

1 FULL TITLE

2 From “don, doff, and discard” to “don, doff, and decontaminate” – determination of filtering facepiece
3 respirator and surgical mask integrity and inactivation of a SARS-CoV-2 surrogate and a small non-
4 enveloped virus following multiple-cycles of vaporised hydrogen peroxide, ultraviolet germicidal
5 irradiation, and dry heat decontamination

6

7 SHORT TITLE

8 Mask and respirator integrity and viral inactivation after multiple-cycle decontamination

9

10 AUTHORS

11 Louisa F. Ludwig-Begall^{1¶}, Constance Wielick^{1¶}, Olivier Jolois², Lorène Dams¹, Ravo M.
12 Razafimahefa¹, Hans Nauwynck³, Pierre-Francois Demeuldre⁴, Aurore Napp⁴, Jan Laperre², Frédéric
13 Farnir⁵, Etienne Thiry^{1*} and Eric Haubruge⁶

14

15 AUTHOR AFFILIATIONS

16 ¹Veterinary Virology and Animal Viral Diseases, Department of Infectious and Parasitic Diseases,
17 FARAH Research Centre, Faculty of Veterinary Medicine, Liège University, Liège, Belgium

18 ²Centexbel Textile Research Centre, Grace-Hollogne, Belgium

19 ³Laboratory of Virology, Faculty of Veterinary Medicine, Ghent University, Merelbeke, Belgium

20 ⁴Department of Hospital Pharmacy, The University Hospital Center, Liège University, Liège, Belgium

21 ⁵Biostatistics and Bioinformatics Applied to Veterinary Science, FARAH Research Centre, Faculty of
22 Veterinary Medicine, University of Liège, Liège, Belgium

23 ⁶TERRA Research Centre, Gembloux Agro-Bio Tech, Liège University, Gembloux, Belgium

24 [¶]These authors contributed equally to this work.

25 *Corresponding author: etienne.thiry@uliege.be

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

27 WORD COUNT: 5719

28 Non-standard abbreviations: FFR: filtering facepiece respirator; SM: surgical mask; SARS-CoV-2:

29 severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2; PRCV: porcine respiratory coronavirus; MuNoV:

30 murine norovirus; UVGI; ultraviolet germicidal irradiation; VHP: vaporised hydrogen peroxide; DH:

31 dry heat; BFE: bacterial filtration efficiency

32 ABSTRACT

33 Background

34 As the SARS-CoV-2 pandemic accelerates, the supply of personal protective equipment remains under
35 strain. To combat shortages, re-use of surgical masks and filtering facepiece respirators has been
36 recommended. Prior decontamination is paramount to the re-use of these typically single-use only
37 items and, without compromising their integrity, must guarantee inactivation of SARS-CoV-2 and
38 other contaminating pathogens.

39

40 Aim

41 We provide information on the effect of time-dependent passive decontamination at room temperature
42 and evaluate inactivation of a SARS-CoV-2 surrogate and a non-enveloped model virus as well as
43 mask and respirator integrity following active multiple-cycle vaporised hydrogen peroxide (VHP),
44 ultraviolet germicidal irradiation (UVGI), and dry heat (DH) decontamination.

45

46 Methods

47 Masks and respirators, inoculated with infectious porcine respiratory coronavirus or murine norovirus,
48 were submitted to passive decontamination or single or multiple active decontamination cycles;
49 viruses were recovered from sample materials and viral titres were measured via TCID₅₀ assay. In
50 parallel, filtration efficiency tests and breathability tests were performed according to EN standard
51 14683 and NIOSH regulations.

52

53 Results and Discussion

54 Infectious porcine respiratory coronavirus and murine norovirus remained detectable on masks and
55 respirators up to five and seven days of passive decontamination. Single and multiple cycles of VHP-,
56 UVGI-, and DH were shown to not adversely affect bacterial filtration efficiency of masks. Single-
57 and multiple UVGI did not adversely affect respirator filtration efficiency, while VHP and DH
58 induced a decrease in filtration efficiency after one or three decontamination cycles. Multiple cycles of
59 VHP-, UVGI-, and DH slightly decreased airflow resistance of masks but did not adversely affect
60 respirator breathability. VHP and UVGI efficiently inactivated both viruses after five, DH after three,
61 decontamination cycles, permitting demonstration of a loss of infectivity by more than three orders of
62 magnitude. This multi-disciplinal approach provides important information on how often a given PPE
63 item may be safely reused.

64

65 INTRODUCTION

66 As the severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) pandemic accelerates, the
67 supply of personal protective equipment (PPE) remains under severe strain. In particular, the surging
68 global demand for disposable surgical face masks (SMs) and filtering facepiece respirators (FFRs),
69 identified as incremental for source control and prevention of onward transmission from infected
70 individuals (SMs) and protection of health-care personnel during aerosol-generating procedures and
71 support treatments (FFRs) (1–4), by far exceeds current manufacturing capacities.

72

73 To combat critical shortages, and in a departure from the prevailing culture of throwaway living (5)
74 and a shift towards an eco-efficient circular economy within the healthcare industry (6), repeated re-
75 use of typically single-use only items has been recommended (1,2,7,8). Prior decontamination is
76 paramount to safe PPE re-use; SM and FFR reprocessing techniques must guarantee not only the
77 complete inactivation of SARS-CoV-2 and other contaminating respiratory or oral human pathogens
78 (the US Food and Drug Administration recommends a robust proof of infectious bioburden reduction
79 of three orders of magnitude for viral pathogens (9)), but must do so without compromising the
80 integrity of the items themselves.

81

82 In the context of a limited re-use strategy, CDC-issued recommendations include storage of SMs or
83 FFRs at room temperature (in a breathable paper bag) for a minimum period of five days of passive
84 decontamination prior to re-use (10). However, SARS-CoV-2 room temperature survival rates have
85 been subject to much debate, with earlier reports of an only short persistence (three or four days on
86 porous and non-porous surfaces, respectively (11,12)) succeeded by more recent ones of significantly
87 longer viability (21 days on PPE (13) and up to 28 days on various common surfaces (14)). While
88 reported differences are likely dependent on multiple variables, including fluctuations in ambient
89 temperature, relative humidity, light influx, and virus input, they certainly also reflect differences in
90 the surfaces or carrier matrices themselves (15), necessitating targeted assays to evaluate and mitigate
91 the individual risk of transmission via fomites in general and SMs or FFRs in particular.

92

93 Various studies have investigated active SM or FFR decontamination with regard to either biocidal
94 efficacy (modelled utilising a wide range of organisms and matrices) (12,16) or the impact of repeat
95 cycles on functional performance of SMs or FFRs (8,17–20). Few studies, however, offer a
96 consolidated data set examining both viral inactivation as well as SM and FFR integrity subsequent to
97 multiple-cycle decontamination (21). Current recommendations governing SM and FFR re-use are
98 thus based on extrapolations from various sources describing assays performed under vastly differing
99 experimental conditions and necessarily include not inconsiderable degrees of uncertainty (22–24).

100

101 Amongst the various SM or FFR reprocessing techniques under investigation, vaporised hydrogen
102 peroxide (VHP), an industry standard chemical decontaminant implemented in medical-,
103 pharmaceutical-, and research facilities, has garnered attention as a cost-effective and practical option
104 for SM and FFR decontamination (8,9,17,21,22,25). Two physical decontamination methods,
105 ultraviolet germicidal irradiation (UVGI) (18,19) and the application of dry heat (DH) (12,18), have
106 further shown promise as SM or FFR reprocessing techniques.

107

108 We previously demonstrated efficient single-cycle VHP, UVGI, and DH decontamination of SMs and
109 FFRs inoculated with two *in vitro* cultivable BSL2 pathogens. Inactivation of the infectious SARS-
110 CoV-2 surrogate porcine respiratory coronavirus (PRCV) (26–30) demonstrated virucidal activity of
111 all three methods against enveloped coronaviruses (31); decontamination of hardier non-enveloped
112 human respiratory or oral pathogens, which can equally contaminate SMs or FFRs (9,32), was
113 investigated using the notoriously tenacious murine norovirus model (MuNoV) (33–36).

114

115 Here we verify PRCV and MuNoV survivability rates on SMs and FFRs and investigate multiple-
116 cycle active decontamination of coronavirus- or norovirus-inoculated SMs and FFRs, demonstrating
117 that VHP, UVGI, and DH efficiently inactivate both viruses after several rounds of decontamination,
118 all three methods inducing a loss of viral infectivity by more than three orders of magnitude in line
119 with the FDA guidelines (9). In addition, an investigation into filtration efficiency and breathability of
120 treated face coverings demonstrated that the cumulative use of UVGI, VHP, or DH did not adversely
121 affect SM integrity following up to five decontamination cycles. Similarly, FFRs retained their
122 integrity subsequent to five iterations of UVGI or VHP treatment; DH, however, was found to
123 significantly alter the characteristics of FFRs when exceeding three decontamination rounds. Our
124 multi-disciplinal, consolidated approach, wherein both virus inactivation and SM and FFR integrity
125 are investigated subsequent to multiple decontamination cycles, provides important information on
126 how often a given PPE item may be safely reused. This data provides a measure of security to health-
127 care personnel and the general public; it can help close the currently existing gap between PPE supply
128 and demand and can contribute to the development of circular economy policies in a post-Covid-19
129 era healthcare sector.

130

131 MATERIALS AND METHODS

132

133 An overview of the workflow summarising the SM or FFR decontamination techniques, the number of
134 applied cycles, and the tests to evaluate PPE integrity or virus inactivation, is provided in Figure 1.

135

136 **Surgical masks and filtering facepiece respirators**

137 All FFRs and SMs were verified to be from the same respective manufacturing lot. Manufacturers
138 (and models): KN95 FFR - Guangzhou Sunjoy Auto Supplies CO. LTD, Guangdong, China (2020
139 N°26202002240270); surgical mask (Type II) - Hangzhou Sunten Textile Co., LTD, Hangzhou, China
140 (SuninCare™, Protect Plus).

