1	Influencing Factors for the Persistence of SARS-Cov-2
2	(Covid-19) exposed in Environmental Matrices and
3	Disinfection Methods: Systematic Review
4	Chaw Chaw Yu ^{1*} , Thein Hlaing ² , Kyaw Myo Tun ³
5	¹ Faculty of Health and Social Sciences, University of Bedfordshire
6	² District Public Health Department, Pyay District, Bago Region, Myanmar
7	³ Department of Health and Social Sciences, STI Myanmar University, Yangon, Myanmar
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	*Corresponding author
14	Dr Chaw Chaw Yu
15	Yangon, Myanmar
16	+95-9441409996
17	Email. <u>chawchawyu.dr@gmail.com</u>
18	ORCID iD: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5041-0759
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

24 Abstract

31

Background: Since the COVID-19 pandemic has been pestilential over a considerable duration, global deployment and financial crisis could not be reversed as before. It brought up essentials to allow the nations back to work with effective preventive measures. This review intended to evaluate the persistence of SARS-CoV-2(COVID-19) exposed in the environmental matrices, influencing factors on the virus persistence and disinfection methods.

32 Scholar were primarily explored. Data were extracted, entered into the modified data 33 extraction forms and analysed narratively. Quality appraisal was done by the Mixed-Methods

Methods: Applying the PRISMA 2020 tool, MEDLINE/PubMed, HINARI, and Google

34 Appraisal Tool. The findings were presented descriptively.

Results: Persistence of SARS-CoV-2 was revealed <4 hours on aluminium, 4 hours on 35 copper, 24 hours on cardboard, 44 hours on glass, 48 hours on stainless steel, 72 hours on 36 plastic, 92 hours on polystyrene plastic, 1.1-1.2 hours in the air, 7 days (higher titer) to 3 37 days(lower titer) in wastewater. Virus decaying was noted 5-10 times faster at 27°C than at 38 10°C and 2-5 times faster with 65% relative humidity (RH) than with 40% and 100% RH. 39 Virus infectivity was reduced by far-UVC-(222 nm) light for 90%-(8 minutes), 95%-(11 40 minutes), 99%-(16 minutes) and 99.99%-(25 minutes). Sodium hypochlorite (800 g/m³) and 41 ammonium-based detergents were remarkably effective for preliminary disinfection. 42

43 **Conclusions**: This review identified the duration of SARS-CoV-2 survival in 44 environmental matrices for both healthcare and non-healthcare settings. The study explored 45 the impacts of environmental factors on the virus and effective disinfection methods to be 46 considered accordingly to the findings.

2

47 Keywords: SARS-CoV-2/COVID-19; Persistence/exposed; Influencing Factors
48 (Temperature/Humidity/pH); Environmental Matrices (air/water/faeces/fomite/surfaces);
49 Disinfection Methods

50

51 Introduction

Coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) is a newly discovered infectious disease caused by a 52 new human virus of the coronaviridae family which was firstly identified in Wuhan, the 53 capital of Hubei province, China in December 2019. It was officially named COVID-19 by 54 55 the World Health Organisation (WHO) on 12th February 2020 and also named Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus-2(SARS-CoV-2), because of its 88% genetic similarity 56 with SARS-like coronaviruses of bat origin [1]. The first virus was discovered over 100 years 57 ago and found the human infection in the late 1800s. Over 150 species of RNA virus were 58 discovered and Coronavirus is one of them [2]. Viruses can be dispersed through aerosols 59 from coughing, sneezing and talking, which in turn contaminate the environment. Its single 60 droplet may easily contain an infectious dose [3]. 61

Enveloped respiratory viruses, which are though more vulnerable to environmental stress 62 63 than non-enveloped viruses, have been shown to persist on surfaces for a certain period. Enveloped respiratory viruses may persist on common hard surfaces longer and cause the 64 potential risk of infection to whoever touches those contaminated surfaces [4]. When the 65 expelled microorganisms persist with adequate doses of viruses for long enough in the 66 environment to contact with other hosts, indirect and widespread contraction of disease 67 occurs. Once the disease is transmitted from indirect contact, it is challenging to trace the 68 disease's origin, especially in case of contamination from pre-symptomatic patients [5]. While 69 SARS-CoV-2 is assumed as droplet transmission by WHO claimed that viruses may be 70

transmissible through aerosols and may also survive in water apart from contracting via contaminated surfaces [6]. SARS-CoV-2 can persist for a few hours in the air after the generation of aerosols [7]. Virus contamination on air exhaust outlets, means, viruses can be travelled by air [8]. Besides, SARS-CoV-2 RNA is detected in faeces suggesting virus replication and shedding through patients' GI tract [9]. With the likelihood of virus survival in faeces and water, attention should be placed on water-related virus exposures as well [10].

Regarding fomites, these include high touch surfaces of porous and non-porous materials in 77 both healthcare and non-healthcare settings. High touch surfaces of fomites are the highest 78 79 risk of virus transmission through contaminated environments [11]. Various studies of SARS-CoV-2 persistence in common public spaces explored the virus survival duration on the 80 surfaces of furniture, household fixed items, electronic objects, and stairway rails, floors, 81 82 walls, shelves and countertops. According to WHO, SARS-CoV-2 can survive up to several hours on some porous surfaces such as cloths, cardboards and wood while the virus can be 83 persisting up to several days on different porous materials such as the outer layer of a medical 84 85 mask [12]. SARS-CoV-2 on non-porous surfaces like copper, glass and stainless steel may persist up to many hours whereas the virus can survive on plastic for many days. Foremost, 86 healthcare settings are essentially under concern for contamination with microscopic virus 87 particles exhaled from patients. Emergency departments, intensive care units, wards, primary 88 89 health clinics, facilities used for isolation of COVID-19 patients, medical gadgets, surgical 90 tools, instruments in operation theatres, rubbish & waste released from healthcare places (masks & gloves, etc.) are very risky of virus contamination and surface persistence unless 91 effective disinfection measures [13]. The door handle, toilet bowl and sink were found to be 92 93 the test positive for the virus. Airflows equipment like vents and Personal Protective Equipment (PPE) also resulted in positive virus tests [8]. Factors influencing the persistence 94 of SARS-CoV-2 (Covid-19) in different environmental metrics/surfaces are vital to 95

acknowledge in consideration of effective disinfection methods for the prevention of the 96 disease. Many international and national guidelines for preventive measures were developed 97 based on the available information for SARS-CoV-2 so far. The review was to explore the 98 persistence of SARS-CoV-2(Covid-19) exposed in environmental matrices (air, water, 99 faeces)/fomites surfaces (porous and non-porous) with influencing factors for the virus 100 persistence in environments (such temperature, humidity, pH) and different methods of 101 102 disinfection. The resulting information will support the relevant authorities in modification of Covid-19 preventive measures accordingly. 103

