Particulate Matter and Human Health

A Report on Exposure, Effects, Mitigation, and Monitoring

Prepared August 25th, 2026 by Constantin Bucataru

Introduction

Particulate matter (PM) is a key indicator of air pollution, consisting of a heterogeneous mixture of solid and liquid particles suspended in air that vary continuously in size and chemical composition [1]. The aerodynamic diameter of particles is the primary criterion for classifying them and determining their health impact. The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) regulates particles in two main size categories: PM_{10} (coarse particles with aerodynamic diameter ≤10 μm) and $PM_{2.5}$ (fine particles with aerodynamic diameter ≤2.5 μm). An additional category, ultrafine particles (UFPs or $PM_{0.1}$), with diameters <0.1 μm, is an emerging area of research [1].
The health significance of particle size cannot be overstated: the smaller the particle, the more deeply it penetrates the respiratory tract. Coarse particles ($PM_{10–2.5}$) tend to deposit in the upper airways (trachea and bronchi), where mucociliary clearance can remove them. Fine particles ($PM_{2.5}$) reach the respiratory bronchioles and alveoli where gas exchange occurs. Ultrafine particles can translocate into the bloodstream and reach extrapulmonary organs, including the brain [1,3]. Worldwide, millions of deaths annually are attributed to air pollution, with fine PM being the dominant contributor [1].

This report summarizes the current scientific evidence on how PM of different sizes affects human health across common indoor and outdoor settings, outlines evidence-based mitigation strategies, and highlights the benefits of portable PM monitoring technology.

Health Effects of Particulate Matter by Size

Fine Particulate Matter ($PM_{2.5}$)

$PM_{2.5}$ is consistently identified as the size fraction most strongly associated with adverse health outcomes. A landmark study of 12 million Medicare beneficiaries across 108 U.S. counties found that a 10 μg/m³ increase in $PM_{2.5}$ was associated with a 0.71% increase in same-day cardiovascular hospital admissions and a 0.44% increase in respiratory admissions at a 2-day lag [2]. Long-term exposure to $PM_{2.5}$ is linked to accelerated atherosclerosis, with a 10 μg/m³ increase associated with increased carotid intima-media thickness [3]. $PM_{2.5}$ exposure also reduces heart rate variability, a marker of cardiac autonomic function, and increases the risk of myocardial infarction, stroke, and heart failure [3].

The mechanisms underlying these effects include: (i) induction of pulmonary and systemic inflammation through release of pro-inflammatory cytokines; (ii) oxidative stress via transition metals (e.g., iron, copper) that generate reactive oxygen species through Fenton-type reactions; and (iii) disturbance of autonomic nervous system balance [1,3]. Mortality studies show that each 10 μg/m³ increase in $PM_{2.5}$ is associated with a 1–4% increase in all-cause mortality, with some studies reporting risk ratios as high as 1.26 for all-cause mortality among women [1].

Coarse Particulate Matter ($PM_{10–2.5}$)

Coarse particles, which arise primarily from mechanical processes (windblown dust, agricultural activities, road dust resuspension), deposit preferentially in the upper airways. The health effects of $PM_{10–2.5}$ are less consistently documented than those of $PM_{2.5}$, but evidence suggests they are not benign. Peng et al. [2] estimated a 0.36% increase in cardiovascular disease admissions per 10 μg/m³ increase in $PM_{10–2.5}$, although this association attenuated after adjustment for $PM_{2.5}$ [2]. Urban coarse particles—enriched with anthropogenic constituents such as metals—appear more toxic than rural coarse particles dominated by crustal materials [2]. Studies have linked coarse PM to inflammatory responses and emergency department visits for asthma, particularly in children [1].

Ultrafine Particles ($PM_{0.1}$)

Although UFPs contribute little to PM mass, they dominate particle number concentrations. Due to their minuscule size, UFPs can cross the alveolar-capillary barrier and enter systemic circulation within minutes of inhalation [3]. Animal and human studies have detected radiolabeled UFPs in the bloodstream within one minute of intratracheal instillation [3]. UFPs induce greater inflammatory responses per unit mass than larger particles, attributable to their enormous surface-area-to-mass ratio. Studies have found associations between UFP exposure and myocardial ischemia, impaired vascular function, and increased blood markers of inflammation and coagulation [3].

