LBNL-53842

Associations of Indoor Carbon Dioxide Concentrations and Environmental Susceptibilities with Mucous Membrane and Lower Respiratory Building Related Symptoms in the BASE Study: Analyses of the 100 Building Dataset

To be submitted as an invited paper to *Indoor Air Special Edition*
September 30, 2003

Christine A. Erdmann, Ph.D., MPH
Assistant Professor
University of Michigan
Department of Epidemiology
School of Public Health
109 Observatory Street
Ann Arbor, MI 48109-2029
Tel: (734) 647-8438
Fax: (734) 764-3192
Email: chrise@umich.edu

Michael G. Apte, Ph.D.
Staff Scientist
Mailstop 90R3058
Indoor Environment Department
Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory
One Cyclotron Road
Berkeley, CA 94720

This work was supported by the Assistant Secretary of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, Building Technologies Program, U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) under Contract DE-AC03-76SF00098.

DISCLAIMERS

While this document is believed to contain correct information, neither the United States Government, nor any agency thereof, nor The Regents of the University of California, nor any of their employees, makes any warranty, express or implied, or assumes any legal responsibility for the accuracy, completeness, or usefulness of any information, apparatus, product, or process disclosed, or represents that its use would not infringe privately owned rights. Reference to any specific commercial product, process, or service by its trade name, trademark, manufacturer, or otherwise, does not constitute or imply an endorsement or recommendation by the United States Government or any agency thereof, or by The Regents of the University of California. The views and opinions of the authors expressed herein do not necessarily state or reflect those of the United States Government or any agency thereof, or by The Regents of the University of California and shall not be used for advertising or product endorsement purposes.

ABSTRACT

Using the U.S. EPA 100 office-building BASE Study dataset, we conducted multivariate logistic regression analyses to quantify the relationship between indoor CO_2 concentrations (dCO_2) and mucous membrane (MM) and lower respiratory system (LResp) building related symptoms, adjusting for age, sex, smoking status, presence of carpet in workspace, thermal exposure, relative humidity, and a marker for entrained automobile exhaust. In addition, we tested the hypothesis that certain environmentally-mediated health conditions (e.g., allergies and asthma) confer increased susceptibility to building related symptoms within office buildings. Adjusted odds ratios (ORs) for statistically significant, dose-dependant associations ($p < 0.05$) for dry eyes, sore throat, nose/sinus congestion, and wheeze symptoms with 100 ppm increases in dCO_2 ranged from 1.1 to 1.2. These results suggest that increases in the ventilation rates per person among typical office buildings will, on average, reduce the prevalence of several building related symptoms by up to 70%, even when these buildings meet the existing ASHRAE ventilation standards for office buildings. Building occupants with certain environmentally-mediated health conditions are more likely to experience building related symptoms than those without these conditions (statistically significant ORs ranged from 2 to 11).

KEYWORDS

building related symptoms, sick building syndrome, indoor environmental quality, ventilation, carbon dioxide, BASE study

PRACTICAL IMPLICATIONS

If the statistically significant relationships observed in this study exist generally in the population of office workers, large increases in ventilation rates or improvements in ventilation effectiveness, sufficient to reduce indoor CO_2 concentrations to approximately outdoor levels, could decrease prevalence of selected building related symptoms by up to 70%. The observation that increases in office building ventilation reduces the prevalence of these symptoms supports the hypothesis that airborne contaminants, which are removed with ventilation, are a causative factor.

INTRODUCTION

Building related symptoms (BRS), sometimes called sick building syndrome (SBS) symptoms, are a set of symptoms with unidentified etiology frequently reported by building occupants, especially occupants of office buildings. The individuals who suffer from BRS report that the symptoms occur when they spend time indoors and that the symptoms lessen while away from the building (Levin, 1989). Understanding the etiology of BRS in office buildings has been a major challenge. Evidence supporting the hypothesis that building characteristics and related indoor environmental quality affects symptom occurrence in building occupants continues to accumulate (Mendell, 1993; Fisk, 2000; Chao et al., 2003). BRS include symptoms of allergies, asthma, and respiratory illnesses. Indoor air quality also appears to influence absenteeism, work performance, and health care costs (Fisk, 2000).

Carbon Dioxide and Building Related Symptoms (BRS)

The primary source of carbon dioxide (CO_2) in office buildings is the respiration of building occupants. At concentrations occurring in most indoor environments, the increase in indoor carbon dioxide (CO_2) concentration above that outdoors can be considered a surrogate for concentrations of other occupant-generated pollutants, particularly bioeffluents, and for ventilation rate per occupant, but not as a causal factor in human health responses (ASHRAE, 2001; ACGIH, 1991). CO_2 concentrations in office buildings typically range from 350 to 2,500 ppm (Seppänen et al., 1999). The Threshold Limit Value for 8-hour time-weighted-average exposures to CO_2 is 5,000 ppm (ACGIH, 1991), thus CO_2 concentrations encountered in the normal operation of buildings are not expected to directly cause health symptoms. Currently, the American Society of Heating, Refrigeration, and Air-conditioning Engineers (ASHRAE) recommends a minimum office building ventilation rate in offices of 10 Ls^{-1} per person, corresponding to an approximate steady state indoor CO_2 concentration of 870 ppm (ASHRAE, 2001), based on the assumptions that outdoor CO_2 is 350 ppm and indoor CO_2 generation rate is 0.31 $Lmin^{-1}$ per person.

