

## SYNOPSIS

# Review of “The impact of heating, ventilation, and air conditioning design features on the transmission of viruses, including the 2019 novel coronavirus: a systematic review of ventilation and coronavirus”

10/26/2021

**Article citation:** Thornton GM, Fleck BA, Kroeker E, Dandnayak D, Fleck N, Zhong L, et al. The impact of heating, ventilation, and air conditioning design features on the transmission of viruses, including the 2019 novel coronavirus: a systematic review of ventilation and coronavirus. medRxiv 21264765 [Preprint]. 2021 Oct 11 [cited 2021 Oct 19]. Available from:

<https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.10.08.21264765>

## One-minute summary

- The authors performed a systematic review of the evidence examining the effectiveness of mechanical ventilation for reducing or potentially reducing transmission of coronaviruses. The authors included 32 studies in their final narrative synthesis. Coronaviruses considered for this study included severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 1 (SARS-CoV-1), severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) and Middle East respiratory syndrome coronavirus (MERS-CoV).
- In 20 studies investigating the effects of ventilation rate on transmission of coronaviruses, the authors reported that **an increased ventilation rate was associated primarily with decreased risk/probability of infection/transmission (n=13)**. In addition, an increased ventilation rate was associated with: 1) increased virus removal (n=2), 2) increased efficiency of virus removal (n=2), 3) decreased droplet persistence (n=2), and 4) decreased virus concentration (n=1).
- In 7 studies investigating the effects of airflow on transmission of coronaviruses, the authors reported that **airflow patterns affected virus transmission risk and that the placement of fans or exhaust influenced virus particle dispersion (includes situations that increased or decreased the risks of coronavirus transmission)**.
- In 5 studies investigating the combined effects of ventilation rate and airflow on transmission of coronaviruses, the authors concluded that **ventilation feature (e.g., supply/exhaust or fans) placement affected particle distribution**.
- Three studies provided quantified recommendations for ventilation:

Review of “The impact of heating, ventilation, and air conditioning design features on the transmission of viruses, including the 2019 novel coronavirus: a systematic review of ventilation and coronavirus”

- Use an air change rate of 9 per hour for six-bed hospital wards.
- Waiting 6 air changes or 2.5 hours before letting different individuals into an unfiltered office with approximately 2 fresh air changes per hour (FCH)
- Waiting for one air change prior to occupying a laboratory room with filtration by High-Efficiency Particulate Absorbing (HEPA) or Minimum Efficiency Reporting Value (MERV) filters.
- Use a pressure difference from -2 to -25 Pascals (Pa) in negative pressure isolation rooms.
- **Qualitative recommendations were reported in 9 studies:**
  - Use of ventilation and increasing ventilation rates
  - Allow for introduction of fresh air using maximum supply rates
  - Avoid poorly ventilated spaces
  - Assess fan and exhaust placement
  - Perform ventilation testing and air balancing checks
- The authors conclude that using HVAC ventilation systems to reduce coronavirus transmission should take into account ventilation rate, airflow patterns, air balancing, occupancy and ventilation feature placement (e.g., air supply and exhaust, fans); that some form of ventilation is better at reducing coronavirus transmission than no ventilation; efforts should focus on settings at relatively higher risk (low air change rates, being crowded, where high-risk occupants or activities are present).

## Additional information

- For the systematic review, the authors searched Ovid MEDLINE, Compendex and Web of Science Core databases from the inception of each database to January 2021. Only peer-reviewed English language studies were included. The authors have published an *a priori* systematic review protocol and have registered their systematic review. The systematic review was performed in accordance with guidance from Cochrane and the reporting of findings was in accordance with Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA).
- The authors focused on studies investigating mechanical ventilation use in indoor settings, including those with quantitative results of correlation or association between ventilation and coronavirus transmission.
- For experimental and observational studies (n=8), the authors assessed selection bias, information bias and confounding (i.e., low, high or unclear). For modelling studies (n=23), the authors assessed biases associated with definition, assumption and validation (i.e., low, high, unclear). Due to heterogeneity across studies, the authors did not perform meta-analyses. Two studies were considered related to one another and included as a single study.
  - Overall, there was a low risk of bias in 100% (8/8) of experimental studies.