104

105 Methods

A systematic review methodology following PRISMA guidelines and its checklist was 106 adopted for this study (S1 Table). PICO (population, intervention, comparison, outcomes) 107 108 guidelines were used to formulate the research question; "What are the influencing factors for the persistence of SARS-CoV-2(COVID-19) exposed in environmental matrices and 109 disinfection methods?" SARS-CoV-2(COVID-19) in environments was assumed as a 110 problem desired to examine (P). The exposure of SARS-CoV-2 with influencing factors 111 (Temperature, Humidity, UV radiation & pH) and different disinfection methods was 112 113 assumed as intervention (I). The different duration of SARS-CoV-2 persistence in different environmental matrices, various impacts of influencing factors on SARS-CoV-2 in 114 environments and different disinfection methods were measured as outcomes (O). These 115 PICO criteria became key terms for the literature search. 116

117

118 Eligibility Criteria

When determining the type of studies, all primary studies published full-text in English since 119 the beginning of 2020, which were conducted in both healthcare and non-healthcare settings 120 were counted. Systematic, editorial and narrative reviews, government and organisation 121 guidelines, patents, books and data linked with various commercial disinfection products 122 were excluded. The consideration of healthcare settings included but was not limited to acute-123 care hospitals, long-term care facilities, nursing homes and skilled nursing facilities, 124 physicians' offices, urgent-care centres, outpatient clinics, home healthcare (i.e., care 125 provided at home by professional healthcare providers), emergency medical services, mobile 126 127 healthcare services and medical clinic embedded with a workplace or school. In nonhealthcare settings, the review included the community facilities (schools/davcare centres/ 128 community centres/businesses) and common public spaces (plazas/squares/parks/sidewalks/ 129 streets). Any findings, even a single report of the aforesaid outcomes, such as various degrees 130 of SARS-CoV-2 persistence in environments, influencing factors' impacts on the virus 131 persistence in environments and different methods of disinfection were presumed as eligible 132 for inclusion (Table 1). 133

- 134 Table.1. Summary of Eligibility Criteria
- 135

	Inclusion Criteria	Exclusion criteria
•	Primary research studies Full text published as peer-reviewed journals or preprint papers with high quality or other high- quality papers determined by the review team SARS-CoV-2 (Covid-19) in environments Influencing factors for the persistence of SARS- CoV-2 (Covid-19) in environmental matrices Disinfection methods for SARS-CoV-2 (Covid- 19) Published in the English language Articles published since the beginning of 2020	 Secondary research such as systematic reviews, editorial reviews, narrative reviews, reports, letters, Government and organization guidelines, patents and books Another virus except for SARS-CoV-2 Do not examine SARS-CoV-2 in biological matrices Other languages except for English Studies without access to full articles Articles published before 2020 Data with commercial products of disinfection
•	Articles published since the beginning of 2020	• Data with commercial products of disinfection agents (e.g. studies for comparison of 2 commercial products)

136

137 Bibliographic Search

The prime databases used for searching articles were Google Scholar, HINARI and 138 MEDLINE/PubMed. Other databases such as EBSCOHOST and Cochrane Library were also 139 explored. By using the predefined keywords, pilot screening was performed and keywords 140 were modified accordingly. Besides, the search strategy was tested with Boolean Operators 141 by two independent investigators and compared the total number of eligible papers found. 142 Whenever significant differences in the number of searched papers had occurred, thorough 143 144 discussions between investigators were performed to optimise the keywords and searching mechanism. The potential title and abstract screening process was initiated after the 145 146 confirmation of keywords and search strategy. The full-text screening was then proceeded to filter the eligible articles. Additionally, a manual search and screening of the reference lists 147 were elaborated. Moreover, Medical Subject Headings (MeSH) terms and specific symbols 148 such as the asterisk-(*) marks and dollar signs-(\$) were combined in the search mechanism to 149 identify truncation or find the related terms to find relevant articles. 150

151

152 Identification and Selection of Studies

153 The fundamental steps for studies' identification and selection were the title and abstract screening, saving and sorting out potential articles in software like EndNote, filtering the 154 duplicated papers, screening for eligibility of studies and compiling a final selection for 155 analysis. The self-developed screening tool was used to check if the titles/abstracts/full-texts 156 met any of the pre-defined eligibility criteria. Once the titles/abstracts/full-texts met the 157 inclusion criteria or remained unclear, papers were saved for the next-step screening process 158 otherwise excluded. PRISMA 2009 flow diagram was utilised for the screening process. The 159 selection and revision process of obtained papers were performed by two independent 160 reviewers under the supervision of the immediate supervisor. 161

162

163 Quality Appraisal

Mixed-Method Appraisal Tool (MMAT) (version 2018) was a promising and reliable tool for critically appraising and used to assess the strength of the evidence quality. Based on the number of criteria met for the respective study designs, the tool yielded scores of 20%, 40%, 60%, 80% and 100%. In this systematic review, the quality appraisal scores of the selected studies were counter-checked by both reviewers to enhance the quality assurance.

169

Data Extraction

The resulting records from the screening process were saved in Endnote (X7) for the effective elimination of duplication. Data abstracting from the selected studies were collected in an excel spreadsheet. A data extraction form was preliminarily developed, piloted with at least six eligible studies and updated as a final data-entry template. Moreover, limitations of the study, recommendations and remarks on the study results were also documented in the data extracting excel sheet.

177

Data Synthesis and Analysis

After the detailed construe, all selected articles were categorised into four groups such as studies related to environmental persistence, studies related to influencing factors on the persistence of viruses, studies related to disinfection methods, and cross-cutting studies that included more than one variable. After the data extraction and entry into the finalised excel template, the collected key data were arranged, coded and sorted out the same data points. Descriptive analysis was elected and manual synthesis was applied for the narrative presentation.

186

187 Ethical Consideration

Since this systematic review involves none of the human subjects, there is a very low ethical issue for this study. However, the ethical form of a systematic review proposal was completed. Ethical clearance and approval were obtained from the Ethics Committee of the Institute for Health Research, the University of Bedfordshire on 27th June 2020. The reviewers were not intentionally misinterpreted the findings of the articles included in this review and presented the summary of retrieved information in the best interest of validating an accurate and transparent conclusion.

195

196 **Results**

197 Summary of Selection Process

The total number of 6184 titles and abstracts (3130 from reviewer-1 and 3054 from reviewer-198 199 2) were found at the first step of the screening process. 51 relevant published papers (30 from reviewer-1 and 25 from reviewer-2) were identified from other data sources as additional. Of 200 these, 2850 studies were found as duplicates and 3001 studies were as irrelevant. After 201 cleaning out duplicate and irrelevant studies, 333 full-text papers were found includable. 202 Among 333 papers, 282 were ineligible for full-text reviewing due to some reasons (see in S2 203 Fig.), and finally, 51 papers remained for this present review. The characteristics of these 204 included studies were presented in the table-2 in terms of frequency and percentage. 205

206

207 Characteristics of Included Studies

All selected 51 studies were quantitative studies in which cross-sectional analytical studies were mostly contributed (n=24, 47%) and non-randomized controlled trials were second-most contributed for this review (n=22, 43%). The others were longitudinal cohort studies (n=2,

211	4%), quantitative non-randomized studies (n=1, 2%), cross-sectional descriptive studies (n=1,
212	2%) and comparative case-control studies (n=1, 2%). The included studies were published in
213	January 2020 and originated from 16 countries. Most studies included were from the USA
214	(n=16, 31%) and China (n=12, 23%). When the brief review was taken on the studied area by
215	countries, studies in Australia (n=2) focused on the persistence of SARS-CoV-2 in
216	wastewater and the impact of temperature on SARS-CoV-2 in both clinical and non-clinical
217	contexts. All Studies from China (n=12) mainly focused on the persistence of SARS-CoV-2
218	in environmental matrices (surfaces, faeces, air, wastewater and surface) in both clinical and
219	non-clinical areas. Studies from France (n=2) were conducted for SARS-CoV-2 on
220	environmental surfaces in both clinical and non-clinical areas. One study from Hong Kong
221	explored SARS-CoV-2 on surfaces and in the air of hospital environments (Table 2).

