Impact of vacuum cleaning on indoor air quality

Estela D. Vicente, Ana M. Vicente, Margarita Evtyugina, Ana I. Calvo, Fernanda Oduber, Carlos Blanco Alegre, Amaya Castro, Roberto Fraile, Teresa Nunes, Franco Lucarelli, Giulia Calzolai, Silvia Nava, Célia A. Alves

PII: S0360-1323(20)30439-X

DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.buildenv.2020.107059

Reference: BAE 107059

To appear in: Building and Environment

Received Date: 19 April 2020

Revised Date: 19 May 2020

Accepted Date: 8 June 2020

Please cite this article as: Vicente ED, Vicente AM, Evtyugina M, Calvo AI, Oduber F, Blanco Alegre C, Castro A, Fraile R, Nunes T, Lucarelli F, Calzolai G, Nava S, Alves CéA, Impact of vacuum cleaning on indoor air quality, *Building and Environment* (2020), doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.buildenv.2020.107059.

This is a PDF file of an article that has undergone enhancements after acceptance, such as the addition of a cover page and metadata, and formatting for readability, but it is not yet the definitive version of record. This version will undergo additional copyediting, typesetting and review before it is published in its final form, but we are providing this version to give early visibility of the article. Please note that, during the production process, errors may be discovered which could affect the content, and all legal disclaimers that apply to the journal pertain.

© 2020 Published by Elsevier Ltd.



- **1** Impact of vacuum cleaning on indoor air quality
- 3 Estela D. Vicente^{1*}, Ana M. Vicente¹, Margarita Evtyugina¹, Ana I. Calvo², Fernanda Oduber²,
- 4 Carlos Blanco Alegre², Amaya Castro², Roberto Fraile², Teresa Nunes¹, Franco Lucarelli^{3,4}, Giulia
- 5 Calzolai⁴, Silvia Nava^{3,4}, Célia A. Alves¹
- 6 ¹Centre for Environmental and Marine Studies (CESAM), Department of Environment and
- 7 Planning, University of Aveiro, Aveiro 3810-193, Portugal
- 8 ²Department of Physics, IMARENAB University of León, 24071 León, Spain
- ³Department of Physics and Astronomy, Università di Firenze, 50019 Sesto Fiorentino, Italy

⁴INFN - Firenze, National Institute for Nuclear Physics - Florence division, 50019, Sesto
 Fiorentino, Italy

12 *Corresponding author. E-mail address: estelaavicente@ua.pt

13

2

14 Abstract

Vacuum cleaning can be a household source of particulate matter (PM) both from the vacuum 15 motor and from settled dust resuspension. Despite the evidence of this contribution to PM levels 16 indoors, the effect of this source on PM composition is still unknown. In this study, four vacuum 17 cleaners (washable filter bag-less, wet, bagged and HEPA filter equipped robot) were tested for the 18 19 emission rate of particulate mass and number. The detailed PM chemical characterisation included organic and elemental carbon, metals and organic speciation. PM₁₀ emission rates from bagged 20 vacuum operation were much higher (207 \pm 99.0 µg min⁻¹) compared with the ones obtained from 21 wet (86.1 \pm 16.9 µg min⁻¹) and washable filter bag less vacuums (75.4 \pm 7.89 µg min⁻¹). Particle (8 22 to 322 nm) number emission rates ranged from 5.29×10^{11} (washable filter bag less vacuum) to 23 21.2×10^{11} (wet vacuum) particles min⁻¹. Ratios of peak to background levels indicate that 24 25 vacuuming can elevate the ultrafine particle number concentrations by a factor ranging from 4 to 26 61. No increase in PM mass or number concentrations was observed during the HEPA filter equipped vacuum operation. The increase in copper and elemental carbon PM₁₀ contents during 27 28 vacuuming suggested motor emissions. Organic compounds in PM_{10} included alkanes, PAHs, 29 saccharides, phenolics, alcohols, acids, among others. However, it was not possible to establish a 30 relationship between these compounds and vacuuming due to the vast array of possible household sources. The cancer risks associated with metals and PAH inhalation were negligible. 31

32

Keywords: Vacuum cleaners, Indoor air quality, Particles, Elemental composition, OC/EC,
Organic compounds.

35

36 **1. Introduction**

People spend more than 90% of their daily life in indoor environments [1–3] and, for this reason,
personal exposure to pollutants in these microenvironments is of great concern. Due to the

susceptibility of children and elderly to air pollution, numerous studies have been conducted to
assess indoor air quality in schools [4–7], children [8–11] and elderly day care centres [12–14].
Despite the importance of the above-mentioned microenvironments, most of people's time is spent
at home [1–3,15].

Indoors, particulate matter (PM) is one of the biggest health hazards [16]. Particulate matter is a
heterogeneous mixture of different chemical components and physical characteristics, which are
responsible for diverse health effects [17].

46 Household activities, such as cooking, smoking, hair spraying/drying, candle/incense burning or 47 vacuuming, have been reported to generate considerable amounts of particulate matter indoors [18-48 20], which may have a strong influence on short-term exposure [21]. Isaxon et al. [18] evaluated 49 the influence of household activities in 22 homes in Sweden on indoor airborne particles (number concentration and black carbon). The authors reported that despite the transient nature of indoor 50 sources, they rapidly generate particulate peak concentrations. He et al. [20] quantified the effect of 51 20 different household activities on indoor particle mass and number concentrations. The authors 52 reported that depending on the type of source and housing characteristics, indoor particles 53 increased distinctively. The influence of nine specific sources on particulate matter number size 54 55 distribution and mass concentration was evaluated individually in an empty laboratory by Glytsos 56 et al. [19]. High particle number concentrations during activation of the distinct sources and a great 57 influence of the source type on particle number size distributions were observed. Studies carried 58 out to assess household sources of PM reported that vacuuming can significantly elevate indoor PM 59 concentrations [22–24] with a very high total lung deposition fraction by number [25].

According to a survey on time use patterns in Europe for woman and men aged 20 to 74, and across the whole year, cleaning and upkeep activities are among the most time consuming tasks, representing 13 to 28 % of the total time spent on domestic work [26]. An online survey (covering Covering and upkeep activities are among the most time consuming tasks, representing 13 to 28 % of the total time spent on domestic work [26]. An online survey (covering accountries), aiming at assessing household's cleaning habits and preferences, revealed that 33 % of respondents vacuum 2-5 times per week, while 46 % spend 1-2 hours vacuuming [27].

Some studies reported in the literature were focused on the operation of vacuum cleaners and their 65 66 impacts on particle mass and number levels, both in laboratory chambers [21,28–31] and under real life conditions [18,20,32]. Additionally, a number of studies also included bioaerosol levels 67 associated with vacuuming [28,30,31]. Although many studies have investigated particulate mass 68 69 and number emissions during vacuum cleaning operations, an important gap in knowledge still 70 exists with respect to the chemical characteristics of the released particles. The characterisation of 71 the chemical composition of particles arising from specific indoor sources is of great interest due to 72 the risk associated with specific PM components and the possibility of using certain compounds as 73 tracers for source apportionment in indoor environments [33,34]. Regarding PM characterisation, 74 Szymczak et al. [35] reported ultrafine particles from a commercial professional vacuum motor 75 consisting almost entirely of copper. Vu et al. [25] suggested that particles released from the

vacuum cleaner motor were possibly carbon internal void aggregates. The authors' hypothesis was
based on the finding that particles generated from vacuum cleaning were found to be nearly
hydrophobic with an average growth factor around 0.98–1.10 for particle sizes of 50 and 100 nm.
Isaxon et al. [18] reported an increase in black carbon levels during vacuum cleaning.

Despite the significant data provided by these and other studies, the impact of this source on 80 household air quality is still uncertain due to the variability and complexity of vacuum cleaning and 81 limited on-site experiments. Studies conducted in laboratory allow obtaining reproducible 82 83 measurements with greater control of relevant factors that might influence the results and, thus, 84 they can serve as a reference. However, particulate emission rates measured in laboratory chambers 85 may substantially differ from those obtained in households since settled dust resuspension is not 86 considered [36] and neither are the differences in dust loads in residential settings [20]. On the other hand, measurements conducted under real life conditions, in which concentration data is 87 crossed with daily activity logs, can introduce some recall bias and misreporting. 88

The aim of the present study was to evaluate the impact of commercial vacuums on short-term particulate matter mass and number concentrations in indoor air. Since particle inhalation during vacuuming may adversely affect households, a detailed chemical characterisation of particulate matter was performed, which was the basis for a carcinogenic and noncarcinogenic risk assessment. The tests were carried out in a household under controlled conditions with respect to ventilation patterns and concurrent source events.

95

96 2. Materials and methods

97 2.1. Sampling sites and strategy

98 Three cylinder vacuum cleaners (washable filter bag less vacuum, wet vacuum, bagged vacuum) 99 and a HEPA filter equipped robot were temporarily borrowed from Spanish homeowners for 100 testing (Table 1). These devices were selected because cylinder vacuum cleaners are the prevalent 101 type in the EU with a market share of 68% in 2016, whilst robotic cleaners have shown an 102 increasing sales trend [37]. Measurements were performed in the living room (volume = 91.9 m^3) 103 of a suburban Spanish house in León from October to November 2017. Similarly to the approach 104 described by Vu et al. [25], Wu et al. [36] and Corsi et al [32], during the monitoring campaign 105 there were no other activities in the house and the measurements were carried out in a closed room 106 (all the doors and windows were closed) to achieve minimum ventilation conditions. Ventilation 107 rates, estimated by the CO₂ concentration decay method as described by Alves at al. [38], ranged 108 between 0.24 and 0.62 h⁻¹. The average estimates of ventilation rates are presented in Table 1. On 109 average, 45 min measurements were conducted during vacuum cleaning. Only the person 110 responsible for carrying out the activity was present in the room during the experiments. The living room tiled floor and rugs (two cut pile carpet/rug and one long threads shag rug) were vacuumed 111

twice with each vacuum cleaner at least one week apart. After the household activity ceased, the 112 113 room was kept completely empty and closed until the restoration of particle concentration to the 114 original level. Background indoor air measurements were also performed in the living room during which no activities were conducted in the house. The temperature (accuracy $\pm 0.5^{\circ}$ C), relative 115 116 humidity (accuracy $\pm 3.0\%$ with probe at 25°C) and CO₂ (accuracy $\pm 3.0\%$ of reading with probe at 117 25°C) were continuously monitored with an indoor air quality probe (TSI, model 7545). Temperature and relative humidity ranged between 19.7 and 26.3°C and between 30.6 and 45.7 %, 118 119 respectively, for the whole set of measurements (Table 1).

120 Real time size segregated particulate concentrations (PM₁, PM_{2.5}, PM₁₀) were recorded using a 121 DustTrak monitor (TSI, DRX 8533). Real time particle size distributions and number concentrations in the range from 8 to 322 nm were measured using a Scanning Mobility Particle 122 Spectrometer (SMPS, TSI Incorporated). The SMPS consists of an electrostatic classifier (TSI, 123 124 Model 3071) and a condensation particle counter (TSI, Model 3022). The aerosol was sampled through polyethylene tubing. All reported data has been corrected for diffusion losses using 125 equations described in Kulkarni et al. [39]for small particles and impaction/settling losses for larger 126 127 particles as a function of size [40].

