

Atmospheric Environment 38 (2004) 941-951



www.elsevier.com/locate/atmosenv

Characteristics of emissions of air pollutants from burning of incense in a large environmental chamber

Shun-Cheng Lee*, Bei Wang

Department of Civil and Structural Engineering, Research Centre for Urban, Environmental Technology and Management, The Hong Kong Polytechnic University, Kowloon, Hong Kong

Received 9 June 2003; received in revised form 26 October 2003; accepted 12 November 2003

Abstract

The objective of this study was to characterize the emissions of air pollutants from incense burning in a large environmental test chamber. Air pollutants emitted from ten types of commonly used incense manufactured in different regions were compared. The target pollutants included particulate matters (PM₁₀, PM_{2.5}), volatile organic compounds (VOCs), carbonyls, carbon monoxide (CO), carbon dioxide (CO₂), nitrogen oxides (NO_x), methane (CH₄) and nonmethane hydrocarbon (NMHC). The particulate matters emitted from all the incense significantly exceeded the Recommended Indoor Air Quality Objectives for Office Buildings and Public Places in Hong Kong (HKIAQO). The CO peak levels of seven incense types greatly exceeded the HKIAQO standard. The formaldehyde concentrations of six types of incense were higher than the HKIAQO. The highest formaldehyde level exceeded the standard by 2 times. The results indicated that the concentrations of benzene, toluene, methyl chloride and methylene chloride significantly increased with the burning of all incense tested. In addition, the benzene concentrations of all tested incense were significantly higher than the HKIAQO standard. Although Incense 2 and 6 were claimed to be environmental friendly, the quantity of the pollutants emitted was not observed to be lower than the others. It was observed that when comparing the gas pollutant emission factors between two major incense categories (i.e. traditional and aromatic), the traditional incense (i.e. Incense 1-6) had relatively higher values than aromatic incense (i.e. Incense 7-9). Generally, it was found that the VOCs emitted sequence was aromatic incense > tradition incense > church incense (i.e. Incense 10). However, the carbonyl compounds emission sequence was traditional incense > aromatic incense > church incense. The results show that incense burning is one of the important indoor air pollution sources for PM, CO and VOCs. © 2003 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

Keywords: Burning of incense; Environmental Chamber; Emission rate; Emission factor; VOCs

1. Introduction

Incense has been used for centuries for ceremonial purposes as well as to fragrance the environment. It is a traditional and common practice in many families in Hong Kong. With the rising environmental and health awareness, people are paying more attention to the problems caused by incense burning in the indoor and public environments. A wide variety of substances used to produce incense include resins (such as frankincense and myrrh), spices, aromatic wood and bark, herbs, seeds, roots, flowers, essential oils and synthetic substitute chemicals which are used in the perfume industry (Jetter et al., 2002). Incense was discovered to be a significant source of polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs), carbon monoxide, benzene, isoprene and particulate matters (Koo et al., 1992; Li and Ro, 2000; Fan and Zhang, 2001). Roveri et al. (1998) found that some types of Chinese incense contained nitromusks that could cause allergic contact dermatitis and photosensitization. Per a study of particles and carbon monoxide (CO) associated

^{*}Corresponding author. Tel.: +852-2766-6011; fax: +852-2334-6389.

E-mail address: ceslee@polyu.edu.hk (S.-C. Lee).

^{1352-2310/\$ -} see front matter © 2003 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved. doi:10.1016/j.atmosenv.2003.11.002

with burning incense and cigarette, incense generated greater particulate mass, a larger count median particle diameter than burning of cigarette did (Nguyen et al., 1995). Tung et al. (1999) has identified that PM_{10} concentrations in homes with smoking or incense burning were 23% higher than those without such indoor air polluting activities.

Previous studies mainly focused on field investigations and tried to quantify a few air pollutants (e.g. CO, PM). The emission factors of air pollutants from incense burning were not well characterized. In addition, there is a lack of information on comparison of types and quantity of air pollutants emitted from different kinds of incense. Therefore, this study aimed to characterize and compare the emissions of air pollutants before, during and after incense burning in a large environmental chamber. In this study, the emission factors for PM_{2.5}, PM₁₀, CO₂, CO, NO_x, CH₄ and NMHC (in mgg⁻¹ incense burned), VOCs and carbonyl compounds concentrations were measured for ten different types of incense.

2. Materials and methods

2.1. Incense tested

Ten types of incense, which are commonly used in Hong Kong, were tested in this study. Selected incense types were manufactured in different countries (including China, Hong Kong, Singapore, Macau, India, Thailand, South Africa and Italy) and have various appearances (form, length, diameter and color) and scents. Most of the incense is in stick form which is manufactured with compounds attached to a wooden or bamboo stick. The general characteristics of these incenses are listed in Table 1.

| Table 1 | | | |
|---------|-------------|----|---------|
| General | information | of | incense |

Incense 1–6 were traditional incense used to worship deities. In a regular HK family, three incense sticks would be burned once per day on first or 15th day of Chinese lunar and one incense stick would be burned once per day on non-first or non-15th day of Chinese lunar. Three traditional incense sticks were burned simultaneously during each experiment. Among these, Incense 2 and 6 were claimed to be environmental-friendly incense, which was expected to cause less air pollution problems. While, Incense 7–9 were aromatic incenses which were claimed to have aromatherapy use. The common practice was burning one stick each time. On this ground, one stick each of Incense 7–9 was burned in each set of experiment. Incense 10 was church incense burned in a charcoal thurible.

