

1 TITLE

2 The use of germicidal ultraviolet light, vaporised hydrogen peroxide and dry heat to decontaminate  
3 face masks and filtering respirators contaminated with a SARS-CoV-2 surrogate virus

5 RUNNING TITLE

6 Coronavirus mask and FFR decontamination

8 AUTHORS

9 Louisa F. Ludwig-Begall<sup>1,\*</sup>, Constance Wielick<sup>1,\*</sup>, Lorène Dams<sup>1</sup>, Hans Nauwynck<sup>2</sup>, Pierre-Francois  
10 Demeuldre<sup>3</sup>, Aurore Napp<sup>3</sup>, Jan Laperre<sup>4</sup>, Eric Haubruge<sup>5</sup>, Etienne Thiry<sup>1,#</sup>

12 AUTHOR AFFILIATIONS

13 <sup>1</sup>Veterinary Virology and Animal Viral Diseases, Department of Infectious and Parasitic Diseases,  
14 FARAH Research Centre, Faculty of Veterinary Medicine, Liège University, Liège, Belgium

15 <sup>2</sup>Laboratory of Virology, Faculty of Veterinary Medicine, Ghent University, Merelbeke, Belgium

16 <sup>3</sup> Department of Hospital Pharmacy, The University Hospital Center, University of Liège, Liège,  
17 Belgium

18 <sup>4</sup> Centexbel Textile Research Centre, Grace-Hollogne, Belgium

19 <sup>5</sup> TERRA Research Centre, Gembloux Agro-Bio Tech, University of Liège, Gembloux, Belgium

21 \*These authors contributed equally to this work.

22 #Corresponding author: [etienne.thiry@uliege.be](mailto:etienne.thiry@uliege.be)

23 Orcid ID Etienne Thiry: 0000-0002-9585-7933

25 WORD COUNT

26 3944 (excluding Summary and References) + two figures

Non-standard abbreviations:

FFR: filtering facepiece respirator

SM: surgical mask

SARS-CoV-2: severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2

PRCV: positive pressure respirator

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

27 ABSTRACT

28

29 Background

30 In the context of the ongoing severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2)  
31 pandemic, the supply of personal protective equipment remains under severe strain. To address this  
32 issue, re-use of surgical face masks and filtering facepiece respirators has been recommended; prior  
33 decontamination is paramount to their re-use.

34

35 Aim

36 We aim to provide information on the effects of three decontamination procedures on porcine  
37 respiratory coronavirus (PRCV)-contaminated masks and respirators, presenting a stable model for  
38 infectious coronavirus decontamination of these typically single-use-only products.

39

40 Methods

41 Surgical masks and filtering facepiece respirator coupons and straps were inoculated with infectious  
42 PRCV and submitted to three decontamination treatments, UV irradiation, vaporised H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub>, and dry  
43 heat treatment. Viruses were recovered from sample materials and viral titres were measured in swine  
44 testicle cells.

45

46 Findings

47 UV irradiation, vaporised H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub> and dry heat reduced infectious PRCV by more than three orders of  
48 magnitude on mask and respirator coupons and rendered it undetectable in all decontamination assays.

49

50 Conclusion

51 This is the first description of stable disinfection of face masks and filtering facepiece respirators  
52 contaminated with an infectious SARS-CoV-2 surrogate using UV irradiation, vaporised H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub> and dry  
53 heat treatment. The three methods permit demonstration of a loss of infectivity by more than three  
54 orders of magnitude of an infectious coronavirus in line with the FDA policy regarding face masks and  
55 respirators. It presents advantages of uncomplicated manipulation and utilisation in a BSL2 facility,  
56 therefore being easily adaptable to other respirator and mask types.

57

58

59 KEYWORDS

60 SARS-CoV-2; PRCV; decontamination (UV; H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub>; dry heat); respirator; surgical mask

61 INTRODUCTION

62 In the context of the ongoing severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2)  
63 pandemic, the supply of personal protective equipment (PPE) remains under severe strain and both  
64 availability and affordability of items can be subject to fluctuations and disruptions within health-,  
65 social care and other essential public facilities. Access to PPE for the health workforce in all services  
66 (public and private, community and hospital) has been identified as a key factor in strengthening the  
67 international health system response to SARS-CoV-2, the causative agent of COVID-19 [1]; use of  
68 medical/surgical face masks and filtering facepiece respirators (FFR i.e. N95 or FFP2 or FFP3  
69 standard or equivalent with a minimum filtration efficiency of 95% for 0.3  $\mu\text{m}$  (aerodynamic mass  
70 mean diameter) of sodium chloride aerosols) has been recommended in conjunction with other  
71 mitigating measures to prevent transmission of this and other respiratory pathogens [2,3].

72

73 Since the surging global demand cannot currently be met solely by the limited capacities of expanding  
74 PPE production, national and internationally-coordinated efforts are increasingly focused on re-use of  
75 various items [4,5]. While prior decontamination is paramount to re-use of surgical masks or  
76 respirators, little information exists on effective decontamination of these typically single-use-only  
77 products. Without compromising the fit and filtration integrity of the masks themselves,  
78 decontaminating procedures must guarantee the complete inactivation of contaminating pathogens; the  
79 US Food and Drug Administration Enforcement Policy for Face Masks and Respirators issued in April  
80 2020 recommends a robust proof of infectious bioburden reduction of three orders of magnitude for  
81 viral pathogens, specifically coronaviruses, and six orders of magnitude for either mycobacteria or  
82 bacterial spores [6].