141

142 **Decontamination techniques**

143 **Vaporised hydrogen peroxide**

144 Surgical masks, FFRs and a chemical indicator were placed in individual Mylar/Tyvek pouches.
145 Vaporised hydrogen peroxide treatment was performed with the V-PRO Max Sterilizer (Steris, Mentor,
146 OH) which uses 59% liquid hydrogen peroxide to generate vapor. A 28-minute non lumen cycle
147 consisted of 2 min 40 sec conditioning (5 g/min), 19 min 47 sec decontamination (2.2 g/min) and 7
148 min 46 sec aeration, with a peak VHP concentration of 750 ppm.

149

150 **Ultraviolet germicidal irradiation**

151 Surgical masks and FFRs were individually irradiated using a LS-AT-M1 (LASEA Company, Sart
152 Tilman, Belgium) equipped with 4 UV-C lamps of 5.5W (@UV-C). Hung vertically on a metal frame,
153 masks and FFRs were inserted into a safety enclosure. A 2 min UV-C treatment (surgical masks) led
154 to a fluence of 2.6J/cm² per mask (1.3J/cm² per side). Power and irradiation time (120 s) were
155 monitored and recorded throughout. Following irradiation, surgical masks and FFRs were unloaded
156 and placed in individual bags.

157

158 **Dry heat**

159 Surgical masks and FFRs hung horizontally on a metal frame were inserted into an electrically heated
160 vessel (M-Steryl, AMB Ecosteryl Company, Mons, Belgium) for 60 min (\pm 15 min) of heat treatment
161 at 102°C (\pm 4°C) following the “Guidance for the reprocessing of SMs and FFRs during the
162 coronavirus disease (COVID-19) Public Health Emergency” by the Belgian Federal Agency for
163 Medicines and Health Products. Temperatures inside the heated vessel were recorded throughout to
164 ensure correct exposure conditions. After termination of the treatment cycle, masks and FFRs were
165 allowed to cool and then bagged individually.

166

167 **Surgical mask integrity testing**

168 Integrity of decontaminated SMs was determined via initial macroscopic observation followed by EN
169 14683 standard filtration efficiency and breathability tests. Three SMs were used to analyse bacterial
170 filtration efficiency (BFE), five to measure breathability.

171

172 **SMs - Macroscopic observation**

173 All SM performance testing was carried out at the Centexbel Textile Research Centre (Belgium). An
174 initial visual inspection of SMs was carried out to verify their integrity; particular attention was paid to
175 potential signs of degradation such as discoloration or deformation.

176

177 **SMs - Bacterial filtration efficiency**

178 BFE employs a ratio of upstream bacterial challenge to downstream residual concentration to
179 determine filtration efficiency of SM materials against droplets. It is a required quantitative test
180 method for SM clearance by the United States FDA and the European Medical Device Directive
181 93/42/EEC (BFE \geq 98% according to EN 14683 for Type II and ASTM F2100 for Level 2 SMs).
182 Briefly, SMs were conditioned at 85 ± 5 % relative humidity and 21 ± 5 °C prior to testing. BFE was
183 measured using unneutralized *Staphylococcus aureus* bacteria contained within an aerosol droplet with
184 a mean particle size of 3 μ m diameter. The aerosol sample was drawn through an unfolded SM
185 clamped to the top of a 6-stage Andersen impactor with agar plates for collection of the bacteria
186 particles at a flow rate of 28.3 L/min for 1 min as per FDA guidance and ASTM F2101 method
187 (challenge level of 1500 and 3000 colony-forming units (CFU) per test). Following removal and
188 incubation of the culture plates, colonies were counted to determine total CFU and BFE. A positive
189 control without a test filter sample clamped into the system was used to determine the number of
190 viable particles used per test. A negative control with no bacteria in the airstream was performed to
191 determine the background challenge in the glass aerosol chamber prior to testing.

192

193 **SMs - Breathability**

194 Breathability of SMs, defined as the measure of differential pressure required to draw air through a
195 measured surface area at a constant air flow rate, was measured according to EN 14683 +
196 AC:2019 (breathability < 40 Pa/cm² for Type I and II; < 60 Pa/cm² for Type IIR) (37). Briefly, a
197 constant airflow of 8 L/min was applied through a 25 mm diameter holder (4.9 cm² total surface area
198 at orifice) to a SM test specimen. A mass flow controller was used to measure the flow rate and the
199 air exchange pressure of the SM material was measured using two manometers positioned upstream
200 and downstream of the airflow. Measurements were performed on five SMs and five different
201 locations per unfolded mask (top left, top right, bottom left, bottom right, and middle). The differential
202 pressure per mask, expressed in Pa/cm² and obtained by dividing pressure difference by surface area,
203 was reported as the average of all twenty-five measurements (5 measurements per mask; 5 masks
204 tested).

205

206 **Filtering facepiece respirator integrity testing**

207 In the field of protective equipment, the nomenclature and standardisation pertaining to FFRs and their
208 accreditation differ from one continent to another and even from one country to another. FFRs are
209 generally referred to as FFP masks in Europe, KN95s in China, and N95s in the United States; the EN

210 149 + A1:2009 standard (primarily) and an ISO 16900 standard (to a lesser extent) are applied in
211 Europe, National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH) procedures are invoked in the
212 United States. While the different methods do not always have the same standardisation limits, the
213 utilised techniques are generally the same. In the present study, FFR filtration efficiency and
214 breathability tests were performed following NIOSH procedures. Three FFRs were used per test
215 condition (assays performed in triplicate).

216

217 **FFRs - Macroscopic observation**

218 All FFR performance testing was carried out at the Nelson Laboratories (USA). An initial visual
219 inspection of FFRs was carried out to verify their integrity; particular attention was paid to potential
220 signs of degradation such as discoloration or deformation.

221

222 **FFRs - NaCl filtration efficiency**

223 FFR filtration efficiency was measured using the NIOSH sodium chloride (NaCl) aerosol method
224 employed for certification of particulate respirators with an efficiency of $\geq 95\%$ (42 CFR Part 84).
225 Briefly, FFRs were pre-conditioned at $85 \pm 5\%$ relative humidity and $38 \pm 2.5^\circ\text{C}$ for 25 ± 1 hr prior to
226 measurements. A NaCl solution was aerosolized (by atomising an aqueous solution of the salt and
227 evaporating the water), charge neutralized, and then passed through the convex side of the FFRs. The
228 concentrations of NaCl aerosol upstream and downstream of the FFR were measured at 85 L/min flow
229 rate using a flame photometer, allowing for precise determinations in the range $< 0.001\%$ to 100%
230 filter penetration.

231

232 **FFRs - Breathability**

233 FFR breathability was assessed using inhalation and exhalation breathing resistance measurements
234 according to NIOSH 42CFR Part 84. Inhalation and exhalation resistance was tested according to
235 NIOSH Standard Test Procedures (TEB-APR-STP-0007 and TEB-APR-STP-0003 (38)); results in
236 mm H₂O were recorded and evaluated against NIOSH performance criteria for FFR approvals (35 mm
237 H₂O for inhalation and 25 mm H₂O for exhalation) at approximately 85 ± 2 L/min airflow.

238

239 **Virus inactivation testing**

240 Virus infectivity losses at room temperature (passive decontamination) as well as the efficacy of VHP,
241 UVGI, and DH in inactivating infectious PRCV or MuNoV after multiple SM or FFR
242 decontamination cycles (active decontamination) were assessed using experimentally inoculated SMs
243 and FFRs.

244

245 **Viruses and cells**

246 The continuous swine testicle (ST) cell-line, grown from testicular foetal swine tissues as described by
247 McClurkin and Norman (1966) (39), was maintained in MEM (GIBCO), supplemented with 5%
248 foetal calf serum (FCS) (Sigma), 1% sodium pyruvate 100x (GIBCO), and antibiotics (100U/ml
249 penicillin, 0.1mg/ml streptomycin and 0.05 mg/ml gentamycin).

250

251 PRCV strain 91V44 (40) was passaged three times on confluent ST monolayers. Titres were
252 determined via the tissue culture infective dose (TCID₅₀) method; ST cells were seeded in 96-well
253 plates and infected with 10-fold serial dilutions of PRCV and incubated for four days at 37 °C with 5%
254 CO₂. Four days after inoculation, monolayers were analysed for the presence of cytopathic effect by
255 light microscopy. Titres, expressed as TCID₅₀/ml, were calculated according to the Reed and Muench
256 transformation (41). PRCV stocks with a titre range of 2.00×10⁷ to 2.00×10⁸ TCID₅₀/mL were used in
257 subsequent steps.

258

259 The murine macrophage cell line RAW264.7 (ATCC TIB-71) was maintained in Dulbecco's modified
260 Eagle's medium (Invitrogen) containing 10% FCS (BioWhittaker), 1% 1 M HEPES buffer (pH 7.6)
261 (Invitrogen), and 2% of an association of penicillin (5000 SI units/ml) and streptomycin (5 mg/ml)
262 (PS, Invitrogen) at 37 °C with 5% CO₂.

263

264 Stocks of MuNoV isolate MNV-1.CW1 were produced by infection of RAW264.7 cells at a
265 multiplicity of infection of 0.05. Two days post-infection, cells and supernatant were harvested and
266 clarified by centrifugation for 10 minutes at 4000 x g after three freeze/thaw cycles (- 80°C/37°C).
267 Titres were determined via the TCID₅₀ method; RAW 264.7 cells were seeded in 96-well plates,
268 infected with 10-fold serial dilutions of MuNoV, incubated for three days at 37 °C with 5% CO₂, and
269 finally stained with 0.2% crystal violet for 30 minutes. Titres, expressed as TCID₅₀/ml, were calculated
270 according to the Reed and Muench transformation (41). MuNoV stocks with a titre range of 2.00×10⁶
271 to 1.12×10⁷ TCID₅₀/mL were subsequently used.

