part of the group of seven sensors that did not respond to CO₂ (Fig. 2). The
206 remaining sensor 6 appeared to respond neither to CO₂ 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 CO₂, 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,
222 ethylbenzene, xylene, formaldehyde, and other volatile organic gases, incense
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.

227 Globally, several sensors display a very vaguely defined measurement
228 called eCO₂ (equivalent CO₂). This is estimated from the tVOC value and has
229 been shown to differ from the actual CO₂ concentration [15].

230 Sensors 1, 3, 8, 9, 11, and 12, which responded strongly to alcohol (Fig. 3),
231 all displayed tVOC values separately from the CO₂ concentration. Therefore, we
232 suspected that these six sensor models were displaying eCO₂ values rather than
233 actual CO₂ concentrations. However, the sales pages for these six sensors did
234 not indicate that they used eCO₂ sensors.

235

236



237

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

240

241 Based on the results of our experiments, we developed a simple method for
242 consumers to verify the quality of sensors on offer, without needing specialized
243 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 CO₂ 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.

267 This study was conducted using a total of 14 commercially available sensor
268 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
271 regulations for CO₂ sensors. We are planning to use gas chromatography with
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,
278 we suggest that future research focus on not only conducting exposure
279 experiments with pure CO₂ gas, but also include accurate measurements with
280 human-derived CO₂ gases, including various volatile organic compounds.

281

282 **Notes**

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

288

289 **Acknowledgments**

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

294

295 **Data availability**

296 The raw data of the graphs are available on FigShare.

297 [https://figshare.com/articles/figure/Accuracy_verification_of_low-](https://figshare.com/articles/figure/Accuracy_verification_of_low-cost_CO2_concentration_measuring_devices_for_general_use_as_a_countermeasure_against_infectious_diseases/15067557)
298 [cost_CO2_concentration_measuring_devices_for_general_use_as_a_counterm](https://figshare.com/articles/figure/Accuracy_verification_of_low-cost_CO2_concentration_measuring_devices_for_general_use_as_a_countermeasure_against_infectious_diseases/15067557)
299 [easure_against_infectious_diseases/15067557](https://figshare.com/articles/figure/Accuracy_verification_of_low-cost_CO2_concentration_measuring_devices_for_general_use_as_a_countermeasure_against_infectious_diseases/15067557)

300

301 **References**

- 302 1) CDC (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention), SARS-CoV-2
303 Transmission, Summary of recent changes, Updated May 7, 2021
304 Online: [https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/science/science-](https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/science/science-briefs/sars-cov-2-transmission.html)
305 [briefs/sars-cov-2-transmission.html](https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/science/science-briefs/sars-cov-2-transmission.html) (accessed 25 July 2021)
- 306 2) Azimi P, Keshavarz Z, Laurent JGC, Stephens B, Allen JG. Mechanistic
307 transmission modeling of COVID-19 on the Diamond Princess cruise ship
308 demonstrates the importance of aerosol transmission. *Proc Natl Acad Sci*
309 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.
- 313 4) Wells WF. *Airborne contagion and air hygiene*. Harvard: Harvard University
314 Press, 1955.
- 315 5) Riley EC, Murphy G, Riley RL. Airborne spread of measles in a suburban
316 elementary school. *Am J Epidemiol* 1978; 107: 421-432.
- 317 6) Buonanno G, Stabile L, Morawska L. Estimation of airborne viral emission;
318 Quanta emission rate of SARS CoV-2 for infection risk assessment. *Environ*
319 *Int* 2020; 141: 1–8.
- 320 7) Du CR, Wang SC, Yu MC, Chiu TF, Wang JY, Chuang PC, Jou R, Chan PC,
321 Fang CT. Effect of ventilation improvement during a tuberculosis outbreak in
322 underventilated university buildings, *Indoor Air* 2019; 30(3); 422-432.
- 323 8) The Occupational Hygiene and Ergonomics Subcommittee of the Japan
324 Society for Occupational Health (JSOH): Ventilation simulator for COVID-19
325 countermeasures (COVID-19 Taisaku-you Kanki Simulator). Online:
326 [http://jsoh-](http://jsoh-oh.e.umin.jp/covid_simulator/ventilation_simulator_manual_ver1.0.pdf)
327 [oh.e.umin.jp/covid_simulator/ventilation_simulator_manual_ver1.0.pdf](http://jsoh-oh.e.umin.jp/covid_simulator/ventilation_simulator_manual_ver1.0.pdf)
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-](https://ncceh.ca/documents/field-inquiry/indoor-co2-sensors-COVID-19-risk-mitigation-current-guidance-and)
333 [19-risk-mitigation-current-guidance-and](https://ncceh.ca/documents/field-inquiry/indoor-co2-sensors-COVID-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-](https://ardubotics.eu/en/sensors/1243-tpm-300-air-quality-module-intelligent-air-quality-monitoring-module-air-sensor.html)
357 [intelligent-air-quality-monitoring-module-air-sensor.html](https://ardubotics.eu/en/sensors/1243-tpm-300-air-quality-module-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 CO₂ and CO₂ concentration levels. 11th International
361 Conference on Electronics, Computers and Artificial Intelligence (ECAI)
362 2019: pp. 1-4, doi: 10.1109/ECAI46879.2019.9042113.