

Portland State University

PDXScholar

---

Mechanical and Materials Engineering Faculty  
Publications and Presentations

Mechanical and Materials Engineering

---

3-2021

# Evaluating a Commercially Available In-duct Bipolar Ionization Device for Pollutant Removal and Potential Byproduct Formation

Yicheng Zeng

*Illinois Institute of Technology*

Prashik Manwatkar

*Illinois Institute of Technology*

Aurelie Laguerre

*Portland State University, aurelie.prot@pdx.edu*

Marina Beke

*Illinois Institute of Technology*

Insung Kang

*Illinois Institute of Technology*

Follow this and additional works at: [https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/mengin\\_fac](https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/mengin_fac)



Part of the [Environmental Indicators and Impact Assessment Commons](#), and the [Environmental Indicators and Impact Assessment Commons](#)

Let us know how access to this document benefits you.

---

## Citation Details


Zeng, Y., Manwatkar, P., Laguerre, A., Beke, M., Kang, I., Ali, A. S., ... & Stephens, B. (2021). Evaluating a commercially available in-duct bipolar ionization device for pollutant removal and potential byproduct formation. *Building and Environment*, 195, 107750.

This Article is brought to you for free and open access. It has been accepted for inclusion in Mechanical and Materials Engineering Faculty Publications and Presentations by an authorized administrator of PDXScholar. Please contact us if we can make this document more accessible: [pdxscholar@pdx.edu](mailto:pdxscholar@pdx.edu).

---

**Authors**

Yicheng Zeng, Prashik Manwatkar, Aurelie Laguerre, Marina Beke, Insung Kang, Akram S. Ali, Delphine K. Farmer, Elliott T. Gall, Mohammad Heidarinejad, and Brent Stephens



## Evaluating a commercially available in-duct bipolar ionization device for pollutant removal and potential byproduct formation

Yicheng Zeng<sup>a</sup>, Prashik Manwatkar<sup>a</sup>, Aurélie Laguerre<sup>b</sup>, Marina Beke<sup>a</sup>, Insung Kang<sup>a</sup>, Akram S. Ali<sup>a</sup>, Delphine K. Farmer<sup>c</sup>, Elliott T. Gall<sup>b</sup>, Mohammad Heidarinejad<sup>a</sup>, Brent Stephens<sup>a,\*</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Department of Civil, Architectural, and Environmental Engineering, Illinois Institute of Technology, Chicago, IL, USA

<sup>b</sup> Department of Mechanical and Materials Engineering, Portland State University, Portland, OR, USA

<sup>c</sup> Department of Chemistry, Colorado State University, Fort Collins, CO, USA

### ARTICLE INFO

#### Keywords:

Indoor air quality  
Air cleaner  
Ionizer  
Particulate matter  
Volatile organic compounds

### ABSTRACT

We conducted a series of experiments to evaluate the gas and particle removal effectiveness and potential for byproduct formation resulting from the operation of a commercially available in-duct bipolar ionization device. Laboratory tests were conducted with the ionizer installed in a small air handler serving a large semi-furnished chamber. Chamber experiments were conducted under (i) normal operating conditions to characterize the impact of the ionizer on concentrations of particles (0.01–10 μm), ozone (O<sub>3</sub>), nitrogen dioxide (NO<sub>2</sub>), volatile organic compounds (VOCs), and aldehydes, and (ii) particle injection and decay conditions to characterize the impact of the ionizer operation on particle loss rates. The field test involved air sampling of particulates (0.01–10 μm), O<sub>3</sub>, and VOCs upstream and downstream of an operating ionizer device installed in an air handling unit serving an occupied office building. Both the chamber and field tests suggested that the use of the tested bipolar ionization unit led to a decrease in some hydrocarbons (e.g., xylenes) among the lists of compounds we were able to analyze, but an increase in others, most prominently oxygenated VOCs (e.g., acetone, ethanol) and toluene. Ionizer operation appeared to minimally impact particle, O<sub>3</sub>, and NO<sub>2</sub> concentrations during normal operating conditions. Particle injection and decay experiments in the chamber suggest that operation of the ionizer unit led to a small increase in loss rates for ultrafine particles (<0.15 μm) and a small decrease in loss rates for larger particles (>0.3 μm), but with negligible net changes in estimated PM<sub>2.5</sub> loss rates.

### 1. Introduction

As a result of recent global air quality challenges, including smoke from historically large wildfires in the U.S [1] and the increasing recognition of the potential for aerosol transmission of COVID-19 in poorly ventilated indoor environments [2], there has been an unprecedented level of interest and investment in indoor air cleaning technologies. The marketplace for air cleaning devices has become inundated with an array of technologies to meet the demand, including high-efficiency fibrous-media filters, disinfectant misters, and a variety of electronic air cleaners including ultraviolet germicidal irradiation (UVGI) lights, plasma generators, hydroxyl radical generators, ionizers, and more [3,4,5,6,7]. While fibrous media filters are routinely tested for their ability to remove particles [8,9], many electronic air cleaning

technologies are not evaluated by any federal agency or industry standards organizations for their efficacy or their potential for unintended consequences, including the generation of chemical byproducts [10].

One such air cleaning technology that has garnered significant interest is air ionization, which involves the introduction of ions to a space. Air ionization devices include those that generate only negative ions (i.e., *unipolar* ionizers) and those that generate both positive and negative ions (i.e., *bipolar* ionizers). Air ionization has been shown in some peer-reviewed studies to decrease bacterial deposition to surfaces [11], inactivate airborne bacteria [12,13], remove airborne particles [14], and increase submicron particle deposition to surfaces [15]. While the efficacy for some of these constituents has been demonstrated in some peer-reviewed studies, the literature remains sparse and limited to a narrow range of technologies.

\* Corresponding author. Professor and Department Chair, Department of Civil, Architectural, and Environmental Engineering, Illinois Institute of Technology, Alumni Hall Room 228E, 3201 S Dearborn Street, Chicago, IL, 60616, USA.

E-mail address: [brent@iit.edu](mailto:brent@iit.edu) (B. Stephens).

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.buildenv.2021.107750>

Received 17 December 2020; Received in revised form 22 February 2021; Accepted 23 February 2021

Available online 7 March 2021

0360-1323/© 2021 The Authors.

Published by Elsevier Ltd.

This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license

(<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>).

More commonly, efficacy is demonstrated in test reports provided by commercial laboratories, although these tests commonly have limitations such as multiple ionizers in small (or unreported) volume test chambers or with high (or unreported) ion concentrations. Moreover, the potential for byproduct formation resulting from ionizer operation has been investigated in much less depth. Early tests on ionizer devices revealed the potential to form harmful byproducts such as ozone during operation [16], but manufacturers have since developed other forms of ionization technologies that have been shown to avoid ozone emissions [13]. However, a limited number of other studies have shown the potential for ionization to form other products, including nitrogen oxides ( $\text{NO}_x$ ) and VOC oxidation intermediates [17], although little peer-reviewed literature exists on byproduct formation in either laboratory or field settings.

Two recent studies evaluated the impacts of air ionization on markers of human health. One study investigated the short-term effects of a negative ion generating air purifier on cardiovascular and respiratory outcomes in healthy adults in Beijing [18]. The study concluded that exposure to negative ions ( $\sim 60,000$  ions/ $\text{cm}^3$ ) was associated with increased systemic oxidative stress levels (a biomarker of cardiovascular health), and even though the use of the ionizers decreased indoor particulate matter concentrations, there were no beneficial changes in other markers of respiratory health. This phenomenon was hypothesized to be due to byproducts formed from reactions with negative ions, although byproducts were not measured. Another recent study found similar outcomes in 11–14 year old children resulting from the use of air ionizers in school classrooms in Beijing, whereby some positive effects on respiratory health were measured at elevated ion concentrations of  $\sim 13,000$  #/ $\text{cm}^3$ , albeit at the expense of negative effects on cardiac health [19]. These studies demonstrate the potential for air ionization to be effective in reducing particulate matter, but also suggest the potential for ionization to generate potentially harmful byproducts during their operation.

One of the most widely used ionization approaches currently in the U.S. appears to be *bipolar ionization*, which is commonly reported to (i) reduce airborne particulate matter by causing them to cluster or agglomerate and form larger particles that can settle out of the air more rapidly or be filtered more effectively, (ii) neutralize odors and break down volatile organic compounds (VOCs), (iii) inactivate or kill viruses and other microorganisms, and (iv) reduce the amount of required outdoor air. Many engineers have been recommending bipolar ionization devices because of relatively low upfront costs for purchase and installation, low maintenance and materials costs, and they do not introduce additional pressure drop to air handling units. In fact, the Building Owners and Managers Association (BOMA) currently recommends to “explore the possible use and efficacy of bi-polar ionization and other technology for the HVAC system that are effective against COVID” [20].

Conversely, ASHRAE summarizes the literature on electronic air cleaners, including ionizers, in their Epidemic Task Force (ETF) Filtration and Disinfection Guidance, as well as in their most recent position document on filtration and air cleaning, as ranging from “ineffective” to “very effective” in reducing airborne particle concentrations [21,22]. ASHRAE’s COVID-19 resources also cite a statement from a representative from the US Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) that recommends consumers “request efficacy performance data that quantitatively demonstrates a clear protective benefit under conditions consistent with those for which the consumer is intending to apply the technology” and that “the documented performance data under as-used conditions should be available from multiple sources, some of which should be independent, third party sources.” Recent guidance from the CDC considers ionization and other air disinfection technologies as “emerging” technologies “in the absence of an established body of peer-reviewed evidence showing proven efficacy and safety under as-used conditions” [23]. We are not aware of investigations of the effectiveness or potential for byproduct formation of bipolar ionization

devices used in realistic settings, which presents a knowledge gap that this work intends to fill.

## 2. Methods

We conducted a series of experiments to evaluate the gas and particle removal effectiveness and potential for byproduct formation resulting from the operation of a commercially available bipolar ionization device in two different test settings: one laboratory (large chamber) setting in Chicago, IL, USA and one field setting in a city in Eastern Oregon (OR) USA. The same make and model ‘needlepoint’ bipolar ionization device (Global Plasma Solutions, GPS-FC48-AC, Charlotte, NC USA) was tested in each location. We did not assess efficacy in inactivating microbes or potential pathogens.