Exposure Scenarios: Indoor Environments

People spend approximately 90% of their time indoors, making indoor air quality a dominant contributor to total PM exposure [4,5]. Indoor PM originates from both outdoor air infiltration and indoor sources.

Cooking

Cooking is the single largest indoor source of PM in most residences. During the HOMEChem study, conducted in a controlled test house, $PM_{2.5}$ concentrations during cooking exceeded 250 μg/m³—levels comparable to the world's most polluted cities—and average exposures during simulated Thanksgiving activities reached approximately 60 μg/m³ over 12 hours, close to the EPA's 24-hour health-based limit of 35 μg/m³ [5].

Several factors determine cooking-related PM emissions [4]:

Cooking method: Frying generates the highest particle emissions, followed by grilling, while boiling and steaming produce the lowest levels. Gas burners emit substantially more PM than electric stoves, including copious sub-10 nm particles from the combustion flame itself.

Cooking oil: Oils with low smoke temperature (e.g., corn oil at ~166°C, coconut oil at ~156°C) produce far more PM when heated than oils with high smoke temperatures (e.g., soybean, canola, safflower). Olive oil, despite a high smoke temperature, is an exception and produces high PM emissions due to its triolein content.

Other factors: Higher cooking temperature, larger pan surface area, and higher fat content of food all increase PM emission rates. Crucially, sub-10 nm particles from gas stove combustion dominate number concentrations but are too small to contribute appreciably to mass-based regulatory metrics [5].

Post-cooking decay periods contribute 36–77% of total exposure for each meal, as particles linger in indoor air [5]. The respiratory deposition dose for an adult in the kitchen over 12 hours ranged from 7 μg on a day with no activities to 149 μg during Thanksgiving cooking [5].

Other Indoor Sources

Beyond cooking, significant indoor PM sources include:

Incense and candle burning: PM emission rates from individual candles range from 100 to 1700 μg/hr, while incense emits 7 to 202 mg/hr [1].

Cleaning activities: Mopping with bleach can trigger new particle formation (nucleation of <30 nm particles) when residual cooking emissions interact with chlorine chemistry [5].

Smoking: Tobacco smoke produces PM_{10}, $PM_{2.5}$, and PM_1 concentrations approximately 10-fold higher than an idling diesel engine in enclosed spaces [3]. Respirable suspended particle concentrations average 7.7 μg/m³ in smoke-free public places versus 179 μg/m³ in smoking-permitted venues [3].

Building materials and household products: Office equipment (printers, copiers), aerosol sprays, vacuuming (resuspending dust), and even walking across carpets release PM [1].

Personal care: Hair dryers have been shown to produce hazardous $PM_{2.5}$ levels exceeding 2000 μg/m³ in poorly ventilated spaces [11].

Personal, real-time monitors make these otherwise invisible indoor sources visible. By logging PM spikes during cooking, cleaning, candle use, or personal-care routines, individuals can identify which everyday activities drive their exposure and immediately adjust ventilation, source control, or location.

Schools and Workplaces

Children are particularly vulnerable to PM exposure. School indoor PM_{10} concentrations have been reported in the range of 66.7–77.9 μg/m³ in various countries [1]. Occupational settings such as commercial kitchens, construction sites, and dry-cleaning establishments expose workers to severely elevated PM levels [11].

Exposure Scenarios: Outdoor Environments

Wildfires

Landscape fire smoke is a complex mixture dominated by $PM_{2.5}$, along with carbon monoxide, nitrogen oxides, and volatile organic compounds. On smoky days, 24-hour average $PM_{2.5}$ concentrations can be many times the WHO guideline of 25 μg/m³ [7]. Wildfire smoke is associated with increased all-cause mortality, respiratory emergency department visits, hospital admissions for asthma and COPD, cardiovascular mortality, and out-of-hospital cardiac arrests [7]. Smoke can travel hundreds of kilometers, affecting communities far from the fire source, and as global climate change intensifies wildfire seasons, this public health burden is growing [7].