- Simultaneous sampling with a PM₁₀ high volume air (MCV, model CAV-A/mb) instrument was 128 carried out. The equipment was operated at a flow of 30 m³ h⁻¹. Particulate samples were collected 129 on pre-weighed 150 mm quartz fibre filters (Pallflex®). PM₁₀ samples were also collected into 47 130 mm Teflon filters using a low volume sampler (Echo TCR, Tecora) working at 2.3 m³ h⁻¹. To 131 132 ensure the reliability of the measurements, the sampling devices were calibrated prior to sampling 133 and maintenance was performed in a regular basis. The gravimetric quantification was performed 134 following the specifications described in EN 12341:2014 [41], with a microbalance (XPE105 135 DeltaRange[®], Mettler Toledo, readability of 0.01 mg). The particulate mass was obtained from the 136 average of six consecutive measurements (relative standard deviation < 0.02%), after conditioning 137 the filters for 24 h in the weighing room. The high and low volume samplers and the real time 138 monitoring instruments were placed in the middle of the room at a height of about 1.5 m [42].
- 139

140 **2.2. Analytical techniques**

141 The carbonaceous content in the PM_{10} samples (quartz filters) was analysed by a thermal optical 142 transmission technique. The method includes controlled heating steps under inert (N₂) and 143 oxidising (N₂ with 4% of O₂) atmospheres. The carbonaceous content of the sample can be divided 144 into organic carbon (OC), pyrolysed carbon (PC) and elemental carbon (EC). PC, which is 145 produced from organic carbon during heating under inert atmosphere, was determined measuring 146 the filter light transmittance through a laser beam and a photodetector. The OC/EC determination is 147 based on the quantification of the CO₂ released by a non-dispersive infrared (NDIR) analyser. The

148 latter was daily calibrated with standard CO_2 cylinders and the recovery was periodically verified 149 by analysing filters impregnated with known amounts of potassium phthalate.

After weighing, Teflon filters were analysed by proton-induced X-ray emission (PIXE) to detect elements with atomic number above 10. Measurements were performed at the PIXE set-up fully dedicated to aerosol samples [43] at the 3 MV Tandetron accelerator of the INFN-LABEC laboratory, exploiting a 3 MeV proton beam. Further insight in the methods may be found in Lucarelli et al. [44].

- 155 Two 47 mm diameter punches of each quartz filter were extracted first with dichloromethane and 156 then with methanol. The total organic extracts were fractionated by flash chromatography using 157 eluents of increasing polarity through an activated silica-gel column. Four different fractions resulted from this process: (i) aliphatics, (ii) polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons, (iii) n-alkanols, 158 phenols, sterols and other hydroxyl compounds and (iv) acids and sugars. The different organic 159 fractions were concentrated and dried by a gentle nitrogen stream before analysis. Extracts (i) and 160 (ii) were analysed in a gas chromatograph-mass spectrometer (GC-MS) from Shimadzu. Extracts 161 with oxygenated compounds were analysed in a GC-MS from Thermo Scientific. These latter 162 163 fractions (iii and iv) include polar compounds, which require derivatisation before analysis. N,Obis(trimethylsilyl)trifluoroacetamide (BSTFA): trimethylchlorosilane (TMCS) 99:1 (Supelco 164 33149-U) was used as silvlation reagent. The GC-MS calibrations were performed with injection of 165 166 about 150 authentic standards (Sigma-Aldrich) at least at four different concentration levels. 167 Standards and samples were both co-injected with internal standards: tetracosane-d50 and 1-168 chlorohexadecane. Additionally, for PAHs determination, a mixture of six deuterated compounds 169 (1, 4-dichlorobenzene-d4, naphthalene- d8, acenaphthene-d10, phenanthreme-d10, chrysene-d12, 170 perylene-d12), was used. The organic extracts were injected in the single ion monitoring and total 171 ion chromatogram modes and the compound identification was based on comparison of the mass 172 spectra with the Wiley and NIST mass spectral libraries, comparison with authentic standards and 173 analysis of fragmentation patterns[45]. A description of recovery efficiency tests for several 174 compounds can be found in Oliveira et al. [46]. Field blanks were used to account for artefacts 175 associated with transport, handling, and storage of filters, as described in the EN 12341:2014 [41]. 176 These filters were analysed in the same way as samples and the data obtained was subtracted from 177 the samples in order to obtain corrected results.
- 178

179 **3. Results**

180 **3.1. Particulate matter**

181 **3.1.1.** Mass concentrations

Figure 1 depicts the time resolved PM_{10} mass concentrations during the operation of the four vacuum cleaners. An increase in PM_{10} mass concentrations was observed close after the activation

of the source. On average, increases over PM₁₀ initial concentrations (before the activation of the 184 source) of 1.61 \pm 0.636, 1.48 \pm 0.323, 1.22 \pm 0.035 µg m⁻³ were observed during the operation of 185 the bagged, wet and washable filter bag less vacuums, respectively. No increase in PM₁₀ mass 186 187 concentrations was experienced during the operation with the HEPA filter vacuum cleaner. The increase in PM concentrations during vacuuming is determined by the dust collection efficiency, 188 filtration elements employed and degree of reentrainment of already collected particles [47]. The 189 190 reentrainment of collected dust particles was found by Trakumas et al. [47] to be higher for 191 cyclonic and wet collectors. However, the authors highlighted that filter bag collectors also 192 reemitted particles after being loaded, depending on the particulate load and the type of filter 193 material used in the bag.

194 The ratios of peak to background values for PM_{10} concentrations indicate that vacuum cleaning 195 operations can elevate the indoor levels by a factor ranging from over 1.5 to over 2.5. Raaschou-196 Nielson et al. [48] reported an increase in indoor PM_{2.5} by a factor of 1.3 in Danish infants' bedrooms during vacuum cleaning. Fine particles dominate the PM₁₀ mass as indicated by 197 PM_{2.5}/PM₁₀ and PM₁/PM₁₀ ratios ranging from 0.74 to 0.81 and from 0.72 to 0.79 (except for the 198 199 HEPA filter equipped robot), respectively (Table 1). Despite the predominance of finer particles, 200 coarser particles were also recorded during the vacuuming tests. These coarser particles may result from resuspension caused by direct contact of vacuum cleaner components with flooring and also 201 by the action of walking during vacuuming [32]. Corsi et al. [32] reported significant PM₁₀ mass 202 resuspension during vacuuming with a mean time-averaged PM_{10} increase over 17 µg m⁻³ above 203 204 background levels. Fine particle emissions during vacuum cleaning have been associated with 205 mechanical abrasion of the vacuum motor and spark discharging between the graphite brushes and 206 the commutator [19,21,29,35]. Vacuum motor emissions can be partly or totally removed with the 207 installation of a HEPA filter [47,49].





209 Figure 1. PM₁₀ mass concentrations during vacuum cleaning.



211 The average particle emission rate $(\overline{Q_s})$ was calculated as follows [20,50]:

212

213
$$\overline{Q_s} = V \times \left[\frac{C_{in} - C_{in0}}{\Delta t} + \overline{(\alpha + \kappa)}\overline{C_{in}} - \alpha C_{in0}\right]$$
 (1)

where V is the room volume, C_{in} and C_{in0} are the peak and initial indoor particle concentrations, respectively, α is the average air exchange rate, $\alpha + \kappa$ is the average removal rate and Δt is the time difference between the initial and peak particle concentration. The particle removal rate is the slope obtained by plotting ln(C_{in}/C_{in0}) versus time [22,51,52].

Table 1. Characteristics of the vacuums tested, sampling conditions and PM_{10} mass and particle number concentrations and emission rates during the operation of distinct vacuum cleaners.

	Washable filter bag less vacuum	Wet vacuum	Bagged vacuum	HEPA filter equipped robot
Vacuum characteristics				
Year of purchase	2010	2014	2016	2016
Motor power (W)	2200	750	1000	Battery powered model
Dust collection	Plastic chamber	Water tank	Disposable paper bag	Plastic chamber
Vacuum tests				
N	2	2	2	2
Air exchange rate (α, h^{-1})	0.29 ± 0.06	0.42 ± 0.05	0.50 ± 0.16	0.47 ± 0.07
T (°C)	24.6 ± 2.40	20.6 ± 1.30	21.7 ± 0.31	20.4 ± 0.07
HR (%)	38.2 ± 10.7	39.8 ± 3.66	37.8 ± 1.05	35.7 ± 1.22
PM_{10} initial mass concentration (µg m ⁻³)	30.5 ± 9.19	18.0 ± 9.90	42.0 ± 41.0	23.5 ± 0.707

	Journal Pre-	-proof		
PM_{10} peak mass concentration (µg m ⁻³)	51.0 ± 8.49	37.5 ± 4.95	65.0 ± 42.4	26.0 ± 1.41
PM _{2.5} /PM ₁₀ (%)	74.2 ± 10.1	81.2 ± 4.45	81.1 ± 16.4	43.3 ± 3.61
PM_{1}/PM_{10} (%)	72.1 ± 10.6	79.4 ± 4.92	79.4 ± 17.7	39.2 ± 4.00
Particle number initial concentration (particles $\times 10^3$ cm ³)	6.59 ± 4.16	3.57 ± 0.38	19.7 ± 16.9	4.88 ± 1.34
Particle peak number concentration (particles $\times 10^5$ cm ³)	0.548 ± 0.014	2.10 ± 0.136	1.39 ± 0.102	0.050 ± 0.011
Emission rate PM_{10} (µg s ⁻¹)	1.26 ± 0.131	1.44 ± 0.282	3.46 ± 1.65	-
Emission rate particle number (particles $\times 10^{11} \text{ min}^{-1}$)	5.29 ± 1.48	21.2 ± 2.10	12.6 ± 4.54	-

222

The estimated PM₁₀ emission rates from bagged vacuum operation were, on average, 2.4 and 2.8 223 times higher $(207 \pm 99.0 \ \mu g \ min^{-1})$ than those from wet $(86.1 \pm 16.9 \ \mu g \ min^{-1})$ and washable filter 224 bag less vacuum operation (75.4 \pm 7.89 µg min⁻¹) (Table 1). The emission rates derived from this 225 study are in line with those presented in the literature. He et al. [20] reported a PM_{2.5} emission rate 226 of 70 \pm 40 µg min⁻¹ for vacuuming. Higher vacuum emission rates (690 \pm 30 µg min⁻¹) were 227 228 reported by Nasir and Colbeck [50] in a shared multi storey single room. The large variability in 229 vacuum emissions was highlighted in the study of Knibbs et al. [28]. The authors reported PM_{2.5} 230 emission rates from 21 vacuum cleaners during warm and cold start tests in the ranges from 0.41 to 1962 and from 0.24 to 2870 μ g min⁻¹, respectively. 231

232

233 3.1.2. Number concentrations

234 Figure 2 illustrates the time evolution of the total particle number concentration during vacuuming. The maximum particle number concentration was reached within a few minutes. The average 235 particle number concentration in the room was higher during the operation of the wet vacuum (1.69 236 $\times 10^5 \pm 7.54 \times 10^2$ particles cm⁻³) and the bagged vacuum $(1.09 \times 10^5 \pm 4.95 \times 10^3 \text{ particles cm}^{-3})$. 237 The HEPA filter equipped vacuum cleaner did not increase the number of particles in the room. 238 During its operation, the particle number concentration was $4.53 \times 10^3 \pm 8.16 \times 10^2$ particles cm⁻³, 239 which was similar to the one recorded before the vacuum operation (5.86×10^3) and after the robot 240 was turned off (4.38×10^3) . 241





244

245 These results are in accordance with previous studies reporting very high (> 99%) fine particle 246 collection efficiency of vacuums equipped with a HEPA filter [29,53]. Manigrasso et al. [54] documented a decrease in particle number concentration compared to background levels when 247 using a HEPA filter equipped vacuum cleaner, suggesting that the filter removes particles from the 248 249 ambient air to some extent. The ratios of peak to background levels for ultrafine particle number 250 concentrations presented in Table 1 indicate that vacuuming can elevate concentrations by a factor ranging from 4 (bagged vacuum) to 61 (wet vacuum). Table 1 also provides estimates of particle 251 252 number emission rates for the different vacuums, which were calculated as described above for particulate mass emissions (Equation 1). A previous study conducted by He et al. [20] in suburban 253 Brisbane households reported submicrometer particle emission rates of $0.97 \pm 1.57 \times 10^{11}$ particles 254 min⁻¹ (particles from 0.007 to 0.808 µm). Knibbs et al. [28] measured particle number emission 255 rates from 21 vacuum cleaners in the range from 0.004 to 108×10^9 particles min⁻¹ (particles from 256 0.54 to 20 µm). The assessment of vacuum cleaning in a full-scale chamber carried out by Afshari 257 et al. [21] resulted in an emission rate of 0.35×10^{11} particles min⁻¹ (particles from 0.02 and about 258 259 1.0 µm). Wu et al. [36] tested 3 different scenarios of vacuum cleaning in a closed living room,

including normal condition, filter removed, and filter and dust bag removed. The ultrafine particle number emission rates (from 0.0146 to 0.6612 μ m) for the operation with no filter and without filter and dust bag was 2.2 and 2.5 times higher than that of the normal scenario (1.32 ± 0.58 × 10¹⁰ particles min⁻¹). In the present study, the average emission rates (particles from 0.008 to 0.322 μ m) were estimated to range from 5.29 × 10¹¹ to 21.2 × 10¹¹ particles min⁻¹.

