

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 Hlaing², Kyaw Myo Tun³

5 ¹Faculty of Health and Social Sciences, University of Bedfordshire

6 ²District Public Health Department, Pyay District, Bago Region, Myanmar

7 ³Department 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. chawchawyu.dr@gmail.com

18 ORCID iD: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5041-0759>

19

20

21

22

23

24 **Abstract**

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

31 **Methods:** Applying the PRISMA 2020 tool, MEDLINE/PubMed, HINARI, and Google
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
34 Appraisal Tool. The findings were presented descriptively.

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

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.

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**

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

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

71 transmissible through aerosols and may also survive in water apart from contracting via
72 contaminated surfaces [6]. SARS-CoV-2 can persist for a few hours in the air after the
73 generation of aerosols [7]. Virus contamination on air exhaust outlets, means, viruses can be
74 travelled by air [8]. Besides, SARS-CoV-2 RNA is detected in faeces suggesting virus
75 replication and shedding through patients' GI tract [9]. With the likelihood of virus survival
76 in faeces and water, attention should be placed on water-related virus exposures as well [10].
77 Regarding fomites, these include high touch surfaces of porous and non-porous materials in
78 both healthcare and non-healthcare settings. High touch surfaces of fomites are the highest
79 risk of virus transmission through contaminated environments [11]. Various studies of SARS-
80 CoV-2 persistence in common public spaces explored the virus survival duration on the
81 surfaces of furniture, household fixed items, electronic objects, and stairway rails, floors,
82 walls, shelves and countertops. According to WHO, SARS-CoV-2 can survive up to several
83 hours on some porous surfaces such as cloths, cardboards and wood while the virus can be
84 persisting up to several days on different porous materials such as the outer layer of a medical
85 mask [12]. SARS-CoV-2 on non-porous surfaces like copper, glass and stainless steel may
86 persist up to many hours whereas the virus can survive on plastic for many days. Foremost,
87 healthcare settings are essentially under concern for contamination with microscopic virus
88 particles exhaled from patients. Emergency departments, intensive care units, wards, primary
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
91 (masks & gloves, etc.) are very risky of virus contamination and surface persistence unless
92 effective disinfection measures [13]. The door handle, toilet bowl and sink were found to be
93 the test positive for the virus. Airflows equipment like vents and Personal Protective
94 Equipment (PPE) also resulted in positive virus tests [8]. Factors influencing the persistence
95 of SARS-CoV-2 (Covid-19) in different environmental metrics/surfaces are vital to

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

104

105 **Methods**

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

117

118 **Eligibility Criteria**

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

134 **Table.1. Summary of Eligibility Criteria**

135

Inclusion Criteria	Exclusion criteria
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 agents (e.g. studies for comparison of 2 commercial products)

136

137 **Bibliographic Search**

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

151

152 **Identification and Selection of Studies**

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

162

163 **Quality Appraisal**

164 Mixed-Method Appraisal Tool (MMAT) (version 2018) was a promising and reliable tool for
165 critically appraising and used to assess the strength of the evidence quality. Based on the
166 number of criteria met for the respective study designs, the tool yielded scores of 20%, 40%,
167 60%, 80% and 100%. In this systematic review, the quality appraisal scores of the selected
168 studies were counter-checked by both reviewers to enhance the quality assurance.

169

170 **Data Extraction**

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

177

178 **Data Synthesis and Analysis**

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

186

187 **Ethical Consideration**

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

195

196 **Results**

197 **Summary of Selection Process**

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

206

207 **Characteristics of Included Studies**

208 All selected 51 studies were quantitative studies in which cross-sectional analytical studies
209 were mostly contributed (n=24, 47%) and non-randomized controlled trials were second-most
210 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
224 revealed SARS-CoV-2 RNA in air samples of hospitals. Two studies from Italy and two from
225 the UK detected SARS-CoV-2 RNA in air, surfaces and wastewater while an Israel study was
226 done on sewage measurements for SARS-CoV-2. Two papers from Korea studied
227 environment contamination of SARS-CoV-2 on faeces and surfaces whereas 2 articles from
228 Japan revealed surface and air contamination with SARS-CoV-2 and the effect of acidic pH
229 on SARS-CoV-2. While a Netherland study measured SARS-CoV-2 aerosol, one study in
230 Mexico explored the effectiveness of polymers and oligomers on the inactivation of the virus.
231 Two studies in Singapore tested air and surface of clinical places for persistence of SAR-
232 CoV-2 and a Spain study used UVG irradiator to examine the effects of UV on the virus.
233 Sixteen studies from the USA covered all topics of environmental persistence of the virus,
234 factors influencing virus persistence in environments and disinfection methods.