In an extensive review of mostly cross-sectional studies (Seppänen et al., 1999), one half of 18 studies of BRS in office buildings reported that increased indoor CO_2 concentrations levels were associated with a statistically significant increase in the prevalence of one or more BRS. Symptoms that were associated with CO_2 levels included headache, fatigue, eye symptoms, nasal symptoms, respiratory tract symptoms, and total symptom scores. When limiting the review to mechanically ventilated and air-conditioned buildings only (i.e., excluding naturally ventilated buildings), the proportion of studies reporting a statistically significant association between indoor CO_2 and BRS increased to 70% (Seppänen et al., 1999; Apte et al., 2000). An analysis of the 41-building 94-96 BASE dataset (cross-sectional design) found statistically significant dose-response relationships between indoor minus outdoor CO_2 levels (dCO2) and the following symptoms: sore throat, nose/sinus, combined mucous membrane symptoms, tight chest, and wheeze; the adjusted odds ratios for these symptoms ranged from 1.2 to 1.5 per 100 ppm increase in dCO_2 levels (Apte et al., 2000).

In a longitudinal study using a modified version of the BASE questionnaire, Chao et al. (2003) found that upper respiratory symptoms ("sore/dry throat," "sinus congestion," "cough," "sneezing") were associated with indoor CO_2 levels (OR = 1.49; 95% CI, 1.09-2.03); eye irritation and non-specific symptoms (e.g., "headache," "unusual tiredness," "tension," "dizziness") were not related to indoor CO_2 levels. Not surprisingly, the relationship between CO_2 concentrations and upper respiratory symptoms in this study was no longer statistically significant after adjusting for the number of people in the office, since people are the main source of CO_2 in office buildings.

In this paper, we focus on building-related upper respiratory and mucous membrane (MM) symptoms (i.e., dry eyes, sore throat, and nose/sinus) and lower respiratory (LResp) symptoms (i.e., tight chest, short breath, cough, or wheeze) [1]. We examine the relationship of the MM and LResp symptoms to indoor building ventilation as inferred from occupant-generated indoor CO_2 concentrations, while controlling for potentially confounding individual-level and environmental variables. The analyses presented here expand those presented in Apte et al. (2000) to the full 94-98 BASE Study dataset collected in 100 U.S. office buildings.

METHODS

The BASE Study

The data analyzed in this paper were collected in 100 randomly selected, non-complaint, large U.S office buildings from 1994 to 1998 by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency for the Building Assessment Survey and Evaluation (BASE) study (Girman et al., 1995; Womble et al., 1996). These buildings were all at least partially mechanically ventilated, and all but one was air-conditioned. BASE buildings were studied during one-week periods either in winter or summer. Environmental data were collected during the same week that the questionnaire was administered. The BASE protocol has been discussed fully elsewhere (Womble et al., 1993; BASE Website).

The BASE questionnaire confidentially collected occupant information, including sex, age, smoking status, job characteristics, perceptions about the indoor environment, and health and well-being. The questionnaire inquired about occurrence of the following symptoms: dry eyes, nose/sinus, sore throat, sneeze, tight chest, short breath, cough, wheeze, fatigue, headache, eyestrain, and dry or itchy skin. In this study, we restrict our analyses to the mucous membrane (dry eyes, nose/sinus, and sore throat) and lower respiratory (tight chest, short breath, cough, or wheeze) symptoms. A symptom was considered as "building related" if the occupant reported that the symptom occurred at least 1-3 days per week during the previous month and that the symptom(s) improved when the occupant was away from the building. Symptoms were analyzed both individually and in the following combined categories: Mucous Membrane (MM) = at

[1] Abbreviated symptom phrasing is used throughout the paper. "Dry eyes" abbreviates "dry, itching, irritated eyes." "Sore throat" abbreviates "sore or dry throat." "Nose/sinus" abbreviates "stuffy or runny nose, or sinus congestion." "Tight chest" abbreviates "chest tightness." "Short breath" abbreviates "shortness of breath."

least one of dry eyes, nose/sinus, and sore throat; Lower Respiratory (LResp) = at least one of tight chest, short breath, cough, or wheeze.