Emissions should be compared with caution since the differences between vacuum cleaners 265 266 (model, age, state of preservation, etc.), sampling conditions (real life monitoring campaigns vs 267 laboratory chambers) and particle diameters may lead to non-generalisable results. In real life/on 268 site monitoring campaigns, several factors, such as building characteristics, ventilation conditions, 269 concurrent activities, cleaning routines, etc., should also be taken into account. In fact, He et al. 270 [20] obtained variable results in different houses when vacuumed. In one of the houses, a doubling 271 in PM_{2.5} concentrations was observed during vacuuming compared to background levels, while no 272 increase was noticed in particle number concentrations. However, in a different house, the opposite behaviour was registered, with no increase in the PM₂₅ mass concentrations, while the particle 273 274 number concentration increased. The authors pointed out the differences in vacuums and in 275 cleaning routines as possible reasons behind the observed results. House cleaning routines can 276 affect both the dust resuspension and the dust loads available to vacuum, which, in turn, may affect the particle reemission. The effect of the vacuum cleaner or vacuum cleaner components on 277 emissions can also be significant. Afshari et al. [21] investigated fine particle emissions when 278 279 running a vacuum cleaner in a full-scale chamber. Two experiments were carried out: (i) vacuum 280 cleaner operated with a dust bag and (ii) vacuum cleaner operated without dust bag, filters and hose 281 in order to study the emissions from the motor only. The results revealed that the particle 282 concentrations originating from the motor were higher than those from the vacuum cleaner with a 283 bag.

284 Figure 3 displays the typical evolution of the distribution of the aerosol during the operation of the 285 vacuum cleaners. While using the wet and bagged vacuum cleaners, more than 90 % (93 – 95 %) of 286 the total particle number concentrations was found in the nucleation mode (N < 30 nm). This value dropped to 74 - 78 % when using the washable filter bag less vacuum cleaner. The high number of 287 ultrafine particles emitted from vacuuming is consistent with previous studies [25,28,36,55]. The 288 geometric mean diameter (GMD) of the particle size distribution ranged between 13.5 and 17.8 nm, 289 290 while the source was active (excluding the HEPA filter equipped robot).

Journal Pre-proof



Figure 3. Typical average evolution of the mean particle size distribution before, during and after vacuum cleaning.

295 **3.2. Metals**

Trace and major elements were analysed in PM_{10} samples (Table 2). Among them, Cu and Si strongly dominated when the wet and bagged vacuum cleaners were run, while the washable filter bag less vacuum and the HEPA filter equipped robot generated particles mainly containing Si and Ca. Elements accounted for PM_{10} mass fractions of 31.2, 20.1, 22.4 and 8.41 %wt., which represented increases over background of 6.6, 4.3, 4.8 and 1.8 times for the washable bag less filter, wet, bagged and HEPA filter equipped vacuum cleaners, respectively.

302

303 Table 2. PM_{10} mass fractions (wt.%) of major and trace elements.

Element	Washable filter bag less vacuum	Wet vacuum	Bagged vacuum	HEPA filter equipped robot	Background
Na	0.100	bdl	bdl	0.331	1.05
Mg	0.751	0.762	0.416	0.152	0.152
Al	3.87	3.16	2.18	1.45	0.314
Si	9.74	4.675	4.39	2.73	0.678
Р	0.106	0.167	0.060	0.041	0.013
S	1.30	0.419	0.801	0.370	0.648
Cl	1.27	0.515	0.599	0.319	0.749
Κ	1.71	0.435	0.585	0.359	0.336
Ca	5.94	2.68	2.41	1.77	0.396
Ti	0.884	0.418	0.248	0.133	0.006
V	0.002	bdl	bdl	bdl	bdl
Cr	0.005	bdl	bdl	bdl	0.005
Mn	0.049	bdl	0.019	0.021	0.007
Fe	1.88	0.867	0.843	0.635	0.263
Ni	0.004	0.013	0.007	0.001	0.001
Cu	2.92	5.78	8.89	0.012	0.012
Zn	0.246	0.130	0.116	0.062	0.049
As	bdl	0.010	0.004	bdl	0.004
Se	0.003	0.001	0.002	0.001	0.003
Br	0.009	bdl	0.003	bdl	0.002
Rb	0.017	bdl	0.015	0.001	bdl
Sr	0.040	0.021	0.037	0.011	bdl
Y	0.014	0.014	0.012	bdl	0.003
Zr	0.011	bdl	0.045	bdl	bdl
Mo	0.283	bdl	0.755	0.008	bdl
Pb	0.015	bdl	bdl	0.004	bdl
Σ Elements	31.2	20.1	22.4	8.41	4.69
Σ Element oxides	53.4	32.9	35.2	14.8	7.56

304 bdl – below the detection limit. The measured element concentrations were converted into the respective

305 mass concentrations of the most common oxides (SiO₂, Al₂O₃, MgO, MnO, Fe₂O₃, TiO₂, K₂O, etc.)

The contribution of Cu to the PM_{10} mass ranged from 0.01 % wt. (HEPA equipped robot) to 4.86 % wt. (bagged vacuum), which represent an increase over background concentrations ranging from 1.6 to 848 times. Metals contribute to 20 – 30% of the total weight of a vacuum cleaner. The metallic components are made of aluminum (motor and screws), stainless and galvanized steel (motor), brass (plug) and copper (plug, power cord, wire cables and motor) [56]. Cu concentrations up to 55 µg m⁻³ were previously reported in particulate matter emissions from a professional vacuum cleaner in a test room [35].

For each element, enrichment factors (EFs) were calculated according to equation 2, where E and R represent the concentrations of the element under analysis and the reference element, respectively:

316

306

317
$$EF = (E/R)_{air}/(E/R)_{crust}$$

318

In the present study, Si was used as reference element due to its high abundance in the earth's crust. 319 The average element concentrations in the upper continental crust were taken from Wedepohl [57]. 320 During vacuuming, minimal enrichments were obtained for some elements, such as Al, Mg, K, Fe, 321 322 V, and Mn (EF < 5), indicating that these elements were mostly derived from soil dust. Rasmussen 323 et al. [58] found significant relationships between concentrations in household settled dust and 324 airborne particulate matter for several elements, namely Ag, Al, As, B, Cu, Fe, Mn, Pb, U, V and 325 Zn. In the present study, other elements like P, Ca, Ni, S and Cl were enriched (Figure 4) during the 326 operation of every vacuum cleaner tested and also in the background sample suggesting that the 327 origin of the enrichment was not vacuuming. Zinc (132 < EF < 163) and selenium (743 < EF < 163)328 1285) were also highly enriched elements in all vacuuming tests and background sample (EF = 419329 and EF = 16721 Zn and Se, respectively). Molybdenum was highly enriched (675 < EF < 37240) in 330 all the vacuuming samples except in the one collected during the wet vacuum operation, whereas it 331 was not enriched in the background sample. Copper EFs were very high when operating all the 332 vacuum cleaners (over 6000, 25,000 and 41,000 for the washable filter bag less, wet and bagged vacuum cleaners, respectively), except for the HEPA equipped robot (EF < 100) (Figure 4). 333

(2)



335	A health risk assessment of exposure to major and trace elements by inhalation was carried out as
336	described by the United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA)[59], as follows:
337	
338	$EC = (CA \times ET \times EF \times ED) / AT$
339	(3)
340	
341	where EC is the exposure concentration (ng m^3), CA is the element concentration (ng m^3), ET is
342	the exposure time (0.75 h d ⁻), EF is the exposure frequency (144 d y ⁻), ED is the exposure denotes (70 m) and $(70$
343	duration (70 y) and A1 is the averaging time (70 y \times 365 d y $^{-}$ \times 24 h d ⁻). The exposure time used in the results of an online survey among 28 000 consumers from 22
344	in the calculations was based on the results of an online survey among 28,000 consumers from 25
345	countries on their vacuum cleaning habits [27]. According to the survey, 53% of the respondents
340	vacuum 2 to 5 times per week and 40% vacuum for nam to one nour. Taking into account these
547 240	veck for 45 minutes
340	The excess cancer risk posed by the individual metals associated with PM., inhalation were
350	calculated following equation (4) where IUR is the inhalation unit risk ((ng $m^{-3})^{-1}$)
550	curculated following equation (1), where for is the initiation difference ((ing in)).
351	Risk = IUR × EC
352	(4)
353	The IUR values were retrieved from the database provided by USEPA [60] for three elements (As,
354	Cr (VI), and Pb). In the present study, one seventh of total Cr concentration was used to estimate
355	the risk considering that the tabulated IUR is for Cr (VI), which is based on a Cr (III): Cr (VI)
356	proportion of 1/6. USEPA considers that a 10^{-6} risk is below the level of apprehension, while risks
357	above 1.0×10^{-4} are of concern. In the present study, the cumulative cancer risk for all potential
358	carcinogenic elements was negligible (always $< 5 \times 10^{-7}$).
359	Noncarcinogenic risks associated with inhalation exposure to trace elements in indoor PM_{10} were
360	estimated by the noncancer hazard quotient (HQ) following the methodology proposed by USEPA
361	[59,61]:
362	$HQ = EC / R_f C $ (5)
363	R_fC is the USEPA reference concentration (mg m ⁻³). Considering that, for some elements,
364	reference doses (R_fD , mg kg ⁻¹ day ⁻¹) are available instead of R_fC values [60,62], these latter were
365	calculated taking into consideration the inhalation rate and body weight of an adult following the
366	methodology described by USEPA [63]. The reference values were retrieved from the Integration
367	Risk Information System (IRIS) [62] and USEPA [60] databases. The HQ associated with
368	inhalation exposure to particulate trace elements in the indoor air during vacuuming were much

369 lower than the unity, indicating negligible risks.

370

371 3.3. OC/EC

372 Total carbon (TC) represented from 32.7 ± 2.68 (washable filter bag less vacuum) to 51.6 ± 2.08 (wet vacuum) wt.% of the PM_{10} mass during vacuuming, corresponding to TC increases over 373 background levels ranging from 1.2 to 1.8. EC levels were distinctively higher during the operation 374 375 of the wet (19.0 wt.% PM₁₀ mass) and bagged (15.4 wt.% PM₁₀ mass) vacuum cleaners. For the 376 HEPA filter equipped vacuum cleaner, as well as in background air samples, EC was not present at 377 detectable levels (Figure 5). OC and EC concentrations in samples collected when the vacuum 378 cleaners were run were not correlated with each other, indicating distinct sources. Contrarily, good correlations were found between particulate EC concentrations and both Cu ($r^2 = 0.87$) and Ni 379 concentrations ($r^2 = 0.79$). Good correlations ($r^2 > 0.75$) between OC and several elements, 380 381 including Si, S, Cl, K, Ca, Fe, Zn and Se, were also recorded. Given that one of the main contributors to indoor particles is probably resuspended dust, some of which associated with soil, 382 these correlations are not surprising. Household PM₁₀ dust has been reported to contain appreciable 383 amounts of carbonaceous particles, mainly OC, whereas in many samples EC was too low or 384 385 undetectable [64]. Black carbon, on the other hand, has been associated with motor emissions from vacuum cleaners [18]. OC to EC ratios showed high variability, ranging from 1.7 (bagged vacuum) 386 to 106 (washable filter bag less vacuum). Habre et al. [65] found that household PM_{2.5} OC fractions 387 were mainly related to human activities, including vacuum cleaning, which leads to resuspension of 388 389 dust and $PM_{2.5}$ generation. Alves et al. [38] reported average OC/EC values ranging from 4.2 to 9.7 390 in school classrooms. The researchers argued that these ratios were expected, since resuspended 391 dust, some of which associated with soil, was found to be one of the main primary contributors to indoor particles. 392 393



394

395

396 Figure 5. Chemical mass closure of PM_{10} .

397

398 In the present study, in order to convert the measured mass of OC to total organic matter (OM) mass, the OC concentration was multiplied by a factor of 1.4 [66,67], which is an estimate of the 399 400 average molecular weight per carbon weight for the organic aerosol. The mass closure between 401 chemical and gravimetric measurements was nearly 100% for most samples, except for background air and the sample collected during cleaning with the HEPA filter equipped robot (Figure 5). The 402 403 fraction of unidentified mass might be attributable to the selection of the multiplier factor to derive 404 the OM, particle-bound water, sampling artefacts, among others [67]. The presence of unanalysed 405 constituents might also be responsible for the unaccounted mass.