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

246

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

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

251

252 **Table.3. Persistence Durations of SARS-CoV-2 (Covid-19) in Environmental**
 253 **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

255 **Influencing factors for SARS-CoV-2 persistence in environments**

256 **Temperature and Relative Humidity (RH)**

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

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					
	20°C	30 °C	40 °C	50°C	60.2 °C	70°C
wastewater (higher titer)	1.6-3.2 days			15-30 minutes		2.2-4.5 minutes
wastewater (lower titer)	2.1-4.3 days					

268

269 Sunlight/ UV

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

273

274 pH/ Acidity

275 The pH 2.5 with free available chlorine (FAC) was identified as a potent deactivator for
 276 SARS-CoV-2 signifying >99.99% reduction of virus infectivity. Technically, the test
 277 solution, acidic electrolyzed water (EW), and ratio played a vital role in the inactivation
 278 process. By using the acidic EWs (pH-2.5, FAC-74 ppm) with a 1:9 ratio of the virus: acidic
 279 EW, virus titer was reduced by $\geq 4.25 \log_{10}$ TCID₅₀/mL with $\geq 99.99\%$ reduction of infectivity
 280 after a one-minute reaction. However, neither visible reduction of virus infectivity could be
 281 identified on testing with a 1:1 ratio, an equal volume of virus and acidic EW. Moreover, a
 282 17-days old solution of acidic EW (pH-2.5, FAC-109 ppm) yielded inferior action on
 283 deactivation of the virus compared to that of fresh acidic EW solution and 31-day stored
 284 acidic EW showed no detectable reduction in the virus infectivity [23].

285

286 Disinfection Methods in Healthcare Setting

287 With quaternary ammonium-based detergent for the floor, a sodium hypochlorite for non-
 288 floor surfaces in inpatient rooms and hydrogen peroxide for areas outside the patient rooms,
 289 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 above-
291 mentioned disinfectants. When the disinfecting process was performed more frequently and
292 thoroughly on floors with 2,500 ppm sodium hypochlorite, the persistence of the study virus
293 in surface samples was found significantly reduced by 3.4% [24]. After cleaning with the
294 combined disinfectant and detergent (e.g., Surfanios Premium), the contamination in samples
295 was considerably reduced from 60% to 4.9% for the floors and all the surfaces directly in
296 contact with patients (such as trolleys, sneakers, cuffs, door handles etc.) and from 10% to
297 5.6% for the surfaces not directly in contact with patients (such as stethoscopes) [25].
298 Moreover, Pulsed Xenon Ultraviolet (PX-UV) reduced the infectivity of SARS-CoV-2 to
299 99.97% at 1 minute, 99.997% at 2 minutes and 99.992% at 5 minutes. Contamination of N95
300 respirators in inoculation was reduced to 99.998% with 2 minutes of exposure with PX-UV
301 [26].

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

315 However, 12 hours after sodium hypochlorite had been added to septic tanks, the study virus
316 RNA was significantly detectable again due to the decline of free chlorine. When sodium
317 hypochlorite was increased to 6700 g/m³, SARS-CoV-2 became undetectable in wastewater
318 [30].