83

84 Amongst a variety of different methods under investigation, vaporisation of the oxidizing agent  
85 hydrogen peroxide ( $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2$ ), already a standard hospital sterilisation technology due to its broad  
86 antimicrobial activity and efficacy in surface decontamination [7], has garnered attention as a cost-  
87 effective and practical option for mask decontamination [5,6,8]. Mask shape and fit of unused 3M  
88 FFP2 NR D face masks (type 8822) were shown to remain intact subsequent to two cycles of  
89 vaporised  $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2$  low pressure gas sterilisation in a study by the Dutch National Institute for Public  
90 Health and the Environment [5]; further studies have since demonstrated integrity of other respirator  
91 models after numerous cycles of  $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2$  treatment and have shown virucidal and bactericidal activity of  
92 the method on a number of respiratory pathogens and/or biological indicators [8,9]. To our knowledge,  
93 no study has yet reported the effect of  $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2$  treatment on SARS-CoV-2, although vaporised  $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2$   
94 decontamination trials of SARS-CoV-2 inoculated masks are reportedly underway [8].

95

96 As alternatives to chemical vaporised  $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2$ , two physical decontamination methods, the application of  
97 dry heat and ultraviolet (UV) irradiation, show promise for decontamination of SARS-CoV-2

98 contaminated masks in various settings. Heat treatment acts via denaturation of protein secondary  
99 structures thereby altering conformation of viral proteins involved in attachment to and replication  
100 within host cells and has long been recognised as an efficient method of virus inactivation [10].  
101 Temperatures of over 65°C have previously been shown to inactivate SARS-CoV in suspension [11];  
102 more recently, dry heat treatment of 70°C was identified to inactivate SARS-CoV-2 in solution [12]  
103 and was shown to not significantly alter filtration efficiency of N95 respirators within 20 cycles of  
104 application [13]. Easily scalable, dry heat allows mass treatment of large sample sizes and thus  
105 potentially presents a fast and efficient decontamination alternative to vaporised H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub> in decentralised  
106 hospital centres or industrial settings. Ultraviolet germicidal irradiation with a highly energetic short-  
107 wave (254 nm) acts via viral disruption of viral DNA or RNA and constitutes a physical surface  
108 treatment for contaminated masks or FFRs. A useful sterilisation technique in a variety of applications,  
109 UV irradiation has been implemented to effectively decontaminate influenza virus (H5N1) from two  
110 different models of FFRs (3M models 1860s and 1870) [14] and does not degrade respirator  
111 performance even after multiple applications [13,15]. It is a promising option for rapid  
112 decontamination of smaller, individual sample contingents and is as such easily adaptable to point-of-  
113 care applications. A possible concern relates to UV penetration depth, necessitating studies that not  
114 only investigate viral inactivation of decontaminated surfaces but that address a potential worst-case  
115 scenario in which viruses penetrate deeper layers of contaminated face masks and FFRs [13].

116

117 Since the utilisation, concentration and cultivation of infectious SARS-CoV-2 necessary for analyses  
118 investigating its inactivation, pose obvious problems in terms of the availability and equipping of  
119 BSL3 facilities, the use of conservative surrogates to test decontamination efficacy of various methods  
120 is justified and crucial to gain an as accurate as possible insight into SARS-CoV-2 decontamination. A  
121 recent (non-peer reviewed) publication describes inactivation of murine hepatitis virus (MHV), a  
122 SARS-CoV-2 surrogate of the same *Betacoronavirus* genus, via vaporised H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub>, heat treatment, UV  
123 exposure and other decontamination methods on FFRs; regrettably, the limited dynamic range of the  
124 MHV model (at most 10<sup>1</sup>-10<sup>2</sup> inactivation) fell short of demonstrating a 10<sup>3</sup> reduction [16].

125

126 In the present investigation into filtering facepiece respirator and surgical mask decontamination via  
127 UV irradiation, H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub> and application of dry heat, we implemented porcine respiratory coronavirus  
128 (PRCV), a spike gene deletion mutant of transmissible gastroenteritis virus (TGEV) and a member of  
129 the *Alphacoronavirus 1* species [17,18], as SARS-CoV-2 surrogate. While PRCV, which infects the  
130 respiratory tract of swine [19], is not in the same genus as SARS-CoV-2, the two members of the  
131 subfamily *Coronavirinae* in the family *Coronaviridae* show sufficient similarities as to genome length  
132 and virion structure (notwithstanding differences in envelope glycoproteins), for them to be expected  
133 to behave similarly outside their hosts. Indeed, TGEV has previously been utilised as a surrogate for  
134 another *Betacoronavirus*, SARS-CoV, in studies investigating the persistence of coronaviruses on

135 inanimate surfaces and/or their inactivation with biocidal agents [20,21]. The PRCV model thus  
136 combines the advantages of sufficient genetic and structural relatedness to SARS-CoV-2, the fact that  
137 PRCV can be readily propagated and assayed *in vitro* to high titres in the swine testicle (ST) cell line,  
138 and the absence of human infection risk.

139

140 This is the first description of stable disinfection of FFRs and surgical masks contaminated with an  
141 infectious SARS-CoV-2 surrogate using UV irradiation, vaporised H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub> and dry heat treatment. The  
142 three methods permit demonstration of a loss of infectivity by more than three orders of magnitude of  
143 an infectious coronavirus in line with the FDA policy regarding face masks and respirators. It presents  
144 advantages of uncomplicated manipulation and utilisation in a BSL2 facility, therefore being easily  
145 adaptable to other respirator and mask types to which any of the three or other decontamination  
146 methods may be applied.