272

273 **Passive decontamination and multiple-cycle active decontamination of porcine respiratory** 274 **coronavirus- or murine norovirus- inoculated surgical masks and filtering facepiece respirators**

275 Assays investigating time-dependent effects of virus degradation at room temperature (passive
276 decontamination), were performed using new SMs or FFRs. Per time point (0 hour, 1 day, 2 days, 3
277 days, 4 days, 5 days, 7 days, 14 days, and 21 days) and per virus (PRCV or MuNoV), one SM or FFR
278 was inoculated. The workflow followed previously described protocols for SM and FFR inoculation
279 and virus elution (31,33). Briefly, per SM or FFR, 100 µl of undiluted viral suspension were injected
280 under the first outer layer at the centre of each of three square coupons (34 mm x 34 mm) previously
281 outlined in graphite pencil on the intact SMs or FFRs. In addition to inoculation of the *de facto* SMs or
282 FFRs, 100 µl of viral suspension were pipetted onto both elastic straps. SMs and FFRs thus inoculated

283 were allowed to dry for 20 minutes at room temperature in a class II biological safety cabinet and were
284 then incubated in the dark (to limit any effect light might have on viral decay) at laboratory room
285 temperature (average 20°C) for the specified time points.

286

287 Assays investigating cumulative effects of multiple-cycle VHP and UVGI on SM or FFR
288 decontamination (active decontamination), consisted of either one or four decontamination cycles
289 applied prior to PRCV or MuNoV inoculation and subsequent decontamination, thus resulting in an
290 overall total of two and five decontaminations per SM or FFR. Since cumulative DH treatments were
291 found to significantly alter the characteristics of FFRs when exceeding three decontamination cycles
292 (see below), assays investigating cumulative effects of multiple-cycle DH decontamination, consisted
293 of either one or two FFR decontamination cycles applied prior to PRCV or MuNoV inoculation and
294 subsequent decontamination, resulting in a maximum number of three DH decontaminations. Per
295 decontamination method and type of face covering within the respective assays, one negative control
296 SM or FFR (uncontaminated but treated), three treated SMs or FFRs (PRCV- or MuNoV-
297 contaminated and treated), and three positive controls (PRCV- or MuNoV-contaminated but untreated)
298 were utilised. Per treated or control SM or FFR, 100 µl of undiluted viral suspension were injected
299 under the first outer layer at the centre of each of three square coupons. In addition to inoculation of
300 the *de facto* SMs or FFRs, 100 µl of viral suspension were pipetted onto one elastic strap per
301 contaminated SM or FFR. SMs and FFRs were allowed to dry for 20 minutes at room temperature in
302 a class II biological safety cabinet before final decontamination via UVGI, VHP, or DH.

303

304 Upon completion of the different decontamination protocols, PRCV or MuNoV was eluted from three
305 excised coupons and one severed elastic strap per SM or FFR (in the case of passive decontamination
306 assays both straps) via maximum speed vortex (2500 revolutions per minute in a VWR VX-2500
307 Multi-Tube Vortexer; 1 minute- or 20 minute vortex for PRCV- and MuNoV inoculated SMs or FFRs,
308 respectively) into 4 mL elution medium consisting of MEM or DMEM (Sigma) supplemented with 2
309 % of an association of penicillin (5000 SI units/mL) and streptomycin (5 mg/mL) (PS, Sigma); for
310 elution from VHP-treated SMs or FFRs, 20% FCS and 0.1% β-mercaptoethanol were added to the
311 medium. Titres of infectious PRCV or MuNoV recovered from individual coupons and straps were
312 determined via TCID₅₀ assay. Back titrations of inoculum stocks were performed in parallel to each
313 series of decontamination experiments.

314

315 **Data analysis and statistics**

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

319

320 RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

321

322 **Infectious porcine respiratory coronavirus is recovered up to five and seven days after**
323 **inoculation of SMs and FFRs; murine norovirus remains detectable after seven days of passive**
324 **SM or FFR decontamination.**

325 To combat PPE shortages provoked by the SARS-CoV-2 pandemic, repeated re-use of both SMs and
326 FFRs has been recommended (1,2,7,8). Prior decontamination of SARS-CoV-2 and other respiratory
327 or oral human pathogens is paramount to SM or FFR safe re-use and may be achieved either passively
328 via storage of items or via active SM and FFR reprocessing.

329

330 To validate CDC-issued limited re-use recommendations for passive decontamination by storage (10),
331 we evaluated time-dependent persistence of PRCV, an infectious SARS-CoV-2 surrogate, and
332 MuNoV, a notoriously tenacious small non-enveloped oral pathogen, on SMs and FFRs. Infectious
333 PRCV was detectable for up to five days post inoculation on SM coupons ($1.52 (\pm 0.38) \log_{10}$
334 $\text{TCID}_{50}/\text{mL}$) and three days post inoculation on SM straps ($0.88 (\pm 0.11) \log_{10} \text{TCID}_{50}/\text{mL}$). The
335 recovery of PRCV from FFRs was similar to that of SMs, with coupon virus levels near the assay
336 LOD between days three and five post inoculation and $1.04 (\pm 0.42) \log_{10} \text{TCID}_{50}/\text{mL}$ detected at day
337 seven post inoculation; no infectious PRCV was recovered from straps past day one post inoculation
338 (Figure 2). Infectious MuNoV remained detectable after seven days of passive SM or FFR coupon
339 decontamination ($1.88 (\pm 0.38)$ and $0.97 (\pm 0.14) \log_{10} \text{TCID}_{50}/\text{mL}$, respectively) and was also elutable
340 from SM and FFR straps at this time ($1.43 (\pm 0.53)$ and $1.18 (\pm 0.18) \log_{10} \text{TCID}_{50}/\text{mL}$, respectively)
341 (Figure 3).

342

343 We confirm passive room temperature SM and FFR decontamination to be effective for both PRCV
344 and MuNoV inactivation. However, we show that CDC-issued recommendations of a five-day room
345 temperature storage (10) may be too short as they do not allow for total degradation of high virus loads
346 on all SM and FFR materials (this in line with recent observations on other PPE items (13,14)).
347 According to our observations, the storage period should ideally be extended to at least seven days for
348 safe coronavirus inactivation and to a minimum of 14 days for decontamination of non-enveloped
349 viruses such as noroviruses.

350

351 **Up to five cycles of active VHP and UVGI decontamination do not visually affect SMs or FFRs;**
352 **up to five and up to three DH cycles do not affect the physical appearance of SMs and FFRs,**
353 **respectively.**

354 In high-throughput environments that necessitate a ready PPE availability (hospitals, nursing homes,
355 and other public facilities), an extended storage and turnaround time of one or even two weeks may
356 not be feasible, necessitating the implementation of fast-acting active decontamination techniques.

357 Active decontamination must guarantee not only the inactivation of SARS-CoV-2 and other
358 pathogens, but must do so without compromising the integrity of the SMs or FFRs themselves.
359 Decontaminating treatments are known to have inherently detrimental side effects that may
360 compromise the integrity of decontaminated objects (42); while VHP, UVGI, and DH
361 decontamination have previously been shown to not significantly impact performance of
362 polypropylene-based SMs or FFRs following single cycle decontamination (17–19,21), the maximum
363 number of decontamination cycles may be limited (42). To validate repeated safe reuse of SMs and
364 FFRs, we investigated SM integrity subsequent to one and five, and FFR integrity subsequent to one,
365 two, and five cycles of VHP, UVGI, and DH decontamination.

366

367 After one VHP, UVGI or DH decontamination cycle, no abnormalities were registered at visual SM or
368 FFR inspection. After multiple decontamination cycles VHP- or UVGI- treated SMs and FFRs
369 remained physically unaffected, this in line with previous studies (43,44). Only FFRs subjected to five
370 cycles of DH showed signs of degradation or burning which manifested as brown discoloration of FFR
371 elastic straps and disassociation of the metal noseband from FFR fabrics; as a consequence, five cycles
372 of DH treatment were abandoned in further analyses and were, uniquely for DH, replaced by tests
373 performed after three treatment cycles.

374

375 **Single and multiple cycles of VHP-, UVGI-, and DH decontamination do not adversely affect SM**
376 **BFE. Single- and multiple UVGI decontamination does not adversely affect FFR NaCl filtration**
377 **efficiency, while VHP and DH treatments induce a slight decrease in filtration efficiency after**
378 **one or three decontamination cycles.**

379 To investigate whether one and five and one, two, and five (three for DH) cycles of decontamination
380 affect SM and FFR integrity, respectively, SM BFE testing was performed according to EN14683 and
381 FFR filtration efficiency was investigated using the sub-micron NaCl aerosol method (NIOSH 42 CFR
382 Part 84). Both SMs and FFRs surpassed minimum filtration efficiency requirements before (99.50%
383 (± 0.08) BFE and 97.01% (± 0.56) NaCl filtration efficiency) decontamination. SM BFE remained
384 consistently higher than 98% after single- and multiple-cycle decontamination (Figure 4 A).

385

386 FFR filtration efficiencies remained above the required $\geq 95\%$ (i.e. $< 5\%$ penetration) following DH
387 and UVGI single-cycle treatments, however dropped to 91.02% (± 8.38) post VHP exposure (this
388 owing to the aberrant value of 79.2% for a single FFR). Following two, three (for DH), or five
389 decontamination cycles, filtration efficiency of UVGI- and VHP-treated FFRs remained above 95%,
390 but dropped to 94.16% (± 1.02) after three cycles of DH decontamination (Figure 4 B). VHP (which is
391 FDA-authorized for FFR decontamination) is typically not destructive to polypropylene FFRs (8,22)
392 and has previously been shown to not negatively affect FFR performance after single or multiple
393 decontamination cycles in assays similar to ours (43,45). Since neither two nor five cycles of

394 decontamination caused a drop in filtration efficiency, it seems likely that the single aberrant result
395 after one VHP cycle may have been due to an issue with the item itself rather than the
396 decontamination. It follows that all three methods are suitable for single-cycle FFR decontamination
397 and reuse and that UVGI- and VHP decontamination may safely be applied to FFRs for up to five
398 cycles. DH at 102°C should only be used for a maximum of three iterations; for more than three DH
399 decontamination cycles, only temperatures that preserve the filtration characteristics of pristine FFRs
400 (< 100°C) are to be recommended (18,45).

