Ventilation assessment by carbon dioxide levels in dental treatment rooms

Qirong Huang, Tamer Marzouk, Razvan Cirligeanu, Hans Malmstrom, Eli Eliav, Yan-Fang Ren Eastman Institute for Oral Health, University of Rochester Medical Center, Rochester, New York

Supplemental materials:

Background: Risks of disease transmission in healthcare settings during infectious disease pandemics have consistently challenged dental care professionals in their efforts to maintain a safe environment for their staffs and patients. Dental care professionals have gained tremendous experiences in infection control from the ongoing HIV/AIDS pandemic by implementing universal or standard precautions against contact and droplet transmissions, but we are less confident in dealing with an infectious respiratory disease that may be transmitted through aerosol particles emitted by patients who have no overt symptoms. With mounting evidence that COVID-19 is transmissible through aerosols in an indoor environment (CDC 2020a; 2020b), additional preventive measures beyond the standard care using personal protective equipment (PPE) are essential to minimize risks and alleviate anxieties experienced by staff and patients due to uncertainties associated with a novel infectious disease pandemic.

Engineering controls through mechanical ventilation are important mechanisms to reduce the risks of airborne disease transmission in an indoor environment such as the dental offices. Though CDC recommends improving ventilation and air filtration in its guidance for dental settings during the COVID-19 pandemic (CDC 2020c), few information is available on how to assess the ventilation condition and what measures to take to achieve more effective engineering control of disease transmission in dental offices.

Using steady state CO² level during dental treatments to estimate ventilation rates: Ventilation rate estimates based on steady state $CO₂$ levels during two different treatment procedures at low (0.3) L/min) and high (0.46 L/min) levels of human $CO₂$ generation rates are presented in Supplemental Table 1 (Batterman 2017, Godwin et al 2003).

Appendix Table 1: Ventilation rate estimates based on steady state CO₂ levels

Based on ventilation rate ACH = 6 x 10⁴n G_P / [V(C_{ss}-C_R)]; n: number of persons in the room; V: volumetric size in m³. C_{ss}: steady state CO₂ level in ppm; CR: outdoor CO₂ level in ppm; ACH_{SS30}: ventilation estimate based on CO₂ generation rate G_P=0.3L/min per person; ACH_{SS30}: ventilation estimate based on $CO₂$ generation rate $G_P=0.46L/min$ per person;

Appendix Table 2 could be used to roughly estimate the ventilation rate of the dental treatment rooms in 3 steps. First, measure the length and width of the room to get the area in square feet (ft²). Second, determine the steady state $CO₂$ level during a dental treatment procedure that lasts more than 10 minutes as follows: with the dentist, dental assistant and the patient together in the room and without any person entering or leaving the room, read the $CO₂$ sensor readings 10 minutes into the procedure and record the next 5 readings at 1 min interval, add the 5 readings to get the sum and divide the sum by 5, the result is the steady state $CO₂$ level. Third, match the steady state $CO₂$ level to the closest number under the area column of your room size, the number in the ACH column in the same row is the ventilation rate estimate. For example, if the $CO₂$ level reaches a steady state level of about 1062 ppm during a dental treatment that lasted longer than 5 minutes with 3 persons in a room that is 110 ft² (10-ft W x11-ft L) in area, the ventilation rate is about 3 ACH. It will be about 6 ACH if the $CO₂$ level stays at about 761 ppm (Appendix Table 2).

Appendix Table 2: Steady state CO₂ levels and ventilation rate in air change per hour (ACH)^{*}

*Based on ventilation rate ACH = 6 x 10⁴ n G_P / [V(C_{SS}-C_R)], where number of persons in the room n=3, CO₂ generation rate per person G_P=0.3L/min, outdoor CO₂ level C_R=400 ppm, and V is the volumetric size of the room with ceiling height = 8-ft.

Protocol for assessing ventilation rates by CO₂ decays using dry ice: Outside air CO₂ level was first measured for 5 minutes near the air intake of the ventilation system outside the building before each experiment. To raise the peak $CO₂$ levels inside the dental treatment rooms to approximately 2000 ppm, 250g of dry ice was placed in a water bath and left in the room for two minutes. A small oscillating fan was used to keep the $CO₂$ well mixed in the room. $CO₂$ level was then measured at oneminute intervals using a consumer-grade $CO₂$ sensor (Aranet4, range 0-9999ppm, accuracy \pm 50ppm, SAF Tehnika, Riga, Latvia) for up two hours. The consumer-grade Aranet4 $CO₂$ sensor used in the current study was purchased at amazon.com in the US. It was recommended by the Federation of European Heating, Ventilation and Air Conditioning Associations (REHVA) for monitoring $CO₂$ levels in schools during the COVID-19 pandemic (REHVA 2020), and was found to be comparable to a research-grade LI-COR $CO₂$ sensor in accuracy and suitable for the time-response assessment in this study (Jimenez 2020).