147

## 148 METHODS

### 149 **Virus and cells**

150 PRCV strain 91V44 [22] was passaged three times on confluent cell monolayers of the ST continuous  
151 cell line. A virus stock with a titre of 10<sup>7.8</sup> TCID<sub>50</sub>/ml was used.

152

### 153 **Surgical masks and filtering facepiece respirators**

154 All FFRs and surgical masks, commonly used by the health care community in Belgium at the time of  
155 the study, were supplied by the Department of the Hospital Pharmacy, University Hospital Centre of  
156 Liege (Sart-Tilman). Manufacturers (and models): KN95 FFR - Guangzhou Sunjoy Auto Supplies CO.  
157 LTD, Guangdong, China (2020 N°26202002240270); surgical mask (Type II) - Hangzhou Sunten  
158 Textile Co., LTD, Hangzhou, China (SuninCare™, Protect Plus). Surgical masks and FFRs were  
159 verified to be from the same respective manufacturing lot to minimise any lot-to-lot variation and to  
160 ensure consistency during future respirability and filtration performance testing. FFR and mask  
161 materials were verified via scanning electron microscopy and Fourier-transform infrared spectroscopy  
162 (spectral data obtained by direct  $\mu$ -ATR- FTIR analysis (Nicolet 6700) and compared for best fit  
163 against a Hummel library of known infrared spectra of polymers as well as a Centexbel-curated spectral  
164 library). FFRs consisted of four layers of polypropylene, specifically two outer spunbound structures,  
165 an intermediate meltblown layer, and an inner spunbound layer (Supplementary Figure 3). Surgical  
166 masks were composed of three layers of polypropylene, with an outer and inner layer of spunbound  
167 polypropylene encasing a meltblown polypropylene barrier (Supplementary Figure 4).

168

169 **Inoculation of surgical masks and filtering facepiece respirators with porcine respiratory**  
170 **coronavirus (PRCV)**

171 Efficacy of three different decontamination methods in inactivating an infectious coronavirus was  
172 assessed using surgical masks and FFRs experimentally inoculated with PRCV. Per decontamination  
173 method and mask type, one negative control mask or respirator (not contaminated but treated), three  
174 treated masks or respirators (PRCV-contaminated and treated), and three positive controls (PRCV-  
175 contaminated but untreated), i.e. seven masks in total, were utilised.

176 Prior to inoculation, the masks and FFRs were first marked with a graphite pencil to enable sample  
177 identification and to outline three square areas (34 mm x 34 mm) to the left, right and centre of the  
178 masks and FFRs, corresponding to areas to be cut out post-inoculation (coupons) with a central site of  
179 inoculation (the demarcation of the coupons and inoculation sites are shown in Supplementary Figure  
180 1). Utilising an ultra-fine insulin syringe and needle (BD Medical), 100 µl of undiluted viral  
181 suspension in Minimum Essential Medium (MEM) were injected at the centre of each of the three  
182 square coupons under the first outer layer of mask or FFR (this to simulate a “worst case scenario” for  
183 viral inactivation in which a given decontamination method must reach a virus that has penetrated  
184 beyond the surface layer of a mask owing to respiration pressure gradients) for treated and positive  
185 control masks. In addition to inoculation of the *de facto* masks or respirators themselves, 100 µl of  
186 viral suspension was pipetted onto one elastic strap per contaminated surgical mask or FFR. The  
187 masks were allowed to dry for 20 minutes and were then individually packaged in appropriate  
188 containers (autoclaved empty tip boxes for respirators; sealable plastic bags for masks) ensuring a cold  
189 chain and minimal contamination before decontamination. Throughout, masks were handled only with  
190 sterile tweezers and gloves to limit bacterial or fungal contamination. Gloves were changed between  
191 handling of individual masks to avoid potential carry-over of inoculum.

192

193 **Decontamination of PRCV-inoculated surgical masks and filtering facepiece respirators**

194 PRCV-inoculated surgical masks and FFRs were decontaminated utilising three different  
195 decontamination methods, UV irradiation, vaporised H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub>, and dry heat. Three FFRs and three surgical  
196 masks were subjected to each of the three decontamination methods. Three additional inoculated  
197 masks or respirators (positive controls) and the negative control mask or respirator remained  
198 individually packaged and cooled before and after each decontaminating treatment to account for the  
199 effect of time-dependent surface absorption and/or interaction on virus recovery.

200

201 **UV germicidal irradiation**

202 Surgical masks and FFRs were individually irradiated using a LS-AT-M1 (LASEA Company, Sart  
203 Tilman, Belgium) equipped with 4 UV-C lamps of 5.5W (@UV-C). Hung vertically on a metal frame,  
204 masks and FFRs were inserted into a safety enclosure. A 2 min UV-C treatment (surgical masks) led  
205 to a fluence of 2.6J/cm<sup>2</sup> per mask (1.3J/cm<sup>2</sup> per side), 4 min UV-C irradiation (FFRs) led to a fluence  
206 of 5.2J/cm<sup>2</sup> per mask. Power and irradiation time (120 s) were monitored and recorded throughout.  
207 Following irradiation, surgical masks and FFRs were unloaded and placed in individual bags.

208

#### 209 **Vaporised H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub>**

210 Surgical masks, FFRs and a chemical indicator were placed in individual Mylar/Tyvek pouches.  
211 Vaporised hydrogen peroxide (VHP) treatment was performed with the V-PRO Max Sterilizer (Steris,  
212 Mentor, OH) which uses 59% liquid H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub> to generate hydrogen peroxide vapor. A 28-minute non  
213 lumen cycle was used, consisting of 2 min 40 sec conditioning (5 g/min), 19 min 47 sec  
214 decontamination (2.2 g/min) and 7 min 46 sec aeration. Peak VHP concentration was 750 ppm.