Table.2.	Characteristics	of the	Included	Studies
----------	-----------------	--------	----------	---------

	Frequency	Percentage
Study Design		
cross-sectional analytical study	24	47%
non-randomized controlled trial	22	43%
longitudinal cohort study	2	4%
quantitative non-randomized study	1	2%
cross-sectional descriptive study	1	2%
comparative case-control study	1	2%
Publication Year		
2020	51	100%
Country Origin		
USA	16	31%
China	12	23%
Australia	2	4%
France	2	4%
Spain	2	4%
India	2	4%
Singapore	2	4%
Italy	2	4%
UK	2	4%
Japan	2	4%
Korea	2	4%
Hong Kong	1	2%
Netherland	1	2%

Mexico	1	2%
Israel	1	2%
Iran	1	2%
Focused Fields		
Persistence of SARS-CoV-2 in wastewater	8	6.40%
Impact of temperature and humidity on SARS-CoV-2	10	8.00%
Persistence of SARS-CoV-2 in environmental matrices	28	22.40%
Persistence of SARS-CoV-2 in environmental surfaces	29	23.20%
Factors influencing virus persistence in environments	16	12.80%
Disinfection methods	16	12.80%
Persistence of SARS-CoV-2 on faeces	2	1.60%
Effect of acidic pH on SARS-CoV-2	2	1.60%
Persistence of SARS-CoV-2 in the air of hospital environments	10	8.00%
Persistence of SARS-CoV-2 in sewage	1	0.80%
Persistence of SARS-CoV-2 in aerosol	1	0.80%
Effect of polymers and oligomers on SARS-CoV-2	1	0.80%
Effect of UV on SARS-CoV-2	1	0.80%
Reporting Quality		
80%-100%	45	88.20%
60%-80%	6	11.80%

²²²

223 Two Indian studies emphasized SARS-CoV-2 RNA detection in wastewater. An Iran revealed SARS-CoV-2 RNA in air samples of hospitals. Two studies from Italy and two from 224 the UK detected SARS-CoV-2 RNA in air, surfaces and wastewater while an Israel study was 225 done on sewage measurements for SARS-CoV-2. Two papers from Korea studied 226 environment contamination of SARS-CoV-2 on faeces and surfaces whereas 2 articles from 227 Japan revealed surface and air contamination with SARS-CoV-2 and the effect of acidic pH 228 on SARS-CoV-2. While a Netherland study measured SARS-CoV-2 aerosol, one study in 229 Mexico explored the effectiveness of polymers and oligomers on the inactivation of the virus. 230 Two studies in Singapore tested air and surface of clinical places for persistence of SAR-231 CoV-2 and a Spain study used UVG irradiator to examine the effects of UV on the virus. 232 Sixteen studies from the USA covered all topics of environmental persistence of the virus, 233 factors influencing virus persistence in environments and disinfection methods. 234

After appraising the methodological qualities of the selected studies using MMAT (Version 235 2018), papers in this review had a quality score ranging from 60% to 100%. Of 51 selected 236 studies, 45 (88.2%) was occurred MMAT score of high quality (80-100 %) because those 237 papers mentioned the specific description of in respective studies for the appropriate research 238 problem approach, proper selection of target population and sampling methodology including 239 consideration of confounding factors and appropriate measurements, appropriate explanation 240 of intervention & exposure, completed outcomes summary with suitable analysis and well 241 link between results and interpretation. Six studies (11.8%) had scored 60-80% for quality 242 243 appraisal. The most distinct reasons for reduced scores were the unclear selection of the target population of the study, missed consideration of confounders and weak linkage or 244 explanation between results and interpretation. 245

246

247 Persistence of SARS-CoV- 2 in Environmental Matrices/ Surfaces

Apropos of environmental matrices, not only on fomite surfaces and air media but also faeces
and wastewater become concerned. Table 3 demonstrated the persistent durations of SARSCoV-2 RNA in different environmental matrices/surfaces.

251

Table.3. Persistence Durations of SARS-CoV-2 (Covid-19) in Environmental Matrices/Surfaces

Studies	Types	Persistence of SARS-CoV- 2
On Fomites surfaces		
van Doremalen. V, et al. 2020 [7]	cardboard	up to 24 hours
van Doremalen. V, et al. 2020 [7]	copper	4 hours
van Doremalen. V, et al. 2020 [7]	aluminium	less than 4 hours
van Doremalen. V, et al. 2020 [7]	plastic	up to 72 hours
van Doremalen. V, et al. 2020 [7]	stainless steel	48 hours
Pastorino. B, et al. 2020 [14]	glass	over 44 hours
Pastorino. B, et al. 2020 [14]	polystyrene plastic	over 92 hours
in Air		
van Doremalen. V, et al. [7]	Air	1.1 to 1.2 hours

Studies	Types	Persistence of SARS-CoV- 2
Fears. A. C., et al., 2020 [15]	aerosol	over 12 hours
in Wastewater		
Bivins A, et al. 2020 [16]	higher titer	up to 7 days
Bivins A, et al. 2020 [16]	lower titer	3 days
in Faeces		
Lo, L L. et al., 2020 [17]	faeces	up to 14 days
Lo, L L. et al., 2020 [17]	faeces	19.3 days
Park S. K., et al., 2020 [18]	faeces	50 days
Li Y. et al., 2020 [19]	faeces	6 to 47 days
Wu Y, et al., 2020 [20]	faeces	15 to 33 days

254

Influencing factors for SARS-CoV-2 persistence in environments

256 Temperature and Relative Humidity (RH)

Effect on half-lives of SARS-CoV-2 varied with different combinations of temperature and 257 RH. Virus half-lives were prolonged for 27 hours at 10 °C with 40% RH and were reduced to 258 one and half hours at 27 °C and 65% RH. The estimated mean half-lives of the virus were 259 15.33 ± 2.75 hours with 20% RH, 11.52 ± 1.72 hours with 40% RH, 9.15 ± 3.39 hours with 260 60% RH and 8.33 ± 1.80 hours with 80% RH at 24°C respectively. The mean half-lives of the 261 virus were estimated as 7.33 ± 1.33 hours with 20% RH, 7.52 ± 1.22 hours with 40% RH and 262 2.26 ± 1.42 hours with 60% RH at 35°C. Also, virus-like particles (VLP) survived better 263 when it was incubated at 22°C than that at 34°C under dry conditions [15, 21]. The persistent 264 durations of SARS-CoV-2 (Covid-19) at different temperatures were presented in Table 4. 265