Traffic and Urban Pollution

Traffic emissions are the dominant source of PM in urban environments, originating from combustion engines as well as brake and tire wear [1]. Pedestrians, cyclists, and runners near busy roadways experience $PM_{2.5}$ concentrations 2–10 times higher than those in traffic-free areas [10].

Exercise in Polluted Air

Exercise increases the inhalation rate from ~0.6 m³/hr at rest to ~3.0 m³/hr during moderate physical activity—a 5-fold increase [9]. A systematic review found that exercising in high-traffic environments increases markers of respiratory and systemic inflammation, impairs vascular function, and elevates blood pressure compared to exercising in low-pollution areas [10]. In participants with chronic obstructive pulmonary disease or asthma, exercising near traffic causes significant declines in lung function (FEV_1 and FVC) [10]. However, a risk-benefit analysis demonstrated that for most urban environments, the health benefits of moderate physical activity (2.5 hours/week) outweigh the risks from $PM_{2.5}$ exposure up to concentrations of ~186 μg/m³—a level rarely sustained even in the world's most polluted cities [9]. The calculus shifts for older adults (≥60 years), for whom the optimal exercise duration declines steeply above 45 μg/m³, and for those exercising immediately adjacent to major pollution sources [9].

Sleeping

Sleep represents about one-third of daily life. During sleep, inhalation rates are lowest (~0.3 m³/hr), but the cumulative exposure over 8 hours in a bedroom with elevated PM can be substantial. Indoor PM during nighttime can be elevated due to infiltration of outdoor pollutants, running gas-fueled heating systems (which generate fine particles), and residual particles from daytime cooking activities that have not cleared [8].

Mitigation Strategies

Source Control

The most effective strategy is eliminating or reducing PM generation at the source:

Cooking: Switch from gas to electric stoves; use oils with high smoke temperatures (soybean, canola, safflower); add salt early in cooking (which reduces $PM_{2.5}$ emissions by up to 91% by suppressing triglyceride vaporization); fry in smaller pans; and use back burners with range hoods vented to the outdoors [4].

Smoking: Eliminate indoor smoking entirely.

Cleaning: Use damp mopping rather than dry sweeping to minimize particle resuspension; avoid bleach mopping immediately after cooking to prevent chemical nucleation events [5].

Ventilation and Filtration

Mechanical ventilation with range hoods during and after cooking significantly reduces PM concentrations. However, during wildfire smoke events, the standard advice is to minimize outdoor air exchange to reduce infiltration of outdoor smoke [7].

Portable air cleaners (PACs) with HEPA filters are among the most effective and practical interventions [6–8]:

• HEPA PACs reduce indoor $PM_{2.5}$ by 32–88% depending on device sizing, fan speed, and usage duration [7].

• During wildfire episodes, PACs reduced infiltration efficiency from 61% (control) to 19% (with filtration) [7].

• In homeless shelters, PACs reduced median indoor particle counts by up to 84% compared to outdoor levels [6].

• A modeled analysis of the 2003 Southern California wildfires estimated that PAC use could have reduced smoke-related deaths by 30% and respiratory hospital admissions by 45%, with targeted use among older adults achieving 50% and 78% reductions, respectively [7].

Proper sizing is critical: the Clean Air Delivery Rate (CADR) should match the room volume; the CADR rating for tobacco smoke is most relevant for wildfire smoke applications [7].

Behavioral Modifications

During high-pollution events, the public should: remain indoors with windows and doors sealed; reduce physical activity; use PACs in frequently occupied rooms; and wear N95 respirators when outdoor exposure is unavoidable [7]. Exercising should be shifted to low-traffic areas (parks, trails) or indoor facilities with adequate filtration [9,10].