2.2. Chamber experiments

The controlled experiments were conducted in a 18.26 m³ stainless steel environmental test chamber maintained at a temperature of $23 \pm 0.5^{\circ}$ C and a relative humidity (RH) of $50\pm5\%$. A TSI portable Q-Trak (model 8550, TSI Inc.) was put in the chamber to ensure that the temperature and RH were within the required margin. The air exchange rate was maintained at $0.5 \,\mathrm{h}^{-1}$ to simulate the typical natural ventilation conditions. Fig. 1 shows the schematic diagram of the experimental set-up. The chamber was purged by blower air, which was passed through a clean air system with activated charcoal particle filters and High-Efficiency Particulate Air (HEPA) filters. Mixing fans were installed at the ceiling of the chamber to ensure adequate air mixing. Temperature control was achieved by placing the test chambers in incubator cabinets. The temperature of inlet air was controlled by using conditioning coils. RH is controlled by adding deionized water to the air system. Humidification was accomplished by bubbling a portion

| ID No. | Country of origin | Category | Form | Length of combustible part (cm) | Diameter of combustible part (mm) | Scent | Color | Avg. burn time (min) |
|--|---|---|--|---------------------------------------|---|--|--|----------------------------|
| Inc 1 | China | Traditional | Stick | 16.8 | 1.5 | Not listed | Dark yellow | 26 |
| Inc 2 | Hong Kong | Traditional | Stick | 17.2 | 2.1 | Not listed | Yellow | 25 |
| Inc 3 | Singapore | Traditional | Stick | 27.7 | 3.6 | Not listed | Red | 51 |
| Inc 4 | Hong Kong | Traditional | Stick | 22.5 | 2.9 | Sandalwood | Yellow | 35 |
| Inc 5 | Macau | Traditional | Stick | 24 | 2 | Not listed | Pale yellow | 37 |
| Inc 6 | Macau | Traditional | Stick | 21.3 | 1.9 | Sandalwood | Pale vellow | 27 |
| Inc 7 | India | Aromatic | Stick | 17.3 | 3.2 | Sanskrit | Brown | 39 |
| Inc 8 | Thailand | Aromatic | Stick | 19.2 | 3.9 | Lavender | Purple | 31 |
| Inc 9 | South Africa | Aromatic | Bar | 10.9 | 4.8 | Rosemarv | Rose | 50 |
| Inc 10 | Italy | Church incense | Rock | n/a | n/a | Musk | Colorful | 50 |
| Inc 6 Inc 7 Inc 8 Inc 9 Inc 10 | Macau India Thailand South Africa Italy | Traditional Aromatic Aromatic Aromatic Church incense | Stick Stick Stick Bar Rock | 21.3 17.3 19.2 10.9 n/a | 1.9 3.2 3.9 4.8 n/a | Sandalwood Sanskrit Lavender Rosemary Musk | Pale yellow Brown Purple Rose Colorful | 27 39 31 50 50 |

Note: n/a: The form of Incense 10 is rock. Thus, the length and diameter of combustible part is not applicable.



Fig. 1. Schematic diagram of the experimental set-up.

of the air stream through deionized water at a controlled temperature. Air samples were drawn from the chamber via nonabsorbent tubing into a pre-evacuating canister to determine VOCs. An aldehyde pump located outside the chamber was used to draw chamber air through sampling cartridges to determine the concentrations of carbonyl compounds. A Teflon tubing connected the chamber with a CO analyzer, a NO–NO₂–NO_x analyzer and a CH₄–NMHC analyzer.

Prior to the incense burning, the chamber was conditioned for about 4h at standard test temperature, air exchange rate and RH. The background air samples were collected from the chamber to assess the background air quality. The background levels met the requirements of 'Large Chamber Test Protocol for Measuring Emissions of VOCs and Aldehydes' (US EPA, 1999).

2.3. Sampling methods and analysis

 $PM_{2.5}$, PM_{10} , CO_2 , CO, NO_x , CH_4 , NMHC, carbonyls and VOCs concentrations were measured for the ten incenses. Two Dust-Trak air monitors (model 8520, TSI Inc., MN, USA) were used to measure PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$ concentrations simultaneously in the chamber. A TSI portable Q-Trak (Model 8550, TSI Inc.) was used to monitor CO_2 concentrations. GFC Ambient CO Analyzer (Model 48, Thermo Environmental Instruments Inc.), Chemiluminescence $NO-NO_2-NO_x$ Analyzer (Model 42C, Thermo Environmental Instruments Inc.) and Direct Methane, Non-Methane Hydrocarbon Analyzer (Model 55C, Thermal Environmental Instruments Inc.) were used to quantify CO, NO_x , CH_4 and NMHC concentrations, respectively. A five-point calibration and a zero check were performed daily for each instrument with standard gas at known concentrations.

For VOCs, grab samples were obtained before and after burning (0.5 h after the incense has extinguished). The samples during burning were time-integrated samples, drawn at a flow rate of $38.08-79.57 \,\mathrm{ml\,min^{-1}}$ (depending on the burning time of the incense) using mass flow controllers (model FC4101CV-G, Autoflow Inc., CA). After sampling, the samples were analyzed within 3 h. Prior to sampling, sequential evacuating and pressurizing with humidified zero air was used to clean the canisters. 10% blank sample canisters filled with standard gas containing target organic compounds of known concentrations were conducted during sample collection and storage with other sampling canisters for GC/MS analysis. Prior to the experiments, background air samples were collected to ensure the background levels do not exceed $10 \,\mu g \,m^{-3}$ of TVOC and $2 \,\mu g \,m^{-3}$ of many individual VOC. Detailed description of the analysis can be found in Lee et al. (2002). A total of 38 VOCs species were identified by the GC/MSD system and 11 species were selected in this study.