266

267 Table.4. Persistence of SARS-CoV- 2 at Different Temperatures

Matrix		Persistence of SARS-CoV- 2 at Different Temperatures				
	20°C	30 °C	40 °C	50°C	60.2 °C	70°C
glass	28 days	7 days	within an hour		0.19 Seconds	
polymer note	28 days	7 days	within an hour		0.19 Seconds	
stainless steel	28 days	7 days	within an hour		0.19 Seconds	
vinyl	28 days	3 days	within an hour		0.19 Seconds	
paper notes	28 days	21 days	within an hour		0.19 Seconds	
cotton fabric	14 days	3 days	within an hour		0.19 Seconds	

Matrix		Persistence of SARS-CoV- 2 at Different Temperatures				es
	20°C	30 °C	40 °C	50°C	60.2 °C	70°C
wastewater (higher titer)	1.6-3.2 days			15-30 minu	tes	2.2-4.5 minutes
wastewater (lower titer)	2.1-4.3 days					

268

269 Sunlight/ UV

Virus infectivity was reduced by far-UVC (222 nm) light for 90% in 8 minutes, 95% in 11
minutes, 99% in 16 minutes and 99.99% in 25 minutes with the dose of 1.2 mJ/cm² to 1.7
mJ/cm² [22].

273

274 pH/ Acidity

The pH 2.5 with free available chlorine (FAC) was identified as a potent deactivator for 275 SARS-CoV-2 signifying >99.99% reduction of virus infectivity. Technically, the test 276 solution, acidic electrolyzed water (EW), and ratio played a vital role in the inactivation 277 278 process. By using the acidic EWs (pH-2.5, FAC-74 ppm) with a 1:9 ratio of the virus: acidic EW, virus titer was reduced by $\geq 4.25 \log_{10} \text{TCID}_{50}/\text{mL}$ with $\geq 99.99\%$ reduction of infectivity 279 after a one-minute reaction. However, neither visible reduction of virus infectivity could be 280 identified on testing with a 1:1 ratio, an equal volume of virus and acidic EW. Moreover, a 281 17-days old solution of acidic EW (pH-2.5, FAC-109 ppm) yielded inferior action on 282 deactivation of the virus compared to that of fresh acidic EW solution and 31-day stored 283 acidic EW showed no detectable reduction in the virus infectivity [23]. 284

285

Disinfection Methods in Healthcare Setting

With quaternary ammonium-based detergent for the floor, a sodium hypochlorite for nonfloor surfaces in inpatient rooms and hydrogen peroxide for areas outside the patient rooms, surface disinfection was found effective in the reduction of SARS-CoV-2 persistence. As

290 evidence, 36% of positive samples were reduced to 20% after cleaning with the abovementioned disinfectants. When the disinfecting process was performed more frequently and 291 thoroughly on floors with 2,500 ppm sodium hypochlorite, the persistence of the study virus 292 in surface samples was found significantly reduced by 3.4% [24]. After cleaning with the 293 combined disinfectant and detergent (e.g., Surfanios Premium), the contamination in samples 294 was considerably reduced from 60% to 4.9% for the floors and all the surfaces directly in 295 contact with patients (such as trolleys, skechers, cuffs, door handles etc.) and from 10% to 296 5.6% for the surfaces not directly in contact with patients (such as stethoscopes) [25]. 297 298 Moreover, Pulsed Xenon Ultraviolet (PX-UV) reduced the infectivity of SARS-CoV-2 to 99.97% at 1 minute, 99.997% at 2 minutes and 99.992% at 5 minutes. Contamination of N95 299 respirators in inoculation was reduced to 99.998% with 2 minutes of exposure with PX-UV 300 301 [26].

For the effective decontamination of respirators, the recommended dose and time needed to 302 expose to UV light were 5 mj/cm² UV dose for 11 seconds, 300 mj/cm² for 12 minutes, 1 303 j/cm² for 36 minutes and 3 j/cm² for 1 hour 40 minutes [27]. For filtering faceplate respirators 304 (FFRs), a dose of 1 mj/cm² of UV-C was a bottom need for disinfecting. Biosafety cabinets 305 (BSC) were used for minimum level UV irradiation to achieve the target dose of 306 decontamination on FFRs. The minimum duration of irradiation for FFRs was identified as 307 4.3 hours per side, for PPE as 62 minutes per side and for face shields as 15.6 minutes per 308 309 side (60 mj/cm² of UV radiation) [28]. Furthermore, decontamination of SARS-CoV-2 on 3M-N95 with UVC in germicidal UVC device was also discussed that total disinfection was 310 attained within 120 seconds. 1 log reduction of viral titer was identified in 2 seconds of UV 311 exposure per side and 2 log in 54 - 120 seconds per side [29]. Regarding decontamination of 312 SARS-CoV-2 in wastewater, preliminary disinfection in septic tanks was performed with free 313 chlorine N6.5 mg/L for 1.5 hours with the dosage of sodium hypochlorite (800 g/m³). 314

However, 12 hours after sodium hypochlorite had been added to septic tanks, the study virus RNA was significantly detectable again due to the decline of free chlorine. When sodium hypochlorite was increased to 6700 g/m³, SARS-CoV-2 became undetectable in wastewater [30].

319

320 Disinfection Methods in Non-healthcare/General Setting

With the oligomers disinfectants activated by UV light, complete disinfection happened 321 within 10-15 minutes. However, the effectiveness of oligomers became lower in dark places 322 than that occurred under the light [31]. SARS-CoV-2 infectivity was reduced to >90% in 10 323 minutes and >99.99 % in 2 hours on the antimicrobial treated surfaces of stainless steel [32]. 324 Regarding indoor environments, Far UVC light (222 nm) showed its effectiveness to 325 326 deactivate the SARS-CoV-2 as 90% in 8 minutes, 95% in 11 minutes, 99% in 16 minutes and 99.9 % in 25 minutes [22]. UVB irradiation at 1.6-0.7 W/m² also deactivated the SARS-CoV-327 328 2 faster than that at 0.3 W/m². The effective decontamination of the SARS-CoV-2 in wastewater was achieved by the wastewater treatment, particularly including secondary 329 treatment-(Moving Bed Biofilm Reactor (MBBR), Sequencing Batch Reactor (SBF) and 330 Activated Sludge Process (ASP)) and tertiary treatment-(chlorine and UV) [33]. 331

332

333 **Discussion**

Until the end of the paper screening process i.e., October 2020, by the Author's knowledge, this systematic review was the only comprehensive review covering the three areas of environmental persistence of SARS-CoV-2 in different matrices, influencing factors of the virus persistence and disinfection methods obtained from the primary studies full-text published from January 2020. Moreover, this review exclusively focused on the SARS-CoV-2 virus and explicitly included both healthcare settings and non-healthcare settings.