406

407 **3.4. Organics**

The PM samples collected during vacuuming, as well as the background air samples, encompassed
several aliphatics, polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs), alcohols, acids, sterols, glycerol
derivatives, phenolic compounds, saccharides, among others.

411 The aliphatic fraction of particulate matter comprised n-alkanes from C_{11} to C_{35} . The maximum 412 concentrations were observed for the homologues in the range from C_{20} to C_{22} , which have been 413 described as characteristic of petrogenic sources. The carbon preference indices of n-alkanes were 414 in the range from 0.7 to 0.9 during the vacuuming operation and 1.1 for the background, suggesting 415 the contribution of petroleum derivatives [68]. The presence of these compounds may be related to

416	oil-based or petrochemical textiles such as nylon, polyester, acrylic and spandex, which are made
417	from natural gas or oil. Outgassing of lubricants applied to parts of the vacuum cleaners is another
418	likely source. The Σ_{25} n-alkane concentrations ranged from 22.4 to 39.3 ng m ⁻³ during vacuuming
419	and 17.3 ng m ⁻³ in the background air.
420	Discontinuous series of n-alkanols from C_{10} to C_{30} were detected in the PM_{10} samples, maximising
421	at C_{16} , during the operation of the tested vacuums, as well as in the background sample (Table 3).
422	Cetyl alcohol ($C_{16}H_{34}O$) is widely used in skin lotions and creams due to its water-binding
423	properties [69]. Other long-chain alcohols, such as myristyl (C ₁₄ H ₃₀ O) and stearyl alcohol
424	($C_{18}H_{38}O$), were also found in all samples. Besides being used in a variety of cosmetic products as
425	emulsifier, emollient, antifoaming agent, and surfactant, stearyl alcohol has also been isolated from
426	human sebaceous lipids [69]. The Σ_{15} n-alkanol concentrations ranged from 362 to 858 ng $m^{\text{-}3}$
427	during vacuuming and 172 ng m ⁻³ in the background air.
428	

429 Table 3. Concentrations (ng m⁻³) of oxygenated organic compounds in PM_{10}

	Wet vacuum	Bagged vacuum	HEPA filter equipped robot	Washable filter bag less vacuum	Background
Saccharides	\sim				
Galactosan	2.41	bdl	bdl	bdl	bdl
Mannosan	1.15	2.57	2.74	bdl	1.27
Levoglucosan	8.27	9.69	23.6	5.93	22.1
Unidentified saccharides	45.2	47.4	46.5	278	4.50
Phenolics and alteration products					
Benzyl alcohol	1.96	bdl	6.77	bdl	bdl
Benzoic acid	0.643	0.683	0.858	1.26	0.187
4-Hydroxybenzoic acid	0.049	0.194	0.153	0.279	0.074
Trans-cinnamic acid	bdl	0.102	0.116	0.212	0.027
Pthalic acid	0.358	0.385	bdl	0.544	bdl
Vanillic acid	bdl	0.031	0.046	0.091	0.031
Syringic acid	bdl	bdl	bdl	bdl	0.054
Resorcinol	0.018	0.013	0.049	0.011	0.013
4-Methyl catechol	0.003	0.002	0.004	0.004	0.001
2,6-Dimethoxyphenol	0.005	0.003	0.021	0.005	0.001
Eugenol	0.006	0.006	0.016	0.005	0.001
Isoeugenol	bdl	2.42	3.92	1.78	bdl
4-Allyl-2,6-dimethoxyphenol (methoxy					
eugenol)	0.018	0.082	0.166	0.038	0.010
2,4-Di-tert-buthylphenol	106	123	180	118	20.6
Pyrogallol	0.002	bdl	0.017	0.002	0.001
4-Phenylphenol	0.084	0.052	0.079	0.055	0.005
4-tert-butylphenol	11.9	3.03	24.8	13.3	1.71
4-Octylphenol	0.013	0.015	0.020	0.047	0.006

	Journal Pre	e-proof			
Thymol	2.236	0.063	4.74	1.634	0.19
Coniferyl alcohol	bdl	bdl	0.016	0.009	bc
Sinapyl alcohol	0.006	0.003	0.025	bdl	0.0
Bisphenol F	bdl	bdl	bdl	3.99	bc
Bisphenol A	57.8	8.902	bdl	46.9	0.5
Aliphatic alcohols					
1-Decanol	0.01	bdl	0.52	0.02	0.0
Dodecanol	26.2	53.0	243	38.3	7.0
Tetradecanol	79.9	139	204	122	8.7
1-Pentadecanol	29.8	57.7	87.2	68.2	32
Hexadecanol	137	201	220	189	82.
Heptadecanol	5.50	5.27	9.87	4.48	5.9
1-Octadecanol	74.6	93.8	81.2	119	32.
1-Eicosanol	1.82	1.23	2.98	2.58	1.0
1-Docosanol	1.70	0.40	3.72	bdl	bd
1-Tricosanol	0.17	0.03	0.18	0.20	0.0
1-Pentacosanol	0.20	0.06	2.09	0.45	0.0
Hexacosanol	3.09	3.49	3.23	18.7	0.8
1-Heptacosanol	0.05	0.02	0.04	0.16	0.0
1-Octacosanol	0.82	0.41	0.57	5.23	0.0
1-Tricontanol	0.39	0.18	0.17	0.43	0.0
Steroid compounds					
Cholesterol	7.34	7.57	9.01	10.3	0.42
5-Cholesten-3-ol (epicholesterol)	bdl	0.099	bdl	bdl	bd
β-Sitosterol	0.985	0.253	0.556	0.597	0.12
Lupeol	2.29	0.186	0.763	0.396	0.3
Aliphatic acids					
Octanoic acid	0.820	0 245	1 73	0 754	0.16
Nonanoic acid	0.326	0.453	2 70	1 18	0.10
Decanoic acid	0.240	0.455	5.79	1.18	0.12
Undecanoic acid	27.9	4.13	0.20	4.01	0.54
Dodecanoic acid	0.746	1.78	1.08	1.74	0.24
	13.0	65.3	147	59.8	87.
	13.5	3.04	11.3	3.32	2.3
Pertadecanoic acid	33.7	71.5	144	92.3	16
	4.78	4.87	24.7	9.66	9.5
	bdl	49.5	504	332	14
Heptadecanoic acid	0.367	0.394	0.478	1.46	1.7
Octadecanoic acid	15.8	14.00	107	85.43	61.
Nonadecanoic acid	0.089	0.097	0.096	0.20	0.10
Elcosanoic acid	0.229	0.124	bdl	0.84	0.44
	0.053	0.045	0.334	0.54	1.7
Diacias					
Butanedioic (succinic)	0.205	2.38	2.01	4.77	1.0
Hydroxybutanedioic (malic)	bdl	bdl	2.09	bdl	bd

	Journal Pre-	-proof			
1,5-Pentanedioic (glutaric)	0.825	1.08	2.78	5.13	4.13
Hexanedioic (adipic)	0.090	2.61	3.54	6.85	2.0
Heptanedioic (pimelic)	0.711	0.608	0.530	0.978	0.24
Octanedioic (suberic)	0.324	1.18	0.853	1.44	0.2-
Nonanedioic (azelaic)	0.324	3 10	0.855	6.57	1.0
Other acids	0.040	5.10	2.12	0.57	1.0
Boric acid	bdl	bdl	8.00	1 32	6.0
2-Hydroxyethanoic (glycolic)	162	bdl	122	1.52	0.0
2 3-Dihydroxypropanoic (glyceric)	102 hdl	bdl	133	190	57.
3-Hydroxybutanoic (3-hydroxybutyric)	bdi	0 407	13.8	45.9	14.
0 Cis Havadaaanaia (nalmitalaia)	0.491	0.497	0.335	0.807	0.16
9-Cis-Hexadecenoic (paimitoleic)	0.772	0.616	1.11	1.09	1.4
Cis,cis-9-12-octadecadienoic (linoleic)	0.821	bdl	bdl	bdl	0.14
Cis-9-Octadecenoic (oleic)	4.40	0.928	1.70	2.00	20.3
Cis-Pinonic	0.002	1.52	0.315	0.708	0.30
Citric acid	bdl	0.221	0.723	1.44	0.08
Adipic acid dioctyl ester	32.9	75.2	13.5	34.7	7.7
Abietic	bdl	bdl	0.378	bdl	bd
Dehydroabietic	0.290	0.363	0.706	0.906	0.48
Isopimaric	bdl	bdl	bdl	0.034	0.00
Podocarpic acid Glycerol derivatives	bdl	0.016	0.055	0.154	0.00
Glycerol	0.917	136	237	671	144
Diethylene glycol	1.16	0.575	0.425	bdl	bd
1-Monolauroyl-rac-glycerol	0.001	0.005	0.036	0.005	bd
1-Monolinoleoylglycerol	4.86	bdl	86.0	4.97	1.0
Glycerol monostearate (monostearin)	13.4	19.9	26.3	93.2	4.5
1-Monopalmitate glycerol (1-monopalmitin) Other compounds	15.3	19.4	16.2	71.6	3.5
2,6-Di-tert-butyl-1,4-benzoquinone	0.933	1.33	0.52	1.34	0.21
(-)-Isopulegol	0.087	0.127	0.100	0.086	0.01
5-Isopropyl-3-Methylphenol	0.098	0.168	0.520	0.270	bd
(1S, 2S, 3R, 5S)-2,3-Pinanediol	0.091	0.300	0.628	0.255	0.0
Diethyltoluamide (DEET)	19.6	51.8	66.6	76.9	44.
Tributyl phosphate (TBP)	bdl	118.42	bdl	bdl	0.92
Tetraacetylethylenediamine (TAED)	bdl	6.60	bdl	bdl	bd
Parsol MCX	6.64	4.08	6.72	6.78	3.8
Fyrol FR-2 (tris(1,3- dichloroisopropyl)phosphate)	52.9	5 79	bdl	bdl	0.52
Acetyl tributyl citrate	2.2.9 2.63	144	3 98	<u>4</u> 90	3.52
Oxidised Irgafos 168	2.03	bdl	5.96 71 2	+. <i>22</i> 128	3.2 31 /
Plasticisers	574	Uui	/1.2	120	51.4
Benzyl butyl phthalate	nd	nd	nd	0 268	nd
Bis(2-ethylhexyl)adipate	0.109	nd	bdl	0.361	hď
Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate	bdl	0.419	bdl	0.603	hď

	Journal Pre	e-proof			
Di-n-butyl phthalate	0.300	0.459	bdl	0.677	bdl
Diethyl phthalate	0.000	bdl	bdl	0.155	bdl
Dimethyl phthalate	0.100	nd	nd	0.100	0.010

430 bdl – below the detection limit; nd – not detected.