215

#### 216 **Dry heat**

217 Surgical masks and FFRs, hung horizontally on a metal frame, were inserted into an electrically heated  
218 vessel (M-Steryl, AMB Ecosteryl Company, Mons, Belgium) for treatment with temperatures of  
219 102°C (± 4°C) for 60 min (± 15 min). Temperatures inside the heated vessel were recorded throughout  
220 to ensure correct exposure conditions. After termination of the treatment cycle, masks and FFRs were  
221 allowed to cool and then bagged individually.

222

#### 223 **Elution of PRCV from decontaminated and untreated surgical masks and filtering facepiece** 224 **respirators**

225 Upon completed decontamination, the three previously determined square coupons with the focal  
226 point of PRCV inoculation at their centres were cut from the masks; the inoculated elastic strap was  
227 severed from the masks in its entirety (Supplementary Figure 2). Thus, per mask, three coupons and  
228 one elastic strap were sampled. The different layers of the coupons were separated to facilitate viral  
229 recovery and the separated layers of each individual coupon were placed together in a 15 mL Falcon  
230 tube containing 4 mL elution medium (Eagle's MEM (Sigma)) supplemented with 2 % of an  
231 association of penicillin (5000 SI units/mL) and streptomycin (5 mg/mL) (PS, Sigma)). Pilot  
232 experiments (results not reported) indicated a cytotoxicity of eluate from H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub>-treated masks. To  
233 combat this effect, presumably due to residual H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub> in the suspension, the elution medium was  
234 supplemented with 20% FCS and 0.1% β-mercaptoethanol in a total volume of 4 mL for virus elution  
235 subsequent to vaporised H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub> treatment. Sterile sets of scissors and tweezers were used for each



236 coupon, thus avoiding cross-contamination between inoculation points. The mask and respirator  
237 coupon layers and elution medium were mixed for 20 minutes at maximum speed (2500 rounds per  
238 minute (rpm)) using a multitube vortex mixer (VWR VX-2500 Multi-Tube Vortexer). Supernatant  
239 eluates were recovered via pipette and either directly utilised in downstream applications or stored at -  
240 80°C until further analysis.

241

## 242 **Quantification of infectious PRCV eluted from decontaminated and untreated surgical masks** 243 **and filtering facepiece respirators**

244 Titres of infectious PRCV recovered from individual coupons and straps of decontaminated surgical  
245 masks and respirators were determined separately using a TCID<sub>50</sub> assay in ST cells. Briefly, tenfold  
246 dilutions were made from each sample and 50µl of each dilution were inoculated in each of four wells  
247 of a 96-well plate. After one hour of incubation, 100µl of medium (MEM supplemented with 10%  
248 FCS and antibiotics) were added to each well. Due to toxicity in the undiluted inoculum, the inoculum  
249 was completely removed and 150µl of medium were added. Four days after inoculation, monolayers  
250 were analysed for the presence of cytopathic effect by light microscopy. Virus titres were calculated  
251 using the Reed and Muench method [23]. Back titrations of virus inoculum stocks were performed in  
252 parallel to each series of decontamination experiments.

253

## 254 **Data analysis and statistics**

255 Statistical analyses of differences in infectious viral titres were performed using GraphPad Prism 7  
256 (Graph-Pad Software) and P-values were computed by using a two-sided independent sample t-test,  
257 where \*\*\*\*P<0.0001, \*\*\*P<0.001, \*\*P<0.01, \*P<0.05, and ns is P≥0.05.

258

## 259 **RESULTS**

260 Back titrations of virus inoculums performed in parallel to each series of experiments confirmed  
261 PRCV inoculum titres to be within a range of  $6.31 \times 10^6$  to  $2 \times 10^7$  TCID<sub>50</sub>/mL for all experiments.

262

263 The cell culture limit of detection (LOD) was  $6.31 \times 10^0$  TCID<sub>50</sub>/mL for all assays. An initially  
264 observed H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub> cytotoxicity and correspondingly elevated LOD of  $6.31 \times 10^1$  TCID<sub>50</sub>/mL of H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub>-  
265 treated coupon eluates was corrected via β-mercaptoethanol and FCS supplementation of elution  
266 medium; elevated cytotoxicity of H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub>-treated strap eluates (SM and FFR) could not be neutralised  
267 and remained at  $6.31 \times 10^1$  TCID<sub>50</sub>/mL. Values below the LOD were considered as  $\leq 6.31 \times 10^0$   
268 TCID<sub>50</sub>/mL, with the exception of measurements concerning H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub>-treated straps.

269



270 **Infectious PRCV is recovered at high titres from untreated surgical mask- and filtering**  
271 **facepiece respirator coupons, at lower titres from surgical mask straps, and remains under the**  
272 **limit of detection following recovery from filtering facepiece respirator straps.**