340

341 SARS-CoV-2 Virus Persistence in Environmental Matrices/ 342 Surfaces

343 Based on the findings of the review, the possible persistence of SARS-CoV-2 in environmental matrices was <4 hours on aluminium, 4 hours on copper, 24 hours on 344 cardboard, 44 hours on glass, 48 hours on stainless steel, 72 hours on plastic and 92 hours on 345 polystyrene plastic. These findings had some variations compared with the findings of 346 Kampf, et al.'s review documented the survival of the coronavirus family on aluminium for 347 2-8 hours, latex rubber for \leq 8 hours, glass for 4 days, plastic for 2-6 days, steel/silicon 348 rubber/ceramic/Teflon for 5 days, a disposable gown for 2 days, metal for 5 days, wood for 4 349 days and paper for 4-5 days [34]. In this review, the most contaminated objects with SARS-350 CoV-2 in inpatient rooms and staff areas were the mobile phones of the patients, buttons of 351 water machines, elevators, beepers, doorknobs and hand sanitiser dispensers, printers, 352 desktops, keyboards and eve protection/face shields/gloves. In non-healthcare areas, the 353 SARS-CoV-2 virus was detected in the air with an approximate half-life of 1.1-1.2 hours and 354 even robust over 12 hours in aerosol form. The common areas with virus aerosol were found 355 not only in the mobilised areas of Covid-19 patients but also in general public areas and 356 general wards of the hospitals. These findings were consistent with the findings of Tang et 357 al.'s review in which the infectivity of SARS-CoV-2 aerosols was identified as extending up 358 to 16 hours. The risk of SARS-CoV-2 aerosol was also classified as high risk (for healthcare 359 settings/ laboratory) and medium to low-medium risk (for public transportation/ naval 360 vessels, public places, restrooms, churches, prisons, schools, nursing homes, and kindergarten 361 362 areas) in Tang et al.'s review [35]. In this review, contaminated wastewater with SARS-CoV-2 could be infectious for 3-7 days. To compare, Rosa et al.'s review stated that the SARS-363 CoV virus persisted in wastewater for 2 days at 20 °C and \geq 14 days at 4°C [36]. This review 364

concluded that the duration of SARS-CoV-2 persistence in faeces was 14-50 days and
remained positive up to 15-33 days with negative respiratory samples. The review of Gupta *et al.* mentioned the same outline for the faecal contamination that was positive for 3-30 days
from the onset of symptoms and 3-21 days after the negative nasopharyngeal test [37].

369

Influencing factors for SARS-CoV-2 persistence in environments

By changing temperature and humidity, SARS-CoV-2 persistence in environments 371 372 fluctuated. SARS-CoV-2 persistence on non-porous and porous surfaces was recorded as 28 days and 14 days at 20°C and 7 days and 3 days at 30°C respectively. At 40 °C, 99.99% 373 reduction of virus infectivity on all fomite surfaces within an hour. However, the virus could 374 survive up to 21 days on paper notes at 30°C. Kampf. et al.'s review, though, reported 375 approximately 5 days for non-porous surfaces at room temperature or 20°C [34]. This 376 systematic review identified additional facts on the impact of temperature on viral load 377 reduction and the effect of relative humidity (RH) on SARS-CoV-2 persistence in 378 379 environments which was not included in Kampf, et al [34]. This particular review identified 380 that virus decaying was noted approximately 5-10 times faster at 27°C than that at 10°C and 2-5 times even faster with 65% RH than that with 40% and 100% RH. Quick virus decaying 381 was recognized with high temperature and RH (35°C with 60% RH). The virus half-life 382 varied with changing temperature and RH such as 15.33±2.75 hours at 24°C with 20%RH 383 and 2.26±1.42 hours at 35°C with 60%RH indicating the virus was mostly stable at ambient 384 indoor temperature with relatively low RH. This review also identified that >3-4 days at 385 20°C, 30 minutes at 50°C and only over 4 minutes at 70°C were needed for 99 % reduction of 386 the SARS-CoV-2 infectivity in wastewater. The results denoted that the higher titer virus 387 stayed more days in wastewater than the low titer at the same temperature. The higher the 388 temperature was, the faster the reduction of the SARS-CoV-2 infectivity occurred in 389

390 wastewater. This review's findings on temperature's impacts on the virus infectivity were consistent with the findings from Rosa, et al. 's review where SARS-CoV could survive ≥ 14 391 days at 4°C and 2 days at 20°C. This review also concluded that the virus infectivity was 392 reduced by 99.99% in 25 minutes by far-UVC (222 nm) light with a dose of 1.2 mj/cm² to 1.7 393 mj/cm [2, 36]. This finding was in line with the findings of Riddell et al.'s review described 394 that the virus was susceptible to the UV light around 253.7 nm. This review also identified 395 the critical role of free available chlorine (FAC) concentration in acidic EW activities on the 396 reduction of SARS-CoV-2 infectivity and recorded that acidic EW (pH-2.5), FAC-74 ppm, 397 398 potently reduced >99.99% of SARS-CoV-2 infectivity with a 1:9 ratio of virus: acidic EW solution [38]. In contrast, Cervino et al.'s review recorded that the range of pH (3-10) did not 399 show any significant changes in the stability of SARS-CoV-2 [39]. 400

401

402 Disinfection Methods

Based on the review findings, ammonium-based detergent, sodium hypochlorite, hydrogen 403 peroxide and combined disinfectant and detergent were recommended for effective 404 405 decontamination on surfaces and floors. Besides, polymers and oligomers were identified as significant disinfectants for SARS-CoV-2. These agents effectively deactivated the virus 406 under UV light within 10-15 minutes. However, the deactivation actions of these agents did 407 408 not occur in the darkness. Antimicrobial treatment on the stainless steel was noted for the reduction of SARS-CoV-2 infectivity to >99.99 % in 2 hours. The mentioned findings agreed 409 with Kampf et al. in which a range of disinfectants was recorded as effective decontamination 410 for coronavirus by 4 log₁₀ with 78%-95% ethanol, 70%-100% 2 propanols, combined of 45% 411 2 propanols with 30% 1 propanol, 0.5%-2.5 % glutardialdehyde, 0.7%-1% formaldehyde, 412 0.23%-7.5% povidone-iodine, at least 0.21% sodium hypochlorite and 0.5% hydrogen 413 peroxide in an exposure time of 15 seconds to 10 minutes approximately [35]. In this review, 414

far UVC light (222 nm), UVB irradiation (1.6 - 0.7 W/m²), and Pulsed Xenon Ultraviolet 415 (PX-UV) (200-320 nm) deactivated SARS-CoV-2 in indoor environments. This review 416 revealed that contaminated N95 respirators were disinfected 99.998% at 2 minutes of 417 exposure with PX-UV in the UVGI box. Notably, UV light had the effective decontamination 418 of respirators, medical equipment and PPE, however, the benefit of utilisation should be 419 outweighed by the harmful effect and cost. Regarding decontamination of SARS-CoV-2 in 420 wastewater, sodium hypochlorite (6700 g/m3) with free chlorine was effective for 421 preliminary disinfection in septic tanks. Compared with Carraturo et al.'s review in which 422 423 sodium hypochlorite with 10 mg/l dosage provided an effective reduction of infectivity to 5 logs in 30 minutes of exposure [40]. However, it would be quite concerned to add the 424 recommended dose of sodium hypochlorite per litre of wastewater to maintain 425 decontamination if the wastewater volume was plenteous. Furthermore, MBBR (Moving Bed 426 Biofilm Reactor), SBF (Sequencing Batch Reactor) and ASP (Activated Sludge Process) 427 were recommended as the effective disinfectants in the secondary treatment of wastewater. 428 For the tertiary treatment of wastewater, chlorine and UV were recommended as effective. 429 This systematic review explored the potential spreading sources of COVID-19 in 430 contaminated areas and the influencing factors for the virus in environments since these could 431 be key determinants for the prolongation of the COVID-19 outbreak. Last but not the least, 432 this research revealed effective disinfection methods to break the chain of transmission of 433 434 SARS-CoV-2 to prevent the COVID-19 surge.