431

432 A series of n-alkanoic acids from C_8 to C_{22} , maximising at C_{14} or C_{16} , were identified (Table 3). Sources of alkanoic acids include cooking [70,71], emission from people's skin oils [72], incense 433 434 burning [73] and biomass combustion [74,75]. Other sources include biogenic contributors, such as 435 fungi, bacteria, spores, and pollen [76]. Lower molecular weight n-alkanoic acids ($< C_{18}$) were 436 found in emissions from fossil fuel combustion, road dust and tyre wear debris [e.g. ,76,77]. Zhao 437 et al. [71] pointed out tetradecanoic (myristic) acid as a possible organic marker to distinguish emissions from Chinese cooking. The Σ_{14} n-alkanoic acid concentrations ranged from 111 to 951 438 ng m⁻³ during vacuuming, while the background air sample presented a concentration of 472 ng m⁻ 439 440 ³, indicating that these compounds are originated from household's activities.

441 Among diacids, the compound with highest concentrations was adipic acid (or C_6 diacid) (Table 3). Dicarboxylic acids from C4 to C8 were recorded in fine organic aerosols from charbroilers and meat 442 443 cooking operations by Rogge et al. [78]. The authors identified hexanedioic acid as one of the 444 dominant compounds. Malic acid was only present in the sample collected when the HEPA filter 445 equipped robot was operated. Röhrl and Lammel [79] pointed out the influence of biogenic sources 446 on the occurrence of malic acid. The Σ_8 dicarboxylic acids concentrations ranged from 58.6 to 95.4 447 ng m⁻³ during vacuum cleaning, while the background air sample presented a concentration of 21.0 ng m⁻³. 448

449 Several phenolic compounds were also detected in the samples; 2,4-di-tert-butylphenol, bisphenol 450 A and 4-tert-butylphenol were the most abundant (Table 3). Alkylphenols, such as 4-tert-451 butylphenol and 2,4-di-tert-butylphenol, have a large variety of usages such as emulsifying agents 452 in latex paints, glue, and pesticide ingredients, in the preparation of antioxidants, curing agents, and 453 heat stabilisers for polymer resins, among others [80]. In the present study, concentrations ranging from 106 to 180 ng m⁻³ and from 3.03 to 24.8 ng m⁻³ were registered for 2.4-di-tert-butylphenol and 454 455 4-tert-butylphenol, respectively. These compounds were also detected in background air samples. 456 Indoors, a source of alkylphenols is the biodegradation of alkylphenol ethoxylate, which is a widely 457 used surfactant in detergents. They can also be released from the surface of polymer resins, which 458 are used as antioxidant for wall or floor coverings [80]. Bisphenol A can act both as a plasticiser 459 and as a fungicide and is used in the production of polycarbonate and epoxy resins [81]. This 460 compound is ubiquitous in the atmosphere and its size distributions showed peaks in both fine and 461 coarse fractions. Soil resuspension has been suggested as a main source for bisphenol A in the 462 coarse fraction [82]. Bisphenol A is a decomposition product of polycarbonate, an ubiquitous 463 material indoors (e.g. hard plastic bottles, CDs, DVDs, etc.) [83]. Isoeugenol was another phenolic

compound detected in three of the four samples collected in the living room during vacuuming 464 $(1.78 - 2.42 \text{ ng m}^{-3})$ and was absent from the background air. Eugenol was detected in all samples 465 although in much lower concentrations. Phenylpropenes, such as eugenol and isoeugenol, are 466 467 produced by plants as defense compounds and as floral attractants of pollinators [84]. Isoeugenol is 468 used in fragrance formulations which are incorporated into household laundry and cleaning 469 products [85]. Eugenol is also common in consumer products, such as air fresheners [86]. This 470 compound was also reported in samples collected in rooms from a Spanish household that had been 471 treated with aerosols, electrical diffusion units, as well as with several cleaning products of 472 domestic use [87]. Thymol was present in all samples and was among the phenolic compounds 473 with the highest concentrations. Thyme essential oils are used in a variety of products in the food 474 industry (preservatives and flavourings) and in cosmetics [88].

475 Levoglucosan and its stereoisomers, mannosan and galactosan, were detected in samples (Table 3).
476 These saccharides are formed from the thermal degradation of cellulose [89–91]. Although their
477 individual quantification was not possible, many other saccharides were detected in PM₁₀ samples.

478 Cholesterol and β -sitosterol were also found in PM samples. Cholesterol was the most abundant. It 479 is likely associated with cooking activities [92,93].

480 Other hydroxyl compounds and phthalates were detected in the particulate matter organic extracts (Table 3). Among these, the most abundant were diethyltoluamide (DEET), tri(1,3-481 482 dichloroisopropyl)phosphate and Irgafos 168 (tris(2,4-di-tert-butylphenyl)phosphite). Tris(1,3-483 dichloro-2-propyl) phosphate was not detected in two of the five samples, reaching a concentration of 52.9 ng m⁻³ during the wet vacuum operation, which was up to 100 times higher than the 484 background concentration. Flame retardants are used in many consumer and industrial products 485 486 (e.g. electronics and electrical, building/construction, and textiles) to delay ignition and slow the 487 spread of fire. Organic phosphorous containing flame retardants are mainly used in cellulosic materials, textiles, PVC-based products and polyurethane foam [94]. Air concentrations of this 488 phosphate triester in European homes ranged from no detectable concentrations to 21 ng m^{-3} [95]. 489 Diethyltoluamide was present in all samples. It is used as insect repellent [96]. Irgafos 168 490 491 (tris(2,4-di-tert-butylphenyl)phosphite) is a phosphite antioxidant used in several plastic packaging [97,98]. Parsol MCX (ethylhexyl methoxycinnamate) was also detected in all samples. It is 492 493 frequently contained in personal care products as UV filter to protect human skin from UV 494 radiation or as UV absorber to prevent light-induced product degradation [99].

495 Several plasticisers were detected in PM samples. Di-n-butylphthalate (DBP) was the most 496 abundant phthalate plasticiser present in the samples during vacuuming. In the background sample, 497 only dimethyl phthalate was detected at quantifiable levels (Table 3). Plasticisers are widely used 498 in the production of polyvinyl chloride (PVC) plastics, as well as in other applications such as 499 glues, paints and cosmetics [100,101]. The vacuum body (external structure, dust container, power 500 cord and wire cables) is made of several plastic components, including polypropylene (PP),

acrylonitrile butadiene styrene (ABS), high density polyethylene (HDPE) and PVC materials.
Other vacuum parts, such as the flexible hose, hose collaer and handle, floor brush and extension
tube are made of ethylene vinyl acetate (EVA), PP and HDPE [56]. Plasticisers can leach out from
PVC with materials aging and contaminate the environment [102].

- 505 The Σ_{19} PAHs concentrations ranged from 3.68 to 11.8 ng m⁻³ during vacuuming and 3.32 ng m⁻³ in
- the background air (Table 4). The PAHs with highest concentrations were pyrene, chrysene and
- 507 benzo[b]fluoranthene. Delgado-Saborit et al. [103] measured sixteen PM-bound PAHs in 81
- English households and reported concentrations ranging from undetectable levels to 25 ng m⁻³. In
- Italy, Romagnoli et al. [104] documented concentrations of Σ_8 PAHs in 10 private households in the range from 0.4 to 8.4 ng m⁻³. Higher PAH concentrations were determined by Naumova et al. [105]
- 511 in 55 non-smoking urban residences in the USA. The indoor concentrations of Σ_{30} PAHs were 16-
- 512 220 ng m⁻³ in Los Angeles, 21-310 ng m⁻³ in Houston, and 22-350 ng m⁻³ in Elizabeth.

Benzo[a]pyrene equivalent concentrations (BaP_{eq}) were calculated (Table 4) multiplying the measured levels of each PAH by the respective toxic equivalent factors (TEF), which were taken from Bari et al. [106]. Dibenzo[a,h]anthracene was the compound that most contributed to the carcinogenic potential of the PAH mixture for almost all the samples with values ranging from 33.8 % (washable filter bag less vacuum) to 48.3 % (bagged vacuum). During the wet vacuum operation and in the background sample, the major contributor was benzo[a]pyrene accounting for 35.8 % and 37.2 % to the carcinogenic potential, respectively.

520

521 Table 4. Concentrations of PAHs (ng m^{-3}), carcinogenic potency of total PAHs (BaP_{eq}, ng m^{-3}) and

522 cancer risk.

PAHs	Wet vacuum	Bagged vacuum	HEPA filter equipped robot	Washable filter bag less vacuum	Background
Naphthalene	0.354	0.079	nd	nd	bdl
Acenaphthene	0.081	0.089	0.001	0.021	0.001
Fluorene	0.183	0.026	bdl	bdl	bdl
Phenanthrene	0.436	0.883	0.088	0.346	0.170
Anthracene	0.300	0.405	0.065	0.210	0.119
Acenaphthylene	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd
Retene	0.486	0.547	0.147	0.950	0.097
Fluoranthene	0.258	0.315	0.157	0.152	0.090
Pyrene	2.16	1.588	0.219	0.648	0.525
Chrysene	1.69	0.992	0.368	1.96	0.393
Benzo[a]anthracene	1.45	0.886	0.447	1.38	0.392

Journal Pre-proof						
Benzo[b]fluoranthene	1.36	0.705	0.675	1.36	0.392	
Benzo[k]fluoranthene	1.08	0.755	0.500	1.22	0.333	
Benzo[e]pyrene	0.259	0.311	0.390	0.322	0.162	
Benzo[a]pyrene	0.426	bdl	bdl	0.316	0.145	
Perylene	0.080	nd	0.066	nd	nd	
Dibenzo[a,h]anthracene	0.304	0.259	0.106	0.413	0.105	
Indeno[1,2,3-cd]pyrene	0.453	0.226	0.255	0.677	0.194	
Benzo[g,h,i]perylene	0.493	0.261	0.193	0.591	0.199	
Σ PAHs	11.8	8.33	3.68	10.6	3.32	
BaP _{eq}	1.19	0.54	0.30	1.22	0.39	
Cancer Risk	$1.6 imes 10^{-8}$	$7.4 imes 10^{-9}$	4.1 × 10 ⁻⁹	1.7×10^{-8}	5.3×10^{-10}	

523 bdl – below the detection limit; nd - not detected.

524

The inhalation exposure to PAHs was estimated following equation (3), where CA corresponds to the BaP_{eq} concentration (ng m⁻³). The excess cancer risk posed by PM-bound PAHs was determined following equation (4) where IUR is calculated multiplying the cancer potency for B[a]P of 3.9 ((mg kg day)⁻¹) by the reference human inspiration rate per day (20 m³) and dividing by the reference human body weight (70 kg). Table 4 displays the total carcinogenic risk calculated from the particle-phase PAH mixture. The average carcinogenic risk was found to be negligible $(4.1 \times 10^{-9} \text{ to } 1.7 \times 10^{-8})$.

532

533 Conclusions

534 Cleaning activities are an important part of the household's daily routine and can contribute 535 significantly to personal exposure. Vacuuming is a recognised source of indoor particle generation, 536 however, there is still limited information on the impact of this particular source on indoor air 537 quality, especially concerning the PM composition, which is key to refine indoor source 538 apportionment and to improve estimates of residential human exposure.

539 This study presents indoor particulate mass and number emission rates and a comprehensive PM_{10} 540 chemical characterisation during vacuuming cleaning with different devices (washable filter bag 541 less vacuum, wet vacuum, bagged vacuum) without any other active source. A sharp increase in 542 particle number concentrations was recorded when using most vacuum cleaners (4 to 61-fold in 543 relation to background air levels). The increase in the PM_{10} mass concentrations due to vacuuming 544 was less pronounced, ranging from 1.2 to 1.6 in comparison with the initial concentrations (before 545 the activation of the source). While the bagged vacuum cleaner presented the highest PM_{10} 546 emission rates, the particle (7.64-310.6 nm) number emission rates were highest during the wet

547 vacuum operation. No increase in PM_{10} mass concentrations or ultrafine particle number was 548 observed when using the HEPA filter equipped vacuum cleaner.

549 When the wet and bagged vacuum cleaners were run, EC levels were substantially higher than 550 those measured in the background air and while using other types of vacuum cleaners. The 551 contribution of Cu to the PM_{10} mass ranged from 0.01 %wt. (HEPA equipped robot) to 4.86 %wt. 552 (bag vacuum), which represented an increase over background concentrations ranging from 1.6 to 553 848 times.

