Experimental and numerical analysis of indoor air quality affected by outdoor air particulate levels (PM$_{1.0}$, PM$_{2.5}$ and PM$_{10}$), room infiltration rate, and occupants' behaviour

Nuodi Fu [a,b], Moon Keun Kim [c,*], Long Huang [d], Jiying Liu [e], Bing Chen [f], Stephen Sharples [b]

[a] *Department of Architecture, Xi'an Jiaotong – Liverpool University, Suzhou 215123, China*
[b] *School of Architecture, University of Liverpool, Liverpool L69 7ZX, United Kingdom*
[c] *Department of Civil Engineering and Energy Technology, Oslo Metropolitan University, Oslo 0130, Norway*
[d] *School of Intelligent Manufacturing Ecosystem, Xi'an Jiaotong – Liverpool University, Suzhou 215123, China*
[e] *School of Thermal Engineering, Shandong Jianzhu University, Jinan 250101, China*
[f] *Department of Urban Planning and Design, Xi'an Jiaotong – Liverpool University, Suzhou 215123, China*

HIGHLIGHTS

- The smaller particles could be used as a tracer to estimate the air exchange rate.
- Particle size and prediction accuracy have a negative correlation.
- Outdoor pollution levels impact on the accuracy of a particular matter.
- The real-time air exchange rate of the building can be predictable.

GRAPHICAL ABSTRACT

Figure A: The numerical model for the indoor PM$_{1.0}$ concentration

Figure B: The numerical model for the indoor PM$_{2.5}$ concentration

Figure C: The numerical model for the indoor PM$_{10}$ concentration

The numerical model for estimating steady-state indoor particle level

ARTICLE INFO

ABSTRACT

This study conducted an experimental analysis of how indoor air quality (IAQ) is influenced by the outdoor air pollutants levels, infiltration rate, and occupants' behaviours. The impacts of these factors on IAQ were analyzed using on-site measurements and numerical simulations. The results contribute to a better understanding of how to control the Indoor Particulate Level (IPL) for the specific conditions of the studied building. Results showed that occupant behaviour was the primary factor in determining the IPL, significantly changing the number of outdoor particles introduced to the building. Moreover, it was found that the IPL was exponentially correlated to the Outdoor Particulate Level (OPL). Based on numerical simulations, this study concluded that smaller particles do not always have more chance than larger particles of accessing the indoor environment through the building envelope. Meanwhile, a steady-state indoor particle concentration numerical model was established and verified using the 4-fold cross-validation method. Finally, simulation results identified that the room infiltration rate had a positive linear impact on IAQ if the OPL was under 30 μg/m^3. This is because the increased air exchange rate can help to dilute indoor air pollutants when the outdoor air is relatively clean.

1. Introduction and background

The outbreak of COVID-19 poses a threat to public health worldwide. Better understating of the virus transmission could help reduce the spread

* Corresponding author.
E-mail address: Moon.Kim@oslomet.no (M.K. Kim).

of the disease. Recently, research has shown that airborne particles can carry numerous viruses on their surface, including the coronavirus, and can readily be deposited into human lungs and even the bloodstream (Bowe et al., 2021; Ehsanifar, 2021; Meo et al., 2020; Prinz and Richter, 2022; Stieb et al., 2020). Further, previous research also indicated that a higher Outdoor Particulate Level (OPL) was linked to higher morbidity and mortality (Garaga and Kota, 2018; Wu et al., 2020). Moreover, airborne particles in outdoor air pollution can enter the indoor environment through openings in building envelopes via infiltration and ventilation air, resulting in the Indoor Particulate Level (IPL) being several times higher than the OPL (Kim, 2022; Liu et al., 2020; Zong et al., 2022). Therefore, although people now spend much of their time indoors, due to the rapid urbanization and economic development in many countries, they might still suffer from the impact of outdoor origin air pollutants, which can result in increased respiratory and cardiovascular morbidity and mortality (Chen et al., 2017; EPA, 2019a; Hu et al., 2018; WHO, 2013; Yang et al., 2019; Zauli-Sajani et al., 2018). Consequently, it is essential to understand how to achieve and maintain good indoor air quality (IAQ) within a healthy range in buildings.

There are two primary means of outdoor particles entering and influencing the indoor environment. Firstly, occupants' behaviour is the primary mechanism for changing the number of outdoor particles introduced into a building, which determines IAQ (Um et al., 2022). The human-building interactions, such as window opening behaviour, will significantly impact IAQ since it exposes the indoor environment directly to the outdoor physical environment. Tong et al. (2016) reported that the IPL could be around 20 % higher in a naturally ventilated building than in a mechanically ventilated one. Moreover, several studies reported that occupants' ventilation behaviour showed a low correlation with the outdoor particle concentration but was, instead, mainly driven by indoor thermal comfort (Jeong et al., 2016; Langer et al., 2017; Ren et al., 2022). The occupant's behaviour for natural ventilation may quickly degrade IAQ when the outdoor air pollution rate is quite high. Rotko et al. (2002) conducted a study and found that occupant has a lack of opportunity to assess the outdoor air quality. Under this circumstance, investigating to what extent human behaviours influence IAQ in homes can help to reduce residents' exposure to indoor particles. However, most of the previous studies have not focused on discussing the effect of this factor.

To date, a considerable number of existing buildings are not equipped with mechanical ventilation systems, which results in natural ventilation being the only way to supply fresh air indoors. However, using unfiltered natural ventilation for areas with high outdoor pollution could increase the risks of people being exposed to air pollutants. For those buildings with no mechanical ventilation system, a portable air purifier (PAP) is an effective technology that can dilute indoor air pollutants and supply clean air to the indoor environment. In addition, most of the literature has studied the influence of air filters on particles, and all of them reported a varied capture rate of the same filter regarding particles of different sizes (Ben-David et al., 2018; Feng et al., 2020; Fu et al., 2021b; Ruan and Rim, 2019; Stephens, 2018; Zong et al., 2022). Moreover, previous studies also explored that the PAP could substantially reduce the indoor PM$_{2.5}$ level (Cooper et al., 2021; Shao et al., 2017). However, how people use the PAP and the extent to which the PAP can influence the indoor particle level have not been well studied. Pei et al. (2019) conducted a study within 43 residential buildings in China and found that the majority of occupants will not use the PAP even if it is provided. Further, only around 19 % of the family will use the PAP, but they were only operating for 1 to 4 h each day, and they reported that this pattern of using the PAP could not maintain a healthy indoor PM$_{2.5}$ level. Cooper et al. (2021) concluded that the PAP could sufficiently maintain the indoor PM$_{2.5}$ level in a residential building, which can reduce around 45 % average after 90 min operated. However, most previous studies concentrated on exploring the PAP's performance when the occupants face special outdoor conditions (Brugge et al., 2017; Maestas et al., 2019; Spilak et al., 2014), such as wildfires, or when the occupants have a specific requirement for IAQ

(Park et al., 2017; Weichenthal et al., 2013), such as asthma. Accordingly, there is little to explain how a commercial PAP could influence indoor particle concentration in a naturally ventilated office building under different outdoor conditions.