Carbonyls were collected by drawing the chamber air through a silica gel cartridge impregnated with acidified 2,4-dinitrophenylhydrazine (Waters Sep-Pak DNPHsilica). An ozone scrubber was connected before the

| Table 2 | | | | | | |
|-----------|--------|-----|--------|--------|----------|---------|
| Detection | ranges | and | limits | of the | sampling | methods |

| Detectable mechanism | Range | Minimum detection limit |
|--|---|--|
| Non-dispersive infra-red (NDIR) | 0–5000 ppm | l ppm |
| Non-dispersive infra-red (NDIR) | 0–50 ppm | 0.1 ppm |
| Chemiluminescence based analyzer | 0–1000 ppb | 0.40 ppb |
| Flame ionization detection | 0–200 ppm (non-methane hydrocarbon) | 0.02 ppm methane 0.05 ppm NMHC as propane |
| Gas chromatography mass specific detector (GCMSD) TO-14 method | $0-5000 \mu g/m^3$ | 0.20 ppb |
| High performance liquid chromatography (HPLC) TO-11 method | $05000\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ | 0.20 ppb |
| | Detectable mechanism Non-dispersive infra-red (NDIR) Non-dispersive infra-red (NDIR) Chemiluminescence based analyzer Flame ionization detection Gas chromatography mass specific detector (GCMSD) TO-14 method High performance liquid chromatography (HPLC) TO-11 method | Detectable mechanismRangeNon-dispersive infra-red (NDIR)0-5000 ppmNon-dispersive infra-red (NDIR)0-50 ppmChemiluminescence based analyzer0-1000 ppbFlame ionization detection bydrocarbon)0-200 ppm (non-methane hydrocarbon)Gas chromatography mass specific detector (GCMSD) TO-14 method High performance liquid chromatography (HPLC) TO-11 method0-5000 μg/m³ |

DNPH-silica cartridge in order to prevent interference from ozone. A flow rate of approximately 900 ml/min was used and the sampling period before incense burning was 1h and after incense burning was 0.5h. The sampling period during burning depended on the burning time of each incense. Flow rate measurements were made at the start and end of each sample collection period using a soap-bubble flow meter (Gilian Gilibrator 2, Enviro-Equipment, Inc., N.C.). The cartridges were then measured using reverse-phase high-performance liquid chromatography (HPLC) to determine the concentrations of the carbonyl compound. Three blank cartridges were analyzed from each batch of 50 cartridges to assess the cartridge background. Background air samples were collected to ensure background formaldehyde levels do not exceed $2 \mu g m^{-3}$. A total of 8 carbonyl compounds were identified in this study, with a detection limit of 0.2 ppbv. All analysis procedures were performed according to the US EPA method TO-11 (USEPA, 1998a, b).

The incense tested was weighed using a micro-balance with an accuracy of 0.01 mg. The ranges and limits of the detection of analytical methods are summarized in Table 2. Duplicated samples were collected for all incense types in order to ensure the consistency and accuracy of sampling data (Table 3).

2.4. Modelling of emissions

The emission rates and emission factors for the ten incense types were determined by using a singlecompartment mass balance model (Fan and Zhang, 2001). The concentration of the pollutant in the chamber could be described with the following equations:

$$C = P(1 - e^{-\kappa t})/Vk \text{ (when } 0 \le t \le T),$$
(1)

$$C = C_{\max}(e^{-k(t-T)}) \text{ (when } t > T), \qquad (2)$$

Table 3

Recommended indoor air quality objectives for office buildings and public places in HK

| Parameter | Unit | 8-h average | | | | |
|--|----------------|----------------------|----------------------|--|--|--|
| | | Level 1 ^a | Level 2 ^b | | | |
| Carbon dioxide (CO ₂) | ppm | <800 | <1000 | | | |
| Carbon monoxide (CO) | ppm | <1.750 | < 8.750 | | | |
| Nitrogen dioxide (NO ₂) | ppm | < 0.021 | < 0.08 | | | |
| Respirable suspended particulates (RSP) | mgm^{-3} | < 0.02 | < 0.18 | | | |
| Formaldehyde (HCHO) | μgm^{-3} | < 30 | <100 | | | |
| | | Levels 1 and 2 | | | | |
| Benzene | $\mu g m^{-3}$ | <16.1 | | | | |
| Toluene | $\mu g m^{-3}$ | <1092 | | | | |
| Ethylbenzene | $\mu g m^{-3}$ | <1447 | | | | |
| Xylene | $\mu g m^{-3}$ | <1447 | | | | |
| Chloroform | $\mu g m^{-3}$ | <163 | | | | |

^aLevel 1—represents very good indoor air quality that a high-class and comfortable building should have.

^bLevel 2—represents indoor air quality that provides protection to the public at large including the very young and the aged.

where *C* is the pollutant concentration (mg m^{-3}) in the chamber, *P* is the emission rate (mg h^{-1}) , *V* is the volume of the chamber (m^3) , C_{max} is the maximum pollutant concentration (mg m^{-3}) in the chamber, i.e., the concentration at the time when the incense was extinguished, *k* is the pollutant removal rate (h^{-1}) , *t* is time (h): t = 0 when the incense was ignited; t = T when the incense was extinguished. The value of *k* is the regression slope of the plot of $\ln(C)$ versus *t*, derived from Eq. (2). The value of P/Vk is the regression slope of the plot of *C* versus $(1 - e^{-kt})$. Then, *P* can be

obtained because V is known. Background concentrations of all the measured pollutants were subtracted in determination of k and P/Vk using the above equations. The burning rate B (gh⁻¹) was obtained from the amount (g) of incense burnt and the duration (h) of burning, the emission factor E_f (mg g⁻¹) was calculated

$$E_{\rm f} = P/B. \tag{3}$$

3. Results and discussion

using the following equation:

3.1. Emission rates and emission factors

Emission rates (in milligrams per hour) and emission factors (in milligrams per gram of incense) for $PM_{2.5}$, PM_{10} , CO_2 , CO, NO, NO_2 , NO_x , CH_4 and NMHC emitted from the burning of ten types of incense are summarized in Table 4. The squared correlation coefficient (R^2), a measure of the degree to which the mass balance model fitted the real-time measured target air pollutants concentrations, ranged from 0.8188 to 0.9994.