273 Recovery of infectious PRCV from inoculated untreated surgical masks and FFRs was analysed in ST  
274 cells. Comparable high levels of infectious virus were recovered from PRCV-inoculated, untreated  
275 left, right and middle coupons of all surgical masks. Mean values were  $2.83 \times 10^5 (\pm 2.0)$  TCID<sub>50</sub>/mL,  
276  $1.69 \times 10^5 (\pm 1.81)$  TCID<sub>50</sub>/mL and  $4.25 \times 10^5 (\pm 2.88)$  TCID<sub>50</sub>/mL for recovery from positive control  
277 coupons of the UV, H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub> and dry heat assays, respectively. Mean strap recovery values were also  
278 similar between experiments, however they were lower by two to three orders of magnitude than  
279 surgical mask coupon recovery values, with mean values of  $5.88 \times 10^3 (\pm 2.80)$  TCID<sub>50</sub>/mL,  $1.21 \times 10^2$   
280  $(\pm 0.71)$  TCID<sub>50</sub>/mL, and  $3.92 \times 10^2 (\pm 4.56)$  TCID<sub>50</sub>/mL for straps utilised as positive controls in the  
281 UV, H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub> and dry heat assays, respectively (Figure 1). Recovery from FFR coupons yielded mean  
282 infectious virus at  $6.96 \times 10^4 (\pm 13.27)$  TCID<sub>50</sub>/mL,  $1.80 \times 10^5 (\pm 1.58)$  TCID<sub>50</sub>/mL and  $2.16 \times 10^4 (\pm 3.28)$   
283 TCID<sub>50</sub>/mL for positive controls of the UV, H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub> and dry heat assays, respectively. Recovery values  
284 for infectious virus from FFR straps remained below the LOD for UV and dry heat positive controls;  
285 recovery from straps used as positive control in the H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub> experiments was  $1.75 \times 10^3 (\pm 0.43)$   
286 TCID<sub>50</sub>/mL (Figure 1).

287

288 **UV irradiation, vaporised H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub> and dry heat treatment reduce infectious PRCV by more than**  
289 **three orders of magnitude on surgical mask and filtering facepiece respirator coupons and**  
290 **render it undetectable in all decontamination assays.**

291 Following UV irradiation (2 minutes exposure time), exposure to vaporised H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub>, and dry heat  
292 treatment of surgical masks, all titres for virus recovered from coupons and straps remained below the  
293 respective LOD of the assay, showing a total loss of infectivity of more than five orders of magnitude  
294 for all three treatments on coupons ( $2.83 \times 10^5 (\pm 2.0)$  TCID<sub>50</sub>/mL,  $1.69 \times 10^5 (\pm 1.81)$  TCID<sub>50</sub>/mL and  
295  $4.25 \times 10^5 (\pm 2.88)$  TCID<sub>50</sub>/mL, respectively); titres of virus recovered from treated surgical mask straps  
296 were reduced by three orders of magnitude post UV irradiation ( $5.88 \times 10^3 (\pm 2.80)$  TCID<sub>50</sub>/mL), by two  
297 orders of magnitude for heat-treated straps ( $3.85 \times 10^2 (\pm 4.56)$  TCID<sub>50</sub>/mL), and by one order of  
298 magnitude for H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub>-treated straps ( $5.78 \times 10^1 (\pm 7.10)$  TCID<sub>50</sub>/mL).

299 Decontamination treatment effects followed a similar pattern of viral inactivation for FFR coupons  
300 decontaminated via H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub> and dry heat, reducing viral titres by over five orders of magnitude  
301 ( $1.80 \times 10^5 (\pm 1.58)$  TCID<sub>50</sub>/mL) and four orders of magnitude ( $2.16 \times 10^4 (\pm 3.28)$  TCID<sub>50</sub>/mL,  
302 respectively. While UV irradiation was sufficient to deactivate PRCV on surgical masks with an  
303 exposure time of 2 minutes, it was shown to be insufficient to achieve viral inactivation by more than  
304 three orders of magnitude on a different lot of FFRs in a trial run (results not shown); a 4 minute  
305 exposure time was thus tested for FFRs, reducing viral titres by over four orders of magnitude, from

306  $6.96 \times 10^4 (\pm 13.27)$  TCID<sub>50</sub>/mL to below the LOD (Figure 2). The impact of decontamination could not  
307 be measured for UV- or dry heat-treated FFR straps due to insufficient recovery of infectious virus in  
308 positive FFR strap controls. Hydrogen peroxide treatment of FFR straps resulted in a reduction of  
309 infectious virus load by  $1.69 \times 10^3 (\pm 0.43)$  TCID<sub>50</sub>/mL.

310

## 311 DISCUSSION

312 This is, to our knowledge, the first description of stable disinfection of filtering facepiece respirators  
313 and surgical masks contaminated with an infectious SARS-CoV-2 surrogate using UV irradiation,  
314 vaporised H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub>, and dry heat treatment. While other reports have described efficacy of various  
315 decontamination methods on a range of biological indicators, few studies report on the validated  
316 decontamination of masks or respirators inoculated with SARS-CoV-2 or a conservative surrogate  
317 virus, the former being limited by the availability of BSL3 facilities, the latter by the lack of a stable  
318 high-titre model virus with an adequate dynamic range to fulfil FDA policy requirements of  
319 demonstrating a loss of infectivity by more than three orders of magnitude [8,16].

320

321 PRCV, a SARS-CoV-2 surrogate and fellow member of the *Coronavirinae* subfamily, is classed as a  
322 BSL2 pathogen. It can be cultured to high viral titres in permissive ST cells, thus possessing  
323 advantages of uncomplicated manipulation and utilisation in a BSL2 facility and a wide dynamic  
324 range. Here we demonstrate successful recovery of high quantities of infectious PRCV from  
325 inoculated, otherwise untreated surgical masks and FFR coupons, with recovery titres stably averaging  
326 over  $10^5$  TCID<sub>50</sub>/mL for elution from mask coupons and ranging between values of over  $10^3$  to  $10^5$   
327 TCID<sub>50</sub>/mL for elution from FFR coupons. Slightly lower recovery values of the dry heat assay are  
328 probably attributable to longer delays between inoculation and elution of infectious virus. Three  
329 decontamination methods, chemical vaporised H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub>, physical inactivation via UV irradiation and dry  
330 heat treatment, were tested for their ability to inactivate infectious PRCV on inoculated surgical masks  
331 or FFRs. All three methods rendered PRCV inoculated under the outer surface layer of mask and  
332 respirator coupons undetectable, successfully reducing the infectious load by more than three orders of  
333 magnitude.