In addition, BASE questionnaire responses were used to test the hypothesis that sub-populations with certain environmentally-mediated health conditions are more likely to experience and/or report BRS. The variables used for this purpose include previously diagnosed dust allergy, mold allergy, hayfever, eczema, asthma, and migraine. Self-reported sensitivity to (environmental) tobacco smoke and chemical sensitivity also were considered. The health condition variables were included individually in some models and were combined in other models (i.e., the health conditions variables were combined into a general "susceptibility" variable for some models). It is thought that individuals with these conditions may have a lower threshold in terms of responding to factors that are associated with the symptoms of interest.

At each BASE office building, CO_2, temperature, relative humidity, and volatile organic compounds (VOCs) were measured at three indoor locations and outdoors. CO_2 and indoor temperature were collected as 5-minute averages. VOC samples using both canister and multisorbent tube collection methods were collected and analyzed by gas chromatograph-mass spectrometry for up to 73 VOC species. Spatial-average pollutant concentrations and average temperatures were calculated based on data from the three measurement sites. Time-averaged (8.5 hr) workday difference between indoor and outdoor CO_2 concentrations (dCO_2) was calculated and served as a surrogate measure of ventilation rate per occupant. One-day average concentrations of dCO_2, 19 VOCs, formaldehyde, carbon monoxide, temperature, and relative humidity were available for all 100 buildings.

A thermal exposure (THEMEXP) variable (°C-hours) was calculated as the integrated difference between 5-minute-average-temperature and 20°C, duration-normalized in to 8.5 hours of exposure. The indoor workday-average relative humidity (RH) was calculated. Climatic and season variables were entered into a subset of enhanced models, including heating degree-days for the building site (HDD, °C-days), cooling degree-days for the building site (CDD, °C-days), and the season (summer or winter) during which the building was studied.

One VOC, 1,2,4 trimethylbenzene (1,2,4-TMB), was selected as a covariate in the regression models to adjust for the potential affects of ambient automotive sources on BRS. Previous analyses have shown 1,2,4-TMB to have statistically significant associations with a number of MM and LResp (Apte and Daisey, 1999). 1,2,4-TMB is found in infiltrating outdoor air and originates from automotive sources. Other sources of 1,2,4-TMB in office buildings may include carpet, undercarpet, and building materials (Apte and Daisey, 1999).

Statistical Methods

Prevalence odds ratios (OR) and Wald Maximum Likelihood (WML) statistics were calculated using multivariate logistic regression procedures in SAS Release 8.2 (SAS, 1989). Crude and adjusted multivariate models were constructed using continuous dCO_2

data as the independent variable and each of the BRS variables as dependent variables. Covariates used in all of the multivariate models to control for potential confounding were age, sex, presence of carpet in workspace, smoking status, THEMEXP, RH, and 1,2,4-TMB concentration. Climate related variables were added in enhanced models to account for the variability possibly caused by climate during the study. Additional details regarding model building with the BASE dataset can be found in Apte et al. (2000).

To evaluate the "dose-response" relationship between the CO_2 metric and BRS, additional analyses were conducted where dCO_2 was divided into five exposure categories. The dCO_2 categories reflect the 10th and 90th percentiles of the dCO_2 distribution across all 100 buildings and three bins evenly split between these percentiles. To evaluate the dose-response trends in the associations between dCO_2 levels and BRS, an analysis of covariance approach was used (Selvin, 1995). Dummy variables representing the four highest dCO_2 bins were constructed and used in regression models in place of the continuous dCO_2 variable. The bottom 10th percentile category served as the referent. This approach also was used the previous analysis of the 94-96 BASE dataset (Apte et al., 2000).

Additional logistic regression models used a single categorical dCO_2 variable with five interval levels as defined above. These levels were coded using the bin-mean dCO_2 for each dCO_2 level. The WML statistic and associated p-value for this categorical variable was used as a measure-of-fit of the dose-response relationship for the adjusted associations between categorical dCO_2 measures and BRS.

RESULTS

Comparison of 94-96 and 94-98 BASE datasets

Table 1 provides summary statistics for environmental and individual-level factors for the participants in the full 100 building 94-98 BASE survey. Prior to development of new models, the results of the analysis of dCO_2 association with BRS in the 94-96 dataset were compared to those in the full 100 building 94-98 dataset. This initial comparison did not include climatic/season or the environmentally-mediated health condition variables. Table 2 compares the earlier 94-96 dataset with the full 94-98 dataset using multivariate logistic regression models that were unadjusted and then adjusted for SEX, AGE, CARPET, SMOKER, THERMEXP, RH, and 1,2,4-TMB. These same covariates were used in previously published analyses using the smaller 94-96 dataset (Apte et al., 2000). The dCO_2 odds ratios (ORs) are reported in units per 100 ppm. The larger 94-98 BASE dataset analysis yielded similar but weaker findings compared with the smaller 94-96 dataset, with smaller adjusted ORs ranging from 1.1 to 1.2 per 100 ppm increase in dCO_2 for sore throat, nose/sinus, and wheeze. The effect for dry eyes observed in the 94-96 dataset was not apparent in the 94-98 dataset. Mean levels and standard deviations of dCO_2 and the continuous covariates did not differ substantially between the 94-96 BASE buildings compared with the more recently studied 97-98 BASE buildings (Table 3). Of the dichotomous covariates, only the proportion of females and occupants 40 years of age or older differed between the two data collection periods (Table 4). BRS prevalences

among occupants of the 97-98 buildings were slightly lower (Table 4), though these differences were not statistically significant.

