*Graphical Abstract

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2019.01.250

The following publication Huang, Y., Su, T., Wang, L., Wang, N., Xue, Y., Dai, W., ... & Ho, S. S. H. (2019). Evaluation and characterization of volatile air toxics indoors in a heavy polluted city of northwestern China in wintertime. Science of the Total Environment, 662, 470-480 is available at https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2019.01.250.



Highlights

- Hazardous VOCs and carbonyls were evaluated in typical dwellings in northwestern China
- High levels of the pollutants were associated with characteristic pollution sources
- Paints, adhesives, decoration, and household products are major indoor pollution contributors
- Cancer risks for formaldehyde, 1,3-butadiene and 1,2-dichloroethane exceeded acceptable level
- Household air cleaner can be efficiently reduced pollutant levels in residential airs

Abstract

Hazardous volatile organic compounds (VOCs) and carbonyls were evaluated in typical dwellings in Xi'an in northwestern China in wintertime. High indoor concentrations were observed for formaldehyde, acetone, naphthalene, methylene chloride and acetaldehyde, associated with characteristic pollution sources. In comparison, many of the target VOCs were higher in Chinese dwellings than those in other countries, suggesting the significances of indoor pollutions in China. Source apportionment with receptor model shows that furniture and building materials (44.5%), paints and adhesives (11.9%), household products (17.3%), smoking (14.5%), and cooking (9.8%) are the major contributors to the indoor VOCs and carbonyls. The health risk assessment shows that the cancer risks for formaldehyde (5.73×10^{-5}), 1,3-butadiene (2.07×10^{-5}) and 1,2-dichloroethane (1.44×10^{-5}) were much higher than the acceptable level of 1×10^{-6} recommended by International Register for Certified Auditors (IRCA). The hazard quotient (HQ) of target VOCs were far less than the threshold (HQ=1). Moreover, the practical efficiency of household air purifier in removal of the VOCs and carbonyls was examined first time in dwellings in northern China. The results prove that most of the indoor organic pollutants and their cancer risk to humans can be efficiently reduced, particularly for formaldehyde and 1,3-butadiene. The findings of the study offer useful preliminary and updated information on current indoor air toxics levels, dominant pollution sources and their potential health risks to residents in northwest China.

***Keywords**: indoor air quality, volatile air toxics (VOCs), Carbonyls, residence, health risk,*

23 *indoor air purifier*

1. Introduction

The importance of indoor air quality (IAQ) alerts public in recent decades world-widely. Surveys show that people spend ~80-90% of their daily time indoors on average (Leech et al., 2002). Volatile organic compounds (VOCs) is one of major class of pollutants due to their ubiquity in indoor environments, significantly impacting on human health. Exposure to hazardous volatile air toxics has potential carcinogenic and other toxicological effects, while long-term exposure can harm the respiratory, neurological and reproductive system, or even lead to death (Delfino, 2002; Windham et al., 2006; Wu et al., 2007).

Indoor VOCs and carbonyls can be originated from a variety of sources. Household products were the major contributor (44%), followed by combustion processes and environmental tobacco smoke (ETS) (10.5%), deodorizers (8.4%) and off-gassing of building materials (5.9%) in residences of Edmonton, Alberta (Bari et al., 2015). Seasonal variation on VOCs levels could be seen indoors. Higher indoor levels of alkanes, alkenes, aromatics were reported due to low ventilation rates in heating period (Duan et al., 2014). Pekey et al. (2008) also found that most quantified VOCs had higher concentrations in winter than summer in Turkey (Pekey and Arslanbaş, 2008). The winter values could be even double of those in summer in Edmonton, Canada (Bari et al., 2015). The indoor air can be greatly impacted by coal combustion and biomass burning when household warming is required (Abeleira and Farmer, 2017; Duan et al., 2014). However, in winter, indoor and outdoor air exchange efficiency is much poorer than other seasons, leading to the accumulation of pollutants indoors.

A lot of studies have been conducted to screen and measure those priority toxic VOCs as well as to assess their health-related potentials indoors in China. Duan et al., (2014) quantified nearly one hundred VOCs to obtain the seasonal variations, indoor and outdoor relationships, and potential sources at residential units in Beijing, China (Duan et al., 2014). The results showed that formaldehyde, acetone, acetaldehyde, toluene, ethane and propane were the most dominant indoor airborne organic species. Wang et al. (2007) measured carbonyls simultaneously in twelve urban dwellings in Chinese megacities including Beijing, Shanghai, Guangzhou, and Xi'an (Wang et al., 2007). Formaldehyde was the most abundant compound, accounting for ~46.0% of the quantified carbonyls and ranging from the lowest of 19.3 $\mu g/m^3$ in Xi'an to the highest of 92.8 $\mu g/m^3$ in Beijing during summer.

Higher indoor VOCs and carbonyls levels are always seen in China than other countries. Their concentrations and composition can be varied by interior decorations, activities, ventilations and locations. Guo et al. (2009) conducted a comprehensive study at 100 homes in Hong Kong, reporting that the total VOC and formaldehyde concentration was 46.1±8.8 $\mu g/m^3$ and 112.3±9.5 $\mu g/m^3$, respectively, much higher than other East Asian cities (Guo et al., 2009) . Furthermore, higher levels of 1,2,4-trimethylbenzene, styrene, nonane and heptane were found in gas-use families rather than in electricity-use homes in their study.

Due to the importance of VOCs, Du et al. (Du et al., 2014) accessed sixteen highly prevalent Hazardous Air Pollutants (HAPs) in urban cities in China and reported the average total lifetime cancer risks attributable to HAPs are 2.27×10^{-4} and 2.93×10^{-4} for Chinese females and males, respectively. Over 70% of the risk was found due to exposure

to indoor air at home and formaldehyde, 1,4-dichlorobenzene, benzene and 1,3-butadiene are the major contributors to health hazard.

Xi'an (33°N and 107°E) is a key city in the northwest China and the capital of Shaanxi province. With the supports by the national policies, it has been rapidly developing since 1980's. The growth economy elevates the living standard and also alert residents to concern their health regarding air pollutions. To our best knowledge, there is still a lack of comprehensive study to evaluate both VOCs and carbonyls in dwellings in the northwest China. The objectives of this work are to compare indoor and outdoor VOC levels, to explore the potential effects of VOC levels indoor and to quantify exposure risks. This study was designed to cover as many compounds as possible under the premise of experimental condition, because of the lack of VOCs data in Xi'an residence.

2. Methodology

2.1. Sampling locations

Eleven dwellings in Yanta, Weiyang, Xincheng and Yanliang districts were selected in this study (Fig. 1). The locations represent typical residential areas in urban and suburban Xi'an where the residents are concentrated. The sampling campaign was conducted from mid-November 2016 to mid-February 2017 during the regular regional heating supply period. The average ambient temperature was -1±5 ^{o}C. All selected dwellings have not been renovated in the past three years. No particular pollution sources (e.g., industrial sector or power plant) were near the sampling areas.

88 **2.2. Sample collection**

89 Indoor and outdoor samples were collected simultaneously. For indoor, samplers were
90 placed in the center of living room with an inlet height of 1.5 m above the floor. The living
91 room is the center of the room and the place where people undertakes most activities. All
92 doors and windows were closed when the sampling conducted. The sampling time was
93 between 09:00-11:00 when the impact from household cooking was minimized. Additional
94 comparison tests were carried out indoors on the days when an in-house air purifier was
95 operating in each dwelling. The air purifier had worked for 9 h before the first sample was
96 collected. It has operated continuously for four consecutive days (96h) while the samples
97 were collected daily. Other sampling conditions were the same as before. Two sets of four
98 indoor samples were collected in each dwelling when the air purifier was on or off
99 respectively. Outdoor samples were collected spontaneously on the balcony by extending
100 the sampling tubes outside when indoor sampling was conducted.

101 A total of sixty-five VOCs classified as "Air Toxics" by United States Environmental
102 Protection Department (VOC_{Toxic}) (USEPA, 1999b) and seventeen carbonyls (including
103 mono- and di-carbonyls) were quantified in this study. The VOC_{Toxic} was collected into a
104 stainless-steel multi-bed adsorbent tube filled with Tenax-TA, Carbograph I TD and
105 Carboxen 1003 (C3-DXXX-5266, ¼" o.d., Markes International Ltd., Llantrisant, U.K.)
106 using a low-flow module pump (ACTI-VOC, Markes International Ltd.). The sampling
107 flow rate was 50 mL/min and each sample was collected for 120 min. Prior to the sampling,
108 the sorbent tubes were thermally cleaned in a conditioner (TC20, Markes International Ltd.)
109 at 330 ^{o}C for 20 min. The pre-conditioned and sampled tubes were sealed with Difok caps

(Markes International Ltd.) and stored in pollutant-free desiccators at -4 ^{o}C for a maximum of 14 days. The pump was calibrated with a mass flow calibrator (Defender 510, Bios, Torrance, CA, USA) before and after each sampling event. A Teflon filter assembly (47 mm, Whatman, Clifon, NJ, USA) and coiled potassium iodide (KI)-coated copper tubing (¼" o.d., 1 m in length) were installed in upstream to remove particle and ozone (O_3) influences, respectively (Ho et al., 2017, 2018).

The carbonyls were collected into silica cartridges impregnated with acidified 2,4-dinitrophenylhydrazine (DNPH) (Sep-Pak DNPH-silica, 55-105 μm particle size, 125 Å pore size; Waters Corporation, Milford, MA) at a flow rate of 0.6 L/min for 120 min (USEPA, 1999a). Detailed sampling procedures were shown in our previous publications (Spaulding et al., 1999) (Ho et al., 2011).

An absorbent tube and a cartridge were reserved to serve as field blanks on each sampling trip and were handled in the same way as the samples. The amounts of target compounds were corrected for the field blank. All samples were shipped and stored in a refrigerator at < 4 ^{o}C until the chemical analyses.