334

335 Since carrier surfaces likely influence decontamination efficacy, we aimed to examine viral  
336 inactivation not only on the *de facto* respirators or masks themselves but on their elastic straps that  
337 may become equally contaminated. We compared titres of infectious virus recovered from inoculated,  
338 untreated straps and those inoculated and subsequently decontaminated via either UV irradiation,  
339 vaporised H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub>, or dry heat treatment. All decontamination methods rendered PRCV undetectable  
340 following recovery from straps; however, owing to insufficient virus recovery from untreated mask  
341 straps, only UV decontamination of surgical mask straps could be successfully validated as reducing  
342 viral loads by more than three orders of magnitude. Recovery of infectious virus applied to FFR straps

343 proved impossible with a simple elution medium; however, when 20% FCS and 0.1%  $\beta$ -  
344 mercaptoethanol were added to the elution medium (intended to combat  $H_2O_2$  cytotoxicity), infectious  
345 virus was recoverable from FFR straps. Further studies are planned to elucidate these effects, which  
346 may potentially be associated either to inherent virucidal properties of the elastic materials or  
347 attributable to poor elution from the straps. The fact that supplemented medium enabled recovery of  
348 infectious virus from FFR straps suggests that either of the supplemented constituents could have had  
349 a protective effect shielding infectious virus from potential virucidal impacts of the straps. It is worth  
350 noting that, although the simple MEM matrix used to inoculate and elute virus loads has similarities to  
351 the natural biocontamination arising from use (i.e. build-up of inorganic salts), a complex  
352 biocontamination (e.g. polymer chains in sputum) may not be replicated.

353

354 Decontaminating treatments, by their very nature, are known to have inherently detrimental side  
355 effects; particularly after multiple cycles, the integrity of decontaminated objects may be  
356 compromised. UV irradiation, vaporised  $H_2O_2$ , or dry heat treatment, have previously been shown to  
357 not significantly impact performance of polypropylene-based FFRs and/or masks in a number of  
358 studies [8,9,13,15]; however, others have shown that the maximum number of decontamination cycles  
359 may be limited by the respirator model and treatment conditions required for inactivation [24]. In the  
360 present investigation, masks and FFRs were effectively destroyed at the end of each cycle. Since, the  
361 safe reuse of masks and FFRs is important both in the context of the current Covid-19 pandemic and  
362 beyond, when cost-effectiveness, environmental benefits and logistic considerations will advocate a  
363 continued decontamination of these previously single-use items, further work is planned to investigate  
364 how many decontamination cycles may be safely applied to these previously single use items.

365

## 366 CONCLUSIONS

367 In conclusion, we describe successful validation of three decontamination methods, UV irradiation,  
368 vaporised  $H_2O_2$  and dry heat treatment, in inactivating an infectious coronavirus in line with the FDA  
369 policy regarding face masks and respirators. Without enough proof of inactivation, we cannot  
370 recommend safe decontamination of respirator straps and suggest additionally treating straps  
371 separately by exposure to 70% ethanol [20] until further results become available. Since  $H_2O_2$  breaks  
372 down to water and oxygen, concerns for toxicity of vaporised  $H_2O_2$  treatment are generally held to be  
373 very low risk [25]; however, to eliminate potential exposure of users, we recommend that a short  
374 aeration time should be respected. The PRCV surrogate supplements existing data regarding  
375 decontamination of surgical masks and FFRs, and both it and the different decontamination methods  
376 tested, are easily adaptable to other respirator and mask types, presenting a useful conservative model  
377 for stable validation of coronavirus decontamination.

378

## 379 ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

380 The authors express their sincere gratitude to Amélie Matton and Frédéric de Meulemeester (AMB  
381 Ecosteryl, Mons, Belgium), Axel Kupisiewicz (LASEA, Sart-Tilman, Belgium), Pierre Leonard  
382 (Solwalfin, Belgium) for suggestions and technical and administrative support and thank Chantal  
383 Vanmaercke and Carine Boone for their excellent technical support.

384

#### 385 CONFLICTS OF INTEREST STATEMENT

386 The authors have no conflicts of interest to disclose.

387

#### 388 FUNDING SOURCE

389 This work was supported by a grant from the Walloon Region, Belgium (Project 2010053 -2020-  
390 “MASK - Decontamination and reuse of surgical masks and filtering facepiece respirators”).