It can be seen that Incense 10, the church incense, had the highest emission factors for CO_2 and CO (i.e. 1070.9 and 227.7 mg g⁻¹ incense, respectively). The main reason was that the church incense was burnt with the charcoal thurible, which would emit significant amount of CO

Table 4 Emission rates (a) and emission factors (b) of incense

and CO₂. Incense 9, the incense bar from South Africa had the lowest emission factors for CO and NMHC. Incense 8 had the lowest NO and NO_x emission factors. In general, it was discovered that the traditional incense types (i.e. Incense 1–6) had relatively higher emission factors than the aromatic incense types (i.e. Incense 7-9)

The emission factors (in mg g⁻¹ incense) for CO₂, CO, NO, NO₂, NO_x, CH₄, NMHC, PM_{2.5}, and PM₁₀ ranged between 1.4–1070.9, 1.0–227.7, 0.3–2.6, 0.1–0.7, 0.4–3.3, 0.4–9.6, 0.1–19.1, 7.7–205.4, and 8.5–241.2, respectively. The NO_x emission factor of Incense 6 was almost eight times of that of Incense 8 and the CH₄ emission factor of Incense 5 was 24 times of that of Incense 10. The results implied that the amount of air pollutants emitted from different types of incense varied considerably.

Ranges of target air pollutants concentrations measured in the environmental test chamber are listed in Table 5. The lower values are the background concentrations at the beginning of the experiments. It is noted that CH₄ and NMHC concentrations do not increase significantly due to incense combustion except Incense 3. Most of the peak concentrations of all pollutants were observed during or immediately after extinguishing the incense, which well fitted the mass balance model used. The 8-h average PM₁₀, CO₂, CO and NO₂ levels (i.e., 0.18 mg m^{-3} , 1000 ppm, 8.75 ppm and 79 ppb, respectively) are specified by *Recommended Indoor Air Quality*

| - | Inc 1 | Inc 2 | Inc 3 | Inc 4 | Inc 5 | Inc 6 | Inc 7 | Inc 8 | Inc 9 | Inc 10 |
|-------------------|--------------|-------------------------|--------|--------|-------|--------|-------|-------|-------|--------|
| (a)Emission | n rate (mg h | ⁻¹) | | | | | | | | |
| PM _{2.5} | 227.6 | 205.2 | 300.9 | 242.6 | 372.6 | 28.4 | 9.8 | 85.4 | 23.4 | 2160.3 |
| PM_{10} | 243.3 | 210.1 | 341.8 | 275.1 | 389.4 | 31.9 | 10.8 | 92.5 | 28.1 | 2536.6 |
| CO_2 | 99.7 | 4.7 | 4305.0 | 1092.1 | 819.4 | 2251.7 | 52.5 | 516.1 | 176.0 | 7994.8 |
| CO | 401.3 | 608.1 | 794.7 | 461.3 | 617.2 | 642.9 | 140.2 | 150.7 | 1.9 | 653.0 |
| NO | 2.2 | 4.3 | 7.7 | 3.8 | 1.5 | 7.8 | 1.9 | 0.5 | 1.0 | 3.7 |
| NO ₂ | 0.3 | 0.3 | 1.1 | 0.6 | 0.2 | 1.6 | 0.9 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.5 |
| Nox | 2.9 | 4.6 | 8.8 | 4.4 | 1.9 | 9.8 | 2.6 | 0.6 | 1.0 | 4.3 |
| CH_4 | 16.7 | 23.8 | 51.5 | 8.3 | 34.4 | 28.3 | 1.8 | 4.7 | 12.1 | 1.2 |
| NMHC ^a | 29.0 | 28.1 | 56.0 | 21.9 | 48.4 | 24.0 | 24.3 | 12.3 | 0.1 | 24.1 |
| (b)Emission | n factor (mg | g ⁻¹ incense |) | | | | | | | |
| PM _{2.5} | 99.7 | 62.4 | 41.5 | 71.8 | 104.0 | 9.6 | 7.7 | 11.8 | 12.6 | 205.4 |
| PM_{10} | 106.5 | 63.8 | 47.1 | 81.4 | 108.7 | 10.8 | 8.5 | 12.8 | 15.1 | 241.2 |
| CO_2 | 43.7 | 1.4 | 593.7 | 323.3 | 228.7 | 759.8 | 41.1 | 364.4 | 94.6 | 1070.9 |
| CO | 175.7 | 184.9 | 109.6 | 136.6 | 172.2 | 217.0 | 110.0 | 106.4 | 1.0 | 227.7 |
| NO | 1.0 | 1.3 | 1.1 | 1.1 | 0.43 | 2.6 | 1.5 | 0.3 | 0.6 | 1.3 |
| NO ₂ | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.14 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.5 | 0.7 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.2 |
| No _x | 1.3 | 1.4 | 1.2 | 1.3 | 0.5 | 3.3 | 2.1 | 0.4 | 0.5 | 1.5 |
| CH_4 | 7.3 | 7.2 | 7.1 | 2.5 | 9.6 | 9.6 | 1.5 | 3.3 | 6.5 | 0.4 |
| NMHC ^a | 12.7 | 8.5 | 7.7 | 6.5 | 13.5 | 8.1 | 19.1 | 8.7 | 0.1 | 8.9 |

Note: All values were averaged for duplicated experiments.

^aNMHC was converted by C₃H₈.