Secondly, outdoor particles can enter a building through envelope cracks or ventilation system leakages with infiltrating air. As one of the critical impact factors, infiltrating air can significantly degrade IAQ by bringing outdoor air pollutants indoors if the outdoor air is contaminated (Fu et al., 2021a; Hu et al., 2020; Kim et al., 2020; Li et al., 2019; Liang et al., 2021; Nazaroff, 2021). Previous research has shown that fine and ultra-fine particles are more likely to enter the indoor environment through the building envelope with the infiltrating air than coarse particles, due to their smaller size (Li et al., 2017; Liu and Nazaroff, 2003; Wang, 2013). This is because the particle size substantially impacts the penetration factor, representing the fraction of particles in the infiltration air that passes through the building envelope. Due to the impact of the particle size, the passing rate of particles through the windows and doors varies. Furthermore, the deposition rate as one of the loss mechanisms for the indoor particles also affects the IPL, and its value is highly correlated to the particle size (Ben-David and Waring, 2016; Chen et al., 2012; Li et al., 2017). Thus, the impact of outdoor particles on IAQ evidently corresponds to the particle size. However, this research was targeted to investigate the impact of one size of particles on IAQ and human health (Challoner and Gill, 2014; Garaga and Kota, 2018; Han et al., 2015; Scibor, 2019; Yang et al., 2019). Accordingly, little information is available for comparing the different sizes of particles' impact on IAQ in a building under different outdoor conditions.

It is under such circumstances that the studies in this paper were inspired. Hence, this study selected three sizes of particles as the target - PM$_{1.0}$ (particle size between 0.1 and 1.0 μm), PM$_{2.5}$ (particle size less than 2.5 μm), and PM$_{10}$ (particle size less than 10 μm). The purpose of this study was to investigate to what extent the outdoor air pollutant levels, room infiltration rates, and human-building interactions impacted IAQ under natural conditions and to examine the significance of using a PAP in reducing residents' exposure to indoor particles. The results contribute to a better understanding of how the outdoor particles and occupants' behaviours impact IAQ in buildings. To this end, three research questions were defined:

(1) How does occupants' behaviour, such as opening doors and windows for natural ventilation and installing an air purifier, influence indoor air quality?
(2) How do air infiltration rates, outdoor air pollution levels, and particle sizes affect IAQ?
(3) By using comparative analysis between experimental and numerical investigations, how do outdoor air pollution levels and occupants' behaviour impact on IAQ for a real case study building in China?

2. Methodology

In order to achieve the objectives mentioned above, the methodologies in this study can be divided into four steps: 1) Test the airtightness of the selected room by using a blower door; 2) do on-site measurements of indoor and outdoor concentrations of PM with different specific conditions; 3) develop numerical models based on collected data to assess the fluctuation of the IPL; 4) validate the numerical model using the cross-validation method.

2.1. Descriptions of the measured building

A test room was created in the case study building that was located in Suzhou, Jiangsu Province, China. The building is naturally ventilated and is 12 stories, approximately 63 m high, and the tested room was located on the 3rd floor of the building at a height above ground level of 10.4 m.

The selected building is north-south oriented, and the tested room was in the north part of the building. Details of the test room and building are presented in Fig. 1. The selected building is located on a relatively open site, surrounded by a pedestrianized area and a vehicular road.

2.2. Blower door test

In this study, the blower door test method was used to access the airtightness measurements of the building envelope. The airtightness measurements for the selected room were performed in strict accordance with the standard EN 13829 (CEN, 2001). The Retrotec 5000 test system was utilized in this test method, as shown in Fig. 2. The adopted test system consisted of three parts: a cloth panel for sealing the opening and setting up the instruments, the Model 5000 fan, which is capable of moving air into or out of the zone at required airflow rates (the flow accuracy is ±5 %), and a 32-DM digital manometer control device for setting the fan.

Ten airtightness measurements for the selected room have been done to minimize the error, and all of the tests show high agreement. The results are presented in Table 1. According to the ASHRAE Handbook (ASHRAE, 2017), the air infiltration rate is calculated based on the pressure differential method and can be described as:

$$\lambda_i = \frac{3600}{V} \times c \times (\Delta p)^n \tag{1}$$

where λ_i is the air change rate attributed to the infiltration rate in h^{-1}, and V is the volume of the tested room in m^3. Then, the average value was calculated for the exponent n and the airflow coefficient, c, in $m^3/(s \cdot Pa^n)$. The equation was shown in Eq. (2):

$$\lambda_i = 0.146 \times (\Delta p)^{0.5966} \tag{2}$$

Fig. 3 shows the relationship between the tested room air infiltration rate and the pressure differential. Because the wind direction and wind speed in the outdoor environment are changing rapidly, the wind-effect induced pressure differential is hard to measure. Thus, this study aimed to investigate how significant the impact of the wind-induced pressure differential was on estimating the IPL. Hence, the stack-effect induced pressure differential and the total pressure differential were considered separately.

Fig. 2. The blower door test system.

2.3. Experiment design

The experiments were conducted between 15th January and 21st January 2022. The test room is trapezoidal and is controlled by a centralized ventilation system. During the experiment, the doors and ventilation system were kept closed, and a heating system was used to control the indoor air temperature, which aimed to simulate different temperature differences between indoors and outdoors. In addition, five different scenarios were set for experimental analysis to achieve the purpose of the study, as shown below list, and Table 2 summarizes all the experiments.

(1) Experiment 1: All room openings were kept closed during the experiment, including an inner door, outer door, and two windows. A manometer was used to measure the pressure differential in the experiment, as shown in Fig. 4(E). The tube connected between the outdoor environment and the manometer was perpendicular to the window.

(2) Experiment 2: The inner door was opened during the experiment, while the other two openings were kept closed. An anemometer was used to measure the air velocity through the opening. The anemometer was set at the middle point of the opening and is perpendicular to it, as shown in Fig. 4(B).


Fig. 1. The test room and selected building.

Table 1
Airtightness test results.

| Air flow coefficient (m³/(h∗Pan))	Air change rate at 50 Pa (h⁻¹)	ELA at 50 Pa (cm²)	ELA per envelope area at 50 Pa (cm²/m²)	Slope, n
24.83	8.30	25.28	2.14	0.5966

Fig. 3. Measured air infiltration rate of the tested room.

(3) Experiment 3: One of the windows was opened during the experiment, while the other two openings were kept closed. The anemometer was used to measure the air velocity through the opening, and the setting up method is the same as experiment 2, as shown in Fig. 4(D).

(4) Experiment 4: The outer door was opened during the experiment, while the other two openings were kept closed. The anemometer was used to measure the air velocity through the opening, and the setting up method is the same as experiment 2, as shown in Fig. 4(C).

(5) Experiment 5: An air purifier was set in the middle of the room to dilute indoor air pollutants. During the experiment, a PAP was set at the maximum power, gave a Clean Air Delivery Rate (CADR) of 230 m³/h. Further, the PAP was equipped with a HEPA13 filter, which has a 99.9 % removal efficiency for $PM_{1.0}$, $PM_{2.5}$, and PM_{10}.

The purpose of Experiment 1 was to explore the impact of outdoor air pollution levels on IAQ under natural conditions. The results of this experiment can be used as the benchmark for the follow-up comparative study and also answer research question 2 listed above. Experiments 2, 3, 4, and 5 aimed to investigate the effect of the inner door, windows, outer door, and PAP on IAQ. Comparing Experiment 2 with Experiment 4, the influence of different outdoor conditions on IAQ could be determined. Moreover, the results, based on comparing Experiments 3 with 4, indicated the

Table 2
The setup of the experiments.