391 REFERENCES

392

- 393 [1] WHO. Strengthening the health system response to COVID-19 Recommendations for the  
394 WHO European Region Policy brief 2020:8.
- 395 [2] World Health Organization (WHO). Rational use of personal protective equipment for  
396 coronavirus disease 2019 ( COVID-19 ). Who 2020;2019:1–7.
- 397 [3] Leung NHL, Chu DKW, Shiu EYC, Chan K-H, McDevitt JJ, Hau BJP, et al. Respiratory virus  
398 shedding in exhaled breath and efficacy of face masks. Nat Med 2020.  
399 <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41591-020-0843-2>.
- 400 [4] Lee J, Bong C, Bae PK, Abafogi AT, Baek SH. Fast and easy disinfection of coronavirus-  
401 contaminated face masks using ozone gas produced by a dielectric barrier discharge plasma  
402 generator. MedRxiv 2020;COVID-19 S:1–13.
- 403 [5] Dutch National Institute for Public Health and the Environment (RIVM). Reuse of FFP2 masks  
404 2020:1–5.
- 405 [6] Center for Devices and Radiological Health. Enforcement Policy for Face Masks and  
406 Respirators During the Coronavirus Disease (COVID-19) Public Health Emergency (Revised)  
407 Guidance for Industry and Food and Drug Administration Staff 2020.
- 408 [7] Zonta W, Mauroy A, Farnir F, Thiry E. Virucidal Efficacy of a Hydrogen Peroxide  
409 Nebulization Against Murine Norovirus and Feline Calicivirus, Two Surrogates of Human  
410 Norovirus. Food Environ Virol 2016;8:275–82. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12560-016-9253-5>.
- 411 [8] Kumar A, Kasloff SB, Leung A, Cutts T, Strong JE, Hills K, et al. N95 Mask Decontamination  
412 using Standard Hospital Sterilization Technologies. MedRxiv Prepr 2020:1–9.  
413 <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.04.05.20049346>.
- 414 [9] Schwartz A, Stiegel M, Greeson N, Vogel A, Thomann W, Brown M, et al. Decontamination  
415 and Reuse of N95 Respirators with Hydrogen Peroxide Vapor to Address Worldwide Personal  
416 Protective Equipment Shortages During the SARS-CoV-2 (COVID-19) Pandemic. Appl Biosaf  
417 2020. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1535676020919932>.
- 418 [10] Lelie PN, Reesink HW, Lucas CJ. Inactivation of 12 viruses by heating steps applied during  
419 manufacture of a hepatitis B vaccine. J Med Virol 1987;23:297–301.  
420 <https://doi.org/10.1002/jmv.1890230313>.
- 421 [11] Darnell MER, Subbarao K, Feinstone SM, Taylor DR. Inactivation of the coronavirus that  
422 induces severe acute respiratory syndrome, SARS-CoV. J Virol Methods 2004;121:85–91.  
423 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jviromet.2004.06.006>.
- 424 [12] Chin AWH, Chu JTS, Perera MRA, Hui KPY, Yen H-L, Chan MCW, et al. Stability of SARS-  
425 CoV-2 in different environmental conditions. The Lancet Microbe 2020;1:e10.  
426 [https://doi.org/10.1016/s2666-5247\(20\)30003-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/s2666-5247(20)30003-3).
- 427 [13] Liao L, Xiao W, Zhao M, Yu X, Wang H, Wang Q, et al. Can N95 respirators be reused after

- 428 disinfection? And for how many times? MedRxiv 2020:2020.04.01.20050443.  
429 <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.04.01.20050443>.
- 430 [14] Lore MB, Heimbuch BK, Brown TL, Wander JD, Hinrichs SH. Effectiveness of three  
431 decontamination treatments against influenza virus applied to filtering facepiece respirators.  
432 *Ann Occup Hyg* 2012;56:92–101. <https://doi.org/10.1093/annhyg/mer054>.
- 433 [15] Viscusi DJ, Bergman MS, Novak DA, Faulkner KA, Palmiero A, Powell J, et al. Impact of  
434 three biological decontamination methods on filtering facepiece respirator fit, odor, comfort,  
435 and donning ease. *J Occup Environ Hyg* 2011;8:426–36.  
436 <https://doi.org/10.1080/15459624.2011.585927>.
- 437 [16] Wigginton KR, Arts PJ, Clack H, Fitzsimmons WJ, Gamba M, Katherine R, et al. Validation of  
438 N95 filtering facepiece respirator decontamination methods available at a large university  
439 hospital. *MedRxiv Prepr* 2020. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.04.28.20084038>.
- 440 [17] Pensaert M, Callebaut P, Vergote J. Isolation of a porcine respiratory, non-enteric coronavirus  
441 related to transmissible gastroenteritis. *Vet Q* 1986;8:257–61.  
442 <https://doi.org/10.1080/01652176.1986.9694050>.
- 443 [18] Laude H, Van Reeth K, Pensaert M. Porcine respiratory coronavirus: molecular features and  
444 virus-host interactions. *Vet Res* 1993;24:125–50.
- 445 [19] Saif LJ, Wang Q, Vlasova AN, Jung K, Xiao S. Coronaviruses. In: Zimmerman JJ, Karriker  
446 LA, Ramirez A, Schwartz KJ, Stevenson GW, Jianqiang Z, editors. *Dis. Swine*, Elev. Ed.,  
447 2019, p. 488–523.
- 448 [20] Kampf G, Todt D, Pfaender S, Steinmann E. Persistence of coronaviruses on inanimate  
449 surfaces and their inactivation with biocidal agents. *J Hosp Infect* 2020;104:246–51.  
450 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhin.2020.01.022>.
- 451 [21] Casanova LM, Jeon S, Rutala WA, Weber DJ, Sobsey MD. Effects of air temperature and  
452 relative humidity on coronavirus survival on surfaces. *Appl Environ Microbiol* 2010;76:2712–  
453 7. <https://doi.org/10.1128/AEM.02291-09>.
- 454 [22] Cox E, Hooyberghs J, Pensaert MB. Sites of replication of a porcine respiratory coronavirus  
455 related to transmissible gastroenteritis virus. *Res Vet Sci* 1990;48:165–169.
- 456 [23] Reed LJ, Muench H. A simple method of estimating fifty per cent endpoints. *Am J Hyg*  
457 1938;27:493–7. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordjournals.aje.a118408>.
- 458 [24] Lindsley WG, Martin SB, Thewlis RE, Sarkisian K, Nwoko JO, Mead KR, et al. Effects of  
459 Ultraviolet Germicidal Irradiation (UVGI) on N95 Respirator Filtration Performance and  
460 Structural Integrity. *J Occup Environ Hyg* 2015;12:509–17.  
461 <https://doi.org/10.1080/15459624.2015.1018518>.
- 462 [25] Martin S, Duncan E. Sterilisation considerations for implantable sensor systems. Woodhead  
463 Publishing Limited; 2013. <https://doi.org/10.1533/9780857096289.2.253>.