### 2.1. Laboratory (large chamber) experiments (Chicago, IL)

Because ions added to indoor environments can react with other compounds present in indoor air, potentially leading to the formation of intermediates and oxidation byproducts, we conducted a series of experiments in a large ( $36.7 \text{ m}^3$ ) aluminum environmental chamber recently constructed on the main campus of Illinois Institute of Technology in Chicago, IL USA (Fig. 1). The chamber is located in a large laboratory space and was not directly heated or cooled, but was served by a small custom-built air-handling unit supplying air from the surrounding conditioned laboratory space. Laboratory air was pulled through a charcoal fiber filter (Hydrofarm IGSCFF4, Petaluma, CA USA) on the return side and ducted into the chamber via a flexible aluminum duct. The air handler and ductwork were operated in a single pass-through mode to provide approximately  $40\text{--}120 \text{ m}^3/\text{h}$ , depending on the fan speed setting, of filtered air from outside the chamber into the chamber without any recirculation. The surrounding laboratory space was minimally occupied by researchers during testing.

A variety of (mostly aged) material emission sources were introduced into the chamber prior to testing to simulate a partially furnished office or similar environment with a variety of relatively constant VOC emission sources that introduce a ‘challenge’ indoor VOC mixture with which ions generated by the tested ionizer would conceivably interact. Materials introduced to the chamber included a used table, rug, plastic and metal chairs, suit jackets, a scarf, window shades, paper posters, foam packaging materials, multiple boxes of dissertations ranging in publication date from the 1960s–1990s, a used painting tray, and more. Several dissertations were also left open on the table to encourage emissions. Transient VOC emission sources were specifically avoided in order to ensure reasonably steady-state conditions could be achieved. A small fan was placed in the corner of the chamber to encourage mixing throughout testing. A  $\text{CO}_2$  injection and decay test with three  $\text{CO}_2$  monitors (calibrated via co-location tests) located in three different locations within the chamber confirmed reasonably well-mixed conditions (Fig. S1).

A single GPS-FC48-AC bipolar ionization unit was installed inside the small air-handling unit serving the chamber, positioned upstream of the fan in a small custom-fabricated return plenum. The ionizer was secured to the bottom surface of the return plenum and connected to a 120 VAC power source. The on/off switch for the device extended to the outside of the air handler to allow for powering on the ionizer without disrupting airflow conditions. The manufacturer data sheet for the GPS-FC48-AC unit states that it is designed to accommodate airflows from  $0$  to  $4800 \text{ ft}^3/\text{min}$  ( $\sim 8155 \text{ m}^3/\text{h}$ ) and generates  $>400$  million ions/cc/sec [24].

The goal of this test setup was to deliver ions into the chamber space at an ion concentration that followed our understanding of manufacturer recommendations as closely as possible and at an air change rate with the surrounding environment that was (i) similar to that commonly observed in offices and other commercial buildings (e.g.,  $1\text{--}1.5$  per hour [25,26]) and that also (ii) allowed for reasonably rapid approaches to




Fig. 1. Photos of the environmental test chamber: (a) exterior with instruments set up outside and (b) inside of the chamber with mock-up furnishings and materials.

steady-state conditions for air sampling and for comparisons of pollutant concentrations between ionizer off and on conditions. Air change rates with the surrounding lab air were measured periodically inside the chamber using CO<sub>2</sub> injection and decay to ensure these conditions were met. Repeated CO<sub>2</sub> injection and decay experiments before and after testing confirmed a typical chamber air change rate with air from the surrounding lab area of  $\sim 1.2$ – $1.6$  per hour (1/h). The system was a single pass system without recirculation.

Initial measurements of total volatile organic compound (TVOC) concentrations inside and outside the chamber, both before and after introducing furnishing and materials, were made using a ppbRAE 3000 photoionization detector (PID) monitor (RAE Systems, San Jose, CA USA), which confirmed that the introduction of furnishings and materials led to an increase in TVOC concentrations (reported as isobutylene equivalents) inside the chamber compared to background conditions and that approximately steady-state conditions could be reached within  $\sim 2$ – $3$  h (Fig. S2). Additionally, measurements of ion concentrations were made periodically inside and outside the chamber, both with and without the ionizer operating, using an AlphaLab Air Ion Counter (Gerdien Tube meter) prior to testing (AlphaLab, Inc., Salt Lake City, UT USA). Background ion concentrations inside the laboratory (outside the chamber) and inside the chamber typically ranged between  $\sim 300$  and  $\sim 700$  ions/cm<sup>3</sup>. Operation of the ionizer increased ion concentrations inside the chamber to steady-state concentrations of  $\sim 1400$ – $2000$  ions/cm<sup>3</sup>, which is consistent with the manufacturer recommended target of  $1500$ – $2000$  ions/cm<sup>3</sup> in spaces in which they are installed [27], albeit lower than  $\sim 13,000$  ions/cm<sup>3</sup> and  $\sim 60,000$  ions/cm<sup>3</sup> reported in the recent studies of short-term health outcomes associated with using a different type of ionizer as previously mentioned [11,21] and much lower than the high concentrations (i.e.,  $>10^6$  ions/cm<sup>3</sup>) that have been associated with lower depression scores [28]. While this installation and setup is not the same as a real-life installation in an occupied building, the resulting combination of ion concentrations, ventilation conditions, and, to an extent, indoor VOC concentrations, reasonably represent conditions of a realistic unoccupied indoor space with this ionization unit installed in the air handler serving the space.

Once the chamber, air handler, and ionizer were set up, a series of experiments were conducted over multiple test days to evaluate the gas and particle removal effectiveness and potential for byproduct formation resulting from ionizer operation. The experimental design was intended to capture the effects of ionizer operation under (i) normal operating conditions and (ii) particle injection and decay conditions.

### 2.1.1. Normal operating conditions

First, a series of experiments were conducted under normal operating conditions (i.e., without any particle or pollutant injection other than from the supplied laboratory air and the materials and furnishings inside the chamber) to measure a variety of constituents inside and outside the chamber with the air handler operating, once with the ionizer powered on and once with the ionizer powered off. We repeated the same normal

condition experiments on multiple days under similar conditions, once on October 15, 2020 to primarily focus on measurements of VOCs inside and outside of the chamber (which required sampling and offline analysis at a commercial laboratory), followed by another test day on October 24, 2020 to focus on measurements of particles, ozone, and nitrogen oxides inside and outside of the chamber.

During these experiments, we measured the following constituents inside and/or outside the chamber: (i) airborne particles using a TSI Model 3910 NanoScan Scanning Mobility Particle Sizer (SMPS;  $\sim 0.01$ – $0.4$   $\mu\text{m}$ ; TSI Shoreview, MN USA) and a TSI Model 3330 Optical Particle Sizer (OPS;  $0.3$ – $10$   $\mu\text{m}$ ), (ii) ozone (O<sub>3</sub>) using a 2B Technologies Model 211 ozone analyzer (2B Technologies, Boulder, CO USA), (iii) nitrogen oxides (NO<sub>x</sub>) using a 2B Technologies Model 405 NO<sub>x</sub> analyzer, and (iv) CO<sub>2</sub> using Extech SD800 CO<sub>2</sub> monitors located inside and outside the chamber (Extech, Nashua, NH USA). After the October 15, 2020 test day, the particulate matter (PM) and NO<sub>x</sub> sampling instruments were each connected to automated switching valves (Swagelok Model SS-43GXS4-42DCX electrically actuated three-way ball valves; one each for PM and NO<sub>x</sub>; Swagelok, Solon, OH USA) to alternately measure concentrations inside and outside the chamber at 20-min intervals throughout the duration of testing [29,30,31]. The switching valve was controlled automatically by an electronic timer (Sestos B3S-2R-24; Hong Kong). The O<sub>3</sub> instrument was not connected to a switching valve.

On the October 15, 2020 sampling day conducted to characterize gas-phase organics, we sampled for (i) VOCs using SUMMA canisters (Entech 1.4L Silonite Coated stainless steel Minicans with a flow restrictor providing approximately 30 min fill duration), with off-line analysis conducted via EPA method TO-15 as well as a NIST library compound search to tentatively identify compounds not on the TO-15 list, and (ii) aldehydes and carbonyls following EPA method TO-11A using 2,4-Dinitrophenylhydrazine (DNPH) sampling tubes connected to sampling pumps (Buck Libra Model L-4) with off-line analysis conducted via high-performance liquid chromatography (HPLC). Off-line chemical analysis was conducted at a commercial laboratory (STAT Analysis, Chicago, IL), as described in more detail later in this section. Sampling pump flow rates for TO-11A sampling were confirmed after sampling to be  $\sim 1.6$ – $1.7$  L/min prior to sampling using a Sensidyne Gilian Giliblator-2 bubble flow meter (Sensidyne, St. Petersburg, FL USA). Time-integrated VOC and aldehyde samples were collected using the SUMMA canisters and DNPH tubes, respectively, beginning at least 2 h after perturbation of the chamber (i.e., both before and after the ionizer was switched on) such that the chamber should have approached steady-state conditions by the time of sampling. All sampling devices (except for one CO<sub>2</sub> monitor) were located outside the chamber with sampling lines running into the chamber through openings approximately 0.36 m off the floor, which were sealed with cardboard and tape. Particle instruments were connected to rigid stainless steel sampling lines  $\sim 1.5$  m in length and  $\sim 0.5$  cm in diameter via TSI conductive tubing; O<sub>3</sub>, NO<sub>x</sub>, and SUMMA canisters were connected to flexible



polytetrafluoroethylene (PTFE) tubing for sampling. Temperature and relative humidity were measured continuously both inside and outside the chamber using a combination of Onset HOBO U12-012 (Onset, Bourne, MA USA) and Extech SD800 CO<sub>2</sub> monitors.