Exp.	Inner door	Outer door	Windows	Air purifier
1	−	−	−	−
2	+	−	−	−
3	−	−	+	−
4	−	+	−	−
5	−	−	−	+

1. '−' means the component was kept closed during the experiment.
2. '+' means the component was kept open during the experiment.

impact of the conducted area between indoors and outdoors on IAQ. The Experiment 5 results illustrated how IAQ is affected by the PAP. The results of Experiments 2, 3, 4, and 5 could answer research question 1.

For all experiments, samples were collected indoors and outdoors simultaneously. Based on the pilot study before the official experiment, which was done under the same boundary conditions, we found that the impact of people's motion is minimized after 5 min after the people leave the room. Thus, each experiment was conducted for 95 min, and the first 5 min's data were not considered when doing the data analysis, meaning each data group had 90 samples. Each instrument will be calibrated before every experiment. Moreover, it is assumed that the indoor particle is uniformly distributed. Then, the calibrated instruments were placed on the middle table, as shown in Fig. 4(A), which is around 0.9 m above the floor level. For outdoor measurements, a table was located on the balcony and is 1.5 m away from the room, and the instruments were placed on the table to collect the outdoor data during the whole experiments. Fig. 1 (C and D) illustrated the positions of indoor and outdoor tables for the measurements. The instruments were set to collect data every 10 s, and the record data were the mean values of every minute.

2.4. Instrumentation

The TSI Model 8534 DustTrak Aerosol Monitor (TSI incorporated USA) was used to measure $PM_{1.0}$, $PM_{2.5}$, and PM_{10} concentrations. It is a handheld instrument that uses the 90° light scattering technique, in which the amount of scattered light is proportional to the volume concentration of an aerosol. This instrument has been used to measure atmospheric particles in several widely accepted papers (Liu et al., 2018; Wu et al., 2002). Moreover, the instrument was calibrated for Arizona Test Dust by the manufacturer and recalibrated before the on-site measurement. The TSI Model 7575 Q-Trak Indoor Air Quality Monitor (TSI incorporated USA) measures CO_2 concentrations. This handheld instrument has been used successfully in a recent outdoor CO_2 concentration measurement (Kim and Choi, 2019). Table 3 presents detailed information on the manufacturer-reported detection range, accuracy, and resolution for the testing instruments used in this study.

2.5. Mass balance model of indoor particles

Over time, the change in indoor PM concentration levels can be modelled as a function that mainly depends on source terms (S_i) and loss terms (L_i) and can be represented by Eq. (3) (Ben-David and Waring, 2016; Fu et al., 2021a, 2021b; Kim and Choi, 2019; Liu et al., 2021; Serfozo et al., 2014).

$$\frac{dC_i}{dt} = S_i - L_i \times C_i \tag{3}$$

where C_i is the indoor pollutant concentration in µg/m³. As the tested room is an office room, thus this study assumed that there were no indoor particle emission sources (EPA, 2019b), and the particle concentration in the room was uniform (Huang et al., 2017). Eq. (4) represents the dynamic solution of the mass balance equation that describes the indoor particle concentration (Diapouli et al., 2013; Quang et al., 2013; Ruan and Rim, 2019; Yu et al., 2014).

$$PM_{in,t_k} = PM_{in,t_{k-1}} \times e^{-L(t_k - t_{k-1})} + \left(\frac{S}{L} - \frac{S}{L} \times e^{-L(t_k - t_{k-1})} \right) \tag{4}$$

where, PM_{in,t_k} is the concentration of the indoor PM concentration at time k in µg/m³, S is the source term, L is the loss term, and t_k is the ventilation system's operation time. For the source term, the origin of $PM_{2.5}$ in the indoor environment is the outdoor air coming through the ventilation system or penetrating through building cracks and wall cavities in a mechanically ventilated building (Liu and Nazaroff, 2001; Morawska et al., 2017; Shi and Li, 2018b). However, there was no ventilation system in the tested building, and all openings were kept closed during the experiment, which

Fig. 4. The detailed information regarding the setup of experiments (picture A: the layout of the tested room, and pictures B, C, D and E: the status of each opening during different scenarios).

means the particles penetrated the building with the infiltrating air was the only source of the indoor particles. Moreover, compared to the deposition rate, the particle resuspension rate induced by indoor human activities was weak enough to be neglected (Shi and Li, 2018a), so the source term can be expressed as Eq. (5). In addition, if there is an air purifier, the source term of indoor particles can be rewritten as Eq. (6).

$$S = C_{out} \times p \times \lambda_i \tag{5}$$

$$S = C_{out} \times p \times \lambda_i + C_{in} \times \frac{CADR}{V} \tag{6}$$

where C_{in} and C_{out} are the indoor and outdoor particle concentrations in $\mu g/m^3$, p is the penetration rate of particles, with values set to 0.95, 0.85, 0.76 for $PM_{1.0}$, $PM_{2.5}$, and PM_{10}, respectively (Chen et al., 2012; Liu and Nazaroff, 2001), λ_i is the air change rates attributed to the air infiltration rate in h^{-1}, the Clean Air Delivery Rate (CADR) is in m^3/h, and V is the volume of the tested room in m^3. Furthermore, the loss terms contain the air pollutant removal mechanisms by ventilation and deposition onto indoor surfaces, while only the room infiltration was considered. Hence, the loss

term can be expressed as Eq. (7), and the equation can be rewritten as Eq. (8) if considering the air purifier.

$$L = \lambda_i + \beta \tag{7}$$

$$L = \lambda_i + \beta + \frac{CADR}{V} \tag{8}$$

where β is the deposition rate, which is 0.1, 0.17, 0.29 h^{-1} for $PM_{1.0}$, $PM_{2.5}$, PM_{10}, respectively (Chen et al., 2012; He et al., 2005).

3. Results and discussion

3.1. The impact of occupants' behaviour on the indoor particle level

Based on the data analysis, the results indicated that human behaviour impacted notably on the IPL, as presented in Figs. 5, 6, and 7. The results strongly agree with recent studies (Ahmed et al., 2021; Cooper et al., 2021; Luo et al., 2019; Um et al., 2022). It can be seen that the number of

Table 3
Manufacturer-reported detection range, accuracy, and resolution for testing instruments in this study.

| Parameter	Instrument	Range	Accuracy	Resolution
CO_2	TSI Model 7575 Q-Trak Indoor	0 to 5000 ppm	± 3 % of reading	1 ppm
$PM_{1.0}$	TSI Model 8534 DustTrak	–	1 $\mu g/m^3$ or ± 0.1 % of the reading	0.1 to 15 μm
$PM_{2.5}$				
PM_{10}				
Air temperature	Testo 635-2	− 60–400 ℃	0.1 ℃ or ± 0.3 ℃ of reading	0.1 ℃
Air velocity	Testo 440	0–30 m/s	0.03 m/s ± 4 % observed value	0.01 m/s
Pressure differential	Vadias QDF70A-VD-S	± 100 Pa	0.5 % FS	0.1 Pa

Fig. 5. The value range of $PM_{1.0}$'s I/O ratio for five designed experiments (the five horizontal lines for each box in order from top to bottom: maximum value, 3rd quartile, median, 1st quartile, minimum value).

outdoor particles introduced into the building rapidly increases if unfiltered natural ventilation is used.

From Figs. 5 to 7, it can be seen that opening the outer door could create a substantially degraded indoor environment, followed by opening the inner door and window. This indicates that the outdoor pollution rate and the contact area between the indoors and outdoors are directly proportional to the concentration of the indoor particles. The human-building interaction had the most significant influence on indoor PM_{10} levels, followed by $PM_{2.5}$ and $PM_{1.0}$. Accordingly, the larger particle finds it easier to enter indoors with the airflow through the openings of the building, and this is why the Indoor/Outdoor (I/O) concentration ratio of coarse particles always rises over one during the experiment.