Sensor-Guided Operation

A critical challenge for PAC effectiveness is user adherence. Studies show that people often operate PACs intermittently based on subjective perception rather than actual PM levels [8]. Sensor-based automated control—where a calibrated PM monitor triggers the PAC when $PM_{2.5}$ exceeds a threshold (e.g., 35 μg/m³)—achieves 47% reductions in indoor $PM_{2.5}$, nearly double the 29% reduction achieved by time-based (prescheduled) operation [8]. Sensor-guided purification also identifies pollution episodes that are invisible to human senses, such as nighttime emissions from gas-fueled heating systems, and prolongs the duration of healthy indoor air (<35 μg/m³) by 23% compared to only 13% for time-based operation [8].

This is where continuous personal monitoring becomes especially powerful: a portable sensor that tracks PM in real time can alert the user (or automatically trigger a connected air cleaner) the moment levels rise - whether from cooking, residual smoke, or outdoor infiltration - without relying on human attention or guesswork.

Benefits of Portable Particulate Matter Monitoring

Low-cost portable PM monitors have emerged as powerful tools for personal exposure assessment and public health empowerment [11]:

Personalized Exposure Data

Traditional air quality monitoring relies on stationary outdoor reference stations that poorly represent personal exposure, especially indoors. Portable monitors reveal that personal exposure varies dramatically across microenvironments throughout the day. In a study of 44 participants carrying GPS-enabled $PM_{2.5}$ monitors, home locations had mean $PM_{2.5}$ of 15 μg/m³ (with peaks exceeding 500 μg/m³ during cooking), “other places” averaged 35 μg/m³ (with bonfires producing 1218 μg/m³), while in-transit exposure was lowest at 3.7 μg/m³ [11].

Awareness and Behavioral Change

Participatory monitoring with portable sensors significantly improves attitudes, perceptions, and behaviors regarding air pollution [11]. After carrying portable monitors, participants reported significantly greater concern about air pollution’s health effects and increased confidence in their ability to control indoor air quality. Behavioral changes included eliminating incense burning, improving cooking ventilation, and reducing use of household products that generate particles. Importantly, awareness of indoor sources increased more than awareness of outdoor sources, highlighting the value of personal monitoring in revealing hidden indoor exposures.

Identification of High-Exposure Microenvironments

Portable monitoring enables individuals to identify specific activities and locations driving their personal exposure—whether it is a workplace near a construction site, a church using incense, or a kitchen where frying generates hazardous PM peaks [11]. This information allows for targeted interventions.

Integration with Smart Home Systems

Modern portable monitors can interface with smart plugs and home automation systems to create closed-loop air quality management. When a sensor detects $PM_{2.5}$ exceeding a health-based threshold, it can automatically activate a PAC, ensuring optimal purification without relying on human attention [8]. This approach is especially valuable for vulnerable populations (elderly, low-income, those with pre-existing conditions) who may have lower adherence to manual operation protocols.

Limitations

Portable sensors, particularly low-cost optical particle counters, have limitations. They require calibration against reference instruments, are sensitive to humidity, and may report zero values at low concentrations [6,8]. Nevertheless, their ability to provide real-time, location-specific data makes them indispensable for personal exposure management.

Conclusions

Particulate matter of all size fractions poses significant risks to human health, with fine ($PM_{2.5}$) and ultrafine particles causing the most severe cardiovascular and respiratory effects. Exposure occurs across all daily environments—at home during cooking and cleaning, at work, at school, during exercise, and even during sleep. Wildfires and traffic represent major outdoor sources, while cooking dominates indoor exposure. The health burden is substantial: even short-term elevations in $PM_{2.5}$ trigger hospital admissions for heart and lung disease, and long-term exposure reduces life expectancy.

However, effective mitigation strategies exist. Source control (choosing electric over gas cooking, selecting high-smoke-point oils, avoiding indoor smoking), ventilation, and HEPA-based portable air cleaners can dramatically reduce indoor PM concentrations. Sensor-guided automated air purification optimizes these benefits by ensuring PACs operate when actually needed. Portable PM monitors empower individuals with personalized data, increasing awareness and driving meaningful behavioral change to reduce exposure.