The timeline of the normal operating condition experiments on the single VOC sampling day (October 15, 2020) is shown in Fig. 2. The air handling unit serving the chamber was turned on around 9:45 a.m. local time, with the ionizer off for the first several hours of measurements. The chamber operated at this condition for nearly 3 h to allow for approaching steady-state baseline conditions inside the chamber. VOCs were then sampled inside and outside the chamber during these baseline (ionizer off) conditions beginning around 12:30 p.m. The SUMMA canister valves were opened for approximately 30 min and the DNPH samplers were operated from about 12:30 p.m. to 2:57 p.m. for inside sampling and 1:10 p.m. to 2:57 p.m. for outside sampling. After VOC sampling with the ionizer off was completed, the ionizer was turned on at 3:16 p.m. The ionizer remained on for the duration of the rest of the tests. After approximately 2 h of operating the system, around 5:16 p.m., we again began sampling for VOCs and aldehydes inside and outside the chamber using new SUMMA canisters and DNPH tubes, respectively. Again, the SUMMA canister valves were opened for approximately 30 min and the DNPH personal air sampling pumps were operated with new DNPH tubes from ~5:16 p.m. until ~7:45 p.m. A blank DNPH tube was placed outside the chamber throughout testing to serve as our blank control sample. Finally, CO<sub>2</sub> injection and decay was conducted around 7:45 p.m. to measure the air change rate in the chamber.

After sampling, the DNPH cartridges and field blanks were individually capped and wrapped in aluminum foil and kept in a refrigerator held at ~4 °C. The following day, a total of five DNPH tubes (placed in a thermally insulated box) and four SUMMA canisters were returned to a commercial laboratory for chemical analysis (STAT Analysis, Chicago, IL), including two inside chamber samples (one with ionizer off; one with ionizer on); two outside chamber samples (one with ionizer off; one with ionizer on); and one blank. STAT Analysis originally supplied the evacuated SUMMA canisters for VOC sampling and DNPH cartridges for aldehyde sampling. The SUMMA canisters were analyzed via a purge and trap volatile autosampler on an Agilent 6890 gas chromatograph (GC) with an Agilent 5973 mass selective detector (MS). This results in a chromatogram that shows mass spectral data for any detected compound as well as retention time. The commercial laboratory has a calibrated list of compounds that it can quantitate against. The MS also allowed for an assessment of tentatively identified compounds (TICs), which have peaks and spectrum show up in the chromatogram, but are not a part of the calibrated list. These TICs were reported from comparing the MS data to a known NIST library of compounds; library compound search reports were provided by the lab for subsequent analysis. DNPH cartridges were also acquired from the same commercial laboratory and returned for analysis, which involved extraction in solvent and analysis on an Agilent 1100 HPLC system against a list of known compounds from the TO-11A list. Concentrations from DNPH sampling were calculated by dividing mass values provided by STAT Analysis by the volume of the sample (calculated as the pump flow rate times the sample time). STAT Analysis calibrates their analytical systems to the list of compounds in TO-15 and TO-11A; the TICs allow for some

semi-quantitative assessment of additional TICs not in these lists. Full lists of compounds from the TO-15 and TO-11A analysis are provided in Appendix 1 and Appendix 2. Method blanks were included with each run and verified that target compounds were below reporting limits (RL).

On the October 24, 2020 sampling day, which was designed to characterize impacts on particles, O<sub>3</sub>, and NO<sub>x</sub> during normal operating conditions, all instruments were set to log data at 1-min intervals. To analyze the resulting measurements of particulate matter and NO<sub>x</sub> concentrations from the instruments connected to automated switching valves, we noted the time that initial sampling began with the automated valves sampling from inside the chamber, and then flagged the data points in each 20-min sampling interval as either inside or outside the chamber in alternating fashion. Transition points between inside and outside sampling periods were identified visually in the data and excluded from analysis. Ratios of the concentrations of constituents inside and outside of the chamber (i.e., I/O ratios) were calculated using summary statistics (mean, standard deviation) from each 20-min interval of inside chamber sampling, lagged by the previous 20-min interval of outside chamber sampling.

### 2.1.2. Particle injection and decay

After conducting experiments during normal operating conditions, a series of particle injection and decay experiments were conducted to explore the impact of ionizer operation on particle decay rates in the chamber. These experiments were conducted on two separate days: one day with the ionizer operating (October 31, 2020) and one day without the ionizer operating (November 8, 2020). The chamber was maintained at approximately the same airflow and environmental conditions for both days of testing, which were also similar to the normal operating condition experiments. Particles were generated by burning two sticks of incense placed on a shelf on the desk inside of the chamber. Incense sticks were allowed to burn to completion to avoid researcher entry into the chamber, extinguishing after approximately 30 min, and then particle concentrations were allowed to decay for 2–4 h under each test condition.

Measurements of particle concentrations during these experiments were made again using a TSI NanoScan SMPS and TSI OPS to measure particle number concentrations in size ranges from ~0.01 μm to ~10 μm at 1-min intervals, again connected to the sampling system with an electronically controlled automated switching valve, alternating between 20-min periods sampling inside the chamber and 20-min periods sampling outside the chamber. CO<sub>2</sub> was also injected into the chamber at the same time as incense burning to simultaneously measure the air change rate with the surrounding lab.

### 2.1.3. Data analysis and parameter estimation

Particle injection and decay data were first visually explored on a size-resolved basis (up to 13 bins for SMPS and up to 16 bins for OPS). For simplicity in making comparisons, integral measures total particle number concentrations measured by each instrument were used in the analysis. The Nanoscan SMPS has known issues with counting efficiencies, especially in size ranges >0.15 μm, during some conditions due to the method used to fit distributions required because of the use of a unipolar charger in the instrument [32,30]. Total number




Fig. 2. Timeline of the VOC sampling day experiments conducted during normal operating conditions (October 15, 2020).

concentrations measured by each instrument (SMPS and OPS, respectively) were calculated at each 1-min measurement interval as the sum of the concentrations measured in each size bin measured by each instrument (i.e., 0.01–0.15 μm for the SMPS and 0.3–10 μm for the OPS). Additionally, integral measures of PM<sub>2.5</sub> mass concentrations were estimated at each time interval by calculating the mass concentration in each size bin smaller than 2.5 μm from combination of the SMPS and OPS, assuming spherical shape and constant unit density m [33,34]. We acknowledge that the assumption of unit density may result in an underestimate of PM<sub>2.5</sub> mass [35] but it does not affect loss rate estimates.

We used a dynamic mass balance approach to model the time-varying inside particle concentration for all SMPS and OPS size bins in the well-mixed chamber after the incense sticks extinguished (i.e., in the absence of indoor particle sources), as shown in following Equation (1).

$$\frac{dC_{in}}{dt} = P\lambda C_{out} - (\lambda + k)C_{in} \quad (1)$$

where  $P$  is penetration factor (–),  $\lambda$  is the air change rate of the chamber (1/hr),  $k$  is the particle deposition loss rate constant (1/hr),  $C_{out}$  and  $C_{in}$  are the outside and inside particle concentrations at time  $t$ , respectively (#/cm<sup>3</sup> or #/m<sup>3</sup>).

To solve for the total particle loss rate constant ( $\lambda + k$ ), we used a first-order linear regression solution to the natural logarithm of the particle concentration data measured inside the chamber minus that measured inside the chamber during background conditions applied only to the decay period, as shown in Equation (2).

$$-\ln \frac{C_{in,t} - C_{bg}}{C_{in,t=0} - C_{bg}} = (\lambda + k)t \quad (2)$$

where  $C_{in,t}$  and  $C_{in,t=0}$  are the inside particle concentrations at time  $t$  and  $t=0$ , respectively.  $C_{bg}$  is the average particle concentration measured inside the chamber during approximately steady-state conditions either immediately prior to or after the particle injection and decay periods.

For each test using CO<sub>2</sub> as a tracer gas, the air change rate ( $\lambda$ ) was estimated by regressing the natural logarithm of the inside and outside CO<sub>2</sub> concentrations versus time, as shown in Equation (3).

$$-\ln \frac{Y_{in,t} - Y_{out}}{Y_{in,t=0} - Y_{out}} = \lambda t \quad (3)$$

where  $Y_{in,t}$  and  $Y_{in,t=0}$  are the CO<sub>2</sub> concentrations (ppm) measured inside the chamber at time  $t$  and  $t = 0$ , respectively.  $Y_{out}$  is the average CO<sub>2</sub> concentration (ppm) measured outside the chamber using a second monitor during the test period. The two CO<sub>2</sub> monitors had been previously calibrated to each other via co-location tests.

## 2.2. Field measurements (Oregon, USA)

A separate set of measurements were made at a field site in Oregon, USA with an operating 'needlepoint' bipolar ionization system (again, GPS-FC48-AC) installed in the air handling unit (AHU). The study site was a 360 m<sup>2</sup> office building that was occupied during the measurements. Between five and eight people were present for the duration of monitoring, and two other individuals also entered the space for short durations. The building was served by two AHUs and an ionizer unit was installed into both air handlers. We conducted sampling upstream and downstream of the ionizer unit in the AHU that served a conference room, two offices, a restroom, and an archive room, consisting of ~178 m<sup>2</sup> of floor area. The supply duct was approximately 0.61 m × 0.53 m and the design supply air flow rate was 1000 ft<sup>3</sup>/min (1700 m<sup>3</sup>/h).

We conducted air sampling in four locations in the building: 1) ~0.75 m upstream of the ionizer unit in the supply duct, 2) ~0.75 m downstream of the ionizer unit in the supply duct (Fig. 3), 3) in the outdoor air supply duct, and 4) inside an 11.5 m<sup>2</sup> office served by the AHU where upstream and downstream sampling occurred. At each location, we measured particulate matter, size-resolved in 27 bins between 0.01 μm and 10 μm using a TSI Model 3910 Nanoscan SMPS and a TSI Model 3330 OPS, O<sub>3</sub> using a 2B Technologies Model 106-OEM-L, and VOCs sampled onto AirToxic glass sorbent tubes (PerkinElmer), packed with 180 mg of Carbotrap B followed by 70 mg of Carboxen 1000, and analyzed by thermal desorption–gas chromatography–mass spectrometry (TD-GC-MS). Details regarding the TD-GC-MS method are provided in Appendix 3. In all locations except the location downstream of the ionizer, temperature and relative humidity were measured continuously (Onset, S-THB-M002).