Enhanced modeling

Differences in climate may affect regional variability in building codes, design, construction, and operation and, thus, could influence the environmental conditions inside office buildings. In an attempt to account for the variance due to climatic differences, SEASON, heating degree-days (HDD), and cooling degree-days (CDD) variables were added to further refine the initial models. For simplicity of presentation, Table 5 lists the basic set of variables used in all the models described below. Additionally, variables representing the following selected environmentally-mediated health conditions, or "susceptibilities," were added into these enhance models: dust allergy, mold allergy, hayfever, eczema, asthma, migraine, sensitivity to (environmental) tobacco smoke, and chemical sensitivity. Table 6 identifies the covariates for which a statistically significant relationship with each BRS was found. All of the health condition variables showed some statistically significant relationships with symptoms, thus supporting the hypothesis that individuals with these conditions are more susceptible to experiencing BRS than those without these conditions. In particular, diagnosed asthma and self-reported chemical sensitivity were consistent predictors of lower respiratory and all symptoms, respectively.

After including the health condition variables, the dCO_2 variable was no longer statistically significant with the exception of sore throat (Table 6). An inspection of the model output suggested that this might be due to reduced statistical power, as many observations had missing values for the health condition variables. To create a more parsimonious model, a new variable was defined such that any individual who reported to have one or more of the environmentally-mediated health conditions was considered to be "susceptible" (SUSCEPT). Table 7 summarizes the results of logistic models, regressing the symptoms on dCO_2, the SUSCEPT variable, and other covariates. The increase in sample size achieved by combining the health condition variables is clear (Tables 6 and 7). In these models, associations between dCO_2 and dry eyes, nose/sinus, sore throat, and wheeze symptoms were statistically significant. Table 8 provides a comparison between the crude and adjusted models and also provides the ORs and 95% confidence intervals for the FEMALE and SUSCEPT variables. Other statistically significant covariates in these models (Table 7) were AGE (OR range: 1.2 to 1.4), SMOKER (OR range: 1.4 to 2.2), RH (OR range: 1.6 to 2.0), 1,2,4-TMB (OR = 1.3 for short breath), and CDD (OR range: 0.96 to 0.98 per 100 °C-days).

CO_2 dose-response

Figure 1 presents the results of the analysis of the trend between increasing dCO_2 levels and reported symptoms after adjustment for all of the covariates listed in Table 5 plus SUSCEPT. The data from buildings in the lowest dCO_2 bin served as the referent. Total sample size for each symptom also is shown (n range: 4108-4225). Visually, the plots suggest possible dose-response relationships, but usually with the odds ratio in one exposure category deviating from the expected dose-response pattern. Based on the WML tests for statistically significant trends, the following symptoms or symptom

groups were found to have a statistically significant dose-response relationship with dCO_2 ($p < 0.05$): MM, dry eyes, sore throat ($p < 0.005$), nose/sinus, and wheeze.

Potential for BRS risk reduction

Apte et al. (2000) discussed the Percent Risk Reduction (PRD) method for estimation of the potential for reducing BRS in office buildings based upon the statistically significant odds ratios at the maximum dCO_2 of 608 ppm. Based upon the adjusted models shown in Table 8, the PRD estimate for the maximum dCO_2 analyses of wheeze is 72% (low prevalence). PRD cannot be used to directly calculate prevalence reduction when the symptom prevalence is greater than 5%. However, as discussed in Apte et al. (2000), a correction can be used to make conservative estimates in these cases. Using a correction of –10%, the PRD for building related sore throat (prevalence = 6.6%) through mitigation is about 60%.

DISCUSSION

dCO_2 analyses

It should be re-emphasized here that there is no direct causal link between exposure to CO_2 and BRS, but rather CO_2 is a surrogate measure of ventilation rate and is approximately correlated with other indoor pollutants that may cause BRS. The results of these analyses suggest that there is an association between elevated indoor CO_2 levels and increased prevalence of certain mucous membrane and lower repiratory building related symptoms in the 100 building 94-98 BASE dataset. These findings were evident in crude regression models and persisted through adjustment for a number of potential confounders.

Analysis of trend indicates that in the fully adjusted model (i.e., the model that include dCO_2, the covariates listed in Table 5, and SUSCEPT), a statistically significant dose-response relationship exists for the relationship between dCO_2 and MM, dry eyes, sore throat, nose/sinus, and wheeze symptoms in the 94-98 100 building BASE dataset. This is consistent with the findings for the 94-96 BASE dataset as discussed in Apte et al., 2000; however, the 95% confidence intervals around the odds ratio point estimates are considerably tighter in this study as would be expected given the larger sample size.