401

402 **Multiple cycles of VHP-, UVGI-, and DH decontamination decrease airflow resistance of SMs**
403 **but do not adversely affect FFR breathability.**

404 Breathability, or resistance to airflow during inhalation and exhalation, is an indication of the
405 difficulty in breathing through SMs or FFRs and as such is important to wearer comfort. Breathability
406 of SMs was measured via differential pressure (pressure drop) test according to EN 14683 + AC:2019
407 (37), while breathability of FFRs was assessed by inhalation and exhalation resistance tests according
408 to NIOSH Standard Test Procedures (TEB-APR-STP-0007 and TEB-APR-STP-0003).

409

410 Untreated SMs (n=5) reached 52.08 (± 0.99) Pa/cm² differential pressure before treatment, while
411 differential pressures were only slightly elevated following single-cycle DH (54.88 (± 3.00) Pa/cm²)
412 and VHP (59.2 (± 3.88) Pa/cm²) decontamination, but exceeded the limit of 60 Pa/cm² post UVGI
413 treatment with a measurement of 63.72 (± 7.05) Pa/cm² (Figure 5). Following five decontamination
414 cycles, pressure drop test results consistently exceeded the prescribed maximum of 60 Pa/cm² (Figure
415 5), with mean values of 66.82 (± 2.88) Pa/cm² (DH), 69.04 (± 3.88) Pa/cm² (VHP) and 59.78 (± 1.47)
416 Pa/cm² (UVGI). Such elevated results should exclude the tested SMs from use following multiple-
417 cycle decontamination via all three methods according to EN 14683 + AC:2019; however, it should be
418 noted that mean differential pressure results have been shown to vary depending on the SM type
419 analysed (45). Hence, values exceeding the 60 Pa/cm² limit in this study may have been artificially
420 elevated by high SM baseline values prior to decontamination rather than the decontamination
421 procedures themselves, which have, in other studies, been shown to retain high SM performance even
422 after multiple treatment cycles (45,46). In Belgium, where SMs may be marketed and used in the
423 Covid-19 crisis situation according to an “Alternative Test Protocol” issued by the Belgian Federal
424 Agency for Medicines and Health Products that sets the maximum differential pressure limit at ≤ 70
425 Pa/cm² (47), all treated SMs met current breathability requirements.

426

427 FFR inhalation and exhalation resistance measurements remained far below the recommended
428 maximum limits of ≤ 35 mmH₂O in inhalation and ≤ 25 mmH₂O in exhalation maintaining acceptable
429 respirability according to applicable standards and regulations both before (inhalation: 12.43 (± 0.69))

430 mmH₂O; exhalation: 11.9 (±0.86) mmH₂O) and after single or multiple decontamination cycles,
431 echoing other published results (45,48).

432

433 **Infectious porcine respiratory coronavirus is recovered at high titres from positive control SM-**
434 **and FFR coupons, at lower titres from straps, and remains under the limit of detection following**
435 **two (VHP, UVGI, DH), three (DH-treated FFRs) or five (VHP, UVGI, DH (SM)) active**
436 **decontamination cycles.**

437

438 **PRCV recovery from SM and FFR positive controls**

439 Back titrations of virus inoculums performed in parallel to each series of experiments confirmed
440 PRCV inoculum titres to be within a range of 7.30 to 8.30 log₁₀ TCID₅₀/mL for all experiments. The
441 cell culture limit of detection (LOD) was 0.8 log₁₀ TCID₅₀/mL for all assays. An initially observed
442 VHP cytotoxicity and correspondingly elevated LOD of 1.80 log₁₀ TCID₅₀/mL of VHP-treated coupon
443 eluates was corrected via β-mercaptoethanol and FCS supplementation of elution medium; elevated
444 cytotoxicity of VHP-treated strap eluates (SM and FFR) could not be neutralised and remained at 1.80
445 log₁₀ TCID₅₀/mL. Values below the LOD were thus considered as ≤0.80 log₁₀ TCID₅₀/mL or ≤1.80
446 log₁₀ TCID₅₀/mL (VH-treated straps). Comparable high levels of infectious virus were recovered from
447 once-, twice- (DH-treated FFRs) or four-times treated, PRCV-inoculated left, right and middle
448 coupons of all SMs and FFRs within a range of 4.27 (±0.50) to 6.07 (±0.29) log₁₀ TCID₅₀/mL
449 (Supplementary Figure 1). Recovery values for infectious PRCV from SM and FFR straps were also
450 similar between experiments, however they were lower than coupon recovery values, with mean
451 values ranging from below the LOD to 4.44 (±0.74) log₁₀ TCID₅₀/mL (Supplementary Figure 1).

452

453 **Multiple cycle decontamination of PRCV-inoculated SMs**

454 Following two cycles of SM UVGI, VHP exposure, and DH treatment, all PRCV titres remained
455 below the respective LOD of the assay (with the exception of UVGI treated straps), showing a total
456 loss of infectivity of more than five orders of magnitude for UVGI-treated coupons (5.05 log₁₀
457 reduction) and four orders of magnitude for VHP- and DH-treated coupons (4.83 and 4.39 log₁₀
458 reduction, respectively), this in line with previous publications (48,49). Titres of PRCV recovered
459 from SM straps following two treatment cycles were reduced by over two orders of magnitude post
460 UVGI, VHP and DH treatment of SM straps (2.48, 2.22 and 2.85 log₁₀ reduction) (Figure 7).

461

462 Following five cycles of SM UVGI, VHP exposure, and DH treatment, all PRCV titres remained
463 below the respective LOD of the assay (with the exception of UVGI treated straps), showing a total
464 loss of infectivity of more than five orders of magnitude for UVGI-treated coupons (5.37 log₁₀
465 reduction) and more than four orders of magnitude for VHP- and DH-treated coupons (4.64 and 4.69
466 log₁₀ reduction, respectively); titres of PRCV recovered from treated SM straps were reduced by over

467 one order of magnitude post UVGI (1.59 log₁₀ reduction) and for VHP-treated straps (2.02 log₁₀
468 reduction), and by almost four orders of magnitude for DH- treated straps (3.94 log₁₀ reduction)
469 (Figure 7).

470

471 **Multiple cycle decontamination of PRCV-inoculated FFRs**

472 Decontamination treatment effects followed a similar pattern of PRCV inactivation for FFR coupons
473 decontaminated twice via DH, VHP, and UVGI reducing viral titres by more than three and four
474 orders of magnitude (3.71, 4.45 and 4.62 log₁₀ reduction, respectively), supporting previous
475 observations (31). The impact of two-cycle decontamination could not be measured for DH-treated
476 FFR straps due to insufficient recovery of infectious virus in the corresponding controls. Virus
477 recovery from both SM and FFR straps has been shown to be highly variable both in our hands (31)
478 and in those of others (50) (and indeed, probably for this reason, strap decontamination is rarely
479 assessed). Without enough proof of inactivation, we cannot recommend safe decontamination of SM
480 or FFR straps and suggest treating straps separately using a disinfecting wipe or similar approach.
481 Two-cycle UVGI and VHP treatment of FFR straps resulted in a reduction of infectious PRCV loads
482 by 1.46 and 0.63 log₁₀ reduction, respectively (Figure 8).

483

484 Following five cycles of FFR UVGI, VHP, and DH, all PRCV titres remained below the respective
485 LOD of the assay, reducing viral titres by over four orders of magnitude (4.48, 4.22 and 4.30 log₁₀
486 reduction, respectively). These results are in line with our own and others' prior publications
487 regarding decontamination of SARS-CoV-2- or surrogate-contaminated FFRs (31,49) and confirm that
488 all three methods yield rapid and efficient virus inactivation even after multiple-cycle FFR
489 decontamination. The impact of decontamination could not be measured for DH-treated FFR straps
490 due to insufficient recovery of infectious virus in the corresponding controls. UVGI and VHP
491 treatment of FFR straps resulted in a reduction of infectious PRCV loads by 1.81 and 0.18 log₁₀
492 reduction, respectively (Figure 8).

493

494 **Infectious murine norovirus is recovered at high titres from positive control SM- and FFR**
495 **coupons, at lower titres from straps, and remains under the limit of detection following two**
496 **(VHP, UVGI, DH), three (DH) or five (VHP, UVGI) decontamination cycles.**

497

498 **MuNoV recovery from SM and FFR positive controls**

499 Back titrations of virus inoculums performed in parallel to each series of experiments confirmed
500 MuNoV inoculum titres to be within a range of 6.30 to 7.05 log₁₀ TCID₅₀/mL for all experiments. The
501 cell culture limit of detection (LOD) was 0.80 log₁₀ TCID₅₀/mL for all assays except for those
502 concerning VHP-treated SM- or FFR straps and UVGI-treated FFR straps (1.80 log₁₀ TCID₅₀/mL).
503 Comparable high levels of infectious virus were recovered from once-, twice- (DH-treated FFRs) or

504 four-times treated , MuNoV-inoculated left, right and middle coupons of all SMs and FFRs within a
505 range of 4.55 (± 0.60) to 5.38 (± 0.25) \log_{10} TCID₅₀/mL (Supplementary Figure 2). Recovery values for
506 infectious MuNoV from SM and FFR straps were also similar between experiments, however they
507 were lower than coupon recovery values, with mean values ranging from 1.80 (VHP LOD) to 5.22
508 (± 0.14) \log_{10} TCID₅₀/mL (Supplementary Figure 2).

509

510 **Multiple cycle decontamination of MuNoV-inoculated SMs**

511 Following two cycles of SM UVGI, VHP exposure, and DH treatment, all MuNoV titres remained
512 below the respective LOD of the assay, showing total loss of infectivity of over four orders of
513 magnitude for UVGI-, VHP- and DH-treated SM coupons (4.47, 4.33, and 4.15 \log_{10} reduction,
514 respectively). Titres of MuNoV recovered from treated SM straps were reduced by less than three
515 orders of magnitude post two cycles of UVGI and VHP treatment (0.96 and 2.55 (below the LOD)
516 \log_{10} reduction, respectively) and by over four orders of magnitude post two-cycle-DH treatment (4.43
517 \log_{10} reduction (below LOD)) (Figure 9).