2.3. Analytical methods

The absorbent tubes for collection of VOC_{Toxic} were analyzed using a thermal desorption (TD) unit (Series 2 UNITY-xr system, Markes International Ltd.) coupled with a gas chromatograph/mass spectrometric detector (GC/MSD, Models 7890A/5977 B, Agilent, Santa Clara, CA, USA). A tube was connected into the TD unit at room temperature (~25 ^{o}C) and purged with ultra-high purity (UHP) helium (He) gas at a flow rate of 40 mL/min for 10 s to eliminate air and oxygen intrusion. For the primary

desorption stage, the analytes were desorbed at 330 ^{o}C for 5 min and refocused onto a cryogenic-trap (U-T1703P-2S, Markes International Ltd.) to capture high volatility target compounds at 15 ^{o}C. For the secondary desorption stage, the trap was dry-purged for 10 s and rapidly heated from 15 ^{o}C to 320 ^{o}C and maintained for 5 min. The analytes were passed via a heated transfer line at 160 ^{o}C, and re-refocused onto a cold GC capillary column head (Rtx®-1, 105 m0.25 mm × 1 μm film thickness, Restek Corporation, Bellefonte, PA, USA) at -45 ^{o}C with an aid of liquid nitrogen (N_2) in GC oven. Once the second desorption is completed, the oven temperature program started at an initial temperature of -45 ^{o}C for 4 min, ramped to 230 ^{o}C at a rate of 6 ^{o}C /min, and maintained at 230 ^{o}C for 5 min. The constant flow rate of helium carrier gas was 1.0 mL/min throughout the GC analysis. The MSD was operated in selective ion monitoring (SIM) mode at 230 ^{o}C and 70 eV for electron ionization. Identification was achieved by comparing the mass spectra and retention times of the chromatographic peaks with those of authentic standards. Certified Air Toxics standard mixtures (Restek Corporation) were used in calibrations. A multi-point calibration curve was established to quantify each of the target compounds with linearity>0.995. The minimum detection limits (MDL) were in the range of 0.1-0.158 ppbv with a sampling volume of 6 L. The measurement precision for the analysis of eight replicates of standard samples at 2 ppbv were ＜25%.

The carbonyls in DNPH-silica were eluted with acetone-free acetonitrile (ACN) and the extract was injected into a high-pressure liquid chromatography (HPLC) system (1200; Agilent Technology) equipped with a photodiode array detector (DAD). Details on extraction, calibration, and chromatographic conditions were shown elsewhere (Dai et al.,

2012). The limit of detections (LOD) of the target carbonyls ranged from 0.002 to 0.010 μg/mL.

2.4. Questionnaire

Information of selected dwellings characteristics and potential sources for VOCs and carbonyls were obtained from site investigation and self-administered questionnaire (Table S1). It included details of room description (i.e., area, age, type of wall, refurbishment, and pet), ventilation and heating systems, frequency and fuel of cooking, smoking activities, cleaning activities (detergent and frequency). The occupants were further interviewed on their other daily activities to identify any additional potential exposure to the target compounds as show in Table 1.

2.5. Positive matrix factorization (PMF) receptor model

Positive matrix factorization (PMF) (U.S.EPA, PMF3.0) receptor model was applied to distinguish dominant sources in the indoor environments (Mj et al., 2002). The PMF model can be expressed as a chemical mass balance equation in terms of contributions from *p* independent sources to *n* chemical species measured in a given sample (Miller et al., 1972):

$$x_{ij} = \sum_{k=1}^{p} g_{ik} f_{kj} + e_{ij} \qquad (1)$$

Where x_{ij} is the jth chemical species concentration determined in the ith sample, g_{ik} is the species contribution of the kth source to the ith sample, f_{kj} is the loading of jth species on the kth factor, e_{ij} is the residual resulting from bias in the measurement of g_{ik} and f_{kj}, and p represent the total number of independent sources (Paatero, 1997). Every data point can be individually weighed in PMF, so that the retainment of data below

detection limit with its associated uncertainty was permissible. The stability of the solution can be evaluated by means of examining the proportion of each source undertaken in terms of the object function Q:

$$Q = \sum_{t=1}^{n} \sum_{i=1}^{m} \left[\frac{x_{ij} - \sum_{k=1}^{p} g_{ik} f_{kj}}{\mu_{ij}} \right]^2 \quad (2)$$

where μ_{ij} represents the uncertainty of jth species in ith sample. For the PMF input, the uncertainty caused by sampling and analytical errors was calculated using the following equation suggested by Polissar et al. (Polissar et al., 1998):

$$U = \sqrt{(EF \times conc)^2 + (MDL)^2} (conc > MDL) \quad (3)$$

where EF represent the error fraction, which is the result of the relative standard deviations of the instrument multiply 100, and we set it as 0.10, equal to the average percent uncertainty in our study. For values below detection limit, the uncertainties were replaced by 5/6 times of the detection limit values. Any missing data is replaced with the median concentration of that species and the uncertainty are expressed as four times the median concentration (USEPA, 2008). For the selection of chemical species, typical tracers of different sources and those in high indoor concentrations were taken into account in the receptor modeling. In addition, those species with more than 50% of samples below LODs were screened out.

2.6. Cancer and non-cancer risk calculation model

The risk characterization for indoor VOC inhalation exposure was conducted by combining published toxicity data with the exposure concentrations estimated in this study. To calculate inhalation risks, an adjusted air concentration (EC_i) was calculated using the following equation according to United States Environmental Protection Agency (U.S.EPA)

198 Superfund program (EPA, 2009; Waste, 1991).

199 $$EC_i = \frac{CA_i \times ET \times EF \times ED}{AT} \quad (4)$$

200 Where EC_i is the exposure concentration; CA_i is the measured VOC concentration
201 in the residences (μg/m^3); ET is exposure time (hours/day); EF is the exposure frequency
202 (days/year); ED is exposure duration (years); AT is averaging time (hours). For cancer
203 and chronic hazard assessments, lifetime (70 years) is substituted for AT (lifetime in
204 years × 365 days/year × 24 hours/day).

205 We adjusted exposure air concentration by incorporating time-activity data of Chinese
206 residents. Based on Exposure Factors Handbook of Chinese Population (Duan, 2013) and
207 Wang et al.'s (Wang et al., 2012) study, average exposure time was estimated as 15 h/day
208 for residents (Dai et al., 2017). Exposure frequency was estimated as 350 day/year,
209 exposure duration was estimated as 24 years for adults to calculate inhalation cancer risk
210 attributable to indoor VOCs. The indoor inhalation cancer risk at residences was calculated
211 with the methodology proposed by US EPA (USEPA, 2004).

212 $$LCR_i = IUR_i \times EC_i \quad (5)$$

213 Where LCR_i is the cancer risk associated with compound i; EC_i the daily average
214 inhaled concentration of compound i; and IUR_i is the estimated inhalation unit risk (m^3/μg)
215 for compound i from U.S.EPA, IRIS (Integrated Risk Information System) or OEHHA
216 (Office of Environment Health Hazard Assessment), which is the excess lifetime cancer
217 risk estimated to result from continuous exposure to an individual VOC via inhalation per
218 μg/m^3.

219 Non-cancer inhalation health impacts were assessed by a direct comparison of the

220 average personal exposure (EC_i) with a substance specific RfC. The hazard quotient (HQ)
221 of each compound was calculated:
222 $$HQ_i = \frac{EC_i}{RfC_i} \quad (6)$$
223 Where HQ_i is the hazard quotient for compound *i*; EC_i is the modeled personal
224 exposure to compound *i*; and RfC_i is the reference exposure limits for compound *i*.
225 The results of LCR_i and HQ_i were judged according to U.S.EPA's (2004) approach.
226 Namely, cancer risks no higher than 1×10^{-6} for an "ample margin of safety" and an HQ
227 value of one or less indicates that adverse health effects are not expected to result from
228 exposure to this VOC.
229
230 **3. Results and discussion**
231 **3.1. Characteristics of VOCs and carbonyls**
232 **3.1.1. Indoor and outdoor levels of VOC_{Toxic} and carbonyls**
233 The average concentrations of VOC_{Toxic} and quantified carbonyls indoors and
234 outdoors are listed in Table 2. For the indoors, acetone (35.55±24.34 μg/m^3) was the most
235 dominant species, followed by formaldehyde (21.45±13.72 μg/m^3), naphthalene
236 (16.64±18.96 μg/m^3), methylene chloride (13.13±18.64 μg/m^3), acetaldehyde (12.92±6.36
237 μg/m^3), hexachloro-1,3-butadiene (9.41±15.78 μg/m^3), bromoform (9.21±8.16 μg/m^3),
238 toluene (7.23±7.00 μg/m^3), n-Nonanal (6.86±2.02 μg/m^3), methyl butyl ketone (5.45±8.98
239 μg/m^3) and ethyl acetate (4.59±3.67 μg/m^3). The concentrations of individual target
240 compounds in each dwelling are shown in supporting information (Table S2). The
241 concentrations are associated with specific situations (e.g., size, design, and ventilation rate)

242 and indoor activities. The common indoor sources are known as paints, adhesives, synthetic
243 fragrances and cigarette smoke (Guo et al., 2003; Polzin et al., 2007).

244 Owing to the uniqueness of each dwelling (e.g., size, design, and ventilation rate), it is
245 more appropriate to present the proportion instead of absolute concentration (Fig 2).
246 Acetone had the highest mass proportion of 10-25%. The range is consistent among the
247 dwellings except an extremely high value of 55% at Site 6. Acetone is used as solvent and
248 widely present in many household products (Wang et al., 2007). High proportions of
249 methylene chloride (7-20%) were also found in many dwellings such as Site 2, 4 and 6
250 where occupants frequently conducted cleaning activities with detergents. Methylene
251 chloride is a propellant to form aerosols while spraying (Health et al., 2000). The indoor
252 level of methylene chloride is thus linked with the application of spray products. These
253 could be supported by our results that acetone and methylene chloride were in high
254 proportions at Site 1 and 6 where insecticide had been used (Table 1). The proportion of
255 methylene chloride in Site 1 and 3 were also up to 10% which occupants are not frequently
256 conducted cleaning activities with detergents (1-3 times per week). Methylene chloride is a
257 powerful solvent that often be used as active ingredient in most paint strippers and foaming
258 agent (Riley et al., 2000), so the high proportion of methylene chloride may also from the
259 volatilization of furniture and building materials. Furthermore, high proportion of
260 naphthalene (0-16%) may be related to the use of mothballs but there were difficulties to
261 statistically record their usages in each dwelling in this study (JOWan-Kuen et al., 2008).