Table 5 Ranges of pollutants concentrations during incense burning

| Incense | CO ₂ | CO | NO (mph) | NO ₂ | NO_x | CH ₄ | NMHC | $PM_{2.5}$ | PM_{10} |
|---------|-----------------|-------------|-------------|-----------------|------------|-----------------|-------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| ID | (ppm) | (ppm) | (ppb) | (ррв) | (ppb) | (ppm) | (ppm) | (mg m ⁻¹) | (mg m ⁻¹) |
| Inc 1 | 566-572 | 0.96-10.42 | 5.8-77.5 | 4.1-20.4 | 9.9-92.0 | 1.16-1.96 | 0.04-0.44 | 0.015-6.16 | 0.018-6.872 |
| Inc 2 | 562-573 | 0.96-17.34 | 5.1-120.1 | 5.1-42.2 | 10.2-140.9 | 1.19-2.59 | 0.04 - 0.64 | 0.032-5.092 | 0.058-5.586 |
| Inc 3 | 562-730 | 0.87-38.77 | 6.4-379.8 | 4.6-48.2 | 10.0-427.2 | 1.17-4.57 | 0.04-1.64 | 0.012-18.264 | 0.016-20.877 |
| Inc 4 | 557-598 | 0.87-16.47 | 6.2-133.9 | 4.8-39.8 | 11.0-148.8 | 1.11 - 1.51 | 0.04 - 0.64 | 0.008-8.370 | 0.01-9.55 |
| Inc 5 | 554-594 | 1.01-20.83 | 6.1-73.6 | 4.3-23.3 | 10.4-88.8 | 1.19-2.99 | 0.04 - 1.24 | 0.018-13.805 | 0.20-15.241 |
| Inc 6 | 550-588 | 0.86-16.57 | 6.3-187.5 | 4.3-37.9 | 10.6-223.5 | 1.19-2.49 | 0.04-0.64 | 0.041-1.034 | 0.053-1.219 |
| Inc 7 | 568-809 | 0.96-7.65 | 6.2–94.0 | 4.1-25.2 | 10.3-116.4 | 1.16-1.56 | 0.04 - 0.64 | 0.032-0.721 | 0.045-0.788 |
| Inc 8 | 566-867 | 0.97-5.37 | 6.4-22.3 | 4.2-8.9 | 10.6-30.4 | 1.16-1.36 | 0.04 - 0.44 | 0.023-2.411 | 0.027-2.827 |
| Inc 9 | 570-850 | 0.98 - 1.08 | 5.6-58.9 | 4.8-15.3 | 10.4-74.2 | 1.17-2.37 | 0.04 - 0.64 | 0.028-2.178 | 0.035-2.67 |
| Inc 10 | 568–938 | 0.98-37.78 | 6.2–171.5 | 5.2-20.1 | 11.4–191.4 | 1.17-2.37 | 0.04-0.64 | 0.018-38.351 | 0.024-46.285 |

Objectives for Office Buildings and Public Places in Hong Kong (HKIAQO, HKEPD, 1999). The CO₂ and NO₂ peak concentrations from all the tested incense types satisfy the criteria (1000 ppm, 79 ppb) set by HKIAQO. However, the CO peak levels of seven incense types significantly exceeded the HKIAQO standard. Especially for Incense 3 and 10, the CO peak level exceeded 3 times more than the HKIAQO criteria, and exceeded the US EPA's National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAOS, US EPA, 2000) for 1-h CO of 35 ppm. Although Incense 2 and 6 were claimed to be environmental-friendly, the quantity of the pollutants emitted was not observed to be lower than the others. Both the CO concentrations of incense 2 and 6 exceeded the HKIAQO. Nevertheless, the NO and NO_x emission factors of incense 6 were the highest among all. It is notable that the particulate matters from all the incense significantly exceeded the requirement.

3.2. Carbonyl compounds

Fig. 2 presents the concentrations of eight carbonyl compounds measured for the ten types of incense during and after incense combustion. The burning concentration levels of formaldehyde, butyraldehyde and valeraldehyde were observed to be higher than after-burning levels. However, the levels of acetaldehyde, acetone, propionaldehyde and methacrolein reach the peaks after the incense was extinguished. The 8-h average formaldehyde concentration recommended by HKIAQO is $100 \,\mu g \, m^{-3}$. The result shows that the formaldehyde concentrations of six types of incense were higher than the HKIAQO. Nevertheless, the formaldehyde concentrations of Incense 3 both during and after burning were substantially higher than the standard value; the burning level exceeded the standard by 2 times. Ho and Yu (2002) found that the formaldehyde levels in both the temple yard and the home surpassed the WHO guideline. This implies that the indoor incense-burning environment adversely affects human health.

The carbonyl compounds concentrations emitted by the incense were normalized by the incense mass. The normalized carbonyl compounds concentrations are shown in Fig. 3. The figures of two incense categories (i.e. traditional and aromatic) do not differ significantly for formaldehyde, acetaldehyde, acetone and methacrolein. However, aromatic incense types generally have lower acrolein, butyraldehyde and propionaldehyde concentrations than traditional ones.

3.3. VOCs

Table 6 shows the temporal changes of VOCs concentrations during and after burning of ten types of incense and the concentrations normalized by the incense mass. It was found that benzene, toluene, methyl chloride and methylene chloride concentrations increased significantly during burning of the ten incense types. In addition, the average concentrations of other individual VOCs, such as ethylbenzene, m,p-xylene, styrene and o-xylene were also observed to increase with incense combustion. From Table 6b, it was found that the temporal variations of some VOCs concentrations showed different patterns for traditional and aromatic incense. For example, the majority of methylene chloride concentrations increased after incense burning for traditional incense. However, methylene chloride concentrations from all three aromatic incense decreased after burning of incense. In general, aromatic incense and the church incense would emit more VOCs species than traditional incense. The concentrations for some VOCs were even higher after burning than during burning, which implies that human exposure periods may be long. It was inspected that when some incense was ignited, it would emit black smoke. The black smoke may include a large amount of some VOCs so that the concentrations after burning were higher than during burning.

The benzene and toluene levels recommended by the HKIAQO are 16.1 and $1092 \,\mu g \, m^{-3}$, respectively. From

600

500

300

200

100

300

250

200

150

100 50

0

Inc 1

Inc 2 Inc 3

Conc. (ug m-3)

0

Inc 1

Inc 2 Inc 3

Inc 4 Inc 5 Inc 6

Conc. (ug m⁻³) 400

















Butyraldehyde

70

60

50

40

30

20

10

0

Conc. (ug m⁻³)

Methacrolein

Inc 4 Inc 5 Inc 6 Inc 7



Valeraldehyde



Fig. 2. Carbonyl compounds concentrations of incense burning.