Wear of vacuum materials, grease and oils might be a source of particulate organic compounds. However, in the present study the organic speciation revealed the contribution of multiple sources, making it difficult to differentiate the possible input of vacuuming to the detected components.

557 Taking into account the numerous brands and models of vacuums available on the market, each possessing its own features (e.g. dust containers, bag materials, filtration systems etc), it is 558 559 necessary to borne in mind that the findings of this study cannot be considered representative for each vacuum category (bag less, bagged, wet and robotic) and further investigations are necessary 560 to consolidate the conclusions. Despite the limitations, the present study highlights the great 561 562 variability in particle emission rates depending on the vacuum cleaner, suggesting that household exposure can be enhanced or reduced by proper selection of devices. Further investigation is 563 564 needed to fully evaluate the potential health risk associated with this source.

565

566 Acknowledgments

567 The sampling campaign was partially supported by the Spanish Ministry of Economy and 568 Competitiveness (Grant TEC2014-57821-R), the University of León (Programa Propio 569 2015/00054/001 and 2018/00203/001) and the AERORAIN project (Ministry of Economy and 570 Competitiveness, Grant CGL2014-52556-R, co-financed with European FEDER funds). Other part 571 of the monitoring campaign and the analytical determinations of this work were funded by the 572 project "Chemical and toxicological SOurce PROfiling of particulate matter in urban air 573 (SOPRO)", POCI-01-0145-FEDER-029574, supported by FEDER, through COMPETE2020 -574 Programa Operacional Competitividade e Internacionalização (POCI), and by national funds (OE), 575 through FCT/MCTES. An acknowledgment is due to the Portuguese Foundation of Science and 576 Technology (FCT) and to the POHP/FSE funding programme for the fellowships with the 577 references SFRH/BD/117993/2016 and SFRH/BPD/123176/2016. Ana Vicente is subsidised by 578 national funds (OE), through FCT, I.P., in the framework contract foreseen in the numbers 4, 5 and 579 6 of article 23, of the Decree-Law 57/2016, of August 29, changed by Law 57/2017, of July 19. Thanks are due, for the financial support to CESAM (UIDB/50017/2020+UIDP/50017/2020), to 580 581 FCT/MEC through national funds, and the co-funding by the FEDER, within the PT2020 Partnership Agreement and Compete 2020. F. Oduber and C. Blanco-Alegre acknowledge the 582 grants BES-2015-074473 and FPU16-05764 from the Spanish Ministry of Economy and 583

584 Competitiveness and from the Ministry of Education, Culture and Sports, Spain, respectively. The 585 authors are also grateful for the financial support to CESAM (UID/AMB/50017/2019), to 586 FCT/MCTES through national funds, and the co-funding by the FEDER, within the PT2020 587 Partnership Agreement and Compete 2020.

588

589 **References**

- 590 [1] S. Brasche, W. Bischof, Daily time spent indoors in German homes Baseline data for the
 591 assessment of indoor exposure of German occupants, Int. J. Hyg. Environ. Health. 208
 592 (2005) 247–253. doi:10.1016/J.IJHEH.2005.03.003.
- 593 [2] N.E. Klepeis, W.C. Nelson, W.R. Ott, J.P. Robinson, A.M. Tsang, P. Switzer, J. V Behar,
 594 S.C. Hern, W.H. Engelmann, The National Human Activity Pattern Survey (NHAPS): A
 595 resource for assessing exposure to environmental pollutants, J. Expo. Sci. Environ.
 596 Epidemiol. 11 (2001) 231–252. doi:10.1038/sj.jea.7500165.
- 597 [3] C. Schweizer, R.D. Edwards, L. Bayer-Oglesby, W.J. Gauderman, V. Ilacqua, M. Juhani
 598 Jantunen, H.K. Lai, M. Nieuwenhuijsen, N. Künzli, Indoor time-microenvironment-activity
 599 patterns in seven regions of Europe, J. Expo. Sci. Environ. Epidemiol. 17 (2007) 170–181.
 600 doi:10.1038/sj.jes.7500490.
- 601 [4] P.N. Pegas, C.A. Alves, M.G. Evtyugina, T. Nunes, M. Cerqueira, M. Franchi, C.A. Pio,
 602 S.M. Almeida, M.C. Freitas, Indoor air quality in elementary schools of Lisbon in spring,
 603 Environ. Geochem. Health. 33 (2011) 455–468. doi:10.1007/s10653-010-9345-3.
- 604 [5] C.A. Alves, R.C. Urban, P.N. Pegas, T. Nunes, Indoor/Outdoor relationships between PM₁₀
 605 and associated organic compounds in a primary school, Aerosol Air Qual. Res. 14 (2014)
 606 86–98. doi:10.4209/aaqr.2013.04.0114.
- 607 [6] P. Blondeau, V. Iordache, O. Poupard, D. Genin, F. Allard, Relationship between outdoor
 608 and indoor air quality in eight French schools, Indoor Air. 15 (2005) 2–12.
 609 doi:10.1111/j.1600-0668.2004.00263.x.
- 610 [7] M. Stranger, S.S. Potgieter-Vermaak, R. Van Grieken, Characterization of indoor air quality
 611 in primary schools in Antwerp, Belgium, Indoor Air. 18 (2008) 454–463.
 612 doi:10.1111/j.1600-0668.2008.00545.x.
- 613 [8] D. Aelenei, S. Azevedo, J. Viegas, A. Mendes, A.L. Papoila, M. Cano, P. Martins, N.
 614 Neuparth, Environment and health in children day care centres in Portugal. Results from
 615 phase II on the ventilation characteristics of 16 schools, in: 11th REHVA World Congr. &
 616 8th Int. Conf. IAQVEC, Prague, Czech Republic, 2013.

		Journal Pre-proof
617 618 619 620	[9]	P. Carreiro-Martins, A.L. Papoila, I. Caires, S. Azevedo, M.M. Cano, D. Virella, P. Leiria- Pinto, J. Ao, P. Teixeira, J.E. Rosado-Pinto, I. Annesi-Maesano, N. Neuparth, Effect of indoor air quality of day care centers in children with different predisposition for asthma, Pediatr Allergy Immunol. 27 (2016) 299–306. doi:10.1111/pai.12521.
621 622 623 624	[10]	T.W.; Kruisselbrink, T. Kruisselbrink, J. Tang, H. Bruggema, W. Zeiler, The indoor environmental quality in a Dutch day care cetres : the effects of ventilation on the conditions within the baby cots, in: 12 th REHVA World Congr. (CLIMA 2016), Aalborg, Denmark, 2016.
625 626 627	[11]	N. Michelot, C. Marchand, O. Ramalho, V. Delmas, M. Carrega, Monitoring indoor air quality in French schools and day-care centres. Results from the first phase of a pilot survey, 2012. https://hal.archives-ouvertes.fr/hal-00747458 (accessed January 7, 2020).
628 629	[12]	M. Almeida-Silva, H.T. Wolterbeek, S.M. Almeida, Elderly exposure to indoor air pollutants, Atmos. Environ. 85 (2014) 54–63. doi:10.1016/J.ATMOSENV.2013.11.061.
630 631 632	[13]	C.M. Chiang, P.C. Chou, C.M. Lai, Y.Y. Li, A methodology to assess the indoor environment in care centers for senior citizens, Build. Environ. 36 (2001) 561–568. doi:10.1016/S0360-1323(00)00024-X.
633 634 635	[14]	 A. Mendes, S. Bonassi, L. Aguiar, C. Pereira, P. Neves, S. Silva, D. Mendes, L. Guimarães, R. Moroni, J.P. Teixeira, Indoor air quality and thermal comfort in elderly care centers, Urban Clim. 14 (2015) 486–501. doi:10.1016/J.UCLIM.2014.07.005.
636 637 638	[15]	J.A. Leech, K. Wilby, E. McMullen, K. Laporte, The Canadian human activity pattern survey: report of methods and population surveyed, Chronic Dis. Can. 17 (1996) 118—123. http://europepmc.org/abstract/MED/9097012.
639 640	[16]	A. Gupta, M. Bhandari, Monitoring and control of particulate matter in indoor air: a review,J. Appl. Nat. Sci. 3 (2011) 139–150.
641 642 643	[17]	P.E. Schwarze, J. Øvrevik, M. Lag, M. Refsnes, P. Nafstad, R. Hetland, E. Dybing, Particulate matter properties and health effects: consistency of epidemiological and toxicological studies, Hum. Exp. Toxicol. 25 (2006) 559–579.
644 645 646	[18]	C. Isaxon, A. Gudmundsson, E.Z. Nordin, L. Lonnblad, A. Dahl, G. Wieslander, M. Bohgard, A. Wierzbicka, Contribution of indoor-generated particles to residential exposure, Atmos. Environ. 106 (2015) 458–466. doi:10.1016/j.atmosenv.2014.07.053.

647 [19] T. Glytsos, J. Ondráček, L. Džumbová, I. Kopanakis, M. Lazaridis, Characterization of
648 particulate matter concentrations during controlled indoor activities, Atmos. Environ. 44
649 (2010) 1539–1549. doi:10.1016/j.atmosenv.2010.01.009.

650 [20] C. He, L. Morawska, J. Hitchins, D. Gilbert, Contribution from indoor sources to particle 651 number and mass concentrations in residential houses, Atmos. Environ. 38 (2004) 3405-652 3415. doi:10.1016/j.atmosenv.2004.03.027. 653 [21] A. Afshari, U. Matson, L.E. Ekberg, Characterization of indoor sources of fine and ultrafine particles: a study conducted in a full-scale chamber, Indoor Air. 15 (2005) 141-150. 654 655 doi:10.1111/j.1600-0668.2005.00332.x. 656 [22] E. Abt, H.H. Suh, P. Catalano, P. Koutrakis, Relative contribution of outdoor and indoor particle sources to indoor concentrations, Environ. Sci. Technol. 34 (2000) 3579-3587. 657 658 doi:10.1021/es990348y. C.M. Long, H.H. Suh, P. Koutrakis, Characterization of indoor particle sources using 659 [23] continuous mass and size monitors, J. Air Waste Manage. Assoc. 50 (2000) 1236-1250. 660 661 doi:10.1080/10473289.2000.10464154. L. Rojas-Bracho, H.H. Suh, P.J. Catalano, P. Koutrakis, Personal exposures to particles and 662 [24] 663 their relationships with personal activities for chronic obstructive pulmonary disease 664 patients living in Boston, J. Air Waste Manag. Assoc. 54 (2004) 207-217. 665 doi:10.1080/10473289.2004.10470897.