262 Formaldehyde widely presents in paints, adhesives, synthetic fragrances and cigarette
263 smoke (Guo et al., 2003; Polzin et al., 2007). The mass proportion of formaldehyde were

not greatly varied (5-15%) but high, implying that there were consistent and rich sources in those dwellings in northern China (Salthammer et al., 2010). Wang et al. (2007) revealed that building materials and some combustion activities including tobacco smoke and incense burning are the contributors for indoor carbonyls.

Moderate compositions of BTEX (i.e., benzene, toluene, ethylbenzene, m/p-xylene and o-xylene) and styrene (1-20% in total) were shown in most dwellings. Their proportions were up to 20% at Sites 1 and 4, where the occupants were smokers (Table 1). It was reported that tobacco smoking could emit different degrees of benzene, toluene and m,p-xylene (Lee et al., 2002). Besides, BTEX and styrene can be produced in combustion processes, fuel evaporative losses, and uses of solvents (Buczynska et al., 2009; Ilgen et al., 2001). In general, aromatic VOCs were often found higher in China than other countries (Ohura et al., 2009).

For the outdoors, the highest concentration was also seen for acetone (26.92±28.09 μg/m^3), followed by methylene chloride (18.39±30.48 μg/m^3), methyl butyl ketone (10.80±36.77 μg/m^3). Formaldehyde (8.53±7.94 μg/m^3) and acetaldehyde (7.33±4.54 μg/m^3) were also abundant in ambient air as they can be primarily formed in any combustions (i.e., vehicle emission and industrial activities) and secondarily formed through photochemical reactions (Possanzini et al., 2002). Similar explanation was applied in explanation for high abundances of other compounds such as propylene (4.54±6.28 μg/m^3), toluene (4.22±4.08 μg/m^3), 1,3-butadiene (3.89±0.64 μg/m^3) and benzene (3.01±2.66 μg/m^3) as well (Li et al., 2017a; Xue et al., 2017). Liu et al. (Liu, 2014) evaluated the carbonyls and BTEX levels in indoor air at 128 residential homes in Beijing,

China, and found four major pollution contributors including outdoor incursion, building materials and paints, particle board and plywood, and household cleaning chemicals. Considering that the air can be exchanged physically, the indoor levels can be thus impacted by the outdoor sources particularly during the frequent pollution episodes in northern China.

3.1.2. Comparison of indoor levels with other studies

Table 3 compares the average indoor concentrations of selected compounds between our values and the findings in other literatures. The concentration of formaldehyde was higher in our study than the average value in Japan, but ~50% lower than that report in Beijing. Formaldehyde is mainly released to indoor air from refurbishment materials, wood-based products, flooring materials, smoking, and any indoor combustion (Salthammer et al., 2010). The variations of the indoor levels between the cities could be attributed with the differences of materials used and living styles (i.e., smoking, cleaning, cooking). In addition, formaldehyde is the only carbonyl incorporated in the Chinese national indoor air quality standard. It was found that the concentrations of formaldehyde in all dwellings were well below the standard of 100 $\mu g/m^3$ on 1-h average (GB/T, 2002). Even though the concentrations in the dwellings were below the standard, the high abundances must be an alarm to the Chinese residents. The level of acetaldehyde in our study was comparative or lower than those in Beijing and Japan, but not for acetone. High abundances of acetone in Xi'an potentially associated with more solvents used such as bleach, laundry detergent, laundry stain remover, floor glue, nail color remover, oil paint, and furniture polish (Kwon et al., 2007). For methylene chloride and chloroform, our

values are much lower than the newly renovated apartment in Shanghai and Hong Kong.

For aromatics, the concentrations of benzene, toluene, ethylbenzene, m/p-xylene and o-xylene (BTEX) and styrene in the dwellings in Xi'an were relatively low. This could be explained by less or no smoking and cooking activities had been conducted in the residences during the sampling period. In addition, the concentrations of BTEX were much lower than the newly houses renovated in Shanghai, indicating that less evaporation or releases of solvents from the aged walls and furniture.

3.2. Indoor source identification

3.2.1. Indoor and outdoor ratios

Indoor to outdoor (I/O) ratio is a strong evidence to identify whether indoor or outdoor sources may play decisive roles in IAQ. The I/O ratios of VOC_{Toxic} and carbonyls with air purifier operated and after the use of air purifier in this study were presented in Fig. 3. Higher I/O values (> 1) represent dominant indoor sources. Many VOC_{Toxic} and carbonyls were significantly lower outdoors than those indoors, consistent with the findings in other literatures (Bari et al., 2015). Chlorinated compounds such as hexachloro-1,3-butadiene, 1,2,4-trichlorobenzene,1,1,2-trichloroethane and 1,2-dichlorobenzene had the highest I/O ratios, which were 13-17, 12-17, 6-15 respectively. Bleach is reported to be a contributor for indoor chloroform, and 1,2-dichlorobenzene is used to make mothballs and toilet deodorizer blocks (Shepherd et al., 1996). The I/O ratios of other chlorinated compounds were mostly greater than 3, implying that they were originated form indoor sources such as liquid household products (Kwon et al., 2008). Huang et al. (2014) reported that chlorinated compounds often use as industrial solvent such as pharmaceutical solvents,

dyes, pesticides, detergents, rubber, water disinfection, and chemical plants (Huang et al., 2014). For carbonyls, formaldehyde and acetaldehyde had the I/O ratios of ~2. Most aromatic compounds (e.g., BTEX) displayed moderate I/O ratios, revealing the contributions from both indoor and outdoor sources (Edwards et al., 2001; Jia et al., 2008; Wang et al., 2007). It should be noted that the ratios of carbon disulfide, n-hexane, propylene and 1,3-butadiene were below unity, indicating that these VOCs are primarily form outdoor sources. It was reported that propylene and 1,3-butadiene were the major VOCs of vehicle emission (Li et al., 2017a; Xue et al., 2017), explained that the low I/O values were found in our study.

3.2.2. Source apportionment of Indoor VOC

Source apportionment was conducted with U.S.EPA PMF receptor model. The concentrations and uncertainties for the VOCs and carbonyls from those valid samples collected in the eleven dwellings were used. Calibration was run for 3–7 factors and with random seeds. We finally compared those examination results and considered that five-factor PMF solution is the best fit for further analysis, when the relevant Q value equals to 5144 in the robust mode. The residuals of the analytical results are mostly between -3.0 and 3.0 (88%). With the adjustment of the number of factors, the calculated results tend to be stable and the final determination of six factors. Some parameters of PMF model when six major factors are selected were shown in Table S3. The r^2 of majority species were greater than 0.6 and the model fitted well. The selected compounds' average concentrations and mass contributions of each source factor are shown in Fig. 4. In Factor 1, toluene, ethylbenzene, benzene, 1,4-dichlorobenzene and styrene had the highest

352 contribution. Lee et al. (Lee et al., 2002) reported that tobacco smoking could explain
353 indoor levels of benzene, toluene and m,p-xylene. BTEX and styrene are also found in
354 tobacco smoke (Wallace et al., 1987). Source apportionment shows that the dwellings with
355 two smokers (who consumed 6-9 cigarettes per day) had the contribution from this factor
356 being up to 90%. This factor was thus identified as smoking, accounting for 14.5% of the
357 total loading (Fig. 5).

358 Factor 2 should be associated with the off-gases from furniture, floor, building
359 materials and wall coverings. The key characteristic components in this factor were acetone,
360 formaldehyde, and acetaldehyde, also with high contribution of glyoxal, benzaldehyde and
361 methyl isobutyl ketone. Acetone is widely utilized in lacquers for either wooden- or
362 galvanized steel–furniture finishes (WHO, 1998). Hodgson et al. (2002) reported that
363 several cabinetry materials, passage doors, and the plywood subfloor were the predominant
364 sources of formaldehyde and other aldehydes. Wood-based materials used in construction
365 or in furniture production have long been the typical indoor source (Tunga, 2013). These
366 species can be emitted from indoor decorations such as furniture, floor and wall covering
367 materials including carpet, wallpaper, ceiling tiles, sheetrock, concrete and insulation foam
368 (Wallace et al., 1987; Wilke et al., 2010; Yu and Crump, 1998). This common indoor source
369 had an average loading of 44.5%, apportioned to be the most dominant indoor source.

370 Factor 3 was filled with methyl butyl ketone (MBK), acetone and 1,2-dichloroethane,
371 together with high contributions of methyl isobutyl ketone (MIBK) and benzyl chloride.
372 These species are often used as solvent in paints and adhesives (Chin et al., 2014; Yuan et
373 al., 2010). Therefore, this factor has been assigned to oil paints and adhesives. Its

374 contribution was 11.9% of total measured VOCs and carbonyls.

375 Factor 4 was characterized by methylene chloride, acetone, acetaldehyde, with high
376 contribution of chloroethane, 1,1-dichloroethane, cyclohexane. Small amounts of BTEX
377 also contributed to this factor. Previous studies have shown that toluene, xylenes,
378 methylene chloride, acetone, hexane, tetrachloroethylene, 1,1,1-trichloroethane, and
379 trichloroethylene typically exist at high abundances in household products (Sack and Steele,
380 1992). Formaldehyde, acetaldehyde, acetone can be released from cleaning reagents and
381 floor cleaners (Huang et al., 2011a). Wallace et al. (1987) identified 1,1-dichloroethane and
382 methylene dichloride in cleaning agents, pesticides, wallpaper and carpet glues (Wallace et
383 al., 1987). Kwon et al. (2007) also investigated the emission for household products in
384 Korea and found that acetone, m,p-xylenes, toluene, ethylbenzene, and hexane were
385 abundant. Acetone was determined in cleaning products, glues, nail color removers, paints,
386 and polishes. In another study, Kwon et al. (2008) also reported that many liquid household
387 products (e.g., deodorizers, cleaners, color removers, pesticides, and polishes) can release
388 several toxic aromatic and chlorinated organics (Kwon et al., 2008). Hence, factor 4 was
389 interpreted as household products and had a contribution of 17.3%.