518

519 Following five cycles of SM UVGI, VHP exposure, and DH treatment, all MuNoV titres remained
520 below the respective LOD of the assay, showing total loss of infectivity of over four orders of
521 magnitude for UVGI and DH-treated coupons (4.65 and 4.29 \log_{10} reduction, respectively), while
522 titres of MuNoV recovered from VHP-treated coupons showed a loss of infectivity of almost four
523 orders of magnitude (3.96 \log_{10} reduction). Titres of MuNoV recovered from treated SM straps were
524 reduced by 0.88, 2.39 (below the LOD), and 3.84 \log_{10} , respectively, post UVGI, VHP- and DH-
525 treatment (Figure 9).

526

527 **Multiple cycle decontamination of MuNoV-inoculated FFRs**

528 Decontamination followed a similar pattern of MuNoV inactivation for FFR coupons decontaminated
529 twice via DH, reducing viral titres by over three orders of magnitude (3.96 \log_{10} reduction), and by
530 over four orders of magnitude for VHP- and UVGI-treated FFR coupons (4.42, and 4.44 \log_{10}
531 reduction, respectively). UVGI- and DH-treatment of FFR straps reduced infectivity by 0.06 \log_{10} (not
532 significant), and 3.15 \log_{10} (from 3.63 (± 0.76) \log_{10} TCID₅₀/mL to below the LOD), respectively. Loss
533 of infectivity could not be demonstrated subsequent to MuNoV elution from twice-VHP-treated FFR
534 straps owing to poor virus recovery (Figure 10).

535

536 Decontamination followed a similar pattern of MuNoV inactivation on FFR coupons after five
537 iterations of UVGI, VHP, and DH treatments, reducing viral titres by over four orders of magnitude
538 for UVGI- and DH-treated coupons (4.33 and 4.22 \log_{10} reduction, respectively), and by less than
539 three orders of magnitude for VHP-treated FFR coupons (2.84 \log_{10} reduction). UVGI and DH-
540 treatment of FFR straps reduced infectivity by less than one and over three orders of magnitude (0.65

541 (not significant) and 3.10 (not significant) \log_{10} reduction, respectively); Loss of infectivity could not
542 be demonstrated subsequent to MuNoV elution from VHP-treated FFR straps after five
543 decontamination cycles owing to poor virus recovery (Figure 10).

544

545 CONCLUSION

546 In conclusion, we showed that PRCV and MuNoV remain detectable on SMs and FFRs for up to five
547 and seven days of passive decontamination at room temperature, necessitating either longer
548 decontamination periods than currently recommended by the CDC or active decontamination
549 techniques that can decontaminate PPE within a matter of hours. Three such active decontamination
550 techniques were evaluated in this study with respect to their effect both on SM and FFR integrity and
551 on the inactivation of the enveloped SARS-CoV-2 surrogate PRCV and non-enveloped human
552 norovirus surrogate MuNoV. Single and multiple cycles of VHP-, UVGI-, and DH were shown to not
553 adversely affect bacterial filtration efficiency of SMs. Single- and multiple UVGI did not adversely
554 affect FFR filtration efficiency, while VHP and DH induced a slight decrease in FFR filtration
555 efficiency after one or three decontamination cycles. Multiple cycles of VHP-, UVGI-, and DH
556 decreased airflow resistance of SMs but did not adversely affect FFR breathability. All three active
557 decontamination methods efficiently inactivated both viruses after five decontamination cycles,
558 permitting demonstration of a loss of infectivity by more than three orders of magnitude. This multi-
559 disciplinary, consolidated approach, wherein both SM and FFR integrity and the inactivation of a
560 coronavirus and a hardier non-enveloped norovirus are investigated subsequent to multiple
561 decontamination cycles thus provides important information on how often a given PPE item may be
562 safely reused. The knowledge gained here will help close the existing gap between supply and demand
563 and provide a multi-faceted measure of security to health-care personnel and the general public both
564 during the Covid-19 pandemic and beyond, when established protocols for re-use of single-use only
565 items may be upheld for environmental reasons.

566

567 ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

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

572

573

574 CONFLICTS OF INTEREST STATEMENT

575 The authors have no conflicts of interest to disclose.

576

577 FUNDING SOURCE

578 This work was supported by a grant from the Walloon Region, Belgium (Project 2010053 -2020-
579 “MASK - Decontamination and reuse of surgical masks and filtering facepiece respirators”) and the
580 ULiège Fonds Spéciaux pour la Recherche 2020.

581 REFERENCES

582

- 583 1. World Health Organization (WHO). Rational use of personal protective equipment for
584 coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19). Who. 2020;2019(February):1–7.
- 585 2. Leung NHL, Chu DKW, Shiu EYC, Chan K-H, McDevitt JJ, Hau BJP, et al. Respiratory virus
586 shedding in exhaled breath and efficacy of face masks. *Nat Med* [Internet]. 2020; Available
587 from: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/s41591-020-0843-2>
- 588 3. WHO. Strengthening the health system response to COVID-19 Recommendations for the
589 WHO European Region Policy brief. 2020;(April):8. Available from:
590 <https://www.thelancet.com/journals/langlo/article/PIIS2214-109X>
- 591 4. Lancet T. COVID-19: protecting health-care workers. *Lancet* (London, England) [Internet].
592 2020 Mar 21;395(10228):922. Available from: <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/32199474>
- 593 5. Strasser BJ, Schlich T. A history of the medical mask and the rise of throwaway culture. *Lancet*
594 [Internet]. 2020;396(10243):19–20. Available from: [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(20\)31207-1](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(20)31207-1)
- 596 6. Ibn-Mohammed T, Mustapha KB, Godsell J, Adamu Z, Babatunde KA, Akintade DD, et al. A
597 critical review of the impacts of COVID-19 on the global economy and ecosystems and
598 opportunities for circular economy strategies. *Resour Conserv Recycl* [Internet].
599 2021;164(May 2020):105169. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.resconrec.2020.105169>
- 600 7. Lee J, Bong C, Bae PK, Abafogi AT, Baek SH. Fast and easy disinfection of coronavirus-
601 contaminated face masks using ozone gas produced by a dielectric barrier discharge plasma
602 generator. *medRxiv*. 2020;COVID-19 S:1–13.
- 603 8. Dutch National Institute for Public Health and the Environment (RIVM). Reuse of FFP2
604 masks. 2020;1–5.
- 605 9. Center for Devices and Radiological Health. Enforcement Policy for Face Masks and
606 Respirators During the Coronavirus Disease (COVID-19) Public Health Emergency (Revised)
607 Guidance for Industry and Food and Drug Administration Staff. 2020;(April).
- 608 10. Implementing Filtering Facepiece Respirator (FFR) Reuse, Including Reuse after
609 Decontamination, When There Are Known Shortages of N95 Respirators [Internet]. Centers
610 for Disease Control and Prevention. 2020 [cited 2020 Oct 6]. Available from:
611 [https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/hcp/ppe-strategy/decontamination-reuse-
612 respirators.html](https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/hcp/ppe-strategy/decontamination-reuse-respirators.html)
- 613 11. van Doremalen N, Bushmaker T, Morris DH, Holbrook MG, Gamble A, Williamson BN, et al.
614 Aerosol and Surface Stability of SARS-CoV-2 as Compared with SARS-CoV-1. *N Engl J Med*
615 [Internet]. 2020 Mar 17;382(16):1564–7. Available from:
616 <https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMc2004973>
- 617 12. Chin AWH, Chu JTS, Perera MRA, Hui KPY, Yen H-L, Chan MCW, et al. Stability of SARS-

- 618 CoV-2 in different environmental conditions. *The Lancet Microbe* [Internet]. 2020;1(1):e10.
619 Available from: [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S2666-5247\(20\)30003-3](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S2666-5247(20)30003-3)
- 620 13. Kasloff S, Strong J, Funk D, Cutts T. Stability of SARS-CoV-2 on Critical Personal Protective
621 Equipment. medRxiv. 2020;
- 622 14. Riddell S, Goldie S, Hill A, Eagles D, Drew TW. The effect of temperature on persistence of
623 SARS-CoV-2 on common surfaces. *Virology* [Internet]. 2020;17(1):1–7. Available from:
624 <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12985-020-01418-7>
- 625 15. Bedrosian N, Mitchell E, Rohm E, Rothe M, Kelly C, String G, et al. A Systematic Review of
626 Surface Contamination, Stability, and Disinfection Data on SARS-CoV-2 (Through July 10,
627 2020). *Environ Sci Technol*. 2020;2.
- 628 16. Darnell MER, Subbarao K, Feinstone SM, Taylor DR. Inactivation of the coronavirus that
629 induces severe acute respiratory syndrome, SARS-CoV. *J Virol Methods*. 2004;121(1):85–91.
- 630 17. Schwartz A, Stiegel M, Greeson N, Vogel A, Thomann W, Brown M, et al. Decontamination
631 and Reuse of N95 Respirators with Hydrogen Peroxide Vapor to Address Worldwide Personal
632 Protective Equipment Shortages During the SARS-CoV-2 (COVID-19) Pandemic. *Appl
633 Biosaf*. 2020;
- 634 18. Liao L, Xiao W, Zhao M, Yu X, Wang H, Wang Q, et al. Can N95 respirators be reused after
635 disinfection? And for how many times? medRxiv. 2020;2020.04.01.20050443.
- 636 19. Viscusi DJ, Bergman MS, Novak DA, Faulkner KA, Palmiero A, Powell J, et al. Impact of
637 three biological decontamination methods on filtering facepiece respirator fit, odor, comfort,
638 and donning ease. *J Occup Environ Hyg*. 2011;8(7):426–36.
- 639 20. Lin TH, Chen CC, Huang SH, Kuo CW, Lai CY, Lin WY. Filter quality of electret masks in
640 filtering 14.6–594 nm aerosol particles: Effects of five decontamination methods. *PLoS One*.
641 2017;12(10):1–15.
- 642 21. Kumar A, Kasloff SB, Leung A, Cutts T, Strong JE, Hills K, et al. N95 Mask Decontamination
643 using Standard Hospital Sterilization Technologies. medRxiv Prepr. 2020;(1):1–9.
- 644 22. Rodriguez-Martinez CE, Sossa-Briceño MP, Cortés JA. Decontamination and reuse of N95
645 filtering facemask respirators: A systematic review of the literature. *Am J Infect Control*
646 [Internet]. 2020 Jul 8;S0196-6553(20)30690-8. Available from:
647 <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/32652253>
- 648 23. Toomey E, Conway Y, Burton C, Smith S, Smalle M, Chan XHS, et al. Extended use or re-use
649 of single-use surgical masks and filtering facepiece respirators during COVID-19: A rapid
650 systematic review. *Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol*. 2020;1–9.
- 651 24. Zorko DJ, Gertsman S, O’Hearn K, Timmerman N, Ambu-Ali N, Dinh T, et al.
652 Decontamination interventions for the reuse of surgicalmask personal protective equipment: a
653 systematicreview. *J Hosp Infect*. 2020;106:283–94.
- 654 25. Zonta W, Mauroy A, Farnir F, Thiry E. Virucidal Efficacy of a Hydrogen Peroxide