The odds ratios for the associations of symptoms with the maximum observed difference between indoor and outdoor CO_2 concentrations may indicate the maximum potential to reduce selected symptoms in typical office buildings. As discussed above, the implied potential maximum reductions in prevalence, through increased ventilation, for sore throat and wheeze are roughly 60% and 70%, respectively. This reduction could come through large increases in ventilation rates, improved effectiveness in providing fresh air to the occupants' breathing zone, or through identification of the symptom-causing agents in the indoor air and control of their sources. In no case were the indoor average or the peak indoor CO_2 concentrations extraordinarily high; only two buildings had peak indoor (absolute) CO_2 concentrations routinely above 1,000 ppm.

Susceptible Population

The population of the office buildings with environmentally-mediated health conditions appears to play a strong role in driving the prevalence of BRS. The SUSCEPT variable was a consistently strong and statistically significant predictor of symptoms in the full 94-98 BASE dataset. The lowest adjusted odds ratios observed in this study of BRS risk for individuals with any of the environmental susceptibilities (i.e., allergies, asthma, migraine, eczema, hayfever, chemical and/or tobacco sensitivity) were around 1.9. The odds of a susceptible individual for having short breath in their office building were 5.5 times greater than those of a non-sensitive individual – the odds were 11.4 times greater for tight chest. Interestingly, the prevalence of SUSCEPT in the BASE study building population is very high (81%), although the prevalences of the lower respiratory symptoms were on the order of a few percent. These observations underscore the importance of controlling the quality of the indoor environments of office workers in order to reduce the environmental conditions that trigger symptomatic responses.

Epidemiological Considerations

Epidemiological considerations regarding these analyses were discussed in detail in Apte et al., 2000. We refer the reader to that paper for a discussion of bias and confounding, biological plausibility, and consistency of findings in these BASE study analyses. One statistical concern is the potential impact of cross-level bias. This issue has not been addressed in the analyses presented here. The concern relates to the fact that the individual level observations within a building are not truly independent as the environments of the occupants are shared. The extent to which this bias might lead to error in the estimates of the true relationships is thought to be small, but more sophisticated methods would be needed to verify the assumption.

CONCLUSION AND IMPLICATIONS

The BASE dataset is a valuable source of information about the U.S. building stock, providing an opportunity for identification of causal factors of building related symptoms and for developing solutions to lower their prevalence in buildings. After adjusting for selected covariates, we found statistically significant associations of mucous membrane (MM) and lower respiratory (LResp) building related symptoms (BRS) with increasing dCO_2. Odds ratios for statistically significant associations of dry eyes, sore throat, nose/sinus, and wheeze symptoms with 100 ppm increases in dCO_2 ranged from 1.1 to 1.2. These results suggest that increases in the ventilation rates per person among typical office buildings will reduce the prevalence of several symptoms, even when these buildings meet the existing ASHRAE ventilation standards for office buildings. The magnitude of the reduction depends on the magnitude of the increase in ventilation rates, improvement in ventilation effectiveness, and whether sources of BRS-causing agents are eliminated or reduced. Large increases in ventilation rates, sufficient to reduce indoor CO_2 concentrations to approximately outdoor levels, would be expected, on average, to decrease prevalence of selected symptoms by up to 70%. Furthermore, a large subset of office building occupants (~80%) with selected environmentally-mediated health conditions comprise a large proportion of those experiencing BRS and should be considered when setting standards aimed toward reducing BRS in office environments.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This work was supported by the Assistant Secretary of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, Building Technologies Program, U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) under Contract DE-AC03-76SF00098. We thank John Girman, Laureen Burton, Susan Womble, Bob Axelrad, Mary Smith and others of the U.S. EPA Office of Air and Radiation for producing the large and invaluable BASE dataset used for these analyses, as-well-as the many scientists who helped design the study and the contractors to the U.S. EPA who collected the data. We also thank also to Myrna Cozen, William Fisk, Al Hodgson, and Mark Mendell of Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory for reviewing the manuscript.

REFERENCES

ACGIH (1991) Documentation of the Threshold Limit Values and Biological Exposure Indices, Sixth Edition, Cincinnati, OH, American Conference of Governmental Industrial Hygienists,

Apte, M.G., and Daisey, J.M. (1999) "VOCs and 'Sick Building Syndrome': Application of a new statistical approach for SBS research to U.S. EPA BASE Study data". In: Proceedings of Indoor Air '99, Edinburgh, Scotland, International Conference on Indoor Air Quality and Climate, Vol. 1, pp. 117-122.