319

320 **Disinfection Methods in Non-healthcare/General Setting**

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

332

333 **Discussion**

334 Until the end of the paper screening process i.e., October 2020, by the Author's knowledge,
335 this systematic review was the only comprehensive review covering the three areas of
336 environmental persistence of SARS-CoV-2 in different matrices, influencing factors of the
337 virus persistence and disinfection methods obtained from the primary studies full-text
338 published from January 2020. Moreover, this review exclusively focused on the SARS-CoV-
339 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
344 environmental matrices was <4 hours on aluminium, 4 hours on copper, 24 hours on
345 cardboard, 44 hours on glass, 48 hours on stainless steel, 72 hours on plastic and 92 hours on
346 polystyrene plastic. These findings had some variations compared with the findings of
347 Kampf, et al.'s review documented the survival of the coronavirus family on aluminium for
348 2-8 hours, latex rubber for ≤ 8 hours, glass for 4 days, plastic for 2-6 days, steel/silicon
349 rubber/ceramic/Teflon for 5 days, a disposable gown for 2 days, metal for 5 days, wood for 4
350 days and paper for 4-5 days [34]. In this review, the most contaminated objects with SARS-
351 CoV-2 in inpatient rooms and staff areas were the mobile phones of the patients, buttons of
352 water machines, elevators, beepers, doorknobs and hand sanitiser dispensers, printers,
353 desktops, keyboards and eye protection/face shields/gloves. In non-healthcare areas, the
354 SARS-CoV-2 virus was detected in the air with an approximate half-life of 1.1-1.2 hours and
355 even robust over 12 hours in aerosol form. The common areas with virus aerosol were found
356 not only in the mobilised areas of Covid-19 patients but also in general public areas and
357 general wards of the hospitals. These findings were consistent with the findings of Tang et
358 al.'s review in which the infectivity of SARS-CoV-2 aerosols was identified as extending up
359 to 16 hours. The risk of SARS-CoV-2 aerosol was also classified as high risk (for healthcare
360 settings/ laboratory) and medium to low-medium risk (for public transportation/ naval
361 vessels, public places, restrooms, churches, prisons, schools, nursing homes, and kindergarten
362 areas) in Tang et al.'s review [35]. In this review, contaminated wastewater with SARS-CoV-
363 2 could be infectious for 3-7 days. To compare, Rosa *et al.*'s review stated that the SARS-
364 CoV virus persisted in wastewater for 2 days at 20 °C and ≥ 14 days at 4°C [36]. This review

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

369

370 **Influencing factors for SARS-CoV-2 persistence in environments**

371 By changing temperature and humidity, SARS-CoV-2 persistence in environments
372 fluctuated. SARS-CoV-2 persistence on non-porous and porous surfaces was recorded as 28
373 days and 14 days at 20°C and 7 days and 3 days at 30°C respectively. At 40 °C, 99.99%
374 reduction of virus infectivity on all fomite surfaces within an hour. However, the virus could
375 survive up to 21 days on paper notes at 30°C. Kampf. *et al.*'s review, though, reported
376 approximately 5 days for non-porous surfaces at room temperature or 20°C [34]. This
377 systematic review identified additional facts on the impact of temperature on viral load
378 reduction and the effect of relative humidity (RH) on SARS-CoV-2 persistence in
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
381 2-5 times even faster with 65% RH than that with 40% and 100% RH. Quick virus decaying
382 was recognized with high temperature and RH (35°C with 60% RH). The virus half-life
383 varied with changing temperature and RH such as 15.33±2.75 hours at 24°C with 20%RH
384 and 2.26±1.42 hours at 35°C with 60%RH indicating the virus was mostly stable at ambient
385 indoor temperature with relatively low RH. This review also identified that >3-4 days at
386 20°C, 30 minutes at 50°C and only over 4 minutes at 70°C were needed for 99 % reduction of
387 the SARS-CoV-2 infectivity in wastewater. The results denoted that the higher titer virus
388 stayed more days in wastewater than the low titer at the same temperature. The higher the
389 temperature was, the faster the reduction of the SARS-CoV-2 infectivity occurred in

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

401

402 **Disinfection Methods**

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

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

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

454

455 **Limitations of Study**

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

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

468

469 **Access to data**

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

473

474 **Dissemination plan**

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

482

483 **Administrative information**

484 The authors declare that there was no conflict of interest and they have adhered to all
485 principles of academic honesty and integrity and have not misrepresented any data or
486 information intentionally in this report. This report is a part of the dissertation submission
487 that was dedicated to the University of Bedfordshire for the gratification of a Master of
488 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**