Moreover, experiment 5 illustrated that PAP used indoors could effectively reduce the risk of occupants' exposure to indoor particles. The present study showed that $PM_{1.0}$, $PM_{2.5}$, and PM_{10} levels were reduced by a mean of 86 %, 81 %, and 70 %, respectively, over 90 min with PAP use. Based on the

results, the air purifier's particle removal efficiency decreases as the particle size increases. Hence, human-building interactions, such as opening the outer door, could efficiently degrade IAQ, regardless of how high the OPL (Um et al., 2022). In addition, it is highly recommended to use PAP properly indoors if outdoor air is contaminated (Cooper et al., 2021; Shi and Li, 2018a).

3.2. The impact of outdoor particles on indoor air quality

The wind direction and speed in the outdoor environment vary with time, which results in a challenge in measuring real-time wind-effect induced pressure differentials. Further, the IPL is highly correlated with room infiltration rate, and thus the inaccuracy of room infiltration would cause an error in estimating the IPL. Hence, a comparison study was conducted that used the total pressure differential, tested by the manometer, and the stack-induced pressure differential measured


**Fig. 6.** The value range of $PM_{2.5}$'s I/O ratio for five designed experiments.

Fig. 7. The value range of PM_{10}'s I/O ratio for five designed experiments.

based on the temperature differential to examine the extent of the impact of the wind-induced pressure differential on IAQ. Fig. 8 presents the variation of the pressure differences between indoors and outdoors during the experiments regarding the two methods. Then, the comparison results of measured and estimated indoor particle levels are shown in Figs. 9, 10, and 11. Moreover, according to the manufacturer, the measured indoor PM_{10} level includes $PM_{1.0}$ and $PM_{2.5}$, and the indoor $PM_{2.5}$ level includes $PM_{1.0}$. Therefore, the particles are divided into three size ranges, which are 0.1–1.0 μm, 1.0–2.5 μm, and 2.5–10 μm, to investigate their impact on IAQ, and the results are presented in Figs. 12 and 13.

Figs. 9 to 11 indicate that the indoor particle variation trend meshed well with the mass balance model when the indoor wind environment was steady, but this phenomenon is not evident if the OPL is low. Compared to the larger size particle, the measured indoor $PM_{1.0}$ level is lower than the estimated value, which proves that the real impact of

the outdoor $PM_{1.0}$ is lower than the estimated one. Moreover, the measured indoor PM_{10} level is close to the estimated value if no occupant behaviour impacts exist. However, the measured indoor PM_{10} level is significantly higher than the estimated one if the impacts of human behaviours are considered.

Furthermore, according to Figs. 9, 12, and 13, the measured value of particles with sizes over 1.0 μm is significantly higher than the estimated one when indoor environments directly exposed to outdoors, which indicates the larger size particles finds it easier to enter indoors with the airflow through the openings of the building. It is worth to be mentioned that this phenomenon is not apparent in Fig. 10 since $PM_{1.0}$ is the dominant component of $PM_{2.5}$ in China, which occupies around 65 % - 80 % of that found in this study and strongly agrees with previous results (Chen et al., 2017; Yang et al., 2020). And $PM_{2.5}$ occupies 80 % of PM_{10}, which shows high agreement with the report published by the WHO (WHO, 2006a, 2006b).


Fig. 8. Comparison of the total pressure differential tested by manometer and the stack-induced pressure differential based on the temperature difference.

Fig. 9. Comparison of measured and estimated indoor $PM_{1.0}$ level (the red curve represents the real-time measured IPL, and the blue and black curve represents the estimated IPL based on the stack-induced pressure differential and the total pressure differential).

In addition, the measured indoor $PM_{2.5}$ level has meshed well with the stack and wind effect based estimated value compared to the other two particles, which means that the indoor $PM_{2.5}$ level is significantly correlated with the pressure differential. For a closed space with no emission sources, the outdoor particles that enter the indoor environment by infiltrating air through the building envelope are the primary sources of the indoor particles. Further, the infiltrating air is caused by the pressure differential. Hence, in theory, the indoor particle variation trend should follow the fluctuation of the pressure difference between indoors and outdoors. However, Figs. 8 to 11 illustrate that the infiltration rate has no evident impact on the short-period IPL.

In summary, the smaller particles, with sizes under 1.0 μm, have less chance to impact IAQ than the expected when indoor environment is stable. When considering the impact of human-building interaction, the indoor particle level with a larger size, was notably higher than the estimated value. Moreover, the removal efficiency of the used PAP is higher for the smaller size than the larger particles.

3.2.1. The accuracy analysis of two estimation methods

In order to investigate the level impact of the wind-effect induced pressure differential on estimating the IPL, the stack-effect induced pressure differential and the total pressure differential were considered separately. A comparison of the accuracy of two estimate methods regarding different particle sizes is presented in Figs. 14, 15, and 16.

It can be seen that the total pressure differential-based estimate of IPL is closer to the measured data compared to the stack effect-based method, which indicates that the wind effect cannot be ignored when assessing the short-period indoor particle concentration. Based on the


Fig. 10. Comparison of measured and estimated indoor $PM_{2.5}$ level (the red curve represents the real-time measured IPL, and the blue and black curve represents the estimated IPL based on the stack-induced pressure differential and the total pressure differential).

Fig. 11. Comparison of measured and estimated indoor PM$_{10}$ level (the red curve represents the real-time measured IPL, and the blue and black curve represents the estimated IPL based on the stack-induced pressure differential and the total pressure differential).

analysis, the pressure difference-based method is more accurate in estimating the larger particle's indoor level. From Table 4, the chance of the outdoor particles entering the indoor environment is less than the expected value if there is no other factor impact on IAQ in a closed space. Moreover, using the air purifier would significantly impact the accuracy of the estimated results, and the estimated error would be increased if the outdoor air was relatively clean. Hence, it is suggested that the wind-effect induced pressure differential should be considered when predicting the real-time IPL.

3.3. The numerical model for estimating steady-state indoor particle level

In Section 3.2, the dynamic impacts of outdoor air pollution and air infiltration rate were analyzed. For the purpose of conducting a quantitative

analysis of the influence of outdoor air pollution and infiltration rate on IAQ, the IPL numerical model was constructed for all three particles based on the measured indoor and outdoor particle concentrations and real-time air infiltration rate. The numerical models are shown below:

$$\text{PM}_{1.0}: C_{in} = 16.11 - 4.275 \times \lambda_i - 0.4632 \times C_{out} + 0.1706 \times \lambda_i \times C_{out} + 0.005672 \times C_{out}^2 \tag{9}$$

$$\text{PM}_{2.5}: C_{in} = 22.56 - 19.76 \times \lambda_i - 0.5694 \times C_{out} + 0.6906 \times \lambda_i \times C_{out} + 0.005724 \times C_{out}^2 \tag{10}$$

$$\text{PM}_{10}: C_{in} = 28.42 - 9.799 \times \lambda_i - 0.4864 \times C_{out} + 0.3548 \times \lambda_i \times C_{out} + 0.005253 \times C_{out}^2 \tag{11}$$


Fig. 12. Comparison of measured and estimated indoor PM$_{1.0-2.5}$ level (the red curve represents the real-time measured IPL, and the blue and black curve represents the estimated IPL based on the stack-induced pressure differential and the total pressure differential).