Apte, M.G., Fisk, W.J., and Daisey, J.M. (2000) "Associations between indoor CO_2 concentrations and sick building syndrome symptoms in U.S. office buildings: An analysis of the 1994-1996 BASE study data", Indoor Air, **10**, 246-257.

ASHRAE (2001) Ventilation for Acceptable Indoor Air Quality, Atlanta, GA, American Society of Heating, Refrigerating, and Air-conditioning Engineers (ASHRAE Standard 62-2001).

BASE Website, http://www.epa.gov/iaq/largebldgs/base_page.html

Chao, H.J., Schwartz, J., Milton, D.K., Burge, H.A. (2003) "The work environment and workers' health in four large office buildings", Environmental Health Perspectives, **111**, 1242-1248.

Fisk, W.J. (2000) "Health and productivity gains from better indoor environments and their relationship with building energy efficiency", Annual Reviews of Energy and the Environment, **25**, 537-566.

Girman, J.R., Womble, S.E., and Ronca, E.L. (1995) "Developing baseline information on buildings and indoor air quality (BASE '94): Part II - Environmental pollutant measurements and occupant perceptions". In: Proceedings of Healthy Buildings '95, Milan, Italy, Vol. 3, pp. 1311-1316.

Levin, H. (1989) "Sick building syndrome: Review and exploration of causation hypotheses and control methods". In: IAQ89 The Human Equation: Health and Comfort, Proceedings of the ASHRAE/SOEH Conference IAQ89, San Diego, CA, pp. 263-274.

Mendell, M.J. (1993) "Non-specific symptoms in office workers: a review and summary of the epidemiologic literature", Indoor Air, **3**, 227-236.

SAS. (1989) SAS/STAT user's guide, Version 6, 4th ed., Cary, NC, SAS Institute.

Selvin S. Practical Biostatistical Methods. New York: Duxbury Press, 1995.

Seppänen, O.A., Fisk, W.J., and Mendell, M.J. (1999) "Association of ventilation rates and CO2 concentrations with health and other responses in commercial and institutional buildings", Indoor Air, **9**, 226-252.

Womble, S.E., Axelrad, R., Girman, J.R., et al. (1993) "EPA BASE program - Collecting baseline information on indoor air quality". In: Proceedings of Indoor Air '93, Helsinki, Finland, Vol. 1, pp. 821-825.

Womble SE, Ronca EL, Girman JR, et al. (1996) "Developing baseline information on buildings and indoor air quality (Base '95)". In: IAQ 96/Paths to Better Building Environments/Health Symptoms in Building Occupants, Proceedings of the Conference of the ASHRAE Conference IAQ96, Baltimore, MD, pp. 109-117.

Table 1. Summary statistics for environmental and individual-level variables in the 100 building 94-98 BASE Study dataset.

Variable	n	Percent	Mean	SD	Min	Max
Environmental variables						
dCO_2 (ppm/100)	100		2.6	1.3	0.40	6.1
THERMEXP (°C-hours w/ T > 20°C)	100		25[a]	6.8	2.2	43
1,2,4-TMB (ppb)	100		0.98	1.1	0.05	6.7
Smoking Building	100	25%				
Winter season	100	49%				
Average RH < 20%	100	16%				
Heating degree-days (°C-days)	100		2200	1163	114	4616
Cooling degree-days (°C-days)	100		801	583	22	2243
Individual-level variables						
Current smoker	4304	15%				
Carpet in workspace	4292	89%				
Female	4295	66%				
Age ≥ 40 years	4294	55%				
Dust allergy (diagnosed)	4158	32%				
Mold allergy (diagnosed)	4093	25%				
Hay fever (diagnosed)	4073	29%				
Combined allergy	4208	42%				
Migraine (diagnosed)	4099	21%				
Asthma (diagnosed)	4032	12%				
Eczema	3972	9%				
Sensitivity to tobacco smoke	4263	56%				
Sensitivity to chemicals in the air	4276	49%				
Sensitivity to tobacco or chemicals	4311	67%				
Any allergy, migraine, eczema, or sensitivity	4316	81%				

[a]The geometric mean 1,2,4-TMB concentration across the 100 BASE buildings was 0.6 ppb and the geometric standard deviation was 2.5.

Table 2. Crude and adjusted[a] prevalence odds ratios[b] (OR) for the association of dCO_2 with selected MM and LResp BRS symptoms for both the 94-96 and 94-98 BASE dataset analyses.