Protocols for assessing ventilation rates by CO₂ decays using baking soda: We tested peak CO₂ values in the 10 treatment rooms after mixing baking soda with vinegar using a weight (g):volume (ml) ratio of 1:15 based on the molar masses of the reagents. We aimed at a peak level range of 1500 to 2000 ppm in rooms with various mechanical ventilation rates and with doors closed. We determined

that adding about 125g of baking soda (approximately 3/5 cup measure) to 1893 ml (a 64-oz bottle) of vinegar containing 5% acetic acid will elevate the $CO₂$ level in a typical dental treatment room (10 x 11 ft in area, 8 ft in ceiling height, or 880 ft³ in volume) with a moderate ventilation rate (ACH_{VENT} = 4) to above 1500 ppm. For rooms that are significantly larger or having very high ventilation rates, one full cup measure (about 8 oz or 227g) of baking soda may be used with 3785 ml (a one-gallon jar) of vinegar containing 5% acetic acid.

Calculating ventilation rate using CO² level change after mixing baking soda and vinegar: Details of ventilation rates calculated by time needed to remove $63%$ of excess $CO₂$ generated by dry ice or baking soda are presented in Appendix Table 3.

Appendix Table 3: Ventilation rate estimates by time needed to remove 63% excess CO₂ released by dry ice or baking soda and vinegar

DI: dry ice. BV: baking soda and vinegar. CR: outdoor CO₂ level. Cs: peak CO₂ level after CO₂ generation by dry ice or baking soda. CE: excess CO₂ generated by dry ice or baking soda (Cs - CR). C63%E: CO₂ level after 63% excess CO₂ is removed (Cs-63%C_E). t₂: time (min) needed to reach C_{63%E}. ACH_{T63%}: ventilation rate in air change per air based on t₂

Appendix Table 4 is a dynamic template that will allow you to enter 3 values to get the ventilation rate in air change per hour (ACH) for your treatment rooms: 1, the peak $CO₂$ level (C_S), 2, the outdoor $CO₂$ level, and 3. Time needed to reach 63% removal of excess CO₂. (Fernstrom and Goldblatt 2013; Jimenez 2020; Nardell et al. 1991)

Appendix Table 4: Ventilation rate estimate using time needed to remove 63% excess CO₂ generated by baking soda and vinegar

2. Outdoor CO2 level. You could use 400 ppm as an estimate for this value.

3. Time needed to reach 63% removal of excess CO².

You need to read the value in B5 and check the CO2 sensor readings to get the time needed to reach 63% removal of excess CO².

Application notes: It is important to point out that the setting for the current study is a postdoctoral dental training institution affiliated with an academic medical center, which may differ significantly in ventilation conditions from private dental practices that have a solo or a few dental practitioners. Ventilation conditions in different dental settings are largely unknown as the ventilation design of dental offices is not regulated as other outpatient healthcare facilities that are required to have 6 to 15 ACH by ASHRAE and CDC (Chinn and Sehulster 2003; Ninomura and Bartley 2001). Godwin and colleagues reported that ventilation rate was 1.12 ACH in dental operatories of a small dental clinic (2400 ft²) (Godwin et al. 2003), which is significantly lower than the mean of 13 ACH in the present study but resembles more closely to the mean of 1.09 ACH in typical residential households in the US (Sherman and Matson 1997).

We consider that it is very important for every dental practitioner to be able to accurately assess the ventilation rate in their working environments. Epidemiological data showed that transmission of COVID-19 is almost exclusively an indoor phenomenon, with 99.97% of the transmissions occurring in an indoor environment (Qian et al. 2020). Airborne transmission through respiratory aerosols is increasingly recognized as a major driver for the COVID-19 pandemic (Morawska and Milton 2020; Noorimotlagh et al. 2020; Zhang et al. 2020). As essential healthcare providers, dental professionals work in the frontline during the pandemic and need to adopt measures to mitigate the risk of aerosol transmission in addition to droplet and contact precautions that have been the standard of infection control in dental offices (Harte 2010).

Our data showed that household baking soda (NaHCO $_3$) and vinegar (5% acetic acid) could be used to generate $CO₂$ in dental office to assess the ventilation rate by observing the $CO₂$ concentration decays using a $CO₂$ sensor and a basic calculator. This method will allow dental practitioners to reliably estimate the ventilation rate in their dental offices without expensive equipment and advanced technical skills. The test could be completed within 30 minutes in spaces with ventilation rate higher than 2 ACH but may take longer time if the ventilation is significantly below 1 ACH. We recommend to plan a twohour observation time during off-hours with the building ventilation system operating in its normal setting.