The ionizer unit in the field location was turned on at the beginning of the workday, ~8:00 a.m. local time, with measurements beginning at approximately 11:30 a.m. local time. The ionizer remained on for the duration of the tests. For measurements made in the supply duct, we measured air pollutant concentrations over a 1 h period. For particle measurements, we sampled air upstream and downstream of the ionizer through two runs of ~1.5 m of 3/8" conductive tubing (bev-a-line) that was installed through a sampling port drilled into the aluminum duct. Every 5 min, we manually switched the line attached to the instruments from the upstream to downstream (or vice versa), recording the time-stamp of the switch in a laboratory notebook. For ozone, we similarly sampled from air upstream and downstream the ionizer through two runs of ~1.5 m of 1/4" perfluoroalkoxy (PFA) tubing, switching every 5 min manually. Upstream of the ionizer system, we inserted the temperature and relative humidity (RH) probe into the center of the supply air duct. Particles, ozone, temperature, and RH were all recorded in a 1-min interval. VOC measurements were time-integrated in each location upstream and downstream the ionizer, with two sampling pumps




Fig. 3. Schematic of the AHU in the field site with sampling locations marked. Arrows indicate the direction of airflow through the AHU. MERV = Minimum efficiency reporting value, NPBI™ = needlepoint bipolar ionizer, O<sub>3</sub> = ozone, T = temperature, RH = relative humidity.

drawing air through two runs of  $\sim 0.5$  m of  $1/8$ " diameter PFA tubing with a target flow rate of  $\sim 50$  mL/min for each pump. VOCs were sampled in duplicate at each location for 1 h, for a total sample volume of  $\sim 3$  L in each sorbent cartridge. In outdoor air and inside the office, we sampled particles, ozone, temperature and RH, and VOCs in two 30-min sampling events occurring in series. VOC samples were made with single replicate during outdoor sampling and in duplicate during indoor air sampling.

We sampled in the supply duct upstream and downstream of the ionizer to isolate and observe immediate impacts of the ionization unit. Additional measurements made in the indoor space and outdoor space were made to compare supply, indoor, and outdoor concentrations. Note that we did not have capability to control the indoor space, including occupancy, behaviors, and activities. We also did not have access to the mechanical systems such that we could shut off the ionizer system; therefore, we do not have field data that include a control where the air handling system is operating but the ionization system is off.

### 3. Results

#### 3.1. Laboratory (large chamber) experiments (Chicago, IL)

In this section, we present data from the large chamber laboratory experiments in Chicago, first for the normal operating condition experiments, then followed by the particle injection and decay experiments. Table 1 summarizes the chamber test days and their measurement focus, and also provides average (standard deviation, SD) temperature and relative humidity values measured during each experiment, as well as the measured air change rate with the surrounding laboratory air. Air change rates of 1.2–1.6 per hour were achieved during the test periods approximately as intended, including  $\sim 1.25$  per hour with the air handling unit set to low fan speed and  $\sim 1.6$  per hour with the air handling unit set to medium fan speed.

##### 3.1.1. Normal operating condition experiments

This section summarizes particle concentrations, select VOC concentrations,  $O_3$ , and  $NO_x$  concentrations measured during the normal operating condition experiments conducted in the large chamber.

**3.1.1.1. Particle concentrations.** Fig. 4 shows particle concentrations measured inside and outside the chamber on the October 24, 2020 test day under normal operating conditions with periods of ionizer on and off marked in time. Each data point represents a 1-min interval reading, and readings alternate from 20-min sampling periods inside followed by 20-min sampling periods outside. Fig. 4a shows total number concentrations measured by the SMPS (Total SMPS:  $\sim 0.01$ – $0.3$   $\mu\text{m}$ ); Fig. 4b shows total number concentrations measured by the OPS (Total OPS:  $0.3$ – $10$   $\mu\text{m}$ ); and Fig. 4c shows estimates of  $PM_{2.5}$  concentrations made using data from both the SMPS and OPS. Particle concentrations inside the chamber were lower than concentrations outside the chamber, but closely tracked outside chamber concentrations over time. There was a spike in OPS-measured and estimated  $PM_{2.5}$  mass concentrations outside

the chamber immediately prior to and immediately after switching on the ionizer, likely due to the movements and activities of research personnel. Comparing ionizer on and off periods visually, there were no obvious periods of particle generation or removal inside the chamber for any of the particle measures.

Fig. 5 shows inside/outside (I/O) chamber concentration ratios measured throughout the October 24, 2020 test day. I/O ratios are calculated for each of the three particle measures (total SMPS, total OPS, and  $PM_{2.5}$ ) using the mean inside chamber concentration in a given 20-min sampling interval divided by the mean outside chamber concentration in the prior 20-min interval. Uncertainty in I/O ratios at each 40-min combined I/O sample interval is estimated by adding the relative standard deviations of the inside and outside concentrations at each interval in quadrature. I/O ratios are important to use for comparison purposes because Mann-Whitney U tests revealed significant differences in the absolute number concentrations of all particle measures (total SMPS, total OPS, and  $PM_{2.5}$ ) measured outside the chamber between the ionizer on and off periods ( $p < 0.05$ , Fig. 4), as well as inside the chamber between the ionizer on and off periods ( $p < 0.05$ , Fig. 4). Normalizing inside chamber concentrations to outside chamber concentrations accounts for these variations over time that are likely unrelated to ionizer usage. Fig. 5a shows I/O ratios for each 40-min combined I/O sample interval over time, with periods of ionizer on and off marked in time. Fig. 5b shows mean (SD) I/O ratios from the same data, grouped by ionizer on and off periods.

Large standard deviations in I/O ratios were apparent immediately before and after switching on the ionizer, driven by large fluctuations in particle concentrations (OPS,  $> 0.3$   $\mu\text{m}$ ) outside the chamber. Otherwise, I/O ratios were relatively steady throughout the test day with both the ionizer on and off. The mean ( $\pm$ SD) I/O ratio for the total SMPS concentrations was  $0.41 \pm 0.04$  with the ionizer off and  $0.37 \pm 0.02$  with the ionizer on ( $\sim 10\%$  decrease), but differences in these values were not statistically significant ( $p = 0.09$ , Mann-Whitney U test). The mean ( $\pm$ SD) I/O ratio for the total OPS concentrations was  $0.72 \pm 0.05$  with the ionizer off and  $0.70 \pm 0.03$  with the ionizer on ( $\sim 3\%$  decrease), but differences in these values were not statistically significant ( $p = 0.39$ , Mann-Whitney U test). The mean ( $\pm$ SD) I/O ratio for estimated  $PM_{2.5}$  concentrations was  $0.40 \pm 0.10$  with the ionizer off and  $0.38 \pm 0.08$  with the ionizer on ( $\sim 5\%$  decrease), but differences in these values were also not statistically significant ( $p = 0.67$ , Mann-Whitney U test). These results suggest that while I/O ratios for each measure of particulate matter were slightly lower with the ionizer on than with the ionizer off, the differences were not statistically significant, and may have been affected by variations in concentrations outside the chamber during the test period. Note that the Mann-Whitney U tests applied to these data are also underpowered, with small sample sizes of  $n = 6$  intervals with the ionizer on and  $n = 4$  intervals with the ionizer off.


**3.1.1.2. VOC and aldehyde concentrations.** Tables 2 and 3 show results for the detection and quantification of organic compounds on the VOC sampling day (October 15, 2020). Table 2 shows compounds identified and quantified using the TO-15 and TO-11A target list of compounds;

**Table 1**


Large chamber test condition summary, with average temperature and RH inside and outside the chamber during each test condition.

Date	Condition	Target	Sample	Temperature ( $^{\circ}\text{C}$ )	RH (%)	Air Change Rate (1/hr)
			Location	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)	
Oct 15, 2020	Normal operation	VOCs	Inside	23.4 (1.2)	26.5 (4.4)	1.25
			Outside	24.2 (1.2)	25.0 (4.5)	
Oct 24, 2020	Normal operation	PM, $O_3$ , $NO_x$	Inside	26.9 (2.7)	26.2 (1.3)	1.59
			Outside	23.9 (0.1)	25.6 (0.8)	
Oct 31, 2020	Injection & Decay	PM	Inside	24.3 (1.0)	29.8 (0.6)	1.26
			Outside	22.1 (0.7)	31.2 (1.3)	
Nov 8, 2020	Injection & Decay	PM	Inside	25.7 (0.3)	39.0 (1.7)	1.26
			Outside	24.3 (0.1)	48.4 (0.5)	





**Fig. 4.** Particle concentrations measured inside and outside the chamber, alternating every 20 min, on the October 24, 2020 sampling day with the ionizer on and off periods marked: a) total number concentrations measured by the TSI NanoScan SMPS (~0.01–0.3  $\mu\text{m}$ ), b) total number concentrations measured by the TSI OPS (0.3–10  $\mu\text{m}$ ), and c) estimated  $\text{PM}_{2.5}$  mass concentrations made using both the SMPS and OPS data.



**Fig. 5.** Inside/outside (I/O) chamber concentration ratios calculated for three particle measures (total SMPS, total OPS, and  $\text{PM}_{2.5}$ ) on the October 24, 2020 sampling day under normal operating conditions with the ionizer on and off periods marked: a) I/O ratios for each 40-min combined I/O sample interval over time, and b) mean (SD) I/O ratios, grouped by ionizer on and off periods. I/O ratios are calculated for each of the three particle measures using the mean inside chamber concentration in a given 20-min sampling interval divided by the mean outside chamber concentration in the prior 20-min interval. Uncertainty in I/O ratios at each 40-min combined I/O sample interval is estimated by adding the relative standard deviations of the inside and outside concentrations at each interval in quadrature.

confidence in both detection and quantification in Table 2 is high given the analytical laboratory’s calibrations for these target analytes. Table 3 shows concentrations of organic analytes tentatively identified and pseudo-quantified in the library compound search of spectral peaks detected outside of the TO-15 target list from the SUMMA canister samples.