BRS Symptom	94-96 BASE Dataset dCO_2 OR (per 100 ppm) Crude	94-96 BASE Dataset dCO_2 OR (per 100 ppm) Adjusted	94-98 BASE Dataset dCO_2 OR (per 100 ppm) Crude	94-98 BASE Dataset dCO_2 OR (per 100 ppm) Adjusted
MM	**1.2 (1.07-1.24)**	**1.1 (1.06-1.25)**	1.0 (0.99-1.09)	1.0 (0.99-1.10)
Irritated eyes	**1.1 (1.04-1.23)**	**1.1 (1.03-1.24)**	1.1 (1.00-1.12)	1.0 (0.98-1.11)
Sore throat	**1.4 (1.21-1.59)**	**1.4 (1.19-1.62)**[c]	**1.1 (1.05-1.25)**[c]	**1.1 (1.05-1.26)**[c]
Nose/sinus	**1.1 (1.04-1.26)**	**1.1 (1.02-1.28)**	1.0 (0.98-1.12)	1.1 (0.98-1.13)
LResp	1.1 (1.00-1.27)	1.1 (0.97-1.26)	1.0 (0.95-1.12)	1.0 (0.94-1.12)
Tight chest	1.1 (0.90-1.41)	1.3 (0.99-1.65)	1.0 (0.89-1.20)	1.1 (0.93-1.28)
Short breath	1.1 (0.87-1.37)	1.2 (0.90-1.56)	1.1 (0.89-1.24)	1.1 (0.91-1.29)
Cough	1.1 (0.91-1.23)	1.0 (0.86-1.20)	1.0 (0.88-1.08)	1.0 (0.86-1.07)
Wheeze	**1.4 (1.14-1.78)**	**1.4 (1.10-1.88)**	**1.2 (1.04-1.42)**	**1.2 (1.03-1.43)**

[a]Adjusted for age, sex, presence of carpet in workspace, smoking status, THERMEXP, RH, and 1,2,4-TMB. These models did not include environmentally-mediated health condition variables (e.g., asthma, allergies, chemical sensitivity, etc.).

[b]Values in parentheses are the 95% confidence interval (CI). ORs and CIs given in bold are statistically significant at the 95% confidence level or higher.

Table 3. Means and standard deviations for dCO_2 and continuous covariates.

	94-96 BASE Buildings		97-98 BASE Buildings		
Variable	**Mean**	**SD**	**Mean**	**SD**	**P-value[a]**
dCO_2 (ppm)	242	142	288	130	0.12
THERMEXP (°C-hours)	26.16	6.84	24.37	6.94	0.25
RH (%)	40.28	8.71	44.51	10.97	0.06
1,2,4-TMB[b] (ppb)	1.28	1.31	0.93	0.96	0.17

[a]Student's t-test, 2-sided
[b]1,2,4-TMB

Table 4. Percent of occupants reporting selected characteristics and BRS symptoms by study year groups. Total number of buildings studied during each group is shown in parentheses.

Variable	94-96 BASE Buildings (n = 44)	97-98 BASE Buildings (n = 56)	P-value[a]	94-98 BASE Buildings (n = 100)
female	68.0	64.8	0.04	65.9
≥ 40 years	53.2	57.5	0.01	55.3
carpet	89.9	90.5	0.50	89.1
current smoker	15.5	14.0	0.24	15.2
MM	26.8	25.7	0.30	26.3
dry eyes	20.3	18.8	0.32	18.6
sore throat	7.0	6.9	0.95	6.6
nose/sinus	13.5	12.8	0.58	13.1
LResp	8.8	7.7	0.29	7.9
tight chest	2.4	2.2	0.72	2.2
short breath	2.3	1.5	0.12	1.8
cough	5.3	5.4	0.94	5.1
wheeze	2.4	1.8	0.22	1.8

[a]Chi-square, Fisher's exact test, two-sided comparison of 94-96 BASE buildings and 97-98 BASE buildings.

Table 5. Descriptions of covariates included in all enhanced models.

Variable	Description
SEX	0:male; 1:female
AGE	0:age < 40 years; 1:age ≥ 40 years
CARPET	0:no carpet at workstation; 1:carpet on most or all of floor at workstation
SMOKER	0: never or former smoker; 1:current smoker
THERMEXP	8.5 hour workday normalized degree Celsius hours above 20 °C
RH	0: mean RH < 20%; 1: mean RH ≥ 20%
1,2,4-TMB	indoor canister 1,2,4-Trimethylbenzene; automobile exhaust marker
SEASON	0: summer; 1: winter
CDD	Cooling degree-days (°C-days)
HDD	Heating degree-days (°C-days)

Table 6. Statistically significant ($p < 0.05$) covariates in the adjusted logistic regression model using individual susceptibility variables. A "+" signifies odds ratio point estimates greater than unity while a "-" represents those less than unity.

Variable	BRS Symptom								
	MM	Dry eyes	Sore throat	Nose/ sinus	LResp	Tight chest	Short breath	Cough	Wheeze
dCO_2	+		+						
SEX (female)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	
AGE ($\geq$ 40)			+						
CARPET				-					
SMOKER									
THERMEXP							-		
RH (< 20%)			+			+			
1,2,4-TMB					+		+	+	
SEASON	+								
CDD									
HDD									
Dust allergy			+	+	+			+	
Mold allergy	+	+		+			+		
Migraine	+	+			+	+			
Asthma					+	+	+	+	+
Eczema					+				
Hay fever	+	+		+					
Tobacco sensitivity				-	-	-			
Chemical sensitivity	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Sample Size	3749	3692	3714	3661	3754	3747	3736	3715	3743

Table 7. Statistically significant ($p < 0.05$) covariates in the adjusted logistic regression model using the combined variable "SUSCEPT". A "+" signifies odds ratio point estimates greater than unity while a "-" represents those less than unity.