390 The major loadings in factor 5 was formaldehyde, other species with high contribution
391 were o-xylene, styrene, benzene, 1,2,4-trimethylbenzene, benzyl chloride, trichloroethene,
392 tetrachloroethene. Formaldehyde had the highest concentration in Hong Kong restaurants
393 (Ho et al., 2006). The highest formaldehyde concentration in smoke from frying was also
394 detected (Xin et al., 2016). Formaldehyde is also produced by combustion processes and
395 heating of foods (Tunga, 2013). The concentration of aromatic hydrocarbons such as

benzene, toluene and chlorinated hydrocarbons also increased during the cooking periods (Lin et al., 2014; Wang, 2011). Huang et al. (2011) also reported that the significant increase of aromatic was related to evaporative loss of impurities in cooking fuels (Huang et al., 2011b). As a result, this factor is marked as cooking, accounting for only 9.8% of the total VOCs since the impact from household cooking was minimized.

Factor 6 was characterized by toluene, benzene, methylene chloride, propylene, n-hexane, n-heptane, glyoxal, acrolein and freon-11. This series of compounds are highly correlated with vehicle emission, biomass burning, industrial emission and solvent usage (Li et al., 2017b; Xue et al., 2017; Zhang et al., 2012). The I/O value of these species revealed they may also from outdoor. This factor was interpreted as outdoor, accounting for 2.1%.

3.3. Health risk assessments

Table 4 lists the 17 health-related chemicals catalogued at different groups by IARC (International Agency for Research on Cancer) and with confirmed IUR or RfC inhalation toxicity according to Integrated Risk Information from U.S. EPA's. The inhalation cancer risk or non-cancer hazard risk were calculated based on these parameters.

3.3.1. Cancer risk assessment

The estimated inhalation cancer risks for nine VOCs are shown in the Fig. 6. Formaldehyde had the highest cancer risk of 5.73×10^{-5}, followed by 1,3-butadiene (2.07×10^{-5}) and 1,2-dichloroethane (1.44×10^{-5}). They are all higher than the acceptable risk level of 1×10^{-6} but lower than the tolerable risk level of 1×10^{-4}. Formaldehyde and 1,3-butadiene are all classified in group I as a human carcinogen by IARC groups. The major exposure

route of formaldehyde is inhalation from indoor air, impacting on nasal and upper airways. Long-term exposure to formaldehyde increases the risk of developing multiple myeloma, myelogenous leukemia and other special cancers. 1,3-butadiene is a characteristic of vehicle exhaust, while 1,2-dichloroethane is often used as a solvent, such as resin, rubber, dry cleaning agent and detergent. Therefore, the best health gains can be realized by reducing both indoor and outdoor emissions of these VOCs.

Four chemicals of acetaldehyde (5.84×10^{-6}), chloroform (3.96×10^{-6}), carbon tetrachloride (3.47×10^{-6}) and benzene (1.62×10^{-6}) presented median cancer risks but all were also higher than the acceptable risk of 1×10^{-6}. Trichloroethylene (1.72×10^{-7}) and tetrachloroethylene (2.26×10^{-8}) were well below the acceptable risk level.

3.3.2. Non-cancer hazard risk assessment

1,3-Butadiene presented the highest HQ value at 0.34, followed by acetaldehyde (0.29), but they were below the threshold value (HQ=1). The other target VOCs with HQs values were far less than the 1 (Fig. 7). Adverse health effects are not expected to result from exposure to these VOCs according to the estimation.

3.3.3 Improvement with air purifier

The air purifier combines high efficiency particulate air filter (HEPA) with ambient temperature catalysis technology. The air flow driven by the top fan passes through the HEPA network, catalyst filling layer and inner filter layer and successively be purified hierarchically. At room temperature (15-35 ^{o}C), formaldehyde and other VOCs react with catalyst and rapidly decomposes into CO_2 and H_2O, which can effectively remove VOCs

(Li et al., 2018). The I/O values of VOCs and carbonyls before air purifier operated and after the use of air purifier were shown in Fig. 3. It was obvious that most compounds' I/O values before air purifier operated were higher than the after the use of air purifier especially 1,1-dichloroethene, bromoform, 1,3-dichlorobenzene, chlorobenzene, formaldehyde and hexanal. The air purifier effectively reduces the indoor concentration of air pollutants. Sixteen selected VOCs and carbonyls at high indoor abundances were selected to compare the impact of operation of air purifiers to purify the indoor air (Fig. 8). Obvious declines in concentration were shown for both target compounds. The greatest improvement was seen for 1,3-butadiene and formaldehyde, which were from of 7.54±1.57 and 26.66±17.22 $\mu g/m^3$ to 1.26±0.38 and 16.29±13.41 $\mu g/m^3$, respectively. Correspondingly, their average estimated cancer risks have been also reduced from 4.65×10^{-5} and 7.12×10^{-5} to 7.8×10^{-6} and 4.35×10^{-5}. In addition, good purification efficiencies were also seen for the removal of chloromethane, 1,2-dichloroethane, bromoform, benzene, toluene and m,p-xylene. Even though the health risks for few of them are still higher than the acceptable value, the substantial reduction could benefit the human health.

4. Conclusions

Substantially high indoor VOCs and carbonyls concentrations were observed in dwellings in Xi'an during wintertime. Most of the targeted species were more abundant in China than other countries. The results from source apportionment conclude that both smoking, decoration, furniture and household products are dominated sources at the

dwellings. The health risk of formaldehyde, 1,3-butadiene and 1,2-dichloroethane were much higher than the acceptable risk level, even though the hazard quotient of few target VOCs were far less than the threshold at non-cancer risk assessment. Preliminary data shows that the use of air purifier can effectively reduce most of the indoor organic pollutants, leading to decline in cancer risk to humans. The findings of this study provide solid data to policy makers for understanding of characteristic pollution sources, importance of IAQ management, and establishment of effective ambient pollution control strategies.

Acknowledgments

This research was financially supported by the National Key Research and Development Program of China (2016YFA0203000) and the National Science Foundation of China (Nos. 41401567 and 41573138). It was also partially supported by the Key Project of International Cooperation of the Chinese Academy of Sciences (GJHZ1543). Yu Huang was also supported by the "Hundred Talent Program" of the Chinese Academy of Sciences.

References

Abeleira AJ, Farmer DK. Summer ozone in the northern Front Range metropolitan area: weekend–weekday effects, temperature dependences, and the impact of drought. Atmospheric Chemistry & Physics 2017; 17: 1-21.

Azuma K, Uchiyama I, Uchiyama S, Kunugita N. Assessment of inhalation exposure to indoor air pollutants: Screening for health risks of multiple pollutants in Japanese dwellings. Environ Res 2016; 145: 39-49.

Bari MA, Kindzierski WB, Wheeler AJ, Héroux M-È, Wallace LA. Source apportionment of indoor and outdoor volatile organic compounds at homes in Edmonton, Canada. Building and Environment 2015; 90: 114-124.

Buczynska AJ, Krata A, Stranger M, Locateli Godoi AF, Kontozova-Deutsch V, Bencs L, et al. Atmospheric BTEX-concentrations in an area with intensive street traffic. Atmospheric Environment 2009; 43: 311-318.

Chen Y, Ho KF, Ho SS, Ho WK, Lee SC, Yu JZ, et al. Gaseous and particulate polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs) emissions from commercial restaurants in Hong Kong. Journal of Environmental Monitoring Jem 2007; 9: 1402.

Chin JY, Godwin C, Parker E, Robins T, Lewis T, Harbin P, et al. Levels and Sources of Volatile Organic Compounds in Homes of Children with Asthma. Indoor Air 2014; 24: 403-415.

Dai H, Jing S, Wang H, Ma Y, Li L, Song W, et al. VOC characteristics and inhalation health risks in newly renovated residences in Shanghai, China. Sci Total Environ 2017; 577: 73-83.

Dai WT, Ho SSH, Ho KF, Liu WD, Cao JJ, Lee SC. Seasonal and diurnal variations of mono- and di-carbonyls in Xi'an, China. Atmospheric Research 2012; 113: 102-112.

Delfino RJ. Epidemiologic Evidence for Asthma and Exposure to Air Toxics: Linkages between Occupational, Indoor, and Community Air Pollution Research. Environmental Health Perspectives 2002; 110: 573-589.

Du Z, Mo J, Zhang Y. Risk assessment of population inhalation exposure to volatile organic compounds and carbonyls in urban China. Environ Int 2014; 73: 33-45.

Duan H, Liu X, Yan M, Wu Y, Liu Z. Characteristics of carbonyls and volatile organic compounds (VOCs) in residences in Beijing, China. Frontiers of Environmental Science & Engineering 2014; 10: 73-84.

Duan X. Exposure Factors Handbook of Chinese Population, 2013.

Edwards RD, Jurvelin J, Koistinen K, Saarela K, Jantunen M. VOC source identification from personal and residential indoor, outdoor and workplace microenvironment samples in EXPOLIS-Helsinki, Finland. Atmospheric Environment 2001; 35: 4829-4841.

EPA US. Risk Assessment Guidance for Superfund Volume I: Human Health Evaluation Manual (Part F, Supplemental Guidance for Inhalation Risk Assessment). 2009.

GB/T. Indoor air quality standard. 2002.

Guo H, Kwok NH, Cheng HR, Lee SC, Hung WT, Li YS. Formaldehyde and volatile organic compounds in Hong Kong homes: concentrations and impact factors. Indoor Air 2009; 19: 206-17.

Guo H, Lee SC, Li WM, Cao JJ. Source characterization of BTEX in indoor microenvironments in Hong Kong. Atmospheric Environment 2003; 37: 73-82.