- 655 Nebulization Against Murine Norovirus and Feline Calicivirus, Two Surrogates of Human
656 Norovirus. *Food Environ Virol.* 2016;8(4):275–82.
- 657 26. Pensaert M, Callebaut P, Vergote J. Isolation of a porcine respiratory, non-enteric coronavirus
658 related to transmissible gastroenteritis. *Vet Q.* 1986;8(3):257–61.
- 659 27. Laude H, Van Reeth K, Pensaert M. Porcine respiratory coronavirus: molecular features and
660 virus-host interactions. *Vet Res.* 1993;24(2):125–50.
- 661 28. Saif LJ, Wang Q, Vlasova AN, Jung K, Xiao S. Coronaviruses. In: Zimmerman JJ, Kariker
662 LA, Ramirez A, Schwartz KJ, Stevenson GW, Jianqiang Z, editors. *Diseases of Swine*,
663 Eleventh Edition. 2019. p. 488–523.
- 664 29. Kampf G, Todt D, Pfaender S, Steinmann E. Persistence of coronaviruses on inanimate
665 surfaces and their inactivation with biocidal agents. *J Hosp Infect [Internet].* 2020;104(3):246–
666 51. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhin.2020.01.022>
- 667 30. Casanova LM, Jeon S, Rutala WA, Weber DJ, Sobsey MD. Effects of air temperature and
668 relative humidity on coronavirus survival on surfaces. *Appl Environ Microbiol.*
669 2010;76(9):2712–7.
- 670 31. Ludwig-Begall LF, Wielick C, Dams L, Nauwynck H, Demeuldre P-F, Napp A, et al. The use
671 of germicidal ultraviolet light, vaporised hydrogen peroxide and dry heat to decontaminate face
672 masks and filtering respirators contaminated with a SARS-CoV-2 surrogate virus. *J Hosp
673 Infect [Internet].* 2020; Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bbamem.2019.183135>
- 674 32. Kramer A, Schwebke I, Kampf G. How long do nosocomial pathogens persist on inanimate
675 surfaces? A systematic review. *BMC Infect Dis.* 2006;6:1–8.
- 676 33. Wielick C, Ludwig-Begall LF, Dams L, Razafimahefa R, Demeuldre P-F, Napp A, et al. The
677 use of germicidal ultraviolet light, vaporised hydrogen peroxide and dry heat to decontaminate
678 face masks and filtering respirators contaminated with an infectious norovirus. *medRxiv Prepr
679 [Internet].* 2020; Available from: <http://repositorio.unan.edu.ni/2986/1/5624.pdf>
- 680 34. Zonta W, Mauroy A, Farnir F, Thiry E. Comparative Virucidal Efficacy of Seven Disinfectants
681 Against Murine Norovirus and Feline Calicivirus, Surrogates of Human Norovirus. *Food
682 Environ Virol [Internet].* 2015; Available from: <http://link.springer.com/10.1007/s12560-015-9216-2>
- 683
- 684 35. Nims RW, Zhou SS. Intra-family differences in efficacy of inactivation of small, non-
685 enveloped viruses. *Biologicals [Internet].* 2016;44(5):456–62. Available from:
686 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.biologicals.2016.05.005>
- 687 36. Robilotti E, Deresinski S, Pinsky BA. Norovirus. *Clin Microbiol Rev [Internet].*
688 2015;28(1):134–64. Available from: <http://cmr.asm.org/lookup/doi/10.1128/CMR.00075-14>
- 689 37. EN 14683 □: 2019 + AC □: 2019 Medical face masks — Requirements and test methods.
690 2019;(12).
- 691 38. NIOSH. Procedure No. TEB-APR-STP-0003 - Determination of exhalation resistance test, air-

- 692 purifying respirators Standard Testing Procedure (STD). 2019;1–6.
- 693 39. McClurkin AW, Norman JO. Studies on transmissible gastroenteritis of swine. II. Selected
694 characteristics of a cytopathogenic virus common to five isolates from transmissible
695 gastroenteritis. *Can J Comp Med Vet Sci*. 1966;30(7):190–8.
- 696 40. Cox E, Hooyberghs J, Pensaert MB. Sites of replication of a porcine respiratory coronavirus
697 related to transmissible gastroenteritis virus. *Res Vet Sci*. 1990;48(January):165–169.
- 698 41. Reed, L.J.; Muench H. A simple method of estimating fifty percent endpoints. *Am J Hyg*.
699 1938;27(493–497).
- 700 42. Lindsley WG, Martin SB, Thewlis RE, Sarkisian K, Nwoko JO, Mead KR, et al. Effects of
701 Ultraviolet Germicidal Irradiation (UVGI) on N95 Respirator Filtration Performance and
702 Structural Integrity. *J Occup Environ Hyg*. 2015;12(8):509–17.
- 703 43. Bergman MS, Viscusi DJ, Heimbuch BK, Wander JD, Sambol AR, Shaffer RE. Evaluation of
704 multiple (3-Cycle) decontamination processing for filtering facepiece respirators. *J Eng Fiber
705 Fabr*. 2010;5(4):33–41.
- 706 44. Viscusi DJ, Bergman MS, Eimer BC, Shaffer RE. Evaluation of five decontamination methods
707 for filtering facepiece respirators. *Ann Occup Hyg*. 2009;53(8):815–27.
- 708 45. Lendvay TS, Chen J, Harcourt BH, Scholte FEM, Kilinc-Balci FS, Lin YL, et al. Addressing
709 Personal Protective Equipment (PPE) Decontamination: Methylene Blue and Light
710 Inactivates SARS-CoV-2 on N95 Respirators and Masks with Maintenance of Integrity and Fit.
711 *medRxiv*. 2020;
- 712 46. Suen CY, Leung HH, Lam KW, Hung K, Chan MY, Kwan JKC. Feasibility of Reusing
713 Surgical Mask Under Different Disinfection Treatments. *medRxiv Prepr*. 2020;
- 714 47. Information on the Alternative Test Protocol (ATP) for surgical face masks. *Belgian Fed
715 Agency Med Heal Prod*. 2020;Version va:2–5.
- 716 48. Fischer RJ, Morris DH, Doremalen N Van, Sarchette S, Matson MJ, Bushmaker T, et al.
717 Effectiveness of N95 respirator decontamination and reuse against SARS-CoV-2. *Emerg Infect
718 Dis*. 2020;26(9):2253–5.
- 719 49. Rothe M, Rohm E, Mitchell E, Bedrosian N, Kelly C, String G, et al. A systematic review of
720 mask disinfection and reuse for SARS-CoV-2 (through July 10 , 2020). *medRxiv [Internet]*.
721 2020; Available from: <https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.11.11.20229880v1>
- 722 50. Mills D, Harnish DA, Lawrence C, Sandoval-Powers M, Heimbuch BK. Ultraviolet germicidal
723 irradiation of influenza-contaminated N95 filtering facepiece respirators. *Am J Infect Control
724 [Internet]*. 2018;46(7):e49–55. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ajic.2018.02.018>

FIGURE CAPTIONS

725 **Figure 1.** Experimental set-up of filtering facepiece respirator (FFR) and surgical mask (SM)
726 decontamination assays. (A) Natural virus degradation over time. (B) Integrity testing after multiple-
727 cycle vaporised hydrogen peroxide (VHP), ultraviolet germicidal irradiation (UVGI), and dry heat
728 (DH) decontamination. (C) Multiple-cycle decontamination of porcine respiratory coronavirus
729 (PRCV)- and murine norovirus (MuNoV)- inoculated SMs/FFRs.

730

731 **Figure 2.** Recovery of porcine respiratory coronavirus (PRCV) after elution from filtering facepiece
732 respirators (FFRs) and surgical masks (SMs) kept at room temperature (20°C) over time. PRCV
733 infectivity was analysed in swine testicular cells. The cell culture limit of detection (LOD) was 0.80
734 log₁₀ TCID₅₀/mL (6.31×10^0 TCID₅₀/mL).

735

736 **Figure 3.** Recovery of murine norovirus (MuNoV) after elution from filtering facepiece respirators
737 (FFRs) and surgical masks (SMs) kept at room temperature (20°C) over time. MuNoV infectivity was
738 analysed in RAW264.7 cells. The cell culture limit of detection (LOD) was 0.80 log₁₀ TCID₅₀/mL
739 (6.31×10^0 TCID₅₀/mL).

740

741 **Figure 4.** Filtering facepiece respirator (FFR) NaCl filtration efficiency- and surgical mask (SM)
742 bacterial filtration efficiency (BFE) testing after single-cycle or multiple-cycle decontamination using
743 dry heat (DH), vaporised hydrogen peroxide (VHP), and ultraviolet germicidal irradiation (UVGI).
744 Horizontal dashed lines represent the NaCl filtration efficiency requirement of $\geq 95\%$ according to
745 NIOSH 42 CFR Part 84. Untreated FFRs (n=3) surpassed the minimum NaCl filtration efficiency,
746 achieving 97.01% (± 0.56) as a baseline before treatment. Horizontal dotted lines represent the
747 bacterial filtration efficiency (3 μ m droplet size) requirement of $\geq 98\%$ according to EN 14683 for
748 Type II and ASTM F2100 for Level 2 SMs. Untreated SMs (n=3) surpassed the minimum BFE,
749 achieving 99.50% (± 0.08) as a baseline before treatment.