Table 2 reveals several key observations regarding air composition inside and outside the chamber during testing. First, the summation of total organic compounds (TOC) from the combination of TO-15 and TO-11A analyses shows that summed VOC concentrations were higher in the chamber (84  $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ ) than outside of the chamber (59  $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ ) during baseline (ionizer off) conditions (i.e., an I/O chamber ratio of ~1.4).

**Table 2**

Organic compound analysis for the TO-15 and TO-11A analyte lists applied to samples collected inside (I) and outside (O) the chamber during ionizer on and off conditions on October 15, 2020.

Test Method	Analyte	MW (g/mol)	Ionizer Off			Ionizer On			% Change in I/O Ratio <sup>1</sup>
			Inside	Outside	I/O	Inside	Outside	I/O	
			( $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ )	( $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ )	Ratio	( $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ )	( $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ )	Ratio	
TO-11A	Formaldehyde	30	11.4	5.9	1.95	10.6	5.3	1.98	+2%
TO-11A	Acetaldehyde	44	5.9	5.4	1.10	5.7	4.6	1.25	+13%
TO-15	Acetone	58	23	36	0.64	41	37	1.11	+73%
TO-11A	Butyraldehyde	72	2.1	2.0	1.06	2.2	1.6	1.35	+28%
TO-15	Toluene	92	2.6	4.5	0.58	3.4	5.1	0.67	+15%
TO-15	1,2-Dichloroethane	99	4.1	<2.4	>1.7	<2.4	<2.4	n/a	At least -42%
TO-15	Ethylbenzene	106	7.5	<2.7	>2.8	<2.7	<2.7	n/a	At least -64%
TO-15	m,p-Xylene	106	24	<5.2	>4.6	<5.2	<5.2	n/a	At least -78%
TO-15	Dichlorodifluoromethane	121	3.6	<3.0	>1.2	<3.0	<3.0	n/a	At least -17%
Total	Summed TOC <sup>2</sup>	n/a	84.2	58.9	1.43	68.0	58.8	1.16	-19%

<sup>1</sup> Inside/outside (I/O) chamber ratios are calculated for each ionizer on and off period. The % change in I/O ratio shows comparisons between all inside/outside (I/O) chamber values when possible. When an analyte was reduced inside the chamber below reporting limit (<RL) and/or when the outside chamber concentration of an analyte also found inside the chamber was < RL, then the % change in I/O ratio for that analyte was estimated to be "at least" the shown percent change.

<sup>2</sup> The summation of total organic compounds (TOC) is the sum of the concentrations of each of the analytes shown for each sample. The I/O ratio for summed TOC is calculated as the summed TOC value for inside chamber values divided by the summed TOC value for outside chamber values for each of the ionizer on and off conditions.

**Table 3**

Organic compound analysis for analytes tentatively identified in a compound search (TICS) of the GC-MS analysis of SUMMA canister samples collected inside (I) and outside (O) the chamber during ionizer on and off conditions on October 15, 2020. (ND = not detected).

Test Method	Tentatively Identified Analyte (Quality)	MW (g/mol)	Ionizer Off			Ionizer On			% Change in I/O Ratio <sup>1</sup>
			Inside	Outside	I/O	Inside	Outside	I/O	
			( $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ )	( $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ )	Ratio	( $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ )	( $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ )	Ratio	
TICS	Acetonitrile (<10)	44	ND	6	$\ll 1$	ND	17.3	$\ll 1$	n/a
TICS	Ethanol (<10 ionizer off; >50 ionizer on)	46	13.8	15.9	0.87	12.8	8.3	1.54	+78%
TICS	3-Butenamide (10)	85	ND	ND	n/a	1.9	ND	>1	↑
TICS	4-Penten-1-ol (27)	86	ND	1.8	<1	ND	ND	n/a	n/a
TICS	Hexanal (40)	100	ND	2.1	<1	ND	2.5	n/a	n/a
TICS	Hexane, 3,3-dimethyl- (64)	114	3.8	ND	>1	2.5	ND	>1	↓
TICS	Hexane, 2,3,5-trimethyl- (50)	128	2.8	ND	>1	ND	ND	n/a	↓
TICS	1R- $\alpha$ -Pinene (76)	136	ND	2.2	<1	ND	ND	n/a	n/a
TICS	Cyclohexene, 4-ethenyl-1,4-dimethyl (50)	136	ND	ND	n/a	1.9	ND	>1	n/a
TICS	3-Phenyl-1-butanol (<10)	150	2	ND	>1	ND	ND	n/a	↓
TICS	Nonane, 4,5-dimethyl (64)	156	1.8	ND	>1	ND	ND	n/a	↓
TICS	Decane, 4-ethyl- (59)	170	ND	ND	n/a	9.2	ND	$\gg 1$	↑
TICS	Undecane, 4,6-dimethyl- (72)	184	ND	ND	n/a	5.7	ND	$\gg 1$	↑
TICS	Undetermined <sup>2</sup> (<10)	und.	ND	ND	n/a	17.9	ND	$\gg 1$	↑
Total	Summed TOC	-	24.2	28.0	0.86	51.9	28.1	1.85	+114%

<sup>1</sup> Inside/outside (I/O) chamber ratios are calculated for each ionizer on and off period. The % change in I/O ratio shows comparisons between all inside/outside (I/O) chamber values when possible. Given the uncertainties in both identification and quantification of the compounds from the TICS, the % change in I/O ratios is shown for only a limited number of constituents, and otherwise shows qualitative increases or decreases with an up or down arrow.

<sup>2</sup> Tentatively identified compound possibilities include: ethylene oxide (44 g/mol; quality <10), carbon dioxide (44 g/mol; quality <10), octodrine (129 g/mol; quality <10), or 2-Heptanamine, 5-methyl- (129 g/mol; quality <10).

Present in the indoor challenge mixture in the greatest amounts were: m, p-Xylene ( $\sim 24 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ ), acetone ( $\sim 23 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ ), and formaldehyde ( $\sim 11 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ ). These compounds and their magnitudes are reasonably consistent with medians and means observed in the US EPA Building Assessment Survey and Evaluation Study (BASE) study of office buildings [36] and in a recent study of a variety of commercial retail buildings in California [37]. Second, summed TOC values for these targeted analytes in Table 2 were similar outside the chamber during both ionizer on and off conditions ( $\sim 59 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ ), suggesting reasonably constant conditions during testing in the lab area surrounding the chamber.

Third, summed TOC values for these targeted TO-15 and TO-11A analytes were lower during the ionizer on period than the ionizer off period, with summed TOC concentrations inside chamber decreasing from  $84 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$  to  $68 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$  (19% decrease in I/O chamber ratio). However, the ionizer operation appeared to lead to varying responses for individual compounds, with some increasing in concentration and others decreasing. For example, concentrations of higher molecular

weight compounds (>95 g/mol) 1,2-dichloroethane, ethylbenzene, m,p-xylene, and dichlorodifluoromethane were each reduced from above detection limits prior to ionization to below detection limits during ionization, with percent reductions in I/O chamber ratios ranging from at least 17% to >78% for these compounds. Conversely, concentrations of some of the lower molecular weight compounds identified in the TO-15 and TO-11A analyte lists increased during ionizer operation, including acetone with a  $\sim 73\%$  increase in I/O ratio (and from  $23 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$  to  $41 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$  inside the chamber with fairly constant concentrations outside the chamber), butyraldehyde (i.e., butanal) with a  $\sim 28\%$  increase in I/O ratio (with some potential attribution to variations in concentrations outside the chamber), and toluene with a  $\sim 15\%$  increase in I/O ratio (from  $2.6 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$  to  $3.4 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$  inside the chamber).

These data suggest that while ionization led to a decrease in some hydrocarbons, the ionization process appears to have led to partial decomposition of some hydrocarbons, resulting in the observed increases in some oxygenated VOCs. This proposed phenomenon of

incomplete VOC degradation is consistent with the ionization process charging VOCs, and then those VOC ions (VOC<sup>+</sup> or VOC<sup>-</sup>, depending on ionization mechanism) either decomposing to a smaller VOC and an accompanying ion, or going on to react with molecular oxygen (O<sub>2</sub>). The resulting ion-molecule cluster (e.g., [VOC·O<sub>2</sub>]<sup>+</sup>) could then undergo a rearrangement to form a carbonyl group (C=O), producing the observed enhancements in some oxygenated VOCs (oVOCs). Some of the carbonyl-containing compounds did not increase, but that may be a function of analytical detection limits and the original concentration of precursors to form those aldehydes. The observed increase in toluene from use of the ionizer was unexpected, as toluene is an oxygen-free hydrocarbon, but we hypothesize that it is a decomposition or fragmentation product following ionization of larger aromatics. Further, the net formation of acetone provides further insight on potential VOC degradation - and oVOC production - mechanisms. Acetone has an ionization energy (IE) of 9.7 eV, so ambient acetone should be ionized in the bipolar ionization device. However, the net formation of acetone indicates that it is also being produced, either as a decomposition product of other, larger ketones, or as an oxidation product following the charged VOC + ions binding with O<sub>2</sub> and undergoing subsequent rearrangement and/or decomposition reactions.

Table 3 further demonstrates some compound-specific effects of the ionizer operation, albeit with much less certainty in identification and quantification than the TO-15 and TO-11A results in Table 2 because of high uncertainties in the TICS process. Quality values from the NIST library compound search are reported in Table 3 and should be interpreted as general indicators of quality that primarily serve to distinguish between highly uncertain identification (i.e., lower quality values < 20) and more certain identification (i.e., higher quality values > 50) (but these are not well-defined thresholds). Several tentatively identified compounds were detected only in outside chamber samples and not inside chamber samples with both low and high quality values. Ethanol was detected in all samples and appeared to lead to an increase in I/O chamber ratio of more than 50%, with inside chamber concentrations remaining fairly constant during both ionizer on and off periods, while outside chamber concentrations decreased during ionizer operation.