Health EDo, Substances HSAfT, Registry D. Toxicological profile for methylene chloride. Final report. Atsdr Toxicological Profile 2000; 66: 239-241.

Ho SSH, Ho KF, Liu WD, Lee SC, Dai WT, Cao JJ, et al. Unsuitability of using the DNPH-coated solid sorbent cartridge for determination of airborne unsaturated carbonyls. Atmospheric Environment 2011; 45: 261-265.

Ho SSH, Jian Zhen Y, Kam Wah C, Lam Lung Y. Carbonyl emissions from commercial cooking sources in Hong Kong. Air Repair 2006; 56: 1091-1098.

Ho, S.S.H., Chow, J.C., Watson, J.G., Wang, L., Qu, L., Dai, W., Huang, Y., Cao, J., 2017. Influences of relative humidities and temperatures on the collection of C2-C5 aliphatic hydrocarbons with multi-bed (Tenax TA, Carbograph 1TD, Carboxen 1003) sorbent tube method. Atmospheric Environment 151, 45-51.

Ho, S.S.H., Wang, L., Chow, J.C., Watson, J.G., Xue, Y., Huang, Y., Qu, L. Li, B., Dai, W. Li, L., Cao, J., 2018. Optimization and evaluation of multi-bed adsorbent tube method in collection of volatile organic compounds. Atmospheric Research 202, 187-195.Hodgson AT, Beal D, Mcilvaine JE. Sources of formaldehyde, other aldehydes and terpenes in a new manufactured house: PubMed, 2002.

Huang B, Lei C, Wei C, Zeng G. Chlorinated volatile organic compounds (Cl-VOCs) in environment - sources, potential human health impacts, and current remediation technologies. Environ Int 2014; 71: 118-38.

Huang Y, Ho KF, Ho SSH, Lee SC, Yau PS, Cheng Y. Physical parameters effect on ozone-initiated formation of indoor secondary organic aerosols with emissions from cleaning products. Journal of Hazardous Materials 2011a; 192: 1787-1794.

Huang Y, Ho SS, Ho KF, Lee SC, Yu JZ, Louie PK. Characteristics and health impacts of VOCs and carbonyls associated with residential cooking activities in Hong Kong. J Hazard Mater 2011b; 186: 344-51.

Ilgen E, Karch N, Levsen K, Angerer Jr, Schneider P, Heinrich J, et al. Aromatic hydrocarbons in the atmospheric environment: Part I. Indoor versus outdoor sources, the influence of traffic. Atmospheric Environment 2001; 35: 1235-1252.

Jia C, Batterman S, Godwin C. VOCs in industrial, urban and suburban neighborhoods, Part 1: Indoor and outdoor concentrations, variation, and risk drivers. Atmospheric Environment 2008; 42: 2083-2100.

JOWan-Kuen, LEEJong-Hyo, LIMHo-Jin, JEONGWoo-Sik. Naphthaleneemissionsfrommothrepellentsortoiletdeodorantblocksdeterminedusinghead-spaceand small-chambertests. J Environ Sci 2008; 20: 1012-1017.

Kwon KD, Jo WK, Lim HJ, Jeong WS. Characterization of emissions composition for selected household products available in Korea. J Hazard Mater 2007; 148: 192-8.

Kwon KD, Jo WK, Lim HJ, Jeong WS. Volatile pollutants emitted from selected liquid household products. Environ Sci Pollut Res Int 2008; 15: 521-6.

Lee SC, LI, WaiMing, ChioHang. Investigation of indoor air quality at residential homes in Hong Kong: case study : Asia. Atmospheric Environment 2002; 36: 225-237.

Leech JA, Nelson WC, Burnett RT, Aaron S, Raizenne ME. It's about time: a comparison of Canadian and American time-activity patterns. J Expo Anal Environ Epidemiol 2002; 12: 427-32.

Li B, Ho SSH, Xue Y, Huang Y, Wang L, Cheng Y, et al. Characterizations of volatile organic compounds (VOCs) from vehicular emissions at roadside environment: The first comprehensive study in Northwestern China. Atmospheric Environment 2017a; 161: 1-12.

Li B, Ho SSH, Xue Y, Huang Y, Wang L, Cheng Y, et al. Characterizations of volatile organic compounds(VOCs) from vehicular emissions at roadside environment: The first comprehensive study in Northwestern China. Atmospheric Environment 2017b.

Li H, Huang T, Lu Y, Cui L, Wang Z, Zhang C, et al. Unraveling the mechanisms of room-temperature catalytic

562 degradation of indoor formaldehyde and the biocompatibility on colloidal TiO2-supported
563 MnOx–CeO2. Environmental Science Nano 2018.
564 Lin L, Xiaochu HE, Jianping WU, Peigang YU, Guo T. Research of Shanghai Cooking Fume Pollution.
565 Environmental Science & Technology 2014.
566 Liu Q. Source Apportionment of Personal Exposure to Carbonyl Compounds and BTEX at Homes in Beijing,
567 China. Aerosol and Air Quality Research 2014.
568 Miller MS, Friedlander SK, Hidy GM. A chemical element balance for the Pasadena aerosol. Journal of Colloid
569 & Interface Science 1972; 39: 165-176.
570 Mj MSA, Daly EP, Milford JB. Source apportionment of exposures to volatile organic compounds. I. Evaluation
571 of receptor models using simulated exposure data. Atmospheric Environment 2002; 36: 3629-3641.
572 Ohura T, Amagai T, Shen X, Li S, Zhang P, Zhu L. Comparative study on indoor air quality in Japan and China:
573 Characteristics of residential indoor and outdoor VOCs. Atmospheric Environment 2009; 43:
574 6352-6359.
575 Paatero P. Least squares formulation of robust non-negative factor analysis. Chemometrics & Intelligent
576 Laboratory Systems 1997; 37: 23-35.
577 Pekey H, Arslanbaş D. The Relationship Between Indoor, Outdoor and Personal VOC Concentrations in
578 Homes, Offices and Schools in the Metropolitan Region of Kocaeli, Turkey. Water, Air, and Soil
579 Pollution 2008; 191: 113-129.
580 Polissar AV, Hopke PK, Paatero P, Malm WC, Sisler JF. Atmospheric aerosol over Alaska: 2. Elemental
581 composition and sources. Journal of Geophysical Research Atmospheres 1998; 103: 19045-19057.
582 Polzin GM, Kosa-Maines RE, Ashley DL, Watson CH. Analysis of volatile organic compounds in mainstream
583 cigarette smoke. Environmental Science & Technology 2007; 41: 1297-302.
584 Possanzini M, Palo VD, Cecinato A. Sources and photodecomposition of formaldehyde and acetaldehyde in
585 Rome ambient air. Atmospheric Environment 2002; 36: 3195-3201.
586 Riley DM, Small MJ, Fischhoff B. Modeling methylene chloride exposure-reduction options for home
587 paint-stripper users. Journal of Exposure Analysis & Environmental Epidemiology 2000; 10: 240.
588 Sack TM, Steele DH. A survey of household products for volatile organic compounds. Atmospheric
589 Environment A 1992; 26: 1063-1070.
590 Salthammer T, Mentese S, Marutzky R. Formaldehyde in the Indoor Environment. Chemical Reviews 2010;
591 110: 2536-2572.
592 Schauer JJ, Kleeman MJ, Cass GR, Simoneit BR. Measurement of emissions from air pollution sources. 4.
593 C1-C27 organic compounds from cooking with seed oils. Environmental Science & Technology 2002;
594 36: 567.
595 Shepherd J, Lcorsi R, JeffKemp. Chloroform in Indoor Air and Wastewater: The Role of Residential Washing
596 Machines. Air Repair 1996; 46: 631-642.
597 Spaulding RS, Frazey P, Rao X, Charles MJ. Measurement of Hydroxy Carbonyls and Other Carbonyls in
598 Ambient Air Using Pentafluorobenzyl Alcohol as a Chemical Ionization Reagent. Analytical Chemistry
599 1999; 71: 3420-3427.
600 Tunga S. Formaldehyde in the ambient atmosphere: from an indoor pollutant to an outdoor pollutant?
601 Angewandte Chemie International Edition 2013; 52: 3320-3327.
602 USEPA. Determination of Formaldehyde in Ambient Air Using Adsorbent Cartridge Followed by High
603 Performance Liquid Chromatography (HPLC) [Active Sampling Methodology]. 1999a.
604 USEPA. Determination Of Volatile Organic Compounds (VOCs) In Air Collected In Specially-Prepared Canisters
605 And Analyzed By Gas Chromatography-ass Spectrometry (GCMS). 1999b.