Table 6a, it can be seen that the benzene concentrations of all tested incense are significantly higher than the standard. Meanwhile, all of the toluene levels do not exceed the standard. Löfroth et al. (1991) found

 $Inc\ 1 \quad Inc\ 2 \quad Inc\ 3 \quad Inc\ 4 \quad Inc\ 5 \quad Inc\ 6$

that emissions could increase the indoor benzene concentrations above urban air background levels of $2-20 \,\mu g \, m^{-3}$, which coincides with the findings of this study.

Burning

After burning

Inc 10

Inc 9 Inc 10

Inc 8 Inc 9

Inc 8

In

Acrolein









Propionaldehyde







Valeraldehyde



Butyraldehyde

















Burning

After burning

3.4. Comparisons of different types of incense

900

800 700

600 500

400 300

200

100

0

Emission (ug g⁻¹ incense)

The comparisons of different types of incense were shown in Table 7. For gas pollutants, emission factors

Inc1 Inc2 Inc3 Inc4 Inc5 Inc6 Inc7 Inc8 Inc9 Inc10

were compared. In general, the traditional incense would emit more gas pollutants than the aromatic incense except for NO₂. However, the church incense had the highest emission factors for CO₂ and CO due to the

949

Table 6 Temporal changes of (a) VOCs concentrations and (b) normalized VOCs concentrations for ten types of incense

| | Inc 1 | | Inc 1 Inc 2 | | Inc 3 | | Inc 4 In | | Inc | Inc 5 I | | Inc 6 | | , | Inc 8 | | Inc 9 | | Inc 10 | |
|--------------------------------|-------|------|-------------|------|-------|-------|----------|------|------|---------|------|-------|------|------|-------|------|-------|------|--------|-------|
| | i | ii | i | ii | i | ii | i | ii | i | ii | i | ii | i | ii | i | ii | i | ii | i | ii |
| (a) VOCs ($\mu g m^{-3}$) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Methyl chloride | 4.4 | 8.0 | 33.2 | 59.4 | 22.7 | 38.7 | 16.8 | 29.6 | 52.5 | 91.1 | n.d. | n.d. | 6.3 | 7.1 | 11.6 | 17.7 | 12.1 | 18.2 | n.d. | n.d. |
| Methylene chloride | 2.7 | 3.1 | 37.0 | 74.8 | 34.6 | 45.6 | 28.9 | 28.7 | 53.1 | 64.7 | 14.6 | 20.1 | 2.3 | 1.5 | 2.7 | 1.8 | 33.7 | 29.4 | 103.0 | 162.0 |
| cis-1,2-dichloroethene | 1.1 | 3.4 | n.d. | n.d. | n.d. | n.d. | n.d. | n.d. | n.d. | n.d. | 7.9 | 9.5 | n.d. | n.d. | 1.4 | 3.4 | 15.8 | 27.5 | 0.8 | 3.6 |
| Chloroform | n.d. | n.d. | n.d. | n.d. | 7.5 | 9.4 | n.d. | n.d. | 42.1 | 61.6 | 7.1 | 9.5 | n.d. | n.d. | 1.4 | 1.7 | 3.6 | 9.2 | 3.1 | 6.3 |
| 1,2-dichloroethane | 1.61 | 2.97 | n.d. | n.d. | 15.4 | 21.1 | n.d. | n.d. | 16.1 | 21.8 | 5.8 | n.d. | 6.0 | 9.9 | 1.0 | 1.7 | 5.2 | 11.9 | 14.5 | 32.7 |
| Benzene | 22.8 | 46.7 | 20.2 | 41.5 | 86.4 | 117.0 | 17.8 | 41.2 | 22.7 | 39.4 | 65.4 | 79.6 | 96.0 | 112 | 41.4 | 69.6 | 35.1 | 58.2 | 34.1 | 64.2 |
| Toluene | 29.4 | 17.1 | 10.3 | 11.1 | 87.7 | 98.5 | 11.0 | 17.5 | 4.8 | 43.2 | 48.3 | 51.6 | 17.0 | 20.1 | 9.8 | 13.8 | 31.3 | 48.8 | 44.6 | 80.4 |
| Ethylbenzene | 111.0 | 0.9 | n.d. | n.d. | 54.8 | 0.8 | 35.7 | 2.2 | 5.1 | 0.9 | 4.1 | 3.7 | 0.6 | 0.9 | 0.9 | 0.4 | 1.3 | 2.38 | 10.4 | 21.2 |
| <i>m,p</i> -xylene | 0.7 | 0.7 | n.d. | n.d. | 3.0 | 1.1 | 3.8 | 2.0 | 1.4 | 0.5 | 2.3 | 2.6 | 0.7 | 0.9 | 0.6 | 0.5 | 1.1 | 1.9 | 10.5 | 20.9 |
| Styrene | 1.7 | 2.9 | n.d. | n.d. | 6.3 | 8.2 | 1.3 | 3.0 | 1.7 | 8.2 | 5.2 | 6.2 | 2.9 | 4.1 | n.d. | n.d. | 2.3 | 5.0 | 7.1 | 13.2 |
| o-xylene | 95.6 | 0.4 | n.d. | n.d. | 44.0 | 0.4 | n.d. | n.d. | n.d. | n.d. | 1.1 | 0.9 | 3.3 | 1.2 | 0.7 | 0.2 | n.d. | n.d. | 2.4 | 4.6 |
| (b)VOCs ($\mu g g^{-1}$ incer | nse) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Methyl chloride | 81 | 147 | 442 | 792 | 69 | 117 | 165 | 291 | 434 | 754 | n.d. | n.d. | 82 | 92 | 299 | 458 | 143 | 215 | n.d. | n.d. |
| methylene chloride | 50 | 58 | 493 | 996 | 105 | 138 | 284 | 282 | 440 | 535 | 201 | 276 | 30 | 20 | 70 | 47 | 398 | 347 | 567 | 893 |
| cis-1,2-dichloroethene | 20 | 63 | n.d. | n.d. | n.d. | n.d. | n.d. | n.d. | n.d. | n.d. | 108 | 131 | n.d. | n.d. | 37 | 86 | 186 | 324 | 4 | 20 |
| Chloroform | n.d. | n.d. | n.d. | n.d. | 23 | 28 | n.d. | n.d. | 349 | 510 | 97 | 129 | n.d. | n.d. | 37 | 43 | 42 | 108 | 17 | 35 |
| 1,2-dichloroethane | 30 | 55 | n.d. | n.d. | 47 | 64 | n.d. | n.d. | 133 | 180 | 79 | n.d. | 78 | 130 | 26 | 43 | 62 | 140 | 80 | 180 |
| Benzene | 420 | 862 | 269 | 553 | 261 | 353 | 175 | 405 | 188 | 326 | 895 | 1090 | 1252 | 1455 | 1067 | 1796 | 413 | 686 | 188 | 354 |
| Toluene | 542 | 315 | 138 | 148 | 265 | 298 | 108 | 172 | 39 | 358 | 661 | 707 | 221 | 262 | 254 | 355 | 369 | 575 | 246 | 443 |
| Ethylbenzene | 2048 | 16 | n.d. | n.d. | 165 | 2 | 351 | 22 | 42 | 7 | 57 | 50 | 8 | 12 | 24 | 11 | 16 | 28 | 57 | 117 |
| <i>m,p</i> -xylene | 13 | 13 | n.d. | n.d. | 9 | 3 | 38 | 20 | 11 | 4 | 31 | 36 | 9 | 12 | 16 | 13 | 12 | 22 | 58 | 115 |
| Styrene | 31 | 53 | n.d. | n.d. | 19 | 25 | 13 | 30 | 14 | 68 | 71 | 85 | 37 | 54 | n.d. | n.d. | 27 | 59 | 39 | 73 |
| o-xylene | 1764 | 7 | n.d. | n.d. | 133 | 1 | n.d. | n.d. | n.d. | n.d. | 15 | 12 | 43 | 16 | 18 | 6 | n.d. | n.d. | 13 | 25 |