Several tentatively identified compounds with higher identification confidence (i.e., quality > 50) were reduced from some level of identification and quantification to no identification or quantification during ionizer operation, including potentially 3,3-dimethyl-Hexane, 2,3,5-trimethyl-Hexane, and 4,5-dimethyl-Nonane, each with likely identified MW > 100 g/mol. Conversely, several tentatively identified compounds were detected during ionizer operation that were not originally identified without ionizer operation, including potentially 3-Butenamide (small increase, low quality), 4-ethenyl-1,4-dimethyl-Cyclohexene (small increase, moderate quality), 4-ethyl-Decane (larger increase, higher quality), and 4,6-dimethyl-Undecane (larger increase, higher quality), each with MW > 80 g/mol. There was also an increase in an

indeterminable compound, with mass spectral peaks at either 44 g/mol or 129 g/mol, that could not be identified with high enough quality to yield further insight. While these TICS comparisons should be interpreted with caution (i.e., tentative in identification and even less confidence in quantification), these results further support findings in Table 2 of varied responses in individual compounds in the chamber presumably due to the ionization process, including some being detected or increasing only with the ionizer on and some only with the ionizer off.

**3.1.1.3. O<sub>3</sub> and NO<sub>2</sub> concentrations.** Fig. 6 shows O<sub>3</sub> and NO<sub>2</sub> concentrations measured inside the chamber during one of the normal operating condition experiments with and without the ionizer operating, conducted on October 24, 2020. Concentrations of both constituents inside the chamber were low (i.e., median of ~1.5–2 ppb for O<sub>3</sub> and ~4 ppb for NO<sub>2</sub>) both with and without the ionizer operating, as is fairly typical for an indoor environment with no known sources of either constituent [38–40], and with moderate gas-phase filtration on the air intake. There were no significant differences (i.e., neither an increase nor a decrease) in NO<sub>2</sub> concentrations measured inside the chamber with or without the ionizer operating (Mann-Whitney *U* test *p* = 0.29). There was a small, statistically significant decrease in O<sub>3</sub> concentrations inside the chamber with the ionizer operating compared to ionizer off conditions (Mann-Whitney *U* test *p* < 0.05), with median values of ~2 ppb and ~1.5 ppb, respectively. However, this difference was within instrument uncertainty and O<sub>3</sub> concentrations outside the chamber were not measured but could have varied as well. Operation of the ionizer as described in the chamber clearly did not generate detectable O<sub>3</sub> or NO<sub>2</sub> emissions, nor did it appear to substantially decrease concentrations of either O<sub>3</sub> or NO<sub>2</sub> at these low concentrations. A time-series of O<sub>3</sub> concentration in the chamber is shown in Fig. S3, which illustrates this small decrease, as well as a lack of detectable O<sub>3</sub> emissions. Our finding of no O<sub>3</sub> emissions is consistent with publicly available reports of standardized testing of this same technology using UL Standards 867 and 2998.

### 3.1.2. Particle injection and decay experiments

This section details results from the particle injection and decay experiments conducted on October 31, 2020 (with the ionizer on) and November 8, 2020 (with the ionizer off). Fig. 7 shows profiles of integral measures of particle number concentrations (i.e., total SMPS for particle sizes ~0.01–0.15 μm and total OPS for particle sizes 0.3–10 μm) during the entire injection and decay process. Burning of incense in the chamber increased total particle concentrations in the 0.01–0.15 μm size range from less than 10,000 #/cm<sup>3</sup> during baseline conditions to ~160,000 #/cm<sup>3</sup> at peak concentrations, and subsequently decayed back to baseline values over time. Similarly, burning of incense in the chamber increased total particle concentrations in the 0.3–10 μm size range from less than 200 #/cm<sup>3</sup> during baseline conditions to ~2500 #/cm<sup>3</sup> at peak concentrations, and also subsequently decayed back to





Fig. 6. Concentrations of (a) O<sub>3</sub> and (b) NO<sub>2</sub> measured inside the chamber during the normal operating condition experiment with the ionizer on and off on October 24, 2020.




**Fig. 7.** Time-series profiles of total particle concentrations measured by the SMPS (0.01–0.15  $\mu\text{m}$ ) and OPS (0.3–10  $\mu\text{m}$ ) during particle injection and decay experiments: (a) total SMPS and (b) total OPS on the ionizer test day (October 31, 2020), and (c) total SMPS and (d) total OPS on the test day without the ionizer operating (November 8, 2020). Vertical dashed line in (a) and (b) demonstrate when the ionizer was switched on and off.

baseline values over time. There were no major differences in the injection and decay process with the ionizer on or off conditions, although the ionizer off test period was shorter than the ionizer on period. The estimated  $\text{PM}_{2.5}$  concentrations averaged  $\sim 4\text{--}5 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$  during baseline conditions on both test days and peaked between  $\sim 750$  and  $\sim 900 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$  during the height of the injection period. Fig. S4 shows results from air change rate measurements using  $\text{CO}_2$  injection and decay made during the particle injection and decay experiments conducted on October 31, 2020 (with the ionizer on) and November 8, 2020 (with the ionizer off). On both days, the air change rate with the surrounding space was estimated to be  $\sim 1.26$  1/h, demonstrating the ability to achieve consistent chamber test conditions on different days of experiments.

Fig. 8 shows estimated total particle loss rates ( $\lambda + k$ ) resulting from the particle injection and decay experiments conducted on October 31, 2020 (with the ionizer on) and November 8, 2020 (with the ionizer off)

for three integral particle measures of (a)  $\text{PM}_{2.5}$ , (b) total number concentrations in the 0.01–0.15  $\mu\text{m}$  size range measured by the SMPS (i.e., “Total SMPS”), and (c) total number concentrations in the 0.3–10  $\mu\text{m}$  size range measured by the OPS (i.e., “Total OPS”). Deposition loss rate constants ( $k$ ) can be estimated by subtracting the air change rate ( $\lambda$ ) from the total loss rate ( $\lambda + k$ ), although since the air change rate was the same in each condition, total loss rates can be used for direct comparison between ionizer on and off conditions.

Fig. 8a demonstrates that the operation of the ionizer did not meaningfully increase  $\text{PM}_{2.5}$  loss rates in the chamber, as loss rates were  $\sim 1.27$  1/h with the ionizer off and  $\sim 1.28$  1/h with the ionizer on. The difference of  $\sim 0.01$  1/h ( $<1\%$ ) between ionizer on and off conditions is within the uncertainty of the regression approach. Fig. 8b demonstrates that the loss rates of the integral measure of total particles 0.01–0.15  $\mu\text{m}$  measured by the SMPS apparently increased from  $\sim 1.31$  1/h with the



**Fig. 8.** First-order loss rate constants ( $\lambda + k$ ) with the ionizer on and off for the following: (a)  $\text{PM}_{2.5}$  mass concentrations, (b) total number concentrations measured by the SMPS (0.01–0.15  $\mu\text{m}$ ), and (c) total number concentrations measured by the OPS (0.3–10  $\mu\text{m}$ ). Chamber air change rates were measured to be  $\sim 1.26$  1/h on both test days.



ionizer off to  $\sim 1.45$  1/h with the ionizer on (an increase in total SMPS loss rates of  $\sim 11\%$ ). Conversely, Fig. 8c demonstrates that the operation of the loss rates of the integral measure of total particles  $0.3\text{--}10\ \mu\text{m}$  measured by the OPS apparently decreased from  $\sim 1.16$  1/h with the ionizer off to  $\sim 1.13$  1/h with the ionizer on (a small decrease in total OPS loss rates of  $\sim 3\%$ ). For reference, multiplying these differences in loss rates by the volume of the chamber yields equivalent clean air delivery rate (CADRs) in this test configuration of approximately  $0.7\ \text{m}^3/\text{h}$  ( $0.4\ \text{cfm}$ ),  $5.2\ \text{m}^3/\text{h}$  ( $3\ \text{cfm}$ ), and  $-1.3\ \text{m}^3/\text{h}$  ( $-0.8\ \text{cfm}$ ) for  $\text{PM}_{2.5}$ , Total SMPS, and Total OPS particulate matter metrics.

These results suggest that although the operation of the ionizer appeared to have led to some differences in particle loss rates between the ultrafine (i.e.,  $0.1\text{--}0.15\ \mu\text{m}$  measured by the SMPS) and fine and coarse ( $0.3\text{--}10\ \mu\text{m}$  measured by the OPS) size ranges, the net impacts on estimates of total  $\text{PM}_{2.5}$  loss rates were negligible. This observation of an increase in loss rates for ultrafine particles ( $<0.15\ \mu\text{m}$ ), a decrease in loss rates for larger particles ( $>0.3\ \mu\text{m}$ ), and no net change in  $\text{PM}_{2.5}$  loss rates is conceivably explained in a way that could be consistent with agglomeration of small particles into larger particles, as smaller particles could have grown out of the  $<0.15\ \mu\text{m}$  size range (thus increasing loss rates in the range) but then appeared in the  $>0.3\ \mu\text{m}$  size range (thus decreasing loss rates in the range), yet did not grow large enough to encourage more rapid deposition to surfaces in the test chamber. In other words, while these results suggest that the reported mechanism of action of the ionizer (agglomeration or particle growth) may be working, particle mass was still conserved and the ionizer function contributed to shifting the size distribution slightly in the direction of larger particles.

### 3.2. Field measurements (Oregon, USA)

Fig. 9 shows monitoring results for particle size distributions (Fig. 9a), total particle number concentration from  $0.01$  to  $10\ \mu\text{m}$  (Fig. 9b), and ozone concentrations (Fig. 9c) measured in the four locations in the office building described in Section 2.2. Particle number and size distributions upstream and downstream of the ionization unit are similar; it does not appear that particle agglomeration occurred over the short length ( $\sim 0.75\ \text{m}$ ) from the ionizer to the downstream sampling location in the supply duct. This finding is not unexpected, given the short residence time in the duct from the upstream to downstream sampling location. However, if an ionization system is installed with the intent to increase the single-pass particle removal efficiency of a filter [41,42] by agglomeration, agglomeration would need to occur within the time-scale of transport from the ionizer to the filter. Data shown in Fig. 9 demonstrate that particle size distributions are not substantially altered in the timeframe of transport from the ionization unit to the downstream sampling location. Further testing is warranted, e.g., following ASHRAE Standard 52.2, to determine the impacts of upstream

ionization on mechanical filtration particle removal efficiency. We observe an increase in particles  $>1\ \mu\text{m}$  in indoor air compared to measurements made downstream of the ionizer, though we cannot discern whether this effect is due to the ionization unit or the presence of occupants in the indoor space. We also observed similar ozone concentrations upstream and downstream of the ionizer, implying the system is not generating ozone.