606 USEPA. Air Toxics Risk Assessment Reference Library Volume 2 Facility-Specific Assessment. 2004.
607 USEPA. EPA Positive Matrix Factorization (PMF) 3.0 Fundamentals & User Guide. USEPA Office of Research
608 and Development. 2008.
609 Wallace LA, Pellizzari E, Leaderer B, Zelon H, Sheldon L. Emissions of volatile organic compounds from
610 building materials and consumer products. Atmospheric Environment 1987; 21: 385-393.
611 Wang B, Lee SC, Ho KF. Characteristics of carbonyls: Concentrations and source strengths for indoor and
612 outdoor residential microenvironments in China. Atmospheric Environment 2007; 41: 2851-2861.
613 Wang H, Xiang Z, Wang L, Jing S, Lou S, Tao S, et al. Emissions of volatile organic compounds (VOCs) from
614 cooking and their speciation: A case study for Shanghai with implications for China. Sci Total Environ
615 2018; 621: 1300-1309.
616 Wang L, Xiang Z, Stevanovic S, Ristovski Z, Salimi F, Gao J, et al. Role of Chinese cooking emissions on
617 ambient air quality and human health. Sci Total Environ 2017; 589: 173-181.
618 Wang XY. Measurement of VOCs Emissions from Cooking in Shenyang City. China Population Resources &
619 Environment 2011.
620 Wang Y, Duan X, Li T. Inhalation exposure factors in health risk assessment. Journal of Environment & Health
621 2012; 29: 104-108.
622 Waste USEOoS. Human Health Evaluation Manual, Supplemental Guidance: Standard default exposure
623 factors, Directive 9285. 6-03; Interim Final. Risk Assessment Guideance for Superfund 1991; 1.
624 WHO. Environmental Health Criteria. No. 207-Acetone. Geneva: World Health Organization 1998.
625 Wilke O, Jann O, Brödner D. VOC- and SVOC-emissions from adhesives, floor coverings and complete floor
626 structures. Indoor Air 2010; 14: 98-107.
627 Windham GC, Zhang L, Gunier R, Croen LA, Grether JK. Autism spectrum disorders in relation to distribution
628 of hazardous air pollutants in the san francisco bay area. Environ Health Perspect 2006; 114:
629 1438-1444.
630 Wu F, Jacobs D, Mitchell C, Miller D, Karol MH. Improving indoor environmental quality for public health:
631 impediments and policy recommendations. Environmental Health Perspectives 2007; 115: 953-957.
632 Xin WU, Xiu GL, Wang LN, Xue TL. Impact of Oil Types on Emission Characteristics of Particles. Journal of East
633 China University of Science & Technology 2016.
634 Xue Y, Ho SSH, Huang Y, Li B, Wang L, Dai W, et al. Source apportionment of VOCs and their impacts on
635 surface ozone in an industry city of Baoji, Northwestern China. Sci Rep 2017; 7: 9979.
636 Yu C, Crump D. A review of the emission of VOCs from polymeric materials used in buildings. Building &
637 Environment 1998; 33: 357-374.
638 Yuan B, Shao M, Lu S, Wang B. Source profiles of volatile organic compounds associated with solvent use in
639 Beijing, China. Atmospheric Environment 2010; 44: 1919-1926.
640 Zhang Y, Mu Y, Liu J, Mellouki A. Levels, sources and health risks of carbonyls and BTEX in the ambient air of
641 Beijing, China. Journal of Environmental Sciences 2012; 24: 124-130.
642

643 **Table 1.** Statistical data of the general information and activities in the sampled dwellings obtained from the questionnaires.

Site#	Floor#	No of Rooms	No of Smokers [a]	Ventilation time per day	Cooking per week	Cleaning per week	Incense burning [a]	Insecticide [a]	Types of household chemicals consumed [a]	Fuel
1	26	4	1	<1 h	3-4	2-3	-	+	Laundry, dishwashing, and toilet detergent	LPG
2	6	4	-[b]	1-3 h	7	1-2	-	-	Laundry, dishwashing, and toilet detergent	natural gas
3	18	5	-	<1 h	3-4	7	-	-	Laundry, dishwashing, and toilet detergent	LPG
4	23	6	1	<1 h	7	7	-	-	Laundry, dishwashing, and toilet detergent	natural gas
5	4	5	-	<1 h	7	7	-	-	Laundry, dishwashing, and toilet detergent	electricity
6	23	4	-	<1 h	7	7	-	+	Dishwashing detergent	Electricity, LPG
7	5	4	-	9-12 h	-	7	-	-	Laundry and dishwashing detergent	-
8	2	2	-	1-3 h	7	4-5	-	-	Laundry and dishwashing detergent	Electricity, natural gas
9	8	3	1	1-3 h	1-2	2-3	-	-	Dishwashing and toilet detergent	LPG
10	2	4	-	3-6 h	7	2-3	-	-	Laundry, dishwashing, and toilet detergent, bleach	Electricity, LPG
11	5	4	2	1-3 h	7	7	+	-	Laundry and dishwashing detergent	Electricity, natural gas

644

645 [a] No record on the quantity consumed daily due to limitation

646 [b] No activity conducted in the dwelling

647 **Table 2.** Concentration of different categories of carbonyls and VOCs in indoor and outdoor (μg/m^3)

Compounds	Indoor (n=44)		Outdoor (n=37)		Compounds	Indoor (n=44)		Outdoor (n=37)	
(μg/m^3)	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	(μg/m^3)	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Carbon disulfide	0.63	0.69	1.24	2.41	*Halohydrocarbon*				
Alkane					Methylene Chloride	13.13	18.64	18.39	30.48
n-Hexane	1.76	1.65	1.83	2.12	Hexachloro-1,3-butadiene	9.41	15.78	0.62	1.74
n-Heptane	0.68	0.86	0.4	0.35	Bromoform	9.21	8.16	2.39	2.65
Cyclohexane	0.51	0.75	0.26	0.23	Carbon Tetrachloride	2.81	5.84	2.12	8.01
Alkene					1,2-Dichloroethane	2.69	4.12	1.78	3.08
1,3-Butadiene	3.36	1.16	3.89	0.64	Chloromethane	2.64	3.31	6.46	14.63
Propylene	2.91	3.38	4.54	6.28	1,2-Dichloropropane	1.93	2.98	1.86	3.35
Carbonyls					cis-1,2-Dichloroethene	1.32	0.8	0.53	0.32
Acetone	35.55	24.34	26.92	28.09	Chloroethane	1.08	1.07	0.89	0.9
Formaldehyde	21.45	13.72	8.53	7.94	1,4-Dichlorobenzene	0.99	1.15	0.16	0.21
Acetaldehyde	12.92	6.36	7.33	4.54	Benzyl Chloride	0.98	1.95	0.23	0.53
n-Nonanal	6.86	2.02	4.9	2.84	Chloroform	0.84	0.51	0.55	0.31
Methyl butyl ketone	5.45	8.98	10.8	36.77	1,1,2,2-Tetrachloroethane	0.74	1.31	0.31	0.66
n-Octanal	4.68	2.1	3.6	1.87	1,1,1-Trichloroethane	0.71	0.56	0.32	0.32
n-Decanal	4.05	1.9	2.77	1.44	1,3-Dichlorobenzene	0.68	0.87	0.14	0.16
Methyl Ethyl Ketone	3.56	1.81	3.01	1.53	1,2-Dichlorobenzene	0.56	1.04	0.06	0.1
Hexanal	3.05	1.66	1.23	1.09	1,1-Dichloroethane	0.47	0.44	0.34	0.32
n-Heptanal	2.49	0.88	1.96	0.72	1,2,4-Trichlorobenzene	0.47	0.38	0.03	0.04
iso-Pentanal	1.78	1.25	1	0.54	Dibromochloromethane	0.45	0.31	0.58	0.17
Methylglyoxal	1.72	0.92	2.16	1.57	Trichloroethene	0.42	0.37	0.48	0.51
Glyoxal	1.56	0.81	2.49	1.44	Tetrachloroethene	0.42	0.32	0.23	0.21
Propanal	1.54	0.66	1.35	0.7	Chlorobenzene	0.39	0.75	0.13	0.13
iso-+n-Butanal	1.52	0.76	1.17	0.59	Bromodichloromethane	0.36	0.5	0.46	0.6
Acrolein	1.49	1.14	3.1	3.35	1,1,2-Trichloroethane	0.2	0.1	0.02	-
Benzaldehyde	1.24	0.68	0.9	0.38	1,2-Dichlorobenzene	0.18	0.16	0.26	0.28
n-Pentanal	0.92	0.5	0.53	0.23	1,1-Dichloroethene	0.16	0.11	0.06	0.02
2,5-Dimethylbenzaldehyde	0.9	0.42	0.87	0.46	trans-1,3-Dichloropropene	0.08	0.06	0.04	0.02
Methyl Isobutyl Ketone	0.83	0.76	1.51	1.43	Bromomethane	bd	-	bd	-
o-Tolualdehyde	0.49	0.21	0.43	0.21	trans-1,2-Dichloroethene	bd	-	bd	-
p-Tolualdehyde	0.43	0.19	0.43	0.19	1,4-Dioxane	bd	-	bd	-
m-Tolualdehyde	0.31	0.05	bd	-	cis-1,3-Dichloropropene	bd	-	0.41	0.07
Others					1,2-Dibromoethane	bd	-	bd	-
Ethyl Acetate	4.59	3.67	3.53	2.85	*Aromatic*				
Isopropyl Alcohol	1.17	1.05	1.71	1.71	Naphthalene	16.64	18.96	5.51	6.49
Vinyl Acetate	0.92	1.86	0.55	1.67	Toluene	7.23	7	4.22	4.08
Tetrahydrofuran	0.91	1.18	0.43	0.59	Benzene	3.58	3.48	3.01	2.66
Methyl-tert-butyl ether	0.61	0.56	0.55	0.52	Ethylbenzene	3.46	4.21	1.5	1.64
Methyl Methacrylate	0.15	0.12	0.22	0.42	o-Xylene	3.29	5.16	1.47	1.61
Freon					m,p-Xylene	2.72	4.41	1.22	1.61
Freon-11	1.67	2.15	0.97	1.8	Styrene	1.74	1.25	0.99	0.69
Freon-12	1.18	1.19	0.65	0.63	1,2,4-Trimethylbenzene	0.87	0.89	0.36	0.39
Freon-113	0.39	0.35	0.21	0.21	4-Ethyltoluene	0.37	0.32	0.15	0.15
Freon-114	0.01	0	0.07	0.03	1,3,5-Trimethylbenzene	0.37	0.35	0.15	0.13

648

649 **Table 3.** Comparison of selected concentrations (μg/m^3) in dwelling with other relevant studies
650

Compounds (μg/m^3)	This study	Beijing, China (Duan et al., 2014)	Various cities, Japan (Azuma et al., 2016)	Shanghai, China (Dai et al., 2017)	Hong Kong, China (Lee et al., 2002)	Kocaeli, Turkey (Pekey and Arslanbaş, 2008)
Formaldehyde	21.45±13.72	40.2±26.2	13.00	-	-	-
Acetaldehyde	12.92±636	17.0±10.3	21.10	-	-	-
Acetone	35.55±24.34	23.6±10.7	27.10	-	-	-
Methylene Chloride	13.13±18.64	12.5±78.5	-	47.43±75.66	8.8±0.8	-
Chloroform	0.84±0.51	-	1.10	3.59±6.66	2.6±0.9	-
Benzene	3.58±3.48	7.35±11.6	2.40	2.32±1.19	4.7±0.5	13.06
Toluene	7.23±7.00	23.5±45.6	10.80	200.13±443.89	52.1±8.4	72.44
Ethylbenzene	3.46±4.21	3.68±2.49	5.60	26.33±27.73	0.6±0.8	-
m,p-Xylene	2.72±4.41	6.33±4.41	8.30	39.56±49.81	3.9±1.2	27.46
Styrene	1.74±1.25	1.85±2.13	-	32.59±42.77	-	11.65
o-Xylene	3.29±5.16	2.32±1.57	3.40	-	4.5±0.4	16.24
1,2,4-Trimethylbenzene	0.87±0.89	1.99±2.10	6.40	-	-	4.20

651

652 **Table 4.** Health-related VOCs and related toxicity values.