Fig. 13. Comparison of measured and estimated indoor $PM_{2.5–10}$ level (the red curve represents the real-time measured IPL, and the blue and black curve represents the estimated IPL based on the stack-induced pressure differential and the total pressure differential).

According to Figs. 17 to 19, the fitted model's coefficient of determination (R^2) regarding three different particles was around 0.97, which indicates the numerical model had meshed well with the measured data. It can be seen that several discrete points caused the error of the fitted model. After analysis of the input data, the discrete data are concentrated at the early stage of the experiment. This is because the pressure differential between indoors and outdoors is varied at the beginning of the experiment and causes the rapid fluctuation of the IPL. Moreover, the 4-fold Cross-Validation was used to verify the fitted numerical model (Fig. 18).

It was found from the fitted model that the increased infiltration rate has the most significant impact on indoor $PM_{2.5}$ level, and the outdoor pollution level has an evident influence on indoor PM_{10} level. Compared to the larger particles, the indoor $PM_{1.0}$ level was less affected by the outdoor pollution rate and room infiltration. In addition, if outdoor air is contaminated and the airtightness of the building is poor, then the occupants are more susceptible to indoor $PM_{2.5}$ than other sizes of particles (Fig. 19).

3.3.1. The combined effect of the room infiltration and outdoor particle level on IAQ

Based on the data provided by the China Meteorological Bureau, the hourly average outdoor $PM_{2.5}$ and PM_{10} levels in Suzhou range between 0 and 300 $\mu g/m^3$ (Wang, 2021). However, there is a lack of measured data for the outdoor $PM_{1.0}$ concentration. In this study, it is assumed that the value range of outdoor $PM_{1.0}$ is the same as $PM_{2.5}$ since, in China, $PM_{1.0}$ is the primary component of $PM_{2.5}$ (Yang et al., 2020). Moreover, the airtightness of the tested room generally varied from 0 to 1 ACH and rarely went over 1 ACH under natural conditions. In this instance, these data were used to illustrate the air infiltration rate and OPL's combined


Fig. 14. Comparison of the accuracy of two estimate methods regarding indoor $PM_{1.0}$ level. (The $Increment$ $(\%) = \frac{Estimated\ indoor\ particle\ level\ -\ Measured\ indoor\ particle\ level}{Measured\ indoor\ particle\ level} \times 100$.)

Fig. 15. Comparison of the accuracy of two estimate methods regarding indoor PM$_{2.5}$ level. (The *Increment* $(\%) = \frac{Estimated\ indoor\ particle\ level\ -\ Measured\ indoor\ particle\ level}{Measured\ indoor\ particle\ level} \times 100$.)

effect on IAQ was analyzed based on the fitted model, as shown in Fig. 20. Compared to the ambient PM standard, the indoor PM control standard lacks development since only a few countries have established the indoor PM control standard. The existing recommended concentration limit for indoor PM$_{2.5}$ level is mainly aimed towards industrial environments (Liu et al., 2017), and there is no standard for PM$_{1.0}$. Therefore, the World Health Organization (WHO) Air Quality IT-1 level of 35 μg/m^3 for PM$_{2.5}$ was chosen to evaluate the indoor PM$_{1.0}$ and PM$_{2.5}$ levels, and 70 μg/m^3 for assessing indoor PM$_{10}$ level (WHO, 2006a). The red curve in the figures represents the limit value of indoor particles suggested by WHO, and the area under the red curve means the IPL has met the standard.

The results indicated that the IPL could be higher than the OPL at a leaky building if the outdoor air has deteriorated. Thus, an effective

method, such as using the PAP, is recommended to control the indoor particles in a leaky building if outdoor pollution levels are high. Further, compared to PM$_{1.0}$ and PM$_{10}$, PM$_{2.5}$ has more chance of being introduced indoors with the infiltrated air. One of the possible reasons is that the large and small particles are easier to be influenced by other mechanisms during the progress that infiltrates through the building envelope.

Based on the data analysis, for all three particle sizes, the room air-tightness increase will help dilute the IPL when the outdoor level is under 30 μg/m^3. It was also found that the air infiltration rate had a negative linear impact on the IPL when the outdoor level was over 30 μg/m^3. Moreover, a non-linear negative impact of outdoor particles on indoor air quality was found when the OPL was over 30 μg/m^3. In higher outdoor air pollution levels over 150 μg/m^3 and lower infiltration levels below 0.3 ACH, the PM$_{1.0}$ pollutants significantly dominate


Fig. 16. Comparison of the accuracy of two estimate methods regarding indoor PM$_{10}$ level. (The *Increment* $(\%) = \frac{Estimated\ indoor\ particle\ level\ -\ Measured\ indoor\ particle\ level}{Measured\ indoor\ particle\ level} \times 100$.)

Table 4

The average estimated error of two pressure differential based methods regarding three particles sizes.

	$PM_{1.0}$		$PM_{2.5}$		PM_{10}	
	Stack	Stack & wind	Stack	Stack & wind	Stack	Stack & wind
Exp. 1	156 %	107 %	56 %	23 %	23 %	7 %
Exp. 2	69 %	42 %	10 %	− 0.4 %	− 9 %	− 14 %
Exp. 3	53 %	25 %	8 %	− 1 %	− 8 %	− 13 %
Exp. 4	15 %	5 %	− 5 %	− 6 %	− 14 %	− 14 %
Exp. 5	267 %	102 %	29 %	− 9 %	− 33 %	− 41 %

indoor pollution levels. According to the analysis, this study estimates that smaller particles, such as $PM_{1.0}$, penetrate building facades more easily than bigger particles in lower air infiltrated conditions.

4. Conclusion

An experimental-based study was conducted to explore the impact of the outdoor particles, room infiltration, and occupants' behaviours on

IAQ. The experiments were conducted in a 12-storey building in Suzhou. Based on the European standard EN13829, the blower door test was applied to assess the airtightness of the chosen room, and the results were used to evaluate the impact of room infiltration on the IPL. The results indicated that all of these elements substantially impacted IAQ in a building.

Occupant behaviour was the primary mechanism that determined the IPL. Based on the experimental results, human-building interactions, such as the door and window opening behaviour, would notably increase the number of outdoor particulate matter introduced to the building, whatever the outdoor air pollution levels. Therefore, it is suggested not to use unfiltered natural ventilation, especially for areas with high outdoor pollution. Moreover, the results indicated that an air purifier could efficiently reduce the IPL when outdoor air is contaminated. However, for energy-saving concerns, the PAP should be used properly and reference made to the dominant indoor particles to select the filter class.

Numerical simulation was used to conclude that the IPL is exponentially correlated to the OPL, fitting with the mass balance model. According to the simulation results, this study estimates that the smaller particles, with sizes


$$C_{in} = 16.11 - 4.275 \cdot \lambda_i - 0.4632 \cdot C_{out} + 0.1706 \cdot \lambda_i \cdot C_{out} + 0.005672 \cdot (C_{out})^2 \quad (R^2 = 0.969)$$

Fig. 17. The numerical model for the indoor $PM_{1.0}$ concentration.

$$C_{in} = 22.56 - 19.76 \cdot \lambda_i - 0.5694 \cdot C_{out} + 0.6906 \cdot \lambda_i \cdot C_{out} + 0.005724 \cdot (C_{out})^2 \quad (R^2 = 0.973)$$

Fig. 18. The numerical model for the indoor $PM_{2.5}$ concentration.

$$C_{in} = 28.42 - 9.799 \cdot \lambda_i - 0.4864 \cdot C_{out} + 0.3548 \cdot \lambda_i \cdot C_{out} + 0.005253 \cdot (C_{out})^2 \quad (R^2 = 0.974)$$

Fig. 19. The numerical model for the indoor PM_{10} concentration.

under 1.0 μm, do not always have more chance to enter the indoor environment through the building envelope than the larger ones. However, compared to the other two particles, the PM_{10} significantly dominated indoor pollution levels when the building was under unfiltered natural ventilation conditions. Hence, to determine the primary indoor pollutants, the specific conditions of the building should be considered.