435

436 Conclusion

437 Since the COVID-19 pandemic has been pestilential over a considerable duration, global
438 deployment and financial crisis could not be reversed as before. It brought up essentials to
439 allow the nations fully back to work with effective preventive measures. This systematic

review documented the key findings that came out through the hard work of the 51 studies 440 across 16 countries. The findings of this systematic review reflected a comprehensive 441 overview of the persistence of SARS-CoV-2 in different environmental matrices under 442 different conditions and the effects of disinfectants and their techniques on the viability of 443 SARS-CoV-2 in both healthcare and non-healthcare settings. Those findings will be 444 important inputs for authorities in the development of mitigation strategies and policies for 445 effective preventive measures for COVID-19. This particular review advocated that the 446 persistence of SARS-CoV-2 in environments should be counted in consideration of 447 448 disinfection methods and materials. Besides, the infection control team should be informed to develop proper disinfection guidelines/instructions based on the evidence of review. To 449 optimise, the cleaning interval, mechanism and the agents/methods used for decontamination 450 should be regularly monitored with sampling and testing by a defined supervision team. In 451 conclusion, additional research on the possible food contamination, the weather/climate 452 effects and fumigation/spraying effects on the virus should be advanced. 453

454

455 Limitations of Study

While this study was focusing to review the valuable evidences systematically with the 456 457 predefined criteria, there were some limitations. The exclusive inclusion of the articles which was published in full-text could result in missing of some information from unpublished 458 studies. Besides, this review could not reveal some articles that might exit in other languages 459 460 rather than English. Since the review was dedicated to the academic purpose, there was a time constraint leading to the paper selection process needed to finalize in October 2020 so 461 that published paper later than October 2020 could not be included in this review. Moreover, 462 463 this review did not include the discussion on the possible food contamination, the weather/climate effects and fumigation/spraying effects on the virus. With the above-464

mentioned limitations, the information and discussion conveyed in this systematic review
 may be arguable for certain extent on making a definite conclusion of SARS-CoV-2
 persistence in environmental matrices, influencing factors and disinfection methods.

468

469 Access to data

Details of authors' contacts including phone numbers, emails, and affiliations were mentioned
on the cover page of the manuscript for being requested additional information such as the
extracted data sheets and tables.

473

Dissemination plan

This dissertation was documented at both of the University of Bedfordshire, UK and the STIMU, Myanmar as a part of the academic procedure. A short report of this review would be circulated among medical and public health professionals in Myanmar. Since the study area in this dissertation focused on the current concern of the global health crisis and also registration process was done through PROSPERO (International Prospective Register of Systematic Reviews) on 13th October 2020 as a part of this systematic review, it is expected to be published in the PLOS One, a peer-reviewed open access scientific journal.

482

483 Administrative information

The authors declare that there was no conflict of interest and they have adhered to all principles of academic honesty and integrity and have not misrepresented any data or information intentionally in this report. This report is a part of the dissertation submission that was dedicated to the University of Bedfordshire for the gratification of a Master of Science in Public Health.

489

490 Author contributions

- 491 Research question: Chaw Chaw Yu
- 492 Research Design: Chaw Chaw Yu
- 493 Research protocol: Chaw Chaw Yu, Thein Hlaing, Kyaw Myo Tun
- 494 Searching Literature: Chaw Chaw Yu, Thein Hlaing
- 495 Selection of Studies: Chaw Chaw Yu, Thein Hlaing
- 496 Critical Appraisal: Chaw Chaw Yu, Thein Hlaing
- 497 Data Extraction: Chaw Chaw Yu,
- 498 Data Synthesis and Analysis: Chaw Chaw Yu
- 499 Writing: Chaw Chaw Yu
- 500 Writing (revision & editing): Chaw Chaw Yu, Kyaw Myo Tun

501

502 Acknowledgements

The authors would like to express sincere thanks to the research supervisor, co-reviewers, course lecturers from both Universities (STIMU and the University of Bedfordshire, UK) and batch-mates for their academic support, kind guidance and encouragement to conduct this dissertation on systematic review and for successful submission on schedule.

507

508 **References**

- 1. Lai CC, Shih TP, Ko WC, Tang HJ and Hsueh PR. Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome
- 510 Coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) and Coronavirus Disease-2019 (COVID-19): The
- 511 Epidemic and the Challenges. Int Antimicrob Agents 2020 55(3). DOI:
- 512 10.1016/j.ijantimicag.2020.105924. Available at: <u>https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/</u>
 513 32081636
- Woolhouse MEJ and Adair K. The Diversity of Human RNA viruses. *Futrue Virol* 2013;
 8(2): 159-171. DOI: 10.2217/fvl.12.129.
- 3. Yezli S and Otter JA. Minimum Infective Dose of the Major Human Respiratory and
 Enteric Viruses Transmitted Through Food and the Environment. *Fod Environ Virol*2011; 3: 1-30. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1007/s12560-011-9056-7.
- Firquet S, Beaujard S, Lobert PE, Sané F, Caloone D, Izard D, et al. Survival of
 Enveloped and Non-Enveloped Viruses on Inanimate Surfaces. *Microbes Environ* 2015;
 30(2): 140-144. DOI: 10.1264/jsme2.ME14145.
- 5. World Health Organization (WHO). Contact Tracing in the Context of Covid-19.
 COVID-19: Surveillance, Case Investigation and Epidemiological Protocols 2020a.
- Available at: <u>https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/contact-tracing-in-the-context-</u>
 <u>ofcovid-19</u>
- 526 6. World Health Organization (WHO). Modes of Transmission of Virus Causing Covid-19:
- 527 Implications for IPC Precaution Recommendations. *Scientific Brief* 2020b. Available at:
- 528 <u>https://www.who.int/news-room/commentaries/detail/modes-oftransmission-</u> of-virus-
- 529 causing-covid-19-implications-for-ipc-precautionrecommendations
- 530 7. van Doremalen N, Bushmaker T, Morris DH, Holbrook MG, Gamble A, Williamson BN,
- et al. Aerosol and Surface Stability of SARS-CoV-2 as Compared with SARS-CoV-1. N
- *Engl Med* 2020; 382:1564-1567 DOI: 10.1056/NEJMc2004973.