653

Compounds	Cas no.	IARC	IUR ($\mu g/m^3)^{-1}$	RfC (mg/m^3)
Formaldehyde	50-00-0	1	1.3×10^{-5}	-
Acetaldehyde	75-07-0	2B	2.2×10^{-6}	0.009
1,3-Butadiene	106-99-0	1	3×10^{-5}	0.002
Benzene	71-43-2	1	2.2×10^{-6}	0.03
Toluene	108-88-3	3	-	5
m/p-Xylene	106-42-3	3	-	0.1
o-Xylene	95-47-6		-	-
Ethylbenzene	100-41-4	2B	-	1
Styrene	100-42-5	2B	-	1
1,4-Dichlorobenzene	106-46-7	2B	-	0.8
Chloromethane	74-87-3	3	-	0.09
Methylene chloride	75-09-2	2A	1×10^{-8}	0.6
1,2-Dichloroethane	107-06-2	2B	2.6×10^{-5}	-
Chloroform	67-66-3	2B	2.3×10^{-5}	-
Carbon tetrachloride	56-23-5	2B	6×10^{-6}	0.1
Trichloroethylene	79-01-6	1	4.1×10^{-6}	0.002
Tetrachloroethylene	127-18-4	2A	2.6×10^{-7}	0.04

654



Fig.1 Map shown dwellings in districts in Xi'an.



Fig. 2 Indoor mass proportions of typical compounds in each sampling site.



663

664 **Fig.3** I/O ratios of VOCs and carbonyls



Fig. 4 PMF-resolved indoor VOC source profiles (concentration of species and % of species apportioned to the factor from base run).



668

669 **Fig. 5** Source apportionment of indoor VOCs in Xi'an in winter.

670



671

672 **Fig. 6** Inhalation cancer risk evaluation for nine toxic compounds.

673

674



675

676 **Fig. 7** Non-carcinogenic estimated risk of VOCs using Inhalation Reference Concentration.

677



678

679 **Fig. 8** The comparison of selected VOC concentrations with operation of indoor air purifier.

680 **Table S1.** Indoor air quality questionnaires.

Name of interviewer: _____ Date of interview: _____ Home ID: _____	
Ⅰ. Household information	
1. Name of respondent: _____	2. Gender: ☐Male ☐Female
3. Age: _____ 4.Phone: _____	5. Email: _____
6. What is your address? _____	7. Which kind of dwelling are you staying? ☐Simple house (Numbers of floor: _____) ☐Apartment/Dormitory (Floor: _____) ☐Others, please specify: _____
8. What is the number of members in your home/apartment? ☐1 ☐2 ☐3 ☐4 ☐5 ☐> 5, please specify_____	9. How many hours do you spend at home/apartment? ☐ <1-3 hours ☐ 3-6 hours ☐ 6-9 hours ☐ 9-12 hours ☐>12 hours, please specify_____
10. How many rooms are there in your home/apartments? ☐Living room ☐Bedroom ☐Kitchen room ☐bathroom ☐Others, please specify_____	11. During the past 3 months, have any of the following changes been made in your home/apartment? ☐No ☐New flooring ☐New furnishing ☐New painted wall ☐New partition ☐New carpeting ☐Others, please spicily_____
12. Does your home/apartment has outdoor spaces? ☐Garden ☐Balcony ☐Corridor ☐Others, please spicily_____	13. Do you have any pets? ☐Yes ☐No If yes, please specify how many? ☐1 ☐2 ☐3 ☐> 3, please specify_____
14. Which of the following activities are nearby your home/department? ☐ Industrial activities ☐ Mountain area ☐ Residential home ☐ Shopping mall ☐ Roadside ☐ Restaurants ☐ Construction activities ☐ Beach ☐Others, please spicily_____	15. 1 How many smokers are there in your home/apartment? ☐0 ☐1 ☐2 ☐3 ☐> 3, please specify_____ 2 How many cigarettes do they smoke per day? ☐1 to < 3 ☐3 to < 6 ☐6 to < 9 ☐> 9, please specify_____
Ⅱ. Sources of indoor air pollution	
☐Cooking activities ☐Printer/Photocopy ☐Cleaning activities ☐Carpet/Floor coating ☐Chemical usage ☐Painting activity ☐Incense burning ☐Outdoor sources, please spicily_____	
Ⅲ. Air ventilation	
1. What kind of air ventilation/circulation system do you use in your home/apartment? ☐Air conditioners ☐Fan ☐Natural ventilation(opening windows) ☐Others, please specify_____	2. How often do you use air ventilation in your home/apartment? ☐<1 hour ☐1to < 3 hours ☐3 to < 6 hours ☐6 to < 9 hours ☐9 to < 12 hours ☐>12hours, please specify_____
Ⅳ. Cooking activity	
1. Do you cook at home/apartment? ☐Yes ☐No If yes, please answer following question, if No please pass to part Ⅴ.	2. How often do you cook at home/apartment? ☐1-2 days/week ☐3-4 days/week ☐Everyday
3. How many meals do you cook per day? ☐1 ☐2 ☐3 ☐> 3	4. What kind of fuel do you use for cooking? ☐Electricity ☐LPG ☐Oil ☐Others, please spicily_____

Ⅴ. Cleaning activities	
1. How often do you clean the home/apartment? ☐Every day ☐4-5 days per week ☐2-3 days per week ☐Others, please specify_____	2. How can you clean the home/apartment? ☐Vacuum cleaner ☐Brush and broom ☐Cleaning towel ☐Others, please specify_____
3. What kinds of chemical do you use in the home/apartment? ☐laundry detergent ☐Insecticide ☐Bleach ☐Oven cleaners ☐Dishwashing detergent ☐Antibacterial cleaner ☐Toilet detergents ☐Others, please spicily_____	4. How often do you use these Chemical? ☐Every day ☐Twice a week ☐Once a week ☐Once a month ☐Others, please spicily_____
Ⅵ. IAQ-related information about your health	
1. During the past three months, have you had the following symptoms? (Please fill in the number 1: Always; 2: Usually; 3: Sometimes; 4: Occasionally; 5: Rarely: 6: Never)	
1.1 Eye symptoms ☐Dryness ☐Redness ☐Watering 1.2 Nasal symptoms ☐Dry nose ☐Running nose ☐Sneezing ☐Stuffy nose or congestion 1.3 Throat symptoms ☐Dry cough ☐Sore or dry throat	1.4 Skin problems(皮肤症状) ☐Dryness ☐Itching skin ☐Rash 1.5 Other symptoms ☐Difficulty in concentrating ☐Dizziness ☐Fever ☐ Headache ☐ Nausea ☐ Shortness of breath ☐Unusual fatigue
Ⅶ. Other remarks _____	

681

682 **Table S2**. Concentration of VOC_{Toxic} and carbonyls in each sampling site.

Compounds \ Site#	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
Carbon disulfide	0.23	0.50	0.95	0.47	2.96	0.48	1.35	0.39	0.22	0.47	0.49
n-Hexane	1.52	2.91	2.11	3.75	1.66	0.75	0.56	0.59	0.52	1.52	2.18
Cyclohexane	0.27	0.46	0.41	2.46	0.05	0.03	0.03	0.02	0.02	0.21	0.60
n-Heptane	0.50	0.73	0.56	1.38	2.41	0.17	0.15	bd	bd	0.16	0.20
Propylene	2.37	2.92	2.59	4.66	1.32	2.03	1.51	0.59	0.78	2.77	8.84
1,3-Butadiene	bd	bd	bd	bd	bd	3.36	bd	bd	bd	bd	bd
Formaldehyde	17.01	17.63	53.63	20.35	22.67	7.52	18.97	18.38	17.95	21.82	14.01
Acetaldehyde	9.22	9.99	11.77	16.00	16.27	7.38	10.59	12.40	22.13	11.84	10.65
Acetone	13.70	17.01	22.29	43.29	32.09	80.80	25.94	20.64	39.23	15.28	68.93
Propanal	1.31	0.22	1.50	2.37	1.68	1.04	1.84	1.53	1.96	1.43	1.20
Methyl ethyl ketone	2.60	1.54	4.27	4.95	5.78	2.48	3.40	2.43	2.97	2.32	5.36
iso-+n-Butanal	1.23	0.44	2.14	2.03	2.52	0.77	1.30	1.45	1.58	1.38	1.03
Benzaldehyde	1.09	1.36	1.83	1.77	1.52	0.75	0.81	1.61	1.30	0.65	0.80
iso-Pentanal	1.80	0.44	2.33	1.93	3.18	1.07	1.32	0.94	3.65	0.77	1.36
n-Pentanal	0.86	0.18	1.12	1.36	1.52	0.51	0.57	1.05	1.07	0.75	0.60
o-Tolualdehyde	0.63	0.73	0.65	0.71	0.46	0.57	0.30	0.30	0.59	0.27	0.38
m-Tolualdehyde	bd	bd	bd	bd	bd	bd	bd	0.31	bd	bd	bd
p-Tolualdehyde	0.53	0.50	0.66	0.69	0.50	0.42	0.18	0.23	0.36	0.29	0.44
Hexanal	2.52	0.75	3.64	5.87	3.19	1.54	2.02	3.89	4.29	2.27	1.82
2,5-Dimethylbenzaldehyde	0.85	0.66	1.65	1.15	1.37	0.54	0.59	0.71	0.95	0.62	0.61
n-Heptanal	2.45	2.35	3.21	3.39	2.64	2.62	1.27	2.72	2.43	1.81	2.30
n-Octanal	5.89	1.74	6.51	6.09	4.66	1.91	5.53	6.00	4.57	4.70	2.43
n-Nonanal	5.37	3.84	8.21	9.15	7.67	5.72	6.02	6.51	8.13	5.33	7.42
n-Decanal	3.87	2.08	6.72	4.85	6.27	2.16	2.95	4.38	4.00	2.72	3.23
Glyoxal	0.94	1.19	1.60	2.35	2.73	1.07	1.26	1.32	1.84	1.09	1.25