Although ventilation rate in ACH could be calculated by fitting a linear regression line over time into the natural log scale of time-varying concentrations of $CO₂$ levels (equation $\#2$), we found that a simplified method (equation #4) provided equally if not more accurate estimate of ventilation rate. As it is known that one complete air change replaces 63% of airborne contaminants with outdoor air (Fernstrom and Goldblatt 2013; Jimenez 2020; Nardell et al. 1991), ventilation rate could be easily calculated using the time needed to remove 63% of excess $CO₂$. For example, assuming outdoor $CO₂$ level is 400ppm, and peak $CO₂$ level is 1500ppm after mixing baking soda with vinegar inside the dental office for 2 minutes, excess $CO₂$ inside the room will be 1500–400=1100ppm at peak. The $CO₂$ level that represents 63% removal of excess CO_2 is therefore 1500–63% x1100=807ppm. If it takes 15min for CO_2 level to reach 807ppm from the peak of 1500ppm, ventilation rate will be 60/15=4 ACH; and if it takes 2 hours for the $CO₂$ level to reach 807ppm, it will be $60/120 = 0.5$ ACH. This method will allow dental care professionals to accurately estimate ventilation rate using a simple calculator.

Abbreviations:

References:

- C.D.C. How covid-19 spreads. 2020a. [accessed 2021 Feb. 4]. [https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019](https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/prevent-getting-sick/how-covid-spreads.html) [ncov/prevent-getting-sick/how-covid-spreads.html.](https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/prevent-getting-sick/how-covid-spreads.html)
- C.D.C. Scientific brief: Sars-cov-2 and potential airborne transmission. 2020b. [accessed 2021 Feb. 4]. [https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/more/scientific-brief-sars-cov-2.html.](https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/more/scientific-brief-sars-cov-2.html)
- C.D.C. Uidance for dental settings interim infection prevention and control guidance for dental settings during the covid-19 pandemic. 2020c. [accessed 2021 Feb. 4]. [https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/hcp/dental-settings.html.](https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/hcp/dental-settings.html)
- Chinn RYW, Sehulster L. 2003. Guidelines for environmental infection control in health-care facilities; recommendations of cdc and healthcare infection control practices advisory committee (hicpac).
- Fernstrom A, Goldblatt M. 2013. Aerobiology and its role in the transmission of infectious diseases. J Pathog. 2013:493960-493960.
- Godwin CC, Batterman SA, Sahni SP, Peng CY. 2003. Indoor environment quality in dental clinics: Potential concerns from particulate matter. Am J Dent. 16(4):260-266.
- Harte JA. 2010. Standard and transmission-based precautions: An update for dentistry. J Am Dent Assoc. 141(5):572-581.
- Jimenez, j-l. How to quantify the ventilation rate of an indoor space using an affordable co2 monitor. 2020. [accessed 2021 Feb. 4]. [https://medium.com/@jjose_19945/how-to-quantify-the](https://medium.com/@jjose_19945/how-to-quantify-the-ventilation-rate-of-an-indoor-space-using-a-cheap-co2-monitor-4d8b6d4dab44)[ventilation-rate-of-an-indoor-space-using-a-cheap-co2-monitor-4d8b6d4dab44.](https://medium.com/@jjose_19945/how-to-quantify-the-ventilation-rate-of-an-indoor-space-using-a-cheap-co2-monitor-4d8b6d4dab44)
- Morawska L, Milton DK. 2020. It is time to address airborne transmission of coronavirus disease 2019 (covid-19). Clin Infect Dis. 71(9):2311-2313.
- Nardell EA, Keegan J, Cheney SA, Etkind SC. 1991. Airborne infection. Theoretical limits of protection achievable by building ventilation. Am Rev Respir Dis. 144(2):302-306.
- Ninomura P, Bartley J. 2001. New ventilation guidelines for health-care facilities. ASHRAE Journal,. 43(6):29-32.
- Noorimotlagh Z, Jaafarzadeh N, Martínez SS, Mirzaee SA. 2020. A systematic review of possible airborne transmission of the covid-19 virus (sars-cov-2) in the indoor air environment. Environ Res. 193:110612.
- Qian H, Miao T, Liu L, Zheng X, Luo D, Li Y. 2020. Indoor transmission of sars-cov-2. Indoor Air.
- Sherman MH, Matson N. 1997. Residential ventilation and energy characteristics. ASHRAE Trans. 103:717-730.
- Zhang R, Li Y, Zhang AL, Wang Y, Molina MJ. 2020. Identifying airborne transmission as the dominant route for the spread of covid-19. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A. 117(26):14857-14863.

Correspondence to:

Yanfang Ren, DDS, PhD, MPH Professor Eastman Institute for Oral Health University of Rochester Medical Center 625 Elmwood Ave, Rochester, New York 14620, USA Yanfang_ren@urmc.rochester.edu Phone: +1 585 273 5588