Variable	BRS Symptom								
	MM	Dry eyes	Sore Throat	Nose/ sinus	LResp	Chest tight	Short breath	Cough	Wheeze
dCO_2	+	+	+	+					+
SEX (female)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	
AGE ($\geq$ 40)	+	+	+	+	+			+	
CARPET				-					
SMOKER	+			+	+				+
THERMEXP		+							
RH (< 20%)			+	+		+			
1,2,4-TMB							+		
SEASON									
CDD	-	-	-	-					
HDD									
SUSCEPT	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Sample size	4211	4152	4167	4108	4225	4210	4195	4169	4207

Table 8. Crude and adjusted prevalence odds ratios[a] (OR) for the association of dCO_2, sex, and any environmental susceptibility with MM and LResp BRS symptoms for the 94-98 BASE dataset analyses. Statistically significant covariates are identified in Table 7.

	94-98 BASE Dataset			
BRS	**dCO_2 OR (per 100 ppm)**		**Individual risk factors**	
Symptom	**Crude**	**Adjusted[b]**	**FEMALE[d]**	**SUSCEPT[e]**
MM	1.04 (0.99-1.09)	**1.10 (1.03-1.17)**	**2.1 (1.8-2.4)[c]**	**2.1 (1.7-2.5)[c]**
Dry eyes	1.06 (1.00-1.12)	**1.09 (1.02-1.17)**	**2.2 (1.8-2.6)[c]**	**2.1 (1.7-2.7)[c]**
Sore throat	**1.14 (1.05-1.25)[c]**	**1.21 (1.09-1.34)[c]**	**2.1 (1.6-2.9)[c]**	**2.2 (1.5-3.5)[c]**
Nose/sinus	1.05 (0.98-1.12)	**1.11 (1.02-1.20)**	**1.8 (1.5-2.4)[c]**	**2.3 (1.7-3.2)[c]**
LResp	1.03 (0.95-1.12)	1.08 (0.97-1.19)	**1.7 (1.3-2.3)[c]**	**2.7 (1.8-4.0)[c]**
Tight chest	1.03 (0.89-1.20)	1.07 (0.90-1.28)	**1.8 (1.1-3.1)**	**11.1 (2.7-45.5)[c]**
Short breath	1.05 (0.89-1.24)	1.07 (0.87-1.32)	**3.0 (1.5-5.9)[c]**	**5.5 (1.7-17.8)[c]**
Cough	0.98 (0.88-1.08)	1.03 (0.91-1.16)	**1.8 (1.3-2.5)[c]**	**1.9 (1.2 –3.0)[c]**
Wheeze	**1.22 (1.04-1.42)**	**1.23 (1.01-1.48)**	1.7 (1.0-2.9)	**2.4 (1.1-5.4)**

[a]Values in parentheses are the 95% confidence interval (CI). ORs and CIs given in bold are statistically significant at the 95% confidence level or higher.

[b]Adjusted for covariates listed in Table 5 and the susceptible population variable SUSCEPT[e].

[c]$p \leq 0.005$

[d]Adjusted odds ratio for females vs. males of having the BRS symptoms

[e]One or more of the following susceptibilities: dust allergy, mold allergy, hay fever, eczema, asthma, migraine, sensitivity to (environmental) tobacco smoke, chemical sensitivity.

Figure 1.


dCO2 (ppm)
<110
110 - 188
188 - 273
273 - 444
>444
MM Combined (N = 4211) p < 0.005
Dry Eyes (N = 4152) p = <0.05
Sore Throat (N = 4167) p < 0.005
Irritated Nose/Sinus (N = 4108) p < 0.05
Chest/Breath Combined (N = 4225) p = 0.15
Short Breath (N = 4195) p = 0.14
Tight Chest (N = 4210) p = 0.08
Cough (N = 4169) p = 0.81
Wheeze (N = 4207) p < 0.05
0.1
1
10
100
Adjusted Prevalence Odds Ratio (per 100 ppm)

Caption for Figure 1. Dose-response relationship between binned dCO_2 and MM and LResp symptoms in 100 building 94-98 BASE dataset. Odds ratios and 95% confidence intervals are the results of adjusted models that included covariates listed in Table 5 and the SUSCEPT variable. dCO_2 bins reflect the 10th and 90th percentiles of the dCO_2 distribution across all 100 buildings and three bins evenly split between them. The p-values reflect the fit of the dose-response model with smaller p-values indicating a better fit.