- 533 8. Cheng VCC, Wong SC, Chen JHK, Yip CCY, Chuang VWM, Tsang OTY, et al.
- 534 Escalating Infection Control Response to the Rapidly Evolving Epidemiology of the
- 535 Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) due to SARS-CoV-2 in Hong Kong. *Epub* 2020;
- 536 41 (5): 493-498. DOI: 10.1017/ice.2020.58
- 537 9. Wölfel R, Corman VM, Guggemos W. Seilmaier M, Zange S, Müller MA, et al. Clinical
- 538 presentation and Virological Assessment of Hospitalized Cases of Coronavirus Disease
- 539 2019 in Travel-associated Transmission Cluster, Infectious Diseases (except HIV/AIDS).

540 *medRxiv: Preprint* 2020. DOI: 10.1101/2020.03.05.20030502. Available at:

541 <u>https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.03.05.20030502v1</u>

- 542 10. Gundy PM, Gerba CP and Pepper I.L. Survival of Coronavirus in Water and Wastewater.
 543 *Food Environ Virol* 2009; 1(1): 10. DOI: 10.1007/s12560-008-9001-6
- 544 11. Zhao J, Eisenberg JE, Spicknall IH, Li S and Koopman JS. Model Analysis of Fomite
 545 mediated Influenza Transmission. PloS ONE 2012; 7(12). DOI:
 546 10.1371/journal.pone.0051984. Available at:
- 547 https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3531458/pdf/pone.0051984.pdf
- 548 12. World Health Organization (WHO) Cleaning and disinfection of environment surfaces in
- 549 context of Covid-19. *WHO*, *Switzerland* 2020c. Available at:
- 550 <u>https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/cleaning-and-disinfection-of-environmental-</u>
- 551 <u>surfaces-inthe-context-of-covid-19</u>
- 13. Ong SWX, Tan YK, Chia PY, Lee TH, Ng OT, Wong MSY, et al. Air, surface
 environmental, and personal protective equipment contamination by severe acute
 respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARSCoV-2) from a symptomatic patient. *JAMA*
- 555 2020; 323:1610–1612. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.2020.3227

- 14. Pastorino B, Touret F, Gilles M, de Lamballerie X and Charrel RN. Prolonged Infectivity
- of SARS-CoV-2 in Fomites. *Emerging Infectious Disease* 2020; 26(9). DOI:
- 558 <u>https://doi.org/10.3201/eid2609.201788</u>.
- 559 Available at: <u>https://wwwnc.cdc.gov/eid/article/26/9/20-1788_article</u>
- 15. Fears AC, Klimstra WB, Duprex P, Hartman A, Weaver SC, Plante KS, et al. Persistence
- of Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 in Aerosol Suspensions. *Emerg*
- Infect Dis Journal 2020; 26(9). DOI: <u>https://doi.org/10.3201/eid2609.201806</u>. Available
 at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC7454081/
- 16. Bivins A, Greaves J, Fischer R, Yinda KC, Ahmed W, Kitajima M, et al. Persistence of
- 565 SARS-CoV 2 in Water and Wastewater. *Environmental Science & Technology Letters*
- 566 Article ASAP 2020. DOI: 10.1021/acs.estlett.0c00730. Available at:
 567 https://pubs.acs.org/doi/10.1021/acs.estlett.0c00730
- 17. Lo IL, Lio CF, Cheong HH, Lei CI, Cheong TH, Zhong X, et al. Evaluation of SARS-
- 569 CoV-2 RNA Shedding in Clinical Specimens and Clinical Characteristics of 10 Patients
- 570 with COVID-19 in Macau. International Journal of Biological Sciences 2020; 19(1).
- 571 DIO: 10.7150/ijbs.45357. Available at: <u>https://www.ijbs.com/v16p1698.htm</u>
- 572 18. Park SK, Lee CW, Park DI, Woo HY, Cheong HS, Shin HC, et al. Detection of SARS-
- 573 CoV-2 in Fecal Samples From Patients With Asymptomatic and Mild COVID-19 in
- 574 Korea. *Clinical Gastroenterology and Hepatology* 2020; 1542- 3565. DOI:
 575 <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cgh.2020.06.005</u>.
- 576 Available at: https://www.cghjournal.org/article/S1542-3565(20)30777-1/fulltext
- 577 19. Li Y, Hu Y, Yu Y, Zhang X, Li B, Wu J, et al. Positive result of Sars-Cov-2 in faeces and
- 578 sputum from discharged patients with COVID-19 in Yiwu, China. *Journl of Medical*
- 579 *Virology* 2020; 92: 1938-1947. DOI: 10.1002/jmv.25905

- 580 20. Wu Y, Guo C, Tang L, Hong Z, Zhou J, Dong X, et al. Prolonged presence of SARS-
- 581 CoV-2 viral RNA in Fecal Samples. *Lancet Gastroenterol Hepatol* 2020; 5, 434-435.
- 582 Available at: https://www.thelancet.com/journals/langas/article/PIIS2468-1253(20)30083
- 583 <u>-2/fulltext</u>
- 584 21. Sharma A, Preece B, Swann H, Fan X, McKenney RJ, Ori-McKenney KM, et al.
- 585 Structural Stability of SARS-CoV-2 Degrades with Temperature. *bioRxiv preprint* 2002.

586 doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.10.12.336818

- 587 Available at: <u>https://www.biorxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.10.12.336818v1</u>
- 588 22. Buonanno M, Welch D, Shuryak I and Brenner, D. J. Far-UVC Light (222 nm)
 589 Efficiently and Safely Inactivates Airborne Human Coronaviruses. *Scientific Reports*

590 2020. DOI: <u>https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-020-67211-2</u>.

591 Available at: <u>https://www.nature.com/articles/s41598-020-67211-2</u>

- 592 23. Takeda Y, Uchiumi H, Matsuda S and Ogawa H. Acidic Electrolyzed Water Potently
 593 Inactivates SARS-CoV-2 depending on the Amount of Free Available Chlorine
 594 Contacting with the Virus. *Biochemical and Biophysical Research Communications* 2020;
 595 530, 1-3.
- 24. Redmond SN, Dousa KM, Jones LD, Li DF, Cadnum JL, Navas ME, et al. Severe acute
 respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARSCoV- 2) nucleic acid contamination of
 surfaces on a coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) ward and intensive care unit. *Infection Control & Hospital Epidemiology* 2020; 1-3. DOI: 10.1017/ice.2020.416
- 600 25. Peyrony O, Ellouze S, Fontaine JP, Thegat-Le Cam M, Salmona M, Feghoul L, et al.
- 601 Surfaces and equipment contamination by severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus
- 602 2 (SARS-CoV-2) in the emergency department at a university hospital. *International*
- Journal of Hygiene and Environmental Health 2020. DOI: s://doi.org/10.1016/

j.ijheh.2020.113600. Available at: <u>https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/</u>
S1438463920305460?via%3Dihub