Methylglyoxal	0.98	2.12	2.02	2.65	2.69	0.89	1.43	1.34	2.18	1.03	1.32
Acrolein	0.73	1.63	2.32	2.22	2.53	0.43	1.06	0.11	bd	2.03	1.96
Isopropyl Alcohol	1.20	2.00	1.42	1.05	2.56	0.11	0.68	0.12	bd	0.30	1.26
Ethyl Acetate	3.57	4.78	6.86	8.23	0.10	bd	bd	bd	bd	bd	0.74
Vinyl Acetate	0.16	0.36	0.14	0.41	0.11	0.01	0.30	0.26	0.11	2.16	4.45
Methyl-tert-butyl ether	0.73	0.69	0.50	1.64	1.23	0.14	0.29	0.14	0.03	0.19	0.63
Tetrahydrofuran	0.28	0.79	0.72	0.55	0.18	bd	0.03	0.21	0.19	1.33	3.38
Methyl Methacrylate	0.09	0.13	0.13	0.11	0.18	bd	bd	0.06	0.06	0.31	0.20
Methyl Isobutyl Ketone	0.12	bd	0.21	0.76	0.18	bd	bd	0.20	0.15	2.16	1.56
Methyl butyl ketone	0.04	0.06	0.10	0.19	0.65	0.05	0.26	10.49	11.42	14.60	19.73
Chloromethane	0.82	0.68	1.16	1.35	10.34	4.93	5.75	2.38	1.97	1.99	1.32
Vinyl chloride	0.04	0.12	0.90	0.20	0.11	bd	0.05	bd	bd	0.26	0.17
Bromomethane	bd	bd	bd	bd	bd	bd	bd	bd	bd	bd	bd
Chloroethane	0.76	0.89	1.27	2.30	2.76	0.33	0.09	bd	0.10	2.45	0.71
1,1-Dichloroethene	bd	0.38	bd	0.03	bd	bd	bd	bd	bd	0.02	0.01
Methylene Chloride	10.42	16.03	61.24	50.81	5.49	10.03	4.05	0.81	2.24	4.40	5.43
trans-1,2-Dichloroethene	bd	bd	bd	bd	bd	bd	bd	bd	bd	bd	bd
1,1-Dichloroethane	0.24	0.80	0.46	1.13	0.23	0.03	0.04	0.08	bd	0.65	0.36
cis-1,2-Dichloroethene	bd	bd	bd	1.42	1.46	0.11	0.14	bd	0.09	2.30	2.22
Chloroform	bd	2.75	0.16	0.67	0.79	bd	0.34	bd	bd	bd	bd
1,2-Dichloroethane	1.55	1.64	2.52	5.64	2.12	0.57	0.94	bd	bd	0.39	8.61
1,1,1-Trichloroethane	bd	bd	bd	bd	bd	bd	bd	0.17	0.14	0.73	1.99
1,1,2,2-Tetrachloroethane	0.10	0.06	0.19	0.11	0.06	bd	bd	0.06	0.06	1.70	3.88
Bromoform	bd	bd	bd	bd	bd	bd	bd	1.07	1.40	13.49	19.45
Carbon Tetrachloride	0.34	0.34	0.54	0.64	0.51	0.32	0.53	3.12	2.11	9.02	14.01
1,2-Dichloropropane	0.67	1.58	1.22	2.51	9.13	0.55	0.94	0.70	0.19	0.78	3.90
Bromodichloromethane	0.06	0.06	0.34	0.05	bd	bd	bd	0.09	0.05	0.63	1.32
1,4-Dioxane	bd	bd	bd	bd	bd	bd	bd	bd	bd	bd	bd

Trichloroethene	0.61	0.43	0.69	0.64	0.19	0.09	0.11	bd	bd	0.07	bd
cis-1,3-Dichloropropene	bd	bd	bd	bd	bd	bd	bd	bd	bd	bd	bd
trans-1,3-Dichloropropene	0.04	0.14	0.06	0.07	0.03	bd	bd	bd	bd	bd	bd
1,1,2-Trichloroethane	bd	0.11	0.06	0.05	0.44	bd	bd	bd	bd	bd	bd
Dibromochloromethane	bd	bd	0.07	bd	0.12	bd	bd	bd	bd	0.46	0.94
1,2-Dibromoethane	bd	bd	bd	bd	bd	bd	bd	bd	bd	bd	bd
Tetrachloroethene	0.33	0.46	0.37	0.61	0.21	bd	0.02	bd	bd	bd	1.34
Chlorobenzene	0.07	0.13	0.23	0.23	0.11	bd	bd	bd	bd	0.14	1.65
Benzyl Chloride	0.11	0.18	0.35	0.17	0.04	0.02	bd	0.03	0.05	2.76	4.47
1,3-Dichlorobenzene	0.73	0.49	0.15	1.97	1.97	0.42	0.10	bd	bd	0.08	0.26
1,4-Dichlorobenzene	1.00	0.63	2.62	2.72	1.23	0.27	0.06	0.01	0.01	1.38	0.66
1,2-Dichlorobenzene	0.10	0.10	0.36	0.05	0.01	bd	bd	0.01	0.01	1.55	2.22
1,2,4-Trichlorobenzene	0.89	bd	1.35	0.01	bd	bd	bd	bd	bd	0.21	0.20
Hexachloro-1,3-butadiene	0.71	bd	0.95	0.06	0.00	bd	bd	0.13	0.26	14.47	40.59
Benzene	3.01	4.88	4.82	9.18	1.54	0.45	0.60	bd	bd	bd	1.35
Toluene	6.54	6.51	9.71	12.26	17.97	1.62	1.95	bd	bd	0.06	2.94
Ethylbenzene	2.61	1.63	4.65	12.71	4.73	0.87	0.64	bd	bd	0.05	0.42
m,p-Xylene	1.89	1.76	3.61	13.75	4.54	0.89	0.45	0.10	0.10	1.15	1.27
Styrene	1.94	1.44	2.75	2.64	0.44	bd	0.08	bd	bd	bd	0.77
o-Xylene	2.52	2.40	4.62	16.14	1.69	0.26	0.08	bd	bd	0.03	0.31
4-Ethyltoluene	0.31	0.51	0.52	0.54	0.33	0.02	0.03	0.01	0.02	0.79	0.50
1,3,5-Trimethylbenzene	0.24	0.29	0.43	0.49	0.13	0.01	0.03	bd	0.01	0.95	0.68
1,2,4-Trimethylbenzene	1.04	1.17	1.62	2.18	0.44	0.06	0.07	bd	bd	0.33	0.36
Naphthalene	17.07	26.74	41.31	31.02	0.74	0.10	0.12	bd	bd	0.04	5.57
Freon-11	1.40	2.29	3.34	2.59	0.66	0.28	0.33	0.21	0.61	0.98	5.78
Freon-12	1.95	0.28	bd	2.21	1.29	0.45	0.44	0.23	0.20	1.55	2.69
Freon-113	0.41	0.62	0.51	0.48	0.43	0.21	0.30	0.17	0.05	0.37	0.50
Freon-114	bd	0.01	bd	bd	bd	bd	bd	bd	bd	bd	bd

683 **Table S3.** Parameters of PMF model.

Compounds	Intercept	Slope	r^2
n-Hexane	0.26	0.79	0.90
n-Heptane	0.20	0.36	0.49
Cyclohexane	0.11	0.32	0.65
Propylene	0.79	0.11	0.55
Chloroethane	0.13	0.18	0.60
Methylene Chloride	4.18	0.38	0.48
1,1-Dichloroethane	1.01	0.66	0.79
1,2-Dichloroethane	1.09	0.12	0.09
Carbon Tetrachloride	-0.08	0.99	0.98
Trichloroethene	0.09	0.41	0.45
Tetrachloroethene	0.06	0.49	0.54
Benzyl Chloride	0.09	0.07	0.70
1,4-Dichlorobenzene	0.00	0.86	0.75
Benzene	0.22	0.77	0.96
Toluene	1.40	0.51	0.52
Ethylbenzene	0.16	0.87	0.98
m,p-Xylene	0.38	0.73	0.97
Styrene	0.06	0.80	0.86
o-Xylene	0.67	0.45	0.79
1,2,4-Trimethylbenzene	0.02	0.94	0.97
Formaldehyde	8.16	0.45	0.62
Acetaldehyde	5.47	0.44	0.30
Glyoxal	0.55	0.55	0.33
Benzaldehyde	0.68	0.41	0.28
Acrolein	0.11	0.76	0.88
Acetone	20.76	0.16	0.09
Methyl ethyl ketone	1.64	0.48	0.34
Methyl Isobutyl Ketone	0.05	0.50	0.87
Methyl butyl ketone	-1.00	1.12	0.88
Freon-11	0.44	0.43	0.63
Freon-113	0.07	0.72	0.82

684 **Table S4.** P values of variance analysis at different day in the same room.

Site / P (α :0.05)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
Without purifier operated	0.84	0.81	0.15	0.57	0.54	0.93	1.00	0.49	0.34	0.005	0.02
With purifier operated	0.66	0.06	0.66	0.77	0.97	0.95	0.37	0.34	0.29	0.10	0.16

685