In contrast with the particle and ozone measurements, Fig. 10 shows that chemistry initiated by the ionizer appears to impact VOC concentrations within the duct (i.e., from upstream to downstream the ionizer unit). In particular, we observe increases in lower molecular weight, oxygenated species which are expected to be reactive intermediates of the degradation processes initiated by the ionization unit. Ethanol, isopropanol, and acetone increased by approximately 133%, 213%, and 168% respectively, from upstream to downstream of the ionizer. As discussed previously, the ionization energies of these compounds indicate they should be ionized by the unit; net production of these compounds indicates they are also generated as a result of decomposition or rearrangement reactions. We also observed increases in heptane (230%) and methyl methacrylate (429%) and decreases in larger molecular weight fluorinated compounds. Interestingly, and consistent with the observations in the chamber studies, we observed an increase in toluene and a decrease in xylene levels downstream of the ionizer unit (see Appendix 4).

We also semi-quantified select aldehydes, acids, alcohols, and other compounds, shown aggregated in Fig. 10, as we are less confident in quantification and identification than those compounds present in our calibration standard (explained in Appendix 3). Full reporting of compounds shown is shown in Appendix 4. Indoor concentrations of VOCs (labeled "Office") are higher than downstream the ionizer, primarily due to substantial increases in ethanol, isopropanol, and acetone. These compounds may be generated in the space by ion-initiated chemistry, although they are also emitted from humans [43,44] and other indoor sources [45] such as hand sanitizers and other alcohol-based products. We are unable to discern the relative contribution of the ionizer-initiated chemistry vs. indoor sources to the observed elevated indoor concentrations in this field study.

## 4. Discussion and conclusions

Results from the chamber experiments conducted under normal operating conditions described herein suggest there were small reductions in inside/outside chamber ratios for three particle measures of total SMPS ( $\sim 0.01\text{--}0.3\ \mu\text{m}$ ) number concentrations, total OPS ( $0.3\text{--}10\ \mu\text{m}$ ) number concentrations, and  $\text{PM}_{2.5}$  mass concentrations, but the differences were not statistically significant and were partially impacted by simultaneous changes in the surrounding laboratory. Results from the particle injection and decay experiments in the same chamber suggest





Fig. 9. a) Particle size distributions, b) particle number concentrations, and c) ozone concentrations in an office building with operating needlepoint bipolar ionization (NPBI™) system. Upstream is the sampling location  $\sim 0.75\ \text{m}$  upstream the ionizer in the supply air duct, while downstream is  $\sim 0.75\ \text{m}$  downstream the ionizer in supply air duct. Note that both upstream and downstream sampling locations follow a MERV 8 filter, as described in Section 2.2 of the text.





**Fig. 10.** Summary of VOC monitoring in an occupied office building with an operating needlepoint bipolar ionization system. Upstream is the sampling location  $\sim 0.75$  m upstream the ionizer in the supply air duct, while downstream is  $\sim 0.75$  m downstream the ionizer in supply air duct. "\*" denotes concentrations extrapolated from the calibration curve.

that the operation of the ionization unit in the test chamber appeared to have led to a slight increase in loss rates for ultrafine particles ( $<0.15 \mu\text{m}$ ) and a slight decrease in loss rates for larger particles ( $>0.3 \mu\text{m}$ ), resulting in a negligible net change in  $\text{PM}_{2.5}$  loss rates. This observation is conceivably explained by agglomeration of smaller particles that grew out of the  $<0.15 \mu\text{m}$  size range and appeared in the  $>0.3 \mu\text{m}$  size range but did not grow large enough to encourage more rapid deposition to surfaces in the test chamber. In other words, while these results suggest that the reported mechanism of action of the ionizer (agglomeration or particle growth) may be occurring, estimated particle mass was still conserved, and the ionizer function shifted the size distribution slightly in the direction of larger particles. Results from the field study revealed similar particle number and size distributions upstream and downstream of the ionization unit, suggesting there were minimal impacts within the short duct length in this installation (which occurred after a MERV 8 particle filter).

$\text{O}_3$  was not observed as a byproduct of operation of the tested device. The ionizer used in this study is designed to ionize molecules with ionization energies  $<12.07 \text{ eV}$  [46], which is below the ionization energy of molecular oxygen ( $\text{O}_2$ ). This criterion is important, as ionizing  $\text{O}_2$  is a key method for generating ozone ( $\text{O}_3$ ), a known air pollutant, and, as mentioned, a common drawback to many ionizer devices in the past. This approach appears to successfully prevent  $\text{O}_3$  formation as tested here.

Both the laboratory and field data collected herein suggest that other unintended byproduct formation (e.g., of smaller, potentially oxidized VOCs) is likely occurring, with some consistencies observed in both constituent reductions (e.g., xylenes, ethylbenzene, and 1,2-dichloroethane) and increases (e.g., acetone, ethanol, and toluene), with some consistencies observed between both the chamber tests and field tests. The concept behind ionization with respect to VOCs is that if the ionization energy is below that of the system, the VOCs will lose an electron and become positively charged ions,  $\text{VOC}^+$ . These  $\text{VOC}^+$  ions could then be removed through electrostatic interactions with surfaces or to a negatively charged plate (if present). Negatively charged VOC ions could be produced through reactions with electrons or other anions in the system. However, between initial ionization and removal, many

chemical reactions can occur, producing uncharged, neutral products that would no longer be easily removed. If the ionizer were able to sequentially ionize these neutral daughter products, then these products would not influence indoor air. However, if the residence time in the ionizing region is insufficient to fully ionize not only the parent VOCs initially in the indoor air, but also the multiple generations of daughter products, then the unintended consequence of ionizers may be to enhance concentrations of smaller, potentially oxidized daughter VOCs.

VOC ions formed in an ionizer have several possible fates in the indoor environment: they may (i) be removed to surfaces or (ii) react with neutral molecules in the gas phase to form an array of products. These ion-molecule reactions include adduct formation, charge transfer, and hydride transfer, and the mechanism of reaction determines the product and potential for formation of ultrafine particles versus oxygenated VOC or other products. Adduct formation, or clustering, can lead to new particle formation if additional molecules or ions continue to cluster to the initial adduct. Researchers have shown that ion-molecule reactions are central to new particle formation: clusters of ions and molecules rapidly grow to form small particles and are clearly correlated to particle growth events in the atmosphere [47].

This work is not without limitations and future directions for improvement. For one, this work was limited to a small number of field and laboratory experiments of a single bipolar ionization device, without replicates. Second, we relied on a limited set of analytical approaches, especially for gas-phase organics detection and quantification. Third, we did not evaluate efficacy for microbiological constituents, despite the high level of interest in these types of technologies for inactivating opportunistic pathogens such as SARS-CoV-2. Regardless of these limitations, this work highlights the need to improve and standardize methods of testing air cleaning technologies to capture the net effects of contaminant removal and/or generation on indoor air.

Given the rapid acceleration in the use of these types of electronic air cleaning technologies and many others, additional work should strive to expand and ultimately standardized test methods for evaluating the efficacy and potential for byproduct formation of these devices, especially those that rely on chemical interactions to remove or inactivate pollutants from air. Ionizer products in particular should be tested in greater

quantity and variety, and under other realistic operating configurations (e.g., different ion concentrations, recirculating air configurations, non-well-mixed spaces with varying vertical or horizontal ion distributions). Further efficacy and byproduct testing should explore the impact of other indoor VOC challenge mixtures, including the impact of occupants, perhaps specific to building use types or occupancy scenarios. Test approaches should consider the use of a broader array of analytical approaches, such as additional organic analysis beyond the GC-MS and HPLC approaches and analyte lists used herein, including but not limited to real-time organics analysis, semi-volatile compounds, and especially inactivation of pathogens or surrogate organisms.

### Declaration of competing interest

The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

### Acknowledgements

We would like to acknowledge Ian Cull for loaning sampling pumps for DNPH cartridges and a ppBRAE PID for real-time VOC detection, STAT Analysis for their analytical support, and several colleagues (who will remain anonymous) who provided their insight on experiences with installations of the tested ionizer and also loaned equipment for our testing.

This research did not receive any specific grant from funding agencies in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

### Appendix A. Supplementary data

Supplementary data to this article can be found online at <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.buildenv.2021.107750>.