Note: (i) Time between ignition and completion of incense burning and (ii) after incense burning (30 min after completion of the incense burning).

n.d.: Not detected.

thurible burnt with the incense. Löfroth et al. (1991) found the incense produced approximately 180-220 mg of CO per gram of incense burned, which is similar to our values. For VOCs, the aromatic incense had the highest concentrations for benzene. cis-1.2-dichloroethene and 1,2-dichloroethane. The church incense had the highest methylene chloride and m,p-xylene concentrations. Generally, it was found that the VOCs emitted sequence was aromatic incense > tradition incense > church incense. Löfroth et al. (1991) found that 420-440 µg of benzene was produced per gram of incense burned, which is close to the benzene emissions of the traditional and church incense. However, the aromatic incense was found to produce significantly higher benzene emissions than the values in the Löfroth et al. (1991) study. The general carbonyl compounds emission sequence was traditional incense > aromatic incense > church incense. Among three incense types, the tradition one had the highest emissions for formaldehyde, acrolein, propionaldehyde, methacrolein and butyraldehyde. The comparisons implied that the amount of air pollutants emitted from different types of incense varied considerably.

4. Conclusion

Ten types of incense were tested in order to determine and investigate the characteristics of air pollutant emissions associated with indoor incense burning. It was observed that the levels of CO_2 , CO, NO_x , CH_4 , NMHC, PM_{2.5}, PM₁₀, carbonyl compounds and VOCs increased due to the burning of incense. The CO peak levels of seven incense types greatly exceeded the HKIAQO standard. The formaldehyde concentrations of six types of incense were higher than the HKIAQO. In addition, the benzene concentrations of all tested incense were significantly higher than the HKIAQO standard. This implies that indoor incense combustion has adverse effects on human health. It is also concluded that there is variability among the ten types of incense (with regards to carbonyl compounds, VOCs, PM and gas pollutants). Generally, the traditional incense type had the highest gas emission factors among three incense types. It was also found that the VOCs emitted sequence was aromatic incense > tradition incense > church incense. However, the carbonyl compounds emission sequence was traditional incense > aromatic incense > church

| Table 7 | | | | |
|-------------|----|-------|---------|-------|
| Comparisons | of | three | incense | types |