- Overall, there was low risk of bias in 91% (21/23) of modelling studies.
- Included studies were published from 2004 through 2021, with most studies performed in the United States (n=11) or China (n=10).
- Ventilation rate was measured in several ways, including air changes per hour (ACH) or m<sup>3</sup>/h. Airflow studies used various different means of altering airflow, included mixing ventilation, displacement ventilation and negative pressure.
- **Limitations acknowledged by the authors:**
  - The authors noted that among the studies, ventilation was affected by several factors, including airflow rates, filtration usage, numbers of room occupants, room size, room volume and supply/exhaust rates. These variables made quantification of recommendations difficult, representing a current gap in the literature.
  - Fifteen of the 32 included studies were conducted in healthcare settings; therefore, the results may not be applicable to all indoor settings.

## PHO reviewer's comments

- It is important to note that ventilation or ventilation features are layers in a comprehensive mitigation strategy against SARS-CoV-2 transmission. This layered approach includes vaccination, symptom screening and self-isolation, physical distancing, mask-wearing, hand hygiene, and public health contact tracing. Accordingly, the authors note a caveat from one of the included studies that “ventilation rate did not affect the close-range airborne transmission route”.
- In addition to diverse methods for quantitatively measuring ventilation, the authors also found the importance of qualitative ventilation factors in potentially influencing transmission or particle distribution.
- Although the majority of studies included in the review were based on modelling, the overall conclusion that increased ventilation rate is associated with decreased risk or probability of transmission is broadly consistent with what would be expected based on the function of mechanical ventilation systems and previous literature.
- Since the quantified recommendations were based on 3 studies (2 modelling, 1 experimental), their effectiveness in preventing or reducing infection has to be further tested (and how these interplay with population immunity and other non-pharmaceutical interventions). It was not clear to what extent the modelling studies took into consideration the higher transmissibility of variants of concern (VOCs) and the potential impacts VOCs might have on the quantified recommendations.
- Further research is needed in non-healthcare settings, such as schools and places of work, especially toward quantifying the impacts of ventilation and airflow in these settings. As noted by the authors, it is difficult to extrapolate their findings to settings outside of hospitals. However, even with more data in other settings, ventilation studies will be difficult to generalize due to the diversity of indoor environments and the contexts in which they operate.

- The authors do not mention the limitations and caveats typically associated with systematic reviews, such as publication bias and language bias.
- This work is preliminary. The peer review process should be completed before the findings from this study are used for clinical or public health decision-making.

## Citation

Ontario Agency for Health Protection and Promotion (Public Health Ontario). Review of “The impact of heating, ventilation, and air conditioning design features on the transmission of viruses, including the 2019 novel coronavirus: a systematic review of ventilation and coronavirus”. Toronto, ON: Queen’s Printer for Ontario; 2021.

©Queen’s Printer for Ontario, 2021

## Disclaimer

This document was developed by Public Health Ontario (PHO). PHO provides scientific and technical advice to Ontario’s government, public health organizations and health care providers. PHO’s work is guided by the current best available evidence at the time of publication. The application and use of this document is the responsibility of the user. PHO assumes no liability resulting from any such application or use. This document may be reproduced without permission for non-commercial purposes only and provided that appropriate credit is given to PHO. No changes and/or modifications may be made to this document without express written permission from PHO.

## Public Health Ontario

Public Health Ontario is an agency of the Government of Ontario dedicated to protecting and promoting the health of all Ontarians and reducing inequities in health. Public Health Ontario links public health practitioners, front-line health workers and researchers to the best scientific intelligence and knowledge from around the world.

For more information about PHO, visit [publichealthontario.ca](https://publichealthontario.ca).

©Queen’s Printer for Ontario, 2021