- 666 [25] T. V. Vu, J. Ondracek, V. Zdímal, J. Schwarz, J.M. Delgado-Saborit, R.M. Harrison,
 667 Physical properties and lung deposition of particles emitted from five major indoor sources,
 668 Air Qual. Atmos. Heal. 10 (2017) 1–14. doi:10.1007/s11869-016-0424-1.
- 669 [26] C. Aliaga, Statistics in focus. Population and social conditions. How is the time of women
 670 and men distributed in Europe?, Eurostat, Luxembourg, 2006. ISSN 1024-4352.
- 671 [27] Electrolux, Electrolux Global Vacuuming Survey 2013 Report, 2013.
 672 http://www.electroluxgroup.com/en/wp-content/uploads/sites/2/2013/10/Electrolux-Global673 Vacuuming-Survey-2013-Did-you-know.pdf.
- [28] L.D. Knibbs, C. He, C. Duchaine, L. Morawska, Vacuum cleaner emissions as a source of
 indoor exposure to airborne particles and bacteria, Environ. Sci. Technol. 46 (2012) 534–
 542. doi:10.1021/es202946w.
- 677 [29] P.J. Lioy, T. Wainman, J. Zhang, S. Goldsmith, Typical household vacuum cleaners: the
 678 collection efficiency and emissions characteristics for fine particles, J. Air Waste Manag.
 679 Assoc. 49 (1999) 200–206. doi:10.1080/10473289.1999.10463789.
- [30] M. Veillette, L.D. Knibbs, A. Pelletier, R. Charlebois, P.B. Lecours, C. He, L. Morawska,
 C. Duchaine, Microbial contents of vacuum cleaner bag dust and emitted bioaerosols and
 their implications for human exposure indoors, Appl. Environ. Microbiol. 79 (2013) 6331–

683		6336. doi:10.1128/AEM.01583-13.
684 685 686	[31]	R.D. Lewis, K.H. Ong, B. Emo, J. Kennedy, J. Kesavan, M. Elliot, Resuspension of house dust and allergens during walking and vacuum cleaning., J. Occup. Environ. Hyg. 15 (2018) 235–245. doi:10.1080/15459624.2017.1415438.
687 688 689	[32]	R.L. Corsi, J.A. Siegel, C. Chiang, Particle resuspension during the use of vacuum cleaners on residential carpet, J. Occup. Environ. Hyg. 5 (2008) 232–238. doi:10.1080/15459620801901165.
690 691 692 693	[33]	L. Morawska, A. Afshari, G.N. Bae, G. Buonanno, C.Y.H. Chao, O. Hänninen, W. Hofmann, C. Isaxon, E.R. Jayaratne, P. Pasanen, T. Salthammer, M. Waring, A. Wierzbicka, Indoor aerosols: From personal exposure to risk assessment, Indoor Air. 23 (2013) 462–487. doi:10.1111/ina.12044.
694	[34]	P. Pluschke, H. Schleibinger, eds., Indoor air pollution, Springer, Berlin, Germany, 2018.
695 696 697	[35]	W. Szymczak, N. Menzel, L. Keck, Emission of ultrafine copper particles by universal motors controlled by phase angle modulation, J. Aerosol Sci. 38 (2007) 520–531. doi:10.1016/j.jaerosci.2007.03.002.
698 699 700	[36]	C.L. Wu, M.P. Wan, T.C. Chan, C. Chao, Ultrafine particle resuspension during vacuum cleaning in a household environment, in: 10 th Int. Conf. Heal. Build., Queensland University of Technology, Brisbane, Australia, 2012: pp. 1002–1007.
701 702	[37]	A. Viegand Maagøe, B.V. Van Holsteijn en Kemna, Review study on vacuum cleaners - Final report, European Commission, 2019.
703 704 705	[38]	C. Alves, T. Nunes, J. Silva, M. Duarte, Comfort parameters and particulate matter (PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$) in school classrooms and outdoor air, Aerosol Air Qual. Res. 13 (2013) 1521–1535. doi:10.4209/aaqr.2012.11.0321.
706 707	[39]	K.W. Pramod Kulkarni, Paul A. Baron, ed., Aerosol Measurement: Principles, Techniques, and Applications, Third Edit, JohnWiley & Sons, Inc., New Jersey, 2011.
708 709 710 711 712 713	[40]	A. Wiedensohler, W. Birmili, A. Nowak, A. Sonntag, K. Weinhold, M. Merkel, B. Wehner, T. Tuch, S. Pfeifer, M. Fiebig, A.M. Fjäraa, E. Asmi, K. Sellegri, R. Depuy, H. Venzac, P. Villani, P. Laj, P. Aalto, J.A. Ogren, E. Swietlicki, P. Williams, P. Roldin, P. Quincey, C. Hüglin, R. Fierz-Schmidhauser, M. Gysel, E. Weingartner, F. Riccobono, S. Santos, C. Grüning, K. Faloon, D. Beddows, R. Harrison, C. Monahan, S.G. Jennings, C.D. O&:apos:Dowd A Marinoni H-G Horn L. Keck J. Jiang J. Scheckman P.H.
714		McMurry, Z. Deng, C.S. Zhao, M. Moerman, B. Henzing, G. de Leeuw, G. Löschau, S.
715		Bastian, Mobility particle size spectrometers: harmonization of technical standards and data

		Journal Pre-proof
716 717		structure to facilitate high quality long-term observations of atmospheric particle number size distributions, Atmos. Meas. Tech. 5 (2012) 657–685. doi:10.5194/amt-5-657-2012.
718 719 720	[41]	EN 12341:2014. Ambient air - Standard gravimetric measurement method for the determination of the PM_{10} or $PM_{2.5}$ mass concentration of suspended particulate matter, (2014).
721 722 723	[42]	APA, Metodologia de avaliação da qualidade do ar interior em edifícios de comércio e serviços no âmbito da Portaria 353-A / 2013, Agência Portuguesa do Ambiente em parceria com a Direção-Geral da Saúde, 2015.
724 725 726 727	[43]	G. Calzolai, F. Lucarelli, M. Chiari, S. Nava, M. Giannoni, L. Carraresi, P. Prati, R. Vecchi, Improvements in PIXE analysis of hourly particulate matter samples, Nucl. Instruments Methods Phys. Res. Sect. B Beam Interact. with Mater. Atoms. 363 (2015) 99–104. doi:10.1016/j.nimb.2015.08.022.
728 729 730	[44]	F. Lucarelli, G. Calzolai, M. Chiari, S. Nava, L. Carraresi, Study of atmospheric aerosols by IBA techniques: The LABEC experience, Nucl. Instruments Methods Phys. Res. Sect. B Beam Interact. with Mater. Atoms. 417 (2018) 121–127. doi:10.1016/j.nimb.2017.07.034.
731 732 733 734	[45]	C.A. Alves, A. Vicente, C. Monteiro, C. Gonçalves, M. Evtyugina, C. Pio, Emission of trace gases and organic components in smoke particles from a wildfire in a mixed-evergreen forest in Portugal, Sci. Total Environ. 409 (2011) 1466–1475. doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2010.12.025.
735 736 737 738	[46]	T.S. Oliveira, C.A. Pio, C.A. Alves, A.J.D. Silvestre, M. Evtyugina, J. V. Afonso, P. Fialho, M. Legrand, H. Puxbaum, A. Gelencsér, Seasonal variation of particulate lipophilic organic compounds at nonurban sites in Europe, J. Geophys. Res. Atmos. 112 (2007). doi:10.1029/2007JD008504.
739 740 741	[47]	S. Trakumas, K. Willeke, T. Reponen, S.A. Grinshpun, W. Friedman, Comparison of filter bag, cyclonic, and wet dust collection methods in vacuum cleaners, Am. Ind. Hyg. Assoc. J. 62 (2001) 573–583. doi:10.1080/15298660108984656.
742 743 744	[48]	O. Raaschou-Nielsen, M. Sørensen, O. Hertel, B.L.K. Chawes, N. Vissing, K. Bønnelykke, H. Bisgaard, Predictors of indoor fine particulate matter in infants' bedrooms in Denmark, Environ. Res. 111 (2011) 87–93. doi:10.1016/j.envres.2010.10.007.
745 746 747	[49]	S. Trakumas, K. Willeke, S.A. Grinshpun, T. Reponen, G. Mainelis, W. Friedman, Particle emission characteristics of filter-equipped vacuum cleaners, Am. Ind. Hyg. Assoc. J. 62 (2001) 482–493. doi:10.1080/15298660108984651.

748 [50] Z.A. Nasir, I. Colbeck, Particulate pollution in different housing types in a UK suburban

		Journal Pre-proof
749		location, Sci. Total Environ. 445–446 (2013) 165–176. doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2012.12.042.
750 751	[51]	C. He, L. Morawska, D. Gilbert, Particle deposition rates in residential houses, Atmos. Environ. 39 (2005) 3891–3899. doi:10.1016/j.atmosenv.2005.03.016.
752 753 754	[52]	A.F. Vette, A.W. Rea, P.A. Lawless, C.E. Rodes, G. Evans, V.R. Highsmith, L. Sheldon, N. Carolina, Characterization of Indoor-outdoor aerosol concentration relationships during the Fresno PM exposure studies, Aerosol Sci. Technol. 34 (2001) 118–126.
755 756 757	[53]	K. Willeke, S. Trakumas, S.A. Grinshpun, T. Reponen, M. Trunov, W. Friedman, Test methods for evaluating the filtration and particulate emission characteristics of vacuum cleaners, Am. Ind. Hyg. Assoc. J. 62 (2001) 313–321. doi:10.1080/15298660108984633.
758 759 760 761	[54]	M. Manigrasso, M. Vitali, C. Protano, P. Avino, Temporal evolution of ultrafine particles and of alveolar deposited surface area from main indoor combustion and non-combustion sources in a model room, Sci. Total Environ. 598 (2017) 1015–1026. doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2017.02.048.
762 763 764	[55]	E. Géhin, O. Ramalho, S. Kirchner, Size distribution and emission rate measurement of fine and ultrafine particle from indoor human activities, Atmos. Environ. 42 (2008) 8341–8352. doi:10.1016/j.atmosenv.2008.07.021.
765 766 767	[56]	A. Gallego-Schmid, J.M.F. Mendoza, H.K. Jeswani, A. Azapagic, Life cycle environmental impacts of vacuum cleaners and the effects of European regulation, Sci. Total Environ. 559 (2016) 192–203. doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2016.03.149.
768 769	[57]	K. Hans Wedepohl, The composition of the continental crust, Geochim. Cosmochim. Acta. 59 (1995) 1217–1232. doi:10.1016/0016-7037(95)00038-2.
770 771 772	[58]	P.E. Rasmussen, C. Levesque, M. Chénier, H.D. Gardner, Contribution of metals in resuspended dust to indoor and personal inhalation exposures: Relationships between PM_{10} and settled dust, Build. Environ. 143 (2018) 513–522. doi:10.1016/j.buildenv.2018.07.044.
773 774 775	[59]	USEPA, Risk Assessment Guidance for Superfund Volume I: Human Health Evaluation Manual (Part F, Supplemental Guidance for Inhalation Risk Assessment), Washington, D.C., 2009. doi:EPA-540-R-070-002.
776 777	[60]	USEPA, Regional Screening Level (RSL) Summary Table, (2017). https://semspub.epa.gov/work/03/2245073.pdf (accessed March 2, 2020).
778 779 780	[61]	USEPA, Risk Assessment: Guidance for Superfund Volume 1 Human Health Evaluation Manual (Part A), 1989. http://www.epa.gov/swerrims/riskassessment/risk_superfund.html (accessed March 2, 2020).

		Journal Pre-proof
781 782	[62]	USEPA, Integrated Risk Information System (IRIS) Assessments, (2019). https://cfpub.epa.gov/ncea/iris_drafts/AtoZ.cfm (accessed June 4, 2019).
783 784	[63]	USEPA, Users' guide and background technical document for USEPA regions 9'S preliminary remediation goals, 2013.
785 786 787	[64]	E.D. Vicente, A. Vicente, T. Nunes, A. Calvo, C. Blanco-alegre, F. Oduber, A. Castro, R. Fraile, F. Amato, C. Alves, Household dust: Loadings and PM ₁₀ -bound plasticizers and polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons, Atmosphere (Basel). 10 (2019) 1–22.
788 789 790 791	[65]	 R. Habre, B. Coull, E. Moshier, J. Godbold, A. Grunin, A. Nath, W. Castro, N. Schachter, A. Rohr, M. Kattan, J. Spengler, P. Koutrakis, Sources of indoor air pollution in New York City residences of asthmatic children, J. Expo. Sci. Environ. Epidemiol. 24 (2014) 269–278. doi:10.1038/jes.2013.74.
792 793 794 795	[66]	 A. Polidori, B. Turpin, Q.Y. Meng, J.H. Lee, C. Weisel, M. Morandi, S. Colome, T. Stock, A. Winer, J. Zhang, J. Kwon, S. Alimokhtari, D. Shendell, J. Jones, C. Farrar, S. Maberti, Fine organic particulate matter dominates indoor-generated PM_{2.5} in RIOPA homes, J. Expo. Sci. Environ. Epidemiol. 16 (2006) 321–331. doi:10.1038/sj.jes.7500476.
796 797 798	[67]	J.C. Chow, D.H. Lowenthal, L.W.A. Chen, X. Wang, J.G. Watson, Mass reconstruction methods for $PM_{2.5}$: A review, Air Qual. Atmos. Heal. 8 (2015) 243–263. doi:10.1007/s11869-015-0338-3.
799 800 801 802	[68]	 C.A. Alves, C. Oliveira, N. Martins, F. Mirante, A. Caseiro, C. Pio, M. Matos, H.F. Silva, C. Oliveira, F. Camões, Road tunnel, roadside, and urban background measurements of aliphatic compounds in size-segregated particulate matter, Atmos. Res. 168 (2016) 139–148. doi:10.1016/j.atmosres.2015.09.007.
803 804 805	[69]	Anonymus, 5 Final report on the safety assessment of cetearyl alcohol, cetyl alcohol, isostearyl alcohol, myristyl alcohol, and behenyl alcohol, J. Am. Coll. Toxicol. 7 (1988) 359–413. doi:10.3109/10915818809023137.
806 807 808	[70]	A.L. Robinson, R. Subramanian, N.M. Donahue, A. Bernardo-Bricker, W.F. Rogge, Source apportionment of molecular markers and organic aerosol. 3. Food cooking emissions, Environ. Sci. Technol. 40 (2006) 7820–7827. doi:10.1021/es060781p.
809	[71]	Y. Zhao, M. Hu, Sjaak Slanina, Y. Zhang, Chemical compositions of fine particulate

organic matter emitted from Chinese cooking, (2006). doi:10.1021/ES0614518. M. Arhami, M.C. Minguillón, A. Polidori, J.J. Schauer, R.J. Delfino, C. Sioutas, Organic 811 [72]