750

751 **Figure 5.** Surgical mask (SM) breathability testing after single-cycle or multiple-cycle
752 decontamination using dry heat (DH), vaporised hydrogen peroxide (VHP), and ultraviolet germicidal
753 irradiation (UVGI). Horizontal dotted lines represent the maximum allowed differential pressure in
754 following standards: < 40 Pa/cm² according to EN 14683:2019 Annex C for Type I and II masks and $<$
755 60 Pa/cm² for Type IIR. Untreated SMs (n=5) achieved 52.08 (± 0.99) Pa/cm² differential pressure as a
756 baseline before treatment.

757

758 **Figure 6.** Filtering facepiece respirator (FFR) breathability testing after single-cycle or multiple-cycle
759 decontamination using dry heat (DH), vaporised hydrogen peroxide (VHP), and ultraviolet germicidal
760 irradiation (UVGI). Exhalation (A) and inhalation (B) breathing resistances after decontamination.

761 Horizontal dashed (above) and dotted (below) lines represent the following breathing resistance
762 standards: Exhalation: ≤ 25 mmH₂O and Inhalation: ≤ 35 mmH₂O for FFRs according to NIOSH 42
763 CFR Part 84. Untreated FFRs (n=5) achieved inhalation and exhalation resistance of 12.43 (± 0.69)
764 mmH₂O and 11.9 (± 0.86) mmH₂O, respectively.

765

766 **Figure 7.** Porcine coronavirus (PRCV) inactivation following multiple cycle surgical mask (SM)
767 decontamination using dry heat (DH), vaporised hydrogen peroxide (VHP), and ultraviolet germicidal
768 irradiation (UVGI). Titrations were performed after two or five (three in the case of DH)
769 decontamination treatments on PRCV-inoculated SM coupons and straps. PRCV infectivity was
770 analysed in swine testicular cells. The cell culture limit of detection (LOD) was 0.80 log₁₀ TCID₅₀/mL
771 (6.31×10^0 TCID₅₀/mL) for all analyses except those concerning VHP-treated SM straps (1.80 log₁₀
772 TCID₅₀/mL (6.31×10^1 TCID₅₀/mL)). Per decontamination method, nine PRCV-inoculated,
773 decontaminated coupons (n=9) and three inoculated, decontaminated straps (n=3) were analysed in
774 parallel to inoculated, untreated, positive control coupons (n=9) and straps (n=3). Mean log₁₀
775 TCID₅₀/mL and standard errors of the means are represented. P-values were computed by using a two-
776 sided independent sample t-test, where ****P<0.0001, ***P<0.001, **P<0.01, *P<0.05, and ns is
777 $P \geq 0.05$.

778

779 **Figure 8.** Porcine coronavirus (PRCV) inactivation following multiple cycle filtering facepiece
780 respirator (FFR) decontamination using dry heat (DH), vaporised hydrogen peroxide (VHP), and
781 ultraviolet germicidal irradiation (UVGI). Titrations were performed after two or five (three in the case
782 of DH) decontamination treatments on PRCV-inoculated FFR coupons and straps. PRCV infectivity
783 was analysed in swine testicular cells. The cell culture limit of detection (LOD) was 0.80 log₁₀
784 TCID₅₀/mL (6.31×10^0 TCID₅₀/mL) for all analyses except those concerning VHP-treated FFR straps
785 (1.80 log₁₀ TCID₅₀/mL (6.31×10^1 TCID₅₀/mL)). Per decontamination method, nine PRCV-inoculated,
786 decontaminated coupons (n=9) and three inoculated, decontaminated straps (n=3) were analysed in
787 parallel to inoculated, untreated, positive control coupons (n=9) and straps (n=3). Mean log₁₀
788 TCID₅₀/mL and standard errors of the means are represented. P-values were computed by using a two-
789 sided independent sample t-test, where ****P<0.0001, ***P<0.001, **P<0.01, *P<0.05, and ns is
790 $P \geq 0.05$.

791

792 **Figure 9.** Murine norovirus (MuNoV) inactivation following multiple cycle surgical mask (SM)
793 decontamination using dry heat (DH), vaporised hydrogen peroxide (VHP), and ultraviolet germicidal
794 irradiation (UVGI). Titrations were performed after two or five (three in the case of DH)
795 decontamination treatments on MuNoV-inoculated SM coupons and straps. MuNoV infectivity was
796 analysed in RAW264.7 cells. The cell culture limit of detection (LOD) was 0.80 log₁₀ TCID₅₀/mL
797 (6.31×10^0 TCID₅₀/mL) for all analyses except those concerning VHP-treated SM straps (1.80 log₁₀

798 TCID₅₀/mL (6.31×10^1 TCID₅₀/mL)). Per decontamination method, nine PRCV-inoculated,
799 decontaminated coupons (n=9) and three inoculated, decontaminated straps (n=3) were analysed in
800 parallel to inoculated, untreated, positive control coupons (n=9) and straps (n=3). Mean log₁₀
801 TCID₅₀/mL and standard errors of the means are represented. P-values were computed by using a two-
802 sided independent sample t-test, where ****P<0.0001, ***P<0.001, **P<0.01, *P<0.05, and ns is
803 P_≥0.05.

804

805 **Figure 10.** Murine norovirus (MuNoV) inactivation following multiple cycle filtering facepiece
806 respirator (FFR) decontamination using dry heat (DH), vaporised hydrogen peroxide (VHP), and
807 ultraviolet germicidal irradiation (UVGI). Titrations were performed after two or five (three in the case
808 of DH) decontamination treatments on MuNoV- inoculated FFR coupons and straps. MuNoV
809 infectivity was analysed in RAW264.7 cells. The cell culture limit of detection (LOD) was 0.80 log₁₀
810 TCID₅₀/mL (6.31×10^0 TCID₅₀/mL) for all analyses except those concerning VHP- and UVGI-treated
811 FFR straps ($1.80 \log_{10}$ TCID₅₀/mL (6.31×10^1 TCID₅₀/mL)). Per decontamination method, nine PRCV-
812 inoculated, decontaminated coupons (n=9) and three inoculated, decontaminated straps (n=3) were
813 analysed in parallel to inoculated, untreated, positive control coupons (n=9) and straps (n=3). Mean
814 log₁₀ TCID₅₀/mL and standard errors of the means are represented. P-values were computed by using
815 a two-sided independent sample t-test, where ****P<0.0001, ***P<0.001, **P<0.01, *P<0.05, and ns
816 is P_≥0.05.

817

818 SUPPLEMENTARY FIGURE CAPTIONS

819

820 **Supplementary Figure 1.** Recovery of porcine respiratory coronavirus (PRCV) after elution from
821 filtering facepiece respirators (FFRs) and surgical masks (SMs) decontaminated either once or four
822 times (twice in the case of DH assays) prior to virus inoculation. Infectious PRCV recovery was
823 analysed in swine testicular cells. The cell culture limit of detection (LOD) was 0.80 log₁₀ TCID₅₀/mL
824 (6.31×10^0 TCID₅₀/mL) for all analyses except those concerning VHP-treated SM or FFR straps (1.80
825 \log_{10} TCID₅₀/mL (6.31×10^1 TCID₅₀/mL)). Similar levels of virus recovery were detected for left, right
826 and middle (L, R, M) (n=3) coupons of FFRs and SMs; recovery efficacy of infectious virus from
827 straps (S) (n=3) deviated significantly in all analyses from the mean of all coupons and remained
828 below the LOD for assays performed on DH-treated FFR straps. Mean log₁₀ TCID₅₀/mL and standard
829 errors of the means are represented. P-values were computed by using a two-sided independent sample
830 t-test to calculate differences between individual coupon values and differences between mean values
831 of all coupons and straps, where ****P<0.0001, ***P<0.001, **P<0.01, *P<0.05, and ns.

832

833 **Supplementary Figure 2.** Recovery of murine norovirus (MuNoV) after elution from filtering
834 facepiece respirators (FFRs) and surgical masks (SMs) decontaminated either once or four times

835 (twice in the case of DH assays) prior to virus inoculation. Infectious MuNoV recovery was analysed
836 in RAW264.7 cells. The cell culture limit of detection (LOD) was 0.80 log₁₀ TCID₅₀/mL (6.31×10^0
837 TCID₅₀/mL) for all analyses except those concerning VHP-treated SM- or FFR straps and UVGI-
838 treated FFR straps (1.80 log₁₀ TCID₅₀/mL (6.31×10^1 TCID₅₀/mL)). Similar levels of virus recovery
839 were detected for left, right and middle (L, R, M) (n=3) coupons of FFRs and SMs; recovery efficacy
840 of infectious virus from straps (S) (n=3) deviated significantly in all analyses from the mean of all
841 coupons (except from DH-treated straps). Mean log₁₀ TCID₅₀/mL and standard errors of the means
842 are represented. P-values were computed by using a two-sided independent sample t-test to calculate
843 differences between individual coupon values and differences between mean values of all coupons and
844 straps, where ****P<0.0001, ***P<0.001, **P<0.01, *P<0.05, and ns.




Figure 1. Experimental set-up of filtering facepiece respirator (FFR) and surgical mask (SM) decontamination assays. (A) Natural virus degradation over time. (B) Integrity testing after multiple-cycle vaporised hydrogen peroxide (VHP), ultraviolet germicidal irradiation (UVGI), and dry heat (DH) decontamination. (C) Multiple-cycle decontamination of porcine respiratory coronavirus (PRCV)- and murine norovirus (MuNoV)- inoculated SMs/FFRs.







Figure 2. Recovery of porcine respiratory coronavirus (PRCV) after elution from filtering facepiece respirators (FFRs) and surgical masks (SMs) kept at room temperature (20°C) over time. PRCV infectivity was analysed in swine testicular cells. The cell culture limit of detection (LOD) was 0.80 log₁₀ TCID₅₀/mL (6.31 × 10⁰ TCID₅₀/mL).