| Emission factor (mg g^{-1} incense) | Traditional incense ^a | Aromatic incense ^b | Church incense | | | |
|---------------------------------------|----------------------------------|-------------------------------|----------------|---------------|---------|---------------|
| CO ₂ | 325.1 | 166.7 | 1070.9 | | | |
| СО | 166 | 72.5 | 227.7 | | | |
| NO | 1.3 | 0.8 | 1.3 | | | |
| NO ₂ | 0.2 | 0.3 | 0.2 | | | |
| NO _x | 1.5 | 1 | 1.5 | | | |
| CH ₄ | 7.2 | 3.8 | 0.4 | | | |
| NMHC | 9.5 | 9.3 | 8.9 | | | |
| VOCs ($\mu g g^{-1}$ incense) | Burning | After burning | Burning | After burning | Burning | After burning |
| Methyl chloride | 198.4 | 350.1 | 174.7 | 254.9 | n.d. | n.d. |
| Methylene chloride | 261.8 | 380.7 | 165.7 | 138.0 | 566.9 | 892.7 |
| Cis-1,2-dichloroethene | 21.3 | 32.2 | 74.4 | 136.8 | 4.2 | 19.6 |
| Chloroform | 78.0 | 111.3 | 26.3 | 50.4 | 17.3 | 34.6 |
| 1,2-dichloroethane | 48.0 | 59.7 | 55.0 | 103.9 | 79.7 | 180.2 |
| Benzene | 367.9 | 732.5 | 910.7 | 1312.1 | 188.1 | 354.1 |
| Toluene | 292.2 | 332.9 | 281.3 | 397.5 | 245.8 | 443.4 |
| Ethylbenzene | 443.9 | 16.2 | 15.8 | 16.9 | 57.4 | 116.7 |
| <i>m</i> , <i>p</i> -xylene | 17.0 | 12.6 | 12.5 | 15.4 | 57.7 | 115.3 |
| Styrene | 24.7 | 43.3 | 21.4 | 37.5 | 38.9 | 72.8 |
| o-xylene | 318.7 | 3.3 | 20.4 | 7.2 | 13.2 | 25.3 |
| Carbonyls ($\mu g g^{-1}$ incense) | Burning | After burning | Burning | After burning | Burning | After burning |
| Formaldehyde | 1261.3 | 767.7 | 1109.0 | 696.7 | 549.4 | 359.9 |
| Acetaldehyde | 891.4 | 1028.6 | 940.5 | 1067.3 | 679.2 | 823.7 |
| Acetone | 676.4 | 961.4 | 717.0 | 942.9 | 822.7 | 999.1 |
| Acrolein | 1230.8 | 1154.6 | 106.1 | 72.3 | 54.7 | 81.7 |
| Propionaldehyde | 709.6 | 945.2 | 89.6 | 90.6 | 68.8 | 93.2 |
| Methacrolein | 232.6 | 295.7 | 138.9 | 159.5 | 97.4 | 162.4 |
| Butyraldehyde | 341.0 | 95.5 | 72.6 | 1.7 | 72.8 | 171.5 |
| Valeraldehyde | 149.4 | 96.1 | 187.0 | 92.0 | n.d. | n.d. |

^aThe values were averaged by 6 traditional incense.

^bThe values were averaged by 3 aromatic incense.

incense. The emission factors (mg g⁻¹ incense) were: CO_2 , 1.4–1070.9; CO, 1.0–227.7; NO, 0.3–2.6; NO₂, 0.1–0.7; NO_x, 0.4–3.3; CH₄, 0.4–9.6; NMHC, 0.1–19.1; PM_{2.5}, 3.3–87.8 and PM₁₀, 4.3–123.6, respectively. The emission rates and emission factors obtained in this study can be used in risk assessment for indoor incense burning. Further experiments on emissions of heavy metals and EC/OC are considered necessary in the upcoming study.

Acknowledgements

The study is supported by Environmental and Conservation Fund and Woo Wheelock Green Fund (2001-19) and the Research Grant (G-9051) of the Hong Kong Polytechnic University. The authors thank Mr. W.F. Tam for his technical assistance.

References

- Fan, C.W., Zhang, J.J., 2001. Characterization of emissions from portable household combustion devices: particle size distributions, emission rates and factors, and potential exposures. Atmospheric environment 35 (7), 1281–1290.
- Ho, S.H., Yu, J.Z., 2002. Concentrations of formaldehyde and other carbonyls in environments affected by incense burning. Journal of Environmental Monitoring 4, 728–733.
- Indoor Air Quality Management Group, The Government of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region, 1999. Guidance Notes for the Management of Indoor Air Quality in Offices and Public Places.
- Jetter, J.J., Guo, Z.S., Mcbrian, J.A., Flynn, M.R., 2002. Characterization of emissions from burning incense. The Science of the Total Environment 295, 51–67.
- Koo, L.C., Matsushita, H., Shimizu, H., Mori, T., Tominaga, S., 1992. Sources of PAHs in the indoor air of Hong Kong homes (abstract). Proceedings of the International

Conference on Priorities for Indoor Research and Action, Switzerland, 1991. Indoor Environment 1, 53.

- Lee, S.C., Li, W.M., Ao, C.H., 2002. Investigation of indoor air quality at residential homes in Hong Kong—case study. Atmospheric Environment 36, 225–237.
- Li, C.S., Ro, Y.S., 2000. Indoor characteristics of polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons in the urban atmospheric of Taipei. Atmospheric Environment 34 (4), 611–620.
- Löfroth, G., Stensman, C., Brandhorst-Satzkorn, M., 1991. Indoor sources of mutagenic aerosol particulate matter: smoking, cooking, and incense burning. Mutation Research 261, 21–28.
- Nguyen, K.P., Phalen, R.F., Mannix, R.C., 1995. Particle characteristics and carbon monoxide concentrations associated with burning incense and cigarettes. Air Pollution Health Effects Laboratory Report No. 95-02. Community and Environmental Medicine, University of California, Irvine, CA.
- Roveri, P., Andrisano, V., Di Pietra, A.M., Cavrini, V., 1998. GC-MS analysis of incenses for possible presence of allergenic nitromusks. Journal of Pharmaceutical and Biomedical Analysis 17, 393–398.

- Tung, T.C.W., Chao, C.Y.H., Burnett, J., Pang, S.W., Lee, R.Y.M., 1999. A territory wide survey on indoor particulate level in Hong Kong. Building and Environment 34 (2), 213–220.
- US EPA, 1998a. Compendium method TO-11, the determination of formaldehyde in ambient air using adsorbent cartridge. Quality Assurance Division, Environmental Monitoring Systems Laboratory, Research Triangle Park, North Carolina.
- US EPA, 1998b. Compendium method TO-14, the determination of volatile organic compounds (VOCs) in ambient air using Summa passivated canister sampling and gas chromatographic analysis. Quality Assurance Division, Environmental Monitoring Systems Laboratory, Research Triangle Park, North Carolina.
- US EPA, 1999. Large Chamber Test Protocol for Measuring Emissions of VOCs and Aldehydes. Research Triangle Park, North Carolina.
- US EPA, 2000. National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS). Office of Research and Development, National Center for Environmental Assessment, Washington, DC.