The simulation results indicated that the air infiltration rate had a positive linear impact on IAQ if the OPL was under 30 μg/m³, while a negative linear effect was found when outdoor air deteriorated. Based on the analysis, smaller particles, such as $PM_{1.0}$, more easily penetrate building facades than bigger particles in lower air infiltration conditions. In other words, occupants may significantly suffer from the $PM_{1.0}$ pollutants in an airtight building when the OPL is the same and high.

CRediT authorship contribution statement

Nuodi Fu carried out the conceptualization, methodology, analysis, and writing. Moon Keun Kim carried out conceptualization, methodology, project management, reviewing and editing. Long Huang carried out experiments, reviewing and editing. Jiying Liu carried out methodology, reviewing and editing. Bing Chen carried out project administration and reviewing. And Stephen Sharples carried out supervising, reviewing, and editing.

Data availability

Data will be made available on request.

Fig. 20. The combined effect of the airtightness and outdoor particle level on indoor air quality.

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.

Acknowledgement

References

Ahmed, T., Kumar, P., Mottet, L., 2021. Natural ventilation in warm climates: the challenges of thermal comfort, heatwave resilience and indoor air quality. Renew. Sust. Energ. Rev. 138, 110669. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2020.110669.

ASHRAE, I, 2017. 2017 ASHRAE Handbook : Fundamentals (SI Edition. Ed.). ASHRAE. https://liverpool.idm.oclc.org/login?url=https://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=cat00003a&AN=lvp.b5442900&site=eds-live&scope=site. http://liverpool.idm.oclc.org/login?url=http://app.knovel.com/hotlink/toc/id:kpASHRAEQ1/2017-ashrae-handbook?kpromoter=marc (Bibliographies Handbooks Non-fiction Electronic document).

Ben-David, T., Wang, S., Rackes, A., Waring, M.S., 2018. Measuring the efficacy of HVAC particle filtration over a range of ventilation rates in an office building. Build. Environ. 144, 648–656. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.buildenv.2018.08.018.

Ben-David, T., Waring, M.S., 2016. Impact of natural versus mechanical ventilation on simulated indoor air quality and energy consumption in offices in fourteen U.S. cities [Article]. Build. Environ. 104, 320–336. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.buildenv.2016.05.007.

Bowe, B., Xie, Y., Gibson, A.K., Cai, M., van Donkelaar, A., Martin, R.V., Burnett, R., Al-Aly, Z., 2021. Ambient fine particulate matter air pollution and the risk of hospitalization among COVID-19 positive individuals: cohort study. Environ. Int. 154, 106564. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envint.2021.106564.

Brugge, D., Simon, M.C., Hudda, N., Zellmer, M., Corlin, L., Cleland, S., Lu, E.Y., Rivera, S., Byrne, M., Chung, M., Durant, J.L., 2017. Lessons from in-home air filtration intervention trials to reduce urban ultrafine particle number concentrations. Build. Environ. 126, 266–275. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.buildenv.2017.10.007.

CEN, 2001. BS EN 13829:2001 Thermal performance of buildings. Determination of air permeability of buildings. Fan pressurization method [Standards]. BSI Standards Limited. https://liverpool.idm.oclc.org/login?url=https://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=edsbsi&AN=edsbsi.19983036&site=eds-live&scope=site.

Challoner, A., Gill, L., 2014. Indoor/outdoor air pollution relationships in ten commercial buildings: PM2.5 and NO2. Build. Environ. 80, 159–173. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.buildenv.2014.05.032.

Chen, C., Zhao, B., Zhou, W., Jiang, X., Tan, Z., 2012. A methodology for predicting particle penetration factor through cracks of windows and doors for actual engineering application. Build. Environ. 47, 339–348. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.buildenv.2011.07.004.

Chen, G., Li, S., Zhang, Y., Zhang, W., Li, D., Wei, X., He, Y., Bell, M.L., Williams, G., Marks, G.B., Jalaludin, B., Abramson, M.J., Guo, Y., 2017. Effects of ambient PM1 air pollution on daily emergency hospital visits in China: an epidemiological study. Lancet Planet. Health 1 (6), e221–e229. https://doi.org/10.1016/S2542-5196(17)30100-6.

Cooper, E., Wang, Y., Stamp, S., Burman, E., Mumovic, D., 2021. Use of portable air purifiers in homes: operating behaviour, effect on indoor PM2.5 and perceived indoor air quality. Build. Environ. 191, 107621. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.buildenv.2021.107621.

Diapouli, E., Chaloulakou, A., Koutrakis, P., 2013. Estimating the concentration of indoor particles of outdoor origin: a review. J. Air Waste Manage. Assoc. 63 (10), 1113–1129. https://doi.org/10.1080/10962247.2013.791649.

Ehsanifar, M., 2021. Airborne aerosols particles and COVID-19 transition. Environ. Res. 200, 111752. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envres.2021.111752.

EPA, 2019. Health and Environmental Effects of Particulate Matter (PM). Retrieved 05-11 from https://www.epa.gov/pm-pollution/health-and-environmental-effects-particulate-matter-pm.

EPA, 2019. Indoor Particulate Matter _ Indoor Air Quality (IAQ). https://www.epa.gov/indoor-air-quality-iaq/indoor-particulate-matter.

Feng, Z., Yang, J., Zhang, J., 2020. Numerical optimization on newly developed electrostatic enhanced pleated air filters for efficient removal of airborne ultra-fine particles: towards sustainable urban and built environment. Sustain. Cities Soc. 54, 102001. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scs.2019.102001.

Fu, N., Kim, M.K., Chen, B., Sharples, S., 2021. (15)Comparative Modelling Analysis of Air Pollutants, PM2.5 and Energy Efficiency Using Three Ventilation Strategies in a High-rise Building: A Case Study in Suzhou, China. 13 , p. 8453. https://www.mdpi.com/2071-1050/13/15/8453.

Fu, N., Kim, M.K., Chen, B., Sharples, S., 2021. Investigation of Outdoor Air Pollutant, PM2.5 Affecting the Indoor Air Quality in a High-rise Building. (0)0. https://doi.org/10.1177/1420326x211038279.1420326X211038279.

Garaga, R., Kota, S.H., 2018. Characterization of PM(10) and impact on human health during the annual festival of lights (Diwali). J. Health Pollut. 8 (20), 181206. https://doi.org/10.5696/2156-9614-8.20.181206.

Han, Y., Qi, M., Chen, Y., Shen, H., Liu, J., Huang, Y., Chen, H., Liu, W., Wang, X., Liu, J., Xing, B., Tao, S., 2015. Influences of ambient air PM2.5 concentration and meteorological condition on the indoor PM2.5 concentrations in a residential apartment in Beijing using a new approach. Environ. Pollut. 205, 307–314. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envpol.2015.04.026.

He, C., Morawska, L., Gilbert, D., 2005. Particle deposition rates in residential houses. Atmos. Environ. 39 (21), 3891–3899. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.atmosenv.2005.03.016.