As wildfires become more frequent and urbanization continues, continuous personal monitoring - especially devices that track particulate matter alongside related factors such as CO_2, temperature, humidity, and pressure - gives individuals the real-time insight needed to protect themselves and their families in both indoor and outdoor environments.

References

[1] K. H. Kim, E. Kabir, and S. Kabir, *"A review on the human health impact of airborne particulate matter"*, Environment International, vol. 74, pp. 136–143, 2015. DOI: 10.1016/j.envint.2014.10.005

[2] R. D. Peng, H. H. Chang, M. L. Bell, et al., *"Coarse Particulate Matter Air Pollution and Hospital Admissions for Cardiovascular and Respiratory Diseases Among Medicare Patients"*, JAMA, vol. 299, no. 18, pp. 2172–2179, 2008. DOI: 10.1001/jama.299.18.2172

[3] G. Polichetti, S. Cocco, A. Spinali, V. Trimarco, and A. Nunziata, *"Effects of particulate matter (PM10, PM2.5 and PM1) on the cardiovascular system"*, Toxicology, vol. 261, no. 1–2, pp. 1–8, 2009. DOI: 10.1016/j.tox.2009.04.035

[4] M. Amouei Torkmahalleh, S. Gorjinezhad, H. S. Unluevcek, and P. K. Hopke, *"Review of factors impacting emission/concentration of cooking generated particulate matter"*, Science of The Total Environment, vol. 586, pp. 1046–1056, 2017. DOI: 10.1016/j.scitotenv.2017.02.088

[5] S. Patel, S. Sankhyan, E. K. Boedicker, et al., *"Indoor Particulate Matter during HOMEChem: Concentrations, Size Distributions, and Exposures"*, Environmental Science & Technology, vol. 54, no. 12, pp. 7107–7116, 2020. DOI: 10.1021/acs.est.0c00740

[6] C. H. Huang, T. Bui, D. Hwang, et al., *"Assessing the effectiveness of portable HEPA air cleaners for reducing particulate matter exposure in King County, Washington homeless shelters"*, Science of The Total Environment, vol. 891, pp. 164402, 2023. DOI: 10.1016/j.scitotenv.2023.164402

[7] P. K. Barn, C. T. Elliott, R. W. Allen, T. Kosatsky, K. Rideout, and S. B. Henderson, *"Portable air cleaners should be at the forefront of the public health response to landscape fire smoke"*, Environmental Health, vol. 15, 2016. DOI: 10.1186/s12940-016-0198-9

[8] M. Wang, T. Lu, and Y. Li, *"Optimizing air purification for household particulate matters using sensor-based and time-based intervention strategies"*, Particuology, vol. 79, pp. 78–84, 2023. DOI: 10.1016/j.partic.2022.11.008

[9] R. An, H. Kang, L. Cao, and X. Xiang, *"Engagement in outdoor physical activity under ambient fine particulate matter pollution: A risk-benefit analysis"*, Journal of Sport and Health Science, vol. 11, no. 4, pp. 537–544, 2022. DOI: 10.1016/j.jshs.2020.09.008

[10] J. Madureira, E. A. Brancher, C. Costa, R. Aurino de Pinho, and J. P. Teixeira, *"Cardio-respiratory health effects of exposure to traffic-related air pollutants while exercising outdoors: A systematic review"*, Environmental Research, vol. 178, pp. 108647, 2019. DOI: 10.1016/j.envres.2019.108647

[11] Y. M. Park, D. Chavez, S. Sousan, N. Figueroa-Bernal, J. R. Alvarez, and J. Rocha-Peralta, *"Personal exposure monitoring using GPS-enabled portable air pollution sensors: A strategy to promote citizen awareness and behavioral changes regarding indoor and outdoor air pollution"*, Journal of Exposure Science & Environmental Epidemiology, vol. 33, no. 3, pp. 347–357, 2022. DOI: 10.1038/s41370-022-00515-9