- 606 26. Simmons SE, Carrion R, Alfson KJ, Staples HM, Jinadatha C, Jarvis WR, et al.
- 607 Deactivation of SARS-CoV-2 with pulsed-xenon ultraviolet light: Implications for
- 608 environmental COVID-19 control. *Infection Control & Hospital Epidemiology* 2020; 1-4.
- 609 DOI:10.1017/ice.2020.399 Available at: <u>https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/</u>
- 610 <u>infection-control-and-hospitalepidemiology/article/deactivation-of-sarscov2-with-</u>
- 611 pulsedxenon-ultraviolet-lightimplications-for-environmental-covid19-
- 612 control/AD5CF52419E27E86E0114059FBA78D4C
- 613 27. Baluja A, Arines J, Vilanova R, Cortiñas J, Bao-Varela C and Flores-Arias MT. UV light
- dosage distribution over irregular respirator surfaces. Methods and implications for
- 615 safety. *medRxiv preprint* 2020. doi: <u>https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.04.07.20057224</u>.
- 616 Available at: <u>https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.04.07.20057224v3.full</u>
- 617 <u>.pdf+html</u>
- 28. Card Kyle J, Crozier D, Dhawan A, Dinh MN, Dolson, Emily, Farrokhian N, et al. U V
 Sterilization of Personal Protective Equipment with IdleLaboratory Biosafety Cabinets
 During the COVID-19 Pandemic. *medRxiv preprint* 2020. doi:
- 621 <u>https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.03.25.20043489</u>. Available at: <u>https://www.researchgate</u>.
- 622 net/publication/340244763_UV_Sterilization_of_Personal_Protective_Equipment_with_I
- dle_Laboratory_Biosafety_Cabinets_During_the_Covid-19_Pandemic
- 29. Rathnasinghe R, Karlicek RF, Schotsaert M, Koffas MA, Arduini B, Jangra S, et al.
 Scalable, effective, and rapid decontamination of SARSCoV-2 contaminated N95
 respirators using germicidal ultra-violet C (UVC) irradiation device. *medRxi preprint*2020. doi: <u>https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.10.05.20206953</u> Available a<u>https://www.</u>
 medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.10.05.20206953v1

30. Zhang D, Ling H, Huang X, Li J, Li W, Yi C, et al. Potential Spreading Risks and
Disinfection Challenges of Medical Wastewater by the Presence of Severe Acute

- 630 Disinfection Challenges of Medical Wastewater by the Presence of Severe Acute
- 631 Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) viral RNA in Septic Tanks of
- 632 Fangcang Hospital. Science of the Total Environment 2020; 741. DOI:
- 633 <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.140445</u>. Available at: <u>https://www.sciencedirect.</u>
- 634 <u>com/science/article/pii/S004896972033967X?via%3Dihub</u>
- 635 31. Monge FA, Jagadesan P, Bondu V, Donabedian PL, Ista L, Chi EY, et al. Highly
- Effective Inactivation of SARS-CoV-2 by Conjugated Polymers and Oligomer. *medRxiv*
- 637 *preprint* 2020. doi: <u>https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.09.29.20204164</u>.
- 638 Available at: <u>https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC7553178</u>
- 639 32. Ikner LA, Torre JR, Gundy PM. and Gerba CP. A Continuously Active Antimicrobial
- 640 Coating effective against Human Coronavirus 229E. *preprints from medRxiv and bioRxiv*
- 641 2020. doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.10.20097329.
- 642 Available at: <u>https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.05.10.20097329v1</u>
- 643 33. Arora S, Nag A, Rajpal A, Tiwari SB, Sethi J, Sutaria D. et al. Detection of SARS-CoV-2
- 644 RNA in fourteen wastewater treatment systems in Uttarakhand and Rajasthan States of
- 645 North India. *medRxiv preprint 2020.* doi: <u>https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.09.18.20197178</u>.
- 646 Available at: <u>https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.09.18.20197178v1</u>
- 647 34. Kampf G, Todt D and Pfaender S. Steinmann E.Persistence of Coronaviruses on
 648 inanimate surfaces and their inactivation with biocidal agents. *Journal of Hospital*
- 649 Infection 2020; 104: 246-251. DOI: <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhin.2020.01.022</u>
- 650 35. Tang S, Mao Y, Jones RM, Tan Q, Ji JS, Li N, et al. Aerosol transmission of SARS-CoV-
- 651 2? Evidence, Prevention and Control. *Environmental International* 2020; 114. DOI:
- 652 10.1016/j.envint.2020.106039.
- 653 Available at: <u>https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC7413047/</u>

- 36. La Rosa G, Bonadonna L, Lucentini L, Kenmoe S and Suffredini E. Coronavirus in Water
- Environments: Occurrence, Persistence and Concentration Methods: A Scoping Review.
- 656 *Water Research* 2020; 179. DOI: <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.watres.2020.115899</u>. Available
- at: <u>https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S004313542030436X</u>
- 658 37. Gupta S, Parker J, Smits S, Underwood J and Dolwani S. Persistent Viral Shedding of
- 659 SARS-CoV-2 in Feces: A Rapid Review. *Colorectal Dis* 2020; 22 (6). 611-620. DOI:

660 <u>https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1111/codi.15138</u>

- 38. Riddell S, Goldie S, Hill A, Eagles D and Drew TW. The Effect of Temperature on
- 662 Persistence of SARS-CoV-2 onCommon Surfaces. *Virology Journal* 2020. DOI:
- 663 <u>https://doi.org/10.1186/s12985-020-01418-7</u>.
- 664 Available at: <u>https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC7538848</u>
- 39. Cervino GF, Luca S, Giovanni P, Valeria F, Maria TDS, Rosa L, et al. SARS-CoV-2
 Persistence: Data Summary up to Q2 2020. *MDPI* 2020; 5(3): 81. DOI:
 https://doi.org/10.3390/data5030081.
- 40. Carraturo F, Del Giudice C, Morelli M, Cerullo V, Libralato G, Galdiero E, et al.
- 669 Persistence of SARS-CoV-2 in the environment and Covid-19 Transmission Risk rom
- Environmental matrices and surfaces. *Environ Pollute* 2020; 265. DOI:
 10.1016/j.envpol.2020.115010.
- 672 Available at: <u>https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC7280109/</u>

673

674 Supporting information

- 675 S1 Table. PRISMA (Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Review and Meta-analysis)
- 676 2020 checklist
- 677 S2 Figure. Flow Diagram of Study Selection Process

PRISMA 2020 flow diagram for new systematic reviews which included searches of databases and registers only



Figure 1: Included/Excluded Literature

*Consider, if feasible to do so, reporting the number of records identified from each database or register searched (rather than the total number across all databases/registers).

**If automation tools were used, indicate how many records were excluded by a human and how many were excluded by automation tools.

From: Page MJ, McKenzie JE, Bossuyt PM, Boutron I, Hoffmann TC, Mulrow CD, et al. The PRISMA 2020 statement: an updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. BMJ 2021;372:n71. doi: 10.1136/bmj.n71

For more information, visit: http://www.prisma-statement.org/

Included/Excluded Literature_PRISMA flow chart_Figure 1