Hu, K., Guo, Y., Hu, D., Du, R., Yang, X., Zhong, J., Fei, F., Chen, F., Chen, G., Zhao, Q., Yang, J., Zhang, Y., Chen, Q., Ye, T., Li, S., Qi, J., 2018. Mortality burden attributable to PM1 in Zhejiang province, China. Environ. Int. 121, 515–522. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envint.2018.09.033.

Hu, Y., Yao, M., Liu, Y., Zhao, B., 2020. Personal exposure to ambient PM2.5, PM10, O3, NO2, and SO2 for different populations in 31 Chinese provinces. Environ. Int. 144, 106018. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envint.2020.106018.

Huang, W., Xie, X., Qi, X., Huang, J., Li, F., 2017. Determination of particle penetration coefficient, particle deposition rate and air infiltration rate in classrooms based on monitored indoor and outdoor concentration levels of particle and carbon dioxide. Procedia Eng. 205, 3123–3129. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.proeng.2017.10.126.

Jeong, B., Jeong, J.-W., Park, J.S., 2016. Occupant behavior regarding the manual control of windows in residential buildings. Energy Build. 127, 206–216. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enbuild.2016.05.097.

Kim, M.K., 2022. Handbook of Ventilation Technology for the Built Environment: Design, Control and Testing. IET.

Kim, M.K., Baldini, L., Leibundgut, H., Wurzbacher, J.A., 2020. Evaluation of the humidity performance of a carbon dioxide (CO2) capture device as a novel ventilation strategy in buildings. Appl. Energy 259, 112869. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apenergy.2019.03.074.

Kim, M.K., Choi, J.-H., 2019. Can increased outdoor CO2 concentrations impact on the ventilation and energy in buildings? A case study in Shanghai, China. Atmos. Environ. 210, 220–230. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.atmosenv.2019.04.015.

Langer, S., Ramalho, O., Le Ponner, E., Derbez, M., Kirchner, S., Mandin, C., 2017. Perceived indoor air quality and its relationship to air pollutants in French dwellings. Int. J. Indoor Environ. Health 27 (6), 1168–1176. https://doi.org/10.1111/ina.12393.

Li, A., Ren, T., Yang, C., Lv, W., Zhang, F., 2017. Study on particle penetration through straight, L, Z and wedge-shaped cracks in buildings [Article]. Build. Environ. 114, 333–343. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.buildenv.2016.12.024.

Li, N., Liu, Z., Li, Y., Li, N., Chartier, R., McWilliams, A., Chang, J., Wang, Q., Wu, Y., Xu, C., Xu, D., 2019. Estimation of PM2.5 infiltration factors and personal exposure factors in two megacities, China. Building and Environment 149, 297–304. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.buildenv.2018.12.033.

Liang, D., Lee, W.-C., Liao, J., Lawrence, J., Wolfson, J.M., Ebelt, S.T., Kang, C.-M., Koutrakis, P., Sarnat, J.A., 2021. Estimating climate change-related impacts on outdoor air pollution infiltration. Environ. Res. 196, 110923. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envres.2021.110923.

Liu, C., Ji, S., Zhou, F., Lin, Q., Chen, Y., Shao, X., 2021. A new PM2.5-based CADR method to measure air infiltration rate of buildings. Build. Simul. 14 (3), 693–700. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12273-020-0676-4.

Liu, D.-L., Nazaroff, W.W., 2001. Modeling pollutant penetration across building envelopes. Atmos. Environ. 35 (26), 4451–4462. https://doi.org/10.1016/S1352-2310(01)00218-7.

Liu, D.-L., Nazaroff, W.W., 2003. Particle penetration through building cracks. Aerosol Sci. Technol. 37 (7), 565–573. https://doi.org/10.1080/02786820300927.

Liu, F., Zheng, X.H., Qian, H., 2018. Comparison of particle concentration vertical profiles between downtown and urban forest park in Nanjing (China). Atmos. Pollut. Res. 9 (5), 829–839. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apr.2018.02.001.

Liu, G., Xiao, M., Zhang, X., Gal, C., Chen, X., Liu, L., Pan, S., Wu, J., Tang, L., Clements-Croome, D., 2017. A review of air filtration technologies for sustainable and healthy building ventilation. Sustain. Cities Soc. 32, 375–396. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scs.2017.04.011.

Liu, J., Cai, W., Zhu, S., Dai, F., 2020. Impacts of vehicle emission from a major road on spatiotemporal variations of neighborhood particulate pollution—a case study in a university campus. Sustain. Cities Soc. 53, 101917. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scs.2019.101917.

Luo, N., Weng, W., Xu, X., Hong, T., Fu, M., Sun, K., 2019. Assessment of occupant-behavior-based indoor air quality and its impacts on human exposure risk: a case study based on the wildfires in northern California. Sci. Total Environ. 686, 1251–1261. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2019.05.467.

Maestas, M.M., Brook, R.D., Ziemba, R.A., Li, F., Crane, R.C., Klaver, Z.M., Bard, R.L., Spino, C.A., Adar, S.D., Morishita, M., 2019. Reduction of personal PM2.5 exposure via indoor air filtration systems in Detroit: an intervention study. J. Expo. Sci. Environ. Epidemiol. 29 (4), 484–490. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41370-018-0085-2.

Meo, S.A., Abukhalaf, A.A., Alomar, A.A., Alessa, O.M., 2020. Wildfire and COVID-19 pandemic: effect of environmental pollution PM-2.5 and carbon monoxide on the dynamics of daily cases and deaths due to SARS-COV-2 infection in San-Francisco USA. Eur. Rev. Med. Pharmacol. Sci. 24 (19), 10286–10292. https://doi.org/10.26355/eurrev_202010_23253.

Morawska, L., Ayoko, G.A., Bae, G.N., Buonanno, G., Chao, C.Y.H., Clifford, S., Fu, S.C., Hänninen, O., He, C., Isaxon, C., Mazaheri, M., Salthammer, T., Waring, M.S., Wierzbicka, A., 2017. Airborne particles in indoor environment of homes, schools, offices and aged care facilities: the main routes of exposure. Environ. Int. 108, 75–83. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envint.2017.07.025.

Nazaroff, W.W., 2021. Residential air-change rates: a critical review [doi:10.1111/ina.12785]. Indoor Air 31 (2), 282-313. https://doi.org/10.1111/ina.12785.

Park, H.-K., Cheng, K.-C., Tetteh, A.O., Hildemann, L.M., Nadeau, K.C., 2017. Effectiveness of air purifier on health outcomes and indoor particles in homes of children with allergic diseases in Fresno, California: a pilot study. J. Asthma 54 (4), 341–346. https://doi.org/10.1080/02770903.2016.1218011.

Pei, J., Dong, C., Liu, J., 2019. Operating behavior and corresponding performance of portable air cleaners in residential buildings, China. Build. Environ. 147, 473–481. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.buildenv.2018.08.009.

Prinz, A.L., Richter, D.J., 2022. Long-term exposure to fine particulate matter air pollution: an ecological study of its effect on COVID-19 cases and fatality in Germany. Environ. Res. 204, 111948. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envres.2021.111948.

Quang, T.N., He, C., Morawska, L., Knibbs, L.D., 2013. Influence of ventilation and filtration on indoor particle concentrations in urban office buildings. Atmos. Environ. 79, 41–52. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.atmosenv.2013.06.009.