FIGURES

Figure 1





Figure 2





464 LEGENDS

465


466 Figure 1. Recovery of virus after elution from inoculated, untreated surgical masks and filtering  
467 facepiece respirators. Recovery of infectious porcine respiratory coronavirus from inoculated untreated  
468 surgical masks (SM) and filtering facepiece respirators (FFR) was analysed in swine testicular cells.  
469 The cell culture limit of detection (LOD) was  $0.8 \log_{10} \text{TCID}_{50}/\text{mL}$  ( $6.31 \times 10^0$ ). Similar levels of virus  
470 recovery were detected for left, right and middle (L, R, M) coupons of masks and respirators; recovery  
471 efficacy of infectious virus from straps (S) deviated significantly in all analyses from the mean of all  
472 coupons and remained below the LOD for all assays performed on FFR straps. P-values were  
473 computed by using a two-sided independent sample t-test to calculate differences between individual  
474 coupon values and differences between mean values of all coupons and straps, where \*\*\*\*P<0.0001,  
475 \*\*\*P<0.001, \*\*P<0.01, \*P<0.05, and ns is  $P \geq 0.05$ .

476


477 Figure 2. Effect of three decontaminating treatments on PRCV-inoculated surgical mask- and filtering  
478 facepiece respirator coupons and straps. The infectivity of porcine respiratory coronavirus (PRCV)  
479 recovered from surgical masks (SM) and filtering facepiece respirators (FFR) decontaminated via  
480 exposure to ultraviolet light (UV), vaporised hydrogen peroxide ( $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2$ ), or dry heat treatment was  
481 analysed in swine testicular cells. The cell culture limit of detection (LOD) was  $0.8 \log_{10} \text{TCID}_{50}/\text{ml}$   
482 for all analyses except those concerning  $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2$ -treated SM or FFR straps ( $1.8 \log_{10} \text{TCID}_{50}/\text{ml}$ ). Per  
483 decontamination method, nine PRCV-inoculated, decontaminated coupons (n=9) and three inoculated,  
484 decontaminated straps (n=3) were analysed in parallel to inoculated, untreated, positive control  
485 coupons (n=9) and straps (n=3). Sample size deviated for UV-decontaminated FFR respirators, where  
486 n=6 coupons (left and right) were analysed. P-values were computed by using a two-sided independent  
487 sample t-test, where \*\*\*\*P<0.0001, \*\*\*P<0.001, \*\*P<0.01, \*P<0.05, and ns is  $P \geq 0.05$ .

## SUPPLEMENTARY FIGURES


Supplementary Figure 1




Supplementary Figure 2



Supplementary Figure 3



Supplementary Figure 4



488 SUPPLEMENTARY FIGURE LEGENDS

489 Supplementary Figure 1. Demarcation of the three coupons (black squares), future PRCV inoculation  
490 sites (red dots), and marked elastic strap are shown on a representative surgical mask (top) and  
491 filtering facepiece respirator (bottom).

492

493 Supplementary Figure 2. Three square coupons with a focal point of PRCV inoculation at their centres  
494 are cut from a surgical mask (top); to facilitate viral elution, different layers of the coupons are  
495 separated (middle); an inoculated elastic strap is severed from a surgical mask (bottom).

496

497 Supplementary Figure 3

498 Scanning electron microscopy of a KN95 filtering facepiece respirator (FFR). Far left: Cross section  
499 view of the FFR. The two top layers are polypropylene spunbound structures, the third layer from the  
500 top is a polypropylene meltblown layer, the fourth layer is a polypropylene spunbound layer facing the  
501 wearer (the inner layer). Group of four: Details of all four polypropylene layers of the FFR. The  
502 outermost spunbound layer, the second spunbound layer, the intermediate meltblown layer, and the  
503 inner spunbound layer (61.4, 27.5, 24.4, and 28.8 grams/m<sup>2</sup> from outer to inner layer) are shown in  
504 clockwise direction. The dots in the spunbound layers show points where the fibres are melted  
505 together to ensure layer integrity. Pictures were taken on a JEOL JSM-7600F Analytical Ultrahigh  
506 resolution thermally assisted field-emission gun source scanning electron microscope at 40 times  
507 magnification. Prior to taking the pictures, samples were coated with a platinum/palladium layer  
508 (suited to non-conductive samples) using a JEOL JFC-2300 High Resolution sputter coater.

509

510 Supplementary Figure 4

511 Scanning electron microscopy of a SuninCare™, Protect Plus surgical mask. Top: Cross section view  
512 of the surgical mask. The outer layer (blue) is a polypropylene spunbound structure, the middle layer  
513 is a polypropylene meltblown structure (26.8 grams/m<sup>2</sup>) and the inner layer is a polypropylene  
514 spunbound structure. Bottom: The outer, intermediate and inner surgical mask layers are depicted  
515 from left to right. The dots in the outer and inner spunbound layers show points where the  
516 polypropylene fibres are melted together to ensure layer integrity. Pictures were taken on a JEOL  
517 JSM-7600F Analytical Ultrahigh resolution thermally assisted field-emission gun source scanning  
518 electron microscope at 40 times magnification. Prior to taking the pictures, samples were coated with a  
519 platinum/palladium layer (suited to non-conductive samples) using a JEOL JFC-2300 High Resolution  
520 sputter coater.