### References

- [1] R. Xu, P. Yu, M.J. Abramson, F.H. Johnston, J.M. Samet, M.L. Bell, A. Haines, K. L. Ebi, S. Li, Y. Guo, Wildfires, global climate change, and human health, *N. Engl. J. Med.* 383 (2020) 2173–2181, <https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMs2028985>.
- [2] CDC, Scientific Brief: SARS-CoV-2 and Potential Airborne Transmission, 2020. Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19). URL <https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/more/scientific-brief-sars-cov-2.html>.
- [3] A. Elejalde-Ruize, What Will it Take to Make Diners Feel Safe Indoors? Nearly 60% Feel Uneasy Eating inside, So Restaurants Try Sterilizing UV Wands, Tabletop Air Purifiers as Winter Looms, 2020 (Chicago Tribune).
- [4] Environmental and Modelling Group (EMG), Potential Application of Air Cleaning Devices and Personal Decontamination to Manage Transmission of COVID-19, 2020. Scientific Advisory Group for Emergencies (SAGE).
- [5] Johnson Controls, 2020 Johnson Controls Energy Efficiency Indicator Study: COVID-19 Pulse Survey, 2020.
- [6] A. Mandavilli, How to Keep the Coronavirus at Bay Indoors, *The New York Times*, 2020.
- [7] R. Ori, Worries about COVID-19 spreading through the vents send Chicago building owners in search of cleaner air. 'You can't put a force field around your property, Chicago Tribune (2020).
- [8] ASHRAE, Standard 52.2: method of testing general ventilation air-cleaning devices for removal efficiency by particle size, 2017.
- [9] ISO, ISO 16890: Air Filters for General Ventilation, 2016.
- [10] US EPA, Residential Air Cleaners: A Technical Summary, third ed., 2018.
- [11] S. Meschke, B.D. Smith, M. Yost, R.R. Miksch, P. Geffer, S. Gehlke, H.A. Halpin, The effect of surface charge, negative and bipolar ionization on the deposition of airborne bacteria, *J. Appl. Microbiol.* 106 (2009) 1133–1139, <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2672.2008.04078.x>.
- [12] J. Hyun, S.-G. Lee, J. Hwang, Application of corona discharge-generated air ions for filtration of aerosolized virus and inactivation of filtered virus, *J. Aerosol Sci.* 107 (2017) 31–40, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jaerosci.2017.02.004>.
- [13] S.S. Nunayon, H.H. Zhang, X. Jin, A.C.K. Lai, Experimental evaluation of positive and negative air ions disinfection efficacy under different ventilation duct conditions, *Build. Environ.* 158 (2019) 295–301, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.buildenv.2019.05.027>.
- [14] B. Pushpawela, R. Jayaratne, A. Nguy, L. Morawska, Efficiency of ionizers in removing airborne particles in indoor environments, *J. Electrostat.* 90 (2017) 79–84, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.elstat.2017.10.002>.
- [15] Y.-Y. Wu, Y.-C. Chen, K.-P. Yu, Y.-P. Chen, H.-C. Shih, Deposition removal of monodisperse and polydisperse submicron particles by a negative air ionizer, *Aerosol Air Qual. Res.* 15 (2015) 994–1007, <https://doi.org/10.4209/aaqr.2014.08.0166>.
- [16] Y. Zhang, J. Mo, Y. Li, J. Sundell, P. Wargocki, J. Zhang, J.C. Little, R. Corsi, Q. Deng, M.H.K. Leung, L. Fang, W. Chen, J. Li, Y. Sun, Can commonly-used fan-driven air cleaning technologies improve indoor air quality? A literature review, *Atmos. Environ.* 45 (2011) 4329–4343, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.atmosenv.2011.05.041>.
- [17] K.-H. Kim, J.E. Szulejko, P. Kumar, E.E. Kwon, A.A. Adelodun, P.A.K. Reddy, Air ionization as a control technology for off-gas emissions of volatile organic compounds, *Environ. Pollut.* 225 (2017) 729–743, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envpol.2017.03.026>.
- [18] W. Liu, J. Huang, Y. Lin, C. Cai, Y. Zhao, Y. Teng, J. Mo, L. Xue, L. Liu, W. Xu, X. Guo, Y. Zhang, J.J. Zhang, Negative ions offset cardiorespiratory benefits of PM<sub>2.5</sub> reduction from residential use of negative ion air purifiers, *Indoor Air* 2020, 12728., <https://doi.org/10.1111/ina.12728>.
- [19] W. Dong, S. Liu, M. Chu, B. Zhao, D. Yang, C. Chen, M.R. Miller, M. Loh, J. Xu, R. Chi, X. Yang, X. Guo, F. Deng, Different cardiorespiratory effects of indoor air pollution intervention with ionization air purifier: findings from a randomized, double-blind crossover study among school children in Beijing, *Environ. Pollut.* 254 (2019) 113054, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envpol.2019.11.3054>.
- [20] BOMA, Getting Back to Work 2.0: Building Re-entry: Best Practices in a COVID-19 Reality, 2020.
- [21] ASHRAE, Filtration/disinfection. ASHRAE COVID-19 resources, 2020. URL <https://www.ashrae.org/technical-resources/filtration-disinfection>.
- [22] ASHRAE, ASHRAE Position Document on Filtration and Air Cleaning, 2018.
- [23] CDC, Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19): community, work & school - ventilation, 2020. URL <https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/community/ventilation.html>.
- [24] GPS, GPS-FC48-AC Product Data Sheet, 2019.
- [25] D.H. Bennett, W. Fisk, M.G. Apte, X. Wu, A. Trout, D. Faulkner, D. Sullivan, Ventilation, temperature, and HVAC characteristics in small and medium commercial buildings in California: small and medium commercial buildings in California, *Indoor Air* 22 (2012) 309–320, <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1600-0668.2012.00767.x>.
- [26] A. Persily, J. Gorfain, Analysis of Ventilation Data from the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Building Assessment Survey and Evaluation (BASE) Study (No. NISTIR 7145), National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST), 2004.
- [27] Direct Supply, 11 questions on a proven pathogen-reducing air cleaning system, 2020. <https://www.directsupply.com/blog/11-questions-on-a-proven-pathogen-reducing-air-cleaning-system/>.
- [28] V. Perez, D.D. Alexander, W.H. Bailey, Air ions and mood outcomes: a review and meta-analysis, *BMC Psychiatr.* 13 (2013) 29, <https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-244X-13-29>.
- [29] H. Zhao, E.T. Gall, B. Stephens, Measuring the building envelope penetration factor for ambient nitrogen oxides, *Environ. Sci. Technol.* 53 (2019) 9695–9704, <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.9b02920>.
- [30] H. Zhao, B. Stephens, Using portable particle sizing instrumentation to rapidly measure the penetration of fine and ultrafine particles in unoccupied residences, *Indoor Air* 27 (2017) 218–229, <https://doi.org/10.1111/ina.12295>.
- [31] H. Zhao, B. Stephens, A method to measure the ozone penetration factor in residences under infiltration conditions: application in a multifamily apartment unit, *Indoor Air* 26 (2016) 571–581, <https://doi.org/10.1111/ina.12228>.
- [32] M. Yamada, M. Takaya, I. Ogura, Performance evaluation of newly developed portable aerosol sizers used for nanometer aerosol measurements, *Ind. Health* 53 (6) (2015) 511–516, <https://doi.org/10.2486/indhealth.2014-0243>.
- [33] Y.S. Cheng, W.E. Bechtold, C.C. Yu, I.F. Hung, Incense smoke: characterization and dynamics in indoor environments, *Aerosol. Sci. Technol.* 23 (1995) 271–281, <https://doi.org/10.1080/02786829508965312>.
- [34] X. Ji, O. Le Bihan, O. Ramalho, C. Mandin, B. D'Anna, L. Martinon, M. Nicolas, D. Bard, J.-C. Pairen, Characterization of particles emitted by incense burning in an experimental house, *Indoor Air* 20 (2010) 147–158, <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1600-0668.2009.00634.x>.
- [35] S. Patel, S. Sankhyani, E.K. Boedicker, P.F. DeCarlo, D.K. Farmer, A.H. Goldstein, E. F. Katz, W.W. Nazaroff, Y. Tian, J. Vanhanen, M.E. Vance, Indoor particulate matter during HOMEchem: concentrations, size distributions, and exposures, *Environ. Sci. Technol.* 54 (2020) 7107–7116, <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.0c00740>.
- [36] US EPA, n.d. Summarized data of the building assessment survey and evaluation study, US EPA Indoor Air Quality. URL <https://www.epa.gov/indoor-air-quality-iaq/summarized-data-building-assessment-survey-and-evaluation-study>.
- [37] W.R. Chan, S. Cohn, M. Sidheswaran, D.P. Sullivan, W.J. Fisk, Contaminant levels, source strengths, and ventilation rates in California retail stores, *Indoor Air* 25 (2015) 381–392, <https://doi.org/10.1111/ina.12152>.
- [38] H. Salonen, T. Salthammer, L. Morawska, Human exposure to NO<sub>2</sub> in school and office indoor environments, *Environ. Int.* 130 (2019) 104887, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envint.2019.05.081>.
- [39] J. Xu, H. Jiang, H. Zhao, B. Stephens, Mobile monitoring of personal NO<sub>x</sub> exposures during scripted daily activities in Chicago, IL, *Aerosol Air Qual. Res.* 17 (2017), <https://doi.org/10.4209/aaqr.2017.02.0063>, 1999–2009.
- [40] S. Zhou, C.J. Young, T.C. VandenBoer, T.F. Kahan, Role of location, season, occupant activity, and chemistry in indoor ozone and nitrogen oxide mixing ratios, *Environ. Sci.: Processes Impacts* 21 (2019) 1374–1383, <https://doi.org/10.1039/C9EM00129H>.
- [41] J.H. Park, K.Y. Yoon, J. Hwang, Removal of submicron particles using a carbon fiber ionizer-assisted medium air filter in a heating, ventilation, and air-

- conditioning (HVAC) system, *Build. Environ.* 46 (2011) 1699–1708, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.buildenv.2011.02.010>.
- [42] B. Shi, L. Ekberg, Ionizer assisted air filtration for collection of submicron and ultrafine particles—evaluation of long-term performance and influencing factors, *Environ. Sci. Technol.* 49 (2015) 6891–6898, <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.5b00974>.
- [43] D. Pagonis, D.J. Price, L.B. Algrim, D.A. Day, A.V. Handschy, H. Stark, S.L. Miller, J. de Gouw, J.L. Jimenez, P.J. Ziemann, Time-resolved measurements of indoor chemical emissions, deposition, and reactions in a university art museum, *Environ. Sci. Technol.* 53 (2019) 4794–4802, <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.9b00276>.
- [44] X. Tang, P.K. Misztal, W.W. Nazaroff, A.H. Goldstein, Volatile organic compound emissions from humans indoors, *Environ. Sci. Technol.* 50 (2016) 12686–12694, <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.6b04415>.
- [45] J. Wooley, W. Nazaroff, A. Hodgson, Release of ethanol to the atmosphere during use of consumer cleaning products, *J. Air Waste Manag. Assoc.* 40 (1990) 1114–1120.
- [46] C. Waddell, *An Overview of Needlepoint Bipolar Ionization*, 2019.
- [47] M. Kulmala, T. Petäjä, M. Ehn, J. Thornton, M. Sipilä, D.R. Worsnop, V.-M. Kerminen, Chemistry of atmospheric nucleation: on the recent advances on precursor characterization and atmospheric cluster composition in connection with atmospheric new particle formation, *Annu. Rev. Phys. Chem.* 65 (2014) 21–37, <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-physchem-040412-110014>.