Figure 3. Recovery of murine norovirus (MuNoV) after elution from filtering facepiece respirators (FFRs) and surgical masks (SMs) kept at room temperature (20°C) over time. MuNoV infectivity was analysed in RAW264.7 cells. The cell culture limit of detection (LOD) was 0.80 log₁₀ TCID₅₀/mL (6.31 × 10⁰ TCID₅₀/mL).

A Bacterial filtration efficiency SMs



B NaCl filtration efficiency FFRs




Figure 4. Filtering facepiece respirator (FFR) NaCl filtration efficiency- and surgical mask (SM) bacterial filtration efficiency (BFE) testing after single-cycle or multiple-cycle decontamination using dry heat (DH), vaporised hydrogen peroxide (VHP), and ultraviolet germicidal irradiation (UVGI). Horizontal dashed lines represent the NaCl filtration efficiency requirement of $\geq 95\%$ according to NIOSH 42 CFR Part 84. Untreated FFRs ($n=3$) surpassed the minimum NaCl filtration efficiency, achieving 97.01% (± 0.56) as a baseline before treatment. Horizontal dotted lines represent the bacterial filtration efficiency (3 μ m droplet size) requirement of $\geq 98\%$ according to EN 14683 for Type II and ASTM F2100 for Level 2 SMs. Untreated SMs ($n=3$) surpassed the minimum BFE, achieving 99.50% (± 0.08) as a baseline before treatment.

Breathability SMs





Figure 5. Surgical mask (SM) breathability testing after single-cycle or multiple-cycle decontamination using dry heat (DH), vaporised hydrogen peroxide (VHP), and ultraviolet germicidal irradiation (UVGI). Horizontal dotted lines represent the maximum allowed differential pressure in following standards: <40 Pa/cm² according to EN 14683:2019 Annex C for Type I and II masks and <60 Pa/cm² for Type IIR. Untreated SMs (n=5) achieved 52.08 (±0.99) Pa/cm² differential pressure as a baseline before treatment.

A Exhalation FFRs



B Inhalation FFRs




Figure 6. Filtering facepiece respirator (FFR) breathability testing after single-cycle or multiple-cycle decontamination using dry heat (DH), vaporised hydrogen peroxide (VHP), and ultraviolet germicidal irradiation (UVGI). Exhalation (A) and inhalation (B) breathing resistances after decontamination. Horizontal dashed (above) and dotted (below) lines represent the following breathing resistance standards: Exhalation: ≤ 25 mmH₂O and Inhalation: ≤ 35 mmH₂O for FFRs according to NIOSH 42 CFR Part 84. Untreated FFRs (n=5) achieved inhalation and exhalation resistance of 12.43 (± 0.69) mmH₂O and 11.9 (± 0.86) mmH₂O, respectively.




Figure 7. Porcine coronavirus (PRCV) inactivation following multiple cycle surgical mask (SM) decontamination using dry heat (DH), vaporised hydrogen peroxide (VHP), and ultraviolet germicidal irradiation (UVGI). Titrations were performed after two or five (three in the case of DH) decontamination treatments on PRCV-inoculated SM coupons and straps. PRCV infectivity was analysed in swine testicular cells. The cell culture limit of detection (LOD) was 0.80 log₁₀ TCID₅₀/mL (6.31×10⁰ TCID₅₀/mL) for all analyses except those concerning VHP-treated SM straps (1.80 log₁₀ TCID₅₀/mL (6.31×10¹ TCID₅₀/mL)). Per decontamination method, nine PRCV-inoculated, decontaminated coupons (n=9) and three inoculated, decontaminated straps (n=3) were analysed in parallel to inoculated, untreated, positive control coupons (n=9) and straps (n=3). Mean log₁₀ TCID₅₀/mL and standard errors of the means are represented. P-values were computed by using a two-sided independent sample t-test, where ****P<0.0001, ***P<0.001, **P<0.01, *P<0.05, and ns is P≥0.05.




Figure 8. Porcine coronavirus (PRCV) inactivation following multiple cycle filtering facepiece respirator (FFR) decontamination using dry heat (DH), vaporised hydrogen peroxide (VHP), and ultraviolet germicidal irradiation (UVGI). Titrations were performed after two or five (three in the case of DH) decontamination treatments on PRCV-inoculated FFR coupons and straps. PRCV infectivity was analysed in swine testicular cells. The cell culture limit of detection (LOD) was 0.80 \log_{10} TCID₅₀/mL (6.31×10^0 TCID₅₀/mL) for all analyses except those concerning VHP-treated FFR straps (1.80 \log_{10} TCID₅₀/mL (6.31×10^1 TCID₅₀/mL)). Per decontamination method, nine PRCV-inoculated, decontaminated coupons (n=9) and three inoculated, decontaminated straps (n=3) were analysed in parallel to inoculated, untreated, positive control coupons (n=9) and straps (n=3). Mean \log_{10} TCID₅₀/mL and standard errors of the means are represented. P-values were computed by using a two-sided independent sample t-test, where ****P<0.0001, ***P<0.001, **P<0.01, *P<0.05, and ns is P≥0.05.




Figure 9. Murine norovirus (MuNoV) inactivation following multiple cycle surgical mask (SM) decontamination using dry heat (DH), vaporised hydrogen peroxide (VHP), and ultraviolet germicidal irradiation (UVGI). Titrations were performed after two or five (three in the case of DH) decontamination treatments on MuNoV-inoculated SM coupons and straps. MuNoV infectivity was analysed in RAW264.7 cells. The cell culture limit of detection (LOD) was 0.80 log₁₀ TCID₅₀/mL (6.31×10^0 TCID₅₀/mL) for all analyses except those concerning VHP-treated SM straps (1.80 log₁₀ TCID₅₀/mL (6.31×10^1 TCID₅₀/mL)). Per decontamination method, nine PRCV-inoculated, decontaminated coupons (n=9) and three inoculated, decontaminated straps (n=3) were analysed in parallel to inoculated, untreated, positive control coupons (n=9) and straps (n=3). Mean log₁₀ TCID₅₀/mL and standard errors of the means are represented. P-values were computed by using a two-sided independent sample t-test, where ****P<0.0001, ***P<0.001, **P<0.01, *P<0.05, and ns is P≥0.05.






Figure 10. Murine norovirus (MuNoV) inactivation following multiple cycle filtering facepiece respirator (FFR) decontamination using dry heat (DH), vaporised hydrogen peroxide (VHP), and ultraviolet germicidal irradiation (UVGI). Titrations were performed after two or five (three in the case of DH) decontamination treatments on MuNoV-inoculated FFR coupons and straps. MuNoV infectivity was analysed in RAW264.7 cells. The cell culture limit of detection (LOD) was 0.80 log₁₀ TCID₅₀/mL (6.31×10^0 TCID₅₀/mL) for all analyses except those concerning VHP- and UVGI-treated FFR straps (1.80 log₁₀ TCID₅₀/mL (6.31×10^1 TCID₅₀/mL)). Per decontamination method, nine PRCV-inoculated, decontaminated coupons (n=9) and three inoculated, decontaminated straps (n=3) were analysed in parallel to inoculated, untreated, positive control coupons (n=9) and straps (n=3). Mean log₁₀ TCID₅₀/mL and standard errors of the means are represented. P-values were computed by using a two-sided independent sample t-test, where ****P<0.0001, ***P<0.001, **P<0.01, *P<0.05, and ns is P≥0.05.



Supplementary Figure 1. Recovery of porcine respiratory coronavirus (PRCV) after elution from filtering facepiece respirators (FFRs) and surgical masks (SMs) decontaminated either once or four times (twice in the case of DH assays) prior to virus inoculation. Infectious PRCV recovery was analysed in swine testicular cells. The cell culture limit of detection (LOD) was 0.80 $\text{log}_{10} \text{TCID}_{50}/\text{mL}$ ($6.31 \times 10^0 \text{TCID}_{50}/\text{mL}$) for all analyses except those concerning VHP-treated SM or FFR straps (1.80 $\text{log}_{10} \text{TCID}_{50}/\text{mL}$ ($6.31 \times 10^1 \text{TCID}_{50}/\text{mL}$)). Similar levels of virus recovery were detected for left, right and middle (L, R, M) ($n=3$) coupons of FFRs and SMs; recovery efficacy of infectious virus from straps (S) ($n=3$) deviated significantly in all analyses from the mean of all coupons and remained below the LOD for assays performed on DH-treated FFR straps. Mean $\text{log}_{10} \text{TCID}_{50}/\text{mL}$ and standard errors of the means are represented. P-values were computed by using a two-sided independent sample t-test to calculate differences between individual coupon values and differences between mean values of all coupons and straps, where **** $P < 0.0001$, *** $P < 0.001$, ** $P < 0.01$, * $P < 0.05$, and ns.



Supplementary Figure 2. Recovery of murine norovirus (MuNoV) after elution from filtering facepiece respirators (FFRs) and surgical masks (SMs) decontaminated either once or four times (twice in the case of DH assays) prior to virus inoculation. Infectious MuNoV recovery was analysed in RAW264.7 cells. The cell culture limit of detection (LOD) was $0.80 \log_{10} \text{TCID}_{50}/\text{mL}$ ($6.31 \times 10^0 \text{TCID}_{50}/\text{mL}$) for all analyses except those concerning VHP-treated SM- or FFR straps and UVGI-treated FFR straps ($1.80 \log_{10} \text{TCID}_{50}/\text{mL}$ ($6.31 \times 10^1 \text{TCID}_{50}/\text{mL}$)). Similar levels of virus recovery were detected for left, right and middle (L, R, M) ($n=3$) coupons of FFRs and SMs; recovery efficacy of infectious virus from straps (S) ($n=3$) deviated significantly in all analyses from the mean of all coupons (except from DH-treated straps). Mean $\log_{10} \text{TCID}_{50}/\text{mL}$ and standard errors of the means are represented. P-values were computed by using a two-sided independent sample t-test to calculate differences between individual coupon values and differences between mean values of all coupons and straps, where **** $P < 0.0001$, *** $P < 0.001$, ** $P < 0.01$, * $P < 0.05$, and ns.