810

compound characterization and source apportionment of indoor and outdoor quasi-ultrafine 812 813 particulate matter in retirement homes of the Los Angeles Basin, Indoor Air. 20 (2010) 17-

Journal Pre-proof
30. doi:10.1111/j.1600-0668.2009.00620.x.
Y.I. Tsai, P.L. Wu, Y.T. Hsu, C.R. Yang, Anhydrosugar and sugar alcohol organic markers associated with carboxylic acids in particulate matter from incense burning, Atmos. Environ. 44 (2010) 3708–3718. doi:10.1016/j.atmosenv.2010.06.030.
D.R. Oros, B.R.T. Simoneit, Identification and emission factors of molecular tracers in organic aerosols from biomass burning Part 2. Deciduous trees, Appl. Geochemistry. 16 (2001) 1545–1565.
P.M. Fine, G.R. Cass, B.R.T. Simoneit, Chemical characterization of fine particle emissions from the wood stove combustion of prevalent United States tree species, Environ. Eng. Sci. 21 (2004).
C.A. Alves, Characterisation of solvent extractable organic constituents in atmospheric particulate matter: An overview, An. Acad. Bras. Cienc. 80 (2008) 21–82. doi:10.1590/S0001-37652008000100003.
C.A. Alves, M. Evtyugina, A.M.P. Vicente, E.D. Vicente, T. V. Nunes, P.M.A. Silva, M.A.C. Duarte, C.A. Pio, F. Amato, X. Querol, Chemical profiling of PM ₁₀ from urban road dust, Sci. Total Environ. 634 (2018) 41–51. doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2018.03.338.
W.F. Rogge, L.M. Hildemann, M.A. Mazurek, G.R. Cass, B.R.T. Simoneit, Sources of fine organic aerosol. 1. Charbroilers and meat cooking operations, Environ. Sci. Technol. 25 (1991) 1112–1125. doi:10.1021/es00018a015.
A. Röhrl, G. Lammel, Determination of malic acid and other C_4 dicarboxylic acids in atmospheric aerosol samples, Chemosphere. 46 (2002) 1195–1199. doi:10.1016/S0045-6535(01)00243-0.
I. Saito, A. Onuki, H. Seto, Indoor air pollution by alkylphenols in Tokyo, Indoor Air. 14 (2004) 325–332. doi:10.1111/j.1600-0668.2004.00250.x.
L. Morawska, T. Salthammer, eds., Indoor environment. Airborne particles and settled dust, Wiley-VCH GmbH & Co. KGaA, Weinheim, 2003.
P. Fu, K. Kawamura, Ubiquity of bisphenol A in the atmosphere, Environ. Pollut. 158 (2010) 3138–3143. doi:10.1016/j.envpol.2010.06.040.
C.J. Weschler, Chemistry in indoor environments: 20years of research, Indoor Air. 21 (2011) 205–218. doi:10.1111/j.1600-0668.2011.00713.x.
T. Koeduka, E. Fridman, D.R. Gang, D.G. Vassao, B.L. Jackson, C.M. Kish, I. Orlova, S.M. Spassova, N.G. Lewis, J.P. Noel, T.J. Baiga, N. Dudareva, E. Pichersky, Eugenol and

isoeugenol, characteristic aromatic constituents of spices, are biosynthesized via reduction 846 of a coniferyl alcohol ester, Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. 103 (2006) 10128-10133. 847 doi:10.1073/pnas.0603732103. 848 [85] 849 HERA, Human and environmental risk assessment on ingredients of household cleaning 2005. https://www.heraproject.com/files/19-F-05-850 products ISOEUGENOL, 851 HERA%20Isoeugenol%20(corrections%20May%202005).pdf 852 [86] P. Wolkoff, G.D. Nielsen, Effects by inhalation of abundant fragrances in indoor air – An 853 overview, Environ. Int. 101 (2017) 96-107. doi:10.1016/j.envint.2017.01.013. J.P. Lamas, L. Sanchez-Prado, C. Garcia-Jares, M. Llompart, Determination of fragrance 854 [87] 855 allergens in indoor air by active sampling followed by ultrasound-assisted solvent extraction and gas chromatography-mass spectrometry, J. Chromatogr. A. 1217 (2010) 1882-1890. 856 doi:10.1016/j.chroma.2010.01.055. 857

- B. Salehi, A.P. Mishra, I. Shukla, M. Sharifi-Rad, M. del M. Contreras, A. SeguraCarretero, H. Fathi, N.N. Nasrabadi, F. Kobarfard, J. Sharifi-Rad, Thymol, thyme, and other
 plant sources: Health and potential uses, Phyther. Res. 32 (2018) 1688–1706.
 doi:10.1002/ptr.6109.
- [89] C. Yan, M. Zheng, A.P. Sullivan, G. Shen, Y. Chen, S. Wang, B. Zhao, S. Cai, Y.
 Desyaterik, X. Li, T. Zhou, Ö. Gustafsson, J.L. Collett, Residential coal combustion as a
 source of levoglucosan in China, Environ. Sci. Technol. 52 (2018) 1665–1674.
 doi:10.1021/acs.est.7b05858.
- 866 [90] Y. Zhao, M. Hu, S. Slanina, Y. Zhang, Chemical compositions of fine particulate organic
 867 matter emitted from Chinese cooking, Environ. Sci. Technol. 41 (2007) 99–105.
 868 doi:10.1021/es0614518.
- 869 [91] E.D. Vicente, C.A. Alves, An overview of particulate emissions from residential biomass
 870 combustion, Atmos. Res. 199 (2018) 159–185. doi:10.1016/j.atmosres.2017.08.027.
- [92] J.D. McDonald, B. Zielinska, E.M. Fujita, J.C. Sagebiel, J.C. Chow, J.G. Watson,
 Emissions from charbroiling and grilling of chicken and beef., J. Air Waste Manag. Assoc.
 53 (2003) 185–194. doi:10.1080/10473289.2003.10466141.
- K.L. Abdullahi, J.M. Delgado-Saborit, R.M. Harrison, Emissions and indoor concentrations
 of particulate matter and its specific chemical components from cooking: A review, Atmos.
 Environ. 71 (2013) 260–294. doi:10.1016/j.atmosenv.2013.01.061.
- 877 [94] H. Järnström, S. Vares, M. Airaksinen, Semi volatile organic compounds and flame
 878 retardants: Occurrence in indoor environments and risk assessment for indoor exposure,

		Journal Pre-prool
879		2009.
880 881 882	[95]	B. Sjögren, A. Iregren, J. Järnberg, Phosphate triesters with flame retardant properties; The Nordic Expert Group for Criteria Documentation of Health Risks from Chemicals, Gothenburg, 2010.
883 884	[96]	EPA, DEET Repellents: Protection against Mosquitoes, Ticks and Other Arthropods US EPA, (2017). https://www.epa.gov/insect-repellents/deet (accessed December 11, 2019).
885 886 887	[97]	M. Cherif Lahimer, N. Ayed, J. Horriche, S. Belgaied, Characterization of plastic packaging additives: Food contact, stability and toxicity, Arab. J. Chem. 10 (2017) S1938–S1954. doi:10.1016/j.arabjc.2013.07.022.
888 889 890	[98]	Y. Yang, C. Hu, H. Zhong, X. Chen, R. Chen, K.L. Yam, Effects of Ultraviolet (UV) on Degradation of Irgafos 168 and Migration of Its Degradation Products from Polypropylene Films, J. Agric. Food Chem. 64 (2016) 7866–7873. doi:10.1021/acs.jafc.6b03018.
891 892 893	[99]	E. Manová, N. von Goetz, K. Hungerbuehler, Aggregate consumer exposure to UV filter ethylhexyl methoxycinnamate via personal care products, Environ. Int. 74 (2015) 249–257. doi:10.1016/j.envint.2014.09.008.
894 895	[100]	A. Afshari, L. Gunnarsen, P.A. Clausen, V. Hansen, Emission of phthalates from PVC and other materials, Indoor Air. 14 (2004) 120–128. doi:10.1046/j.1600-0668.2003.00220.x.
896 897 898	[101]	D. Koniecki, R. Wang, R.P. Moody, J. Zhu, Phthalates in cosmetic and personal care products: Concentrations and possible dermal exposure, Environ. Res. 111 (2011) 329–336. doi:10.1016/j.envres.2011.01.013.
899 900 901 902	[102]	H.C. Erythropel, M. Maric, J.A. Nicell, R.L. Leask, V. Yargeau, Leaching of the plasticizer di(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (DEHP) from plastic containers and the question of human exposure, Appl. Microbiol. Biotechnol. 98 (2014) 9967–9981. doi:10.1007/s00253-014-6183-8.
903 904 905 906	[103]	J.M. Delgado-Saborit, C. Stark, R.M. Harrison, Carcinogenic potential, levels and sources of polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbon mixtures in indoor and outdoor environments and their implications for air quality standards, Environ. Int. 37 (2011) 383–392. doi:10.1016/j.envint.2010.10.011.
907 908 909	[104]	P. Romagnoli, C. Balducci, M. Perilli, M. Gherardi, A. Gordiani, C. Gariazzo, M.P. Gatto, A. Cecinato, Indoor PAHs at schools, homes and offices in Rome, Italy, Atmos. Environ. 92 (2014) 51–59. doi:10.1016/j.atmosenv.2014.03.063.

910 [105] Y.Y. Naumova, S. Alimokhtari, J. Kwon, D. Shendell, J. Jones, S. Maberti, S.J. Wall, S.J.

		Journal Pre-proof
911		Eisenreich, B.J. Turpin, C.P. Weisel, M.T. Morandi, S.D. Colome, L.A. Totten, T.H. Stock,
912		A.M. Winer, Polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons in the indoor and outdoor air of three cities
913		in the U.S., Environ. Sci. Technol. 36 (2002) 2552–2559. doi:10.1021/es015727h.
914	[106]	M.A. Bari, G. Baumbach, B. Kuch, G. Scheffknecht, Particle-phase concentrations of
915		polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons in ambient air of rural residential areas in southern
916		Germany, Air Qual. Atmos. Heal. 3 (2010) 103–116. doi:10.1007/s11869-009-0057-8.

Highlights:

- Vacuum cleaner type had a great effect on PM mass and number emissions
- HEPA filters can significantly reduce the PM emitted by the vacuum cleaner motor
- Elemental carbon increased markedly during the operation of wet and bagged vacuums
- Cooper enrichment factors were high when using vacuum cleaners without HEPA filter
- The inhalation cancer risk for metals and PAHs was negligible

Journal Prevention

Declaration of interests

 \boxtimes 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.

□The authors declare the following financial interests/personal relationships which may be considered as potential competing interests:

Estela Domingos vicente

Estela D. Vicente (On behalf of all co-authors) Aveiro, 15/04/2020