Ren, J., Liu, J., Zhou, S., Kim, M.K., Song, S., 2022. Experimental study on control strategies of radiant floor cooling system with direct-ground cooling source and displacement ventilation system: a case study in an office building. Energy 239, 122410. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.energy.2021.122410.

Rotko, T., Oglesby, L., Künzli, N., Carrer, P., Nieuwenhuijsen, M.J., Jantunen, M., 2002. Determinants of perceived air pollution annoyance and association between annoyance scores and air pollution (PM2.5, NO2) concentrations in the European EXPOLIS study. Atmos. Environ. 36 (29), 4593–4602. https://doi.org/10.1016/S1352-2310(02)00465-X.

Ruan, T., Rim, D., 2019. Indoor air pollution in office buildings in mega-cities: effects of filtration efficiency and outdoor air ventilation rates. Sustain. Cities Soc. 49, 101609. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scs.2019.101609.

Scibor, M., 2019. Are we safe inside? Indoor air quality in relation to outdoor concentration of PM10 and PM2.5 and to characteristics of homes. Sustain. Cities Soc. 48, 101537. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scs.2019.101537.

Serfozo, N., Chatoutsidou, S.E., Lazaridis, M., 2014. The effect of particle resuspension during walking activity to PM10 mass and number concentrations in an indoor microenvironment. Build. Environ. 82, 180–189. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.buildenv.2014.08.017.

Shao, D., Du, Y., Liu, S., Brunekreef, B., Meliefste, K., Zhao, Q., Chen, J., Song, X., Wang, M., Wang, J., Xu, H., Wu, R., Wang, T., Feng, B., Lung, C.S.-C., Wang, X., He, B., Huang, W., 2017. Cardiorespiratory responses of air filtration: a randomized crossover intervention trial in seniors living in Beijing: Beijing indoor air purifier StudY, BIAPSY. Sci. Total Environ. 603–604, 541–549. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2017.06.095.

Shi, Y., Li, X., 2018a. Purifier or fresh air unit? A study on indoor particulate matter purification strategies for buildings with split air-conditioners. Build. Environ. 131, 1–11. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.buildenv.2017.12.033.

Shi, Y., Li, X., 2018b. A study on variation laws of infiltration rate with mechanical ventilation rate in a room. Build. Environ. 143, 269–279. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.buildenv.2018.07.021.

Spilak, M.P., Karottki, G.D., Kolarik, B., Frederiksen, M., Loft, S., Gunnarsen, L., 2014. Evaluation of building characteristics in 27 dwellings in Denmark and the effect of using particle filtration units on PM2.5 concentrations. Build. Environ. 73, 55–63. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.buildenv.2013.11.020.

Stephens, B., 2018. Evaluating the sensitivity of the mass-based particle removal calculations for HVAC filters in ISO 16890 to assumptions for aerosol distributions. Atmosphere 9 (3). https://doi.org/10.3390/atmos9030085.

Stieb, D.M., Evans, G.J., To, T.M., Brook, J.R., Burnett, R.T., 2020. An ecological analysis of long-term exposure to PM2.5 and incidence of COVID-19 in Canadian health regions. Environ. Res. 191, 110052. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envres.2020.110052.

Tong, Z., Chen, Y., Malkawi, A., Adamkiewicz, G., Spengler, J.D., 2016. Quantifying the impact of traffic-related air pollution on the indoor air quality of a naturally ventilated building. Environ. Int. 89–90, 138–146. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envint.2016.01.016.

Um, C.Y., Zhang, N., Kang, K., Na, H., Choi, H., Kim, T., 2022. Occupant behavior and indoor particulate concentrations in daycare centers. Sci. Total Environ. 824, 153206. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2022.153206.

Wang, H., 2013. Study shows PM1 air pollution is most harmful. Retrieved 07-19 from http://usa.chinadaily.com.cn/china/2013-10/28/content_17061997.htm.

Wang, J., 2021. Suzhou history daily average outdoor air pollutants concentration from 1st of January 2016 to 31st of December 2020. Retrieved 27/09/2021 from https://www.aqistudy.cn/.

Weichenthal, S., Mallach, G., Kulka, R., Black, A., Wheeler, A., You, H., St-Jean, M., Kwiatkowski, R., Sharp, D., 2013. A Randomized Double-blind Crossover Study of Indoor Air Filtration and Acute Changes in Cardiorespiratory Health in a First Nations Community. 23, pp. 175–184. https://doi.org/10.1111/ina.12019 (3).

WHO, 2006. Air quality guidelines global update 2005 : particulate matter, ozone, nitrogen dioxide and sulfur dioxide. https://apps.who.int/iris/handle/10665/107823.

WHO, 2006. WHO Air Quality Guidelines for Particulate Matter, Ozone, Nitrogen Dioxide and Sulfur Dioxide.

WHO, 2013. Health effects of particulate matter [Journal]. http://www.euro.who.int/_data/assets/pdf_file/0006/189051/Health-effects-of-particulate-matter-final-Eng.pdf.

Wu, X., Nethery, R.C., Sabath, B.M., Braun, D., Dominici, F.J.M., 2020. Exposure to Air Pollution and COVID-19 Mortality in the United States.

Wu, Y., Hao, J.M., Fu, L.X., Wang, Z.S., Tang, U., 2002. Vertical and horizontal profiles of airborne particulate matter near major roads in Macao, China. Atmospheric Environment 36 (31), 4907–4918. https://doi.org/10.1016/S1352-2310(02)00467-3 Pii S1352-2310(02)00467-3.

Yang, B.-Y., Guo, Y., Morawska, L., Bloom, M.S., Markevych, I., Heinrich, J., Dharmage, S.C., Knibbs, L.D., Lin, S., Yim, S.H.-L., Chen, G., Li, S., Zeng, X.-W., Liu, K.-K., Hu, L.-W., Dong, G.-H., 2019. Ambient PM1 air pollution and cardiovascular disease prevalence: insights from the 33 communities Chinese health study. Environ. Int. 123, 310–317. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envint.2018.12.012.

Yang, B.-Y., Guo, Y.-M., Bloom, M.S., Dharmagee, S.C., Morawska, L., Heinrich, J., Jalaludin, B., Markevychd, I., Knibbsf, L.D., Lin, S., Hung Lan, S., Jalava, P., Komppula, M., Roponen, M., Hirvonen, M.-R., Guan, Q.-H., Liang, Z.-M., Yu, H.-Y., Hu, L.-W., Yang, B.-Y., Zeng, X.-W., Dong, G.-H., 2020. Is PM1 similar to PM2.5? A new insight into the association of PM1 and PM2.5 with children's lung function. Environ. Int. 145, 106092. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envint.2020.106092.

Yu, C.K.H., Li, M., Chan, V., Lai, A.C.K., 2014. Influence of mechanical ventilation system on indoor carbon dioxide and particulate matter concentration. Build. Environ. 76, 73–80. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.buildenv.2014.03.004.

Zauli-Sajani, S., Rovelli, S., Trentini, A., Bacco, D., Marchesi, S., Scotto, F., Zigola, C., Lauriola, P., Cavallo, D.M., Poluzzi, V., Cattaneo, A., Hänninen, O., 2018. Higher health effects of ambient particles during the warm season: the role of infiltration factors. Sci. Total Environ. 627, 67–77. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2018.01.217.

Zong, J., Liu, J., Ai, Z., Kim, M.K., 2022. A review of human thermal plume and its influence on the inhalation exposure to particulate matter. Indoor Built Environ. https://doi.org/10.1177/1420326X221080358 1420326X221080358.