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

507

508 **References**

- 509 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: [https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/
513 32081636](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/32081636)
- 514 2. Woolhouse MEJ and Adair K. The Diversity of Human RNA viruses. *Futruue Virol* 2013;
515 8(2): 159-171. DOI: 10.2217/fvl.12.129.
- 516 3. Yezli S and Otter JA. Minimum Infective Dose of the Major Human Respiratory and
517 Enteric Viruses Transmitted Through Food and the Environment. *Fod Environ Virol*
518 2011; 3: 1-30. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12560-011-9056-7>.
- 519 4. Firquet S, Beaujard S, Lobert PE, Sané F, Caloone D, Izard D, et al. Survival of
520 Enveloped and Non-Enveloped Viruses on Inanimate Surfaces. *Microbes Environ* 2015;
521 30(2): 140-144. DOI: 10.1264/jsme2.ME14145.
- 522 5. World Health Organization (WHO). Contact Tracing in the Context of Covid-19.
523 COVID-19: *Surveillance, Case Investigation and Epidemiological Protocols* 2020a.
524 Available at: [https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/contact-tracing-in-the-context-
525 ofcovid-19](https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/contact-tracing-in-the-context-ofcovid-19)
- 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 [https://www.who.int/news-room/commentaries/detail/modes-oftransmission-
529 causing-covid-19-implications-for-ipc-precautionrecommendations](https://www.who.int/news-room/commentaries/detail/modes-oftransmission-of-virus-causing-covid-19-implications-for-ipc-precautionrecommendations)
- 530 7. van Doremalen N, Bushmaker T, Morris DH, Holbrook MG, Gamble A, Williamson BN,
531 et al. Aerosol and Surface Stability of SARS-CoV-2 as Compared with SARS-CoV-1. *N*
532 *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 <https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.03.05.20030502v1>
- 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 [https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/cleaning-and-disinfection-of-environmental-](https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/cleaning-and-disinfection-of-environmental-surfaces-inthe-context-of-covid-19)
551 [surfaces-inthe-context-of-covid-19](https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/cleaning-and-disinfection-of-environmental-surfaces-inthe-context-of-covid-19)
- 552 13. Ong SWX, Tan YK, Chia PY, Lee TH, Ng OT, Wong MSY, et al. Air, surface
553 environmental, and personal protective equipment contamination by severe acute
554 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>

- 556 14. Pastorino B, Touret F, Gilles M, de Lamballerie X and Charrel RN. Prolonged Infectivity
557 of SARS-CoV-2 in Fomites. *Emerging Infectious Disease* 2020; 26(9). DOI:
558 <https://doi.org/10.3201/eid2609.201788>.
559 Available at: https://wwwnc.cdc.gov/eid/article/26/9/20-1788_article
- 560 15. Fears AC, Klimstra WB, Duprex P, Hartman A, Weaver SC, Plante KS, et al. Persistence
561 of Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 in Aerosol Suspensions. *Emerg*
562 *Infect Dis Journal* 2020; 26(9). DOI: <https://doi.org/10.3201/eid2609.201806>. Available
563 at: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC7454081/>
- 564 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>
- 568 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: <https://www.ijbs.com/v16p1698.htm>
- 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 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cgh.2020.06.005>.
576 Available at: [https://www.cghjournal.org/article/S1542-3565\(20\)30777-1/fulltext](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. *Journal 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](https://www.thelancet.com/journals/langas/article/PIIS2468-1253(20)30083-2/fulltext)
583 [-2/fulltext](https://www.thelancet.com/journals/langas/article/PIIS2468-1253(20)30083-2/fulltext)
- 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: <https://www.biorxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.10.12.336818v1>
- 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: <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-020-67211-2>.
591 Available at: <https://www.nature.com/articles/s41598-020-67211-2>
- 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.
- 596 24. Redmond SN, Dousa KM, Jones LD, Li DF, Cadnum JL, Navas ME, et al. Severe acute
597 respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARSCoV- 2) nucleic acid contamination of
598 surfaces on a coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) ward and intensive care unit.
599 *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*
603 *Journal of Hygiene and Environmental Health* 2020. DOI: [s://doi.org/10.1016/](https://doi.org/10.1016/)

- 604 j.ijheh.2020.113600. Available at: [https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/](https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1438463920305460?via%3Dihub)
605 [S1438463920305460?via%3Dihub](https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/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: [https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/](https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/infection-control-and-hospitalepidemiology/article/deactivation-of-sarscov2-with-pulsedxenon-ultraviolet-lightimplications-for-environmental-covid19-control/AD5CF52419E27E86E0114059FBA78D4C)
610 [infection-control-and-hospitalepidemiology/article/deactivation-of-sarscov2-with-](https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/infection-control-and-hospitalepidemiology/article/deactivation-of-sarscov2-with-pulsedxenon-ultraviolet-lightimplications-for-environmental-covid19-control/AD5CF52419E27E86E0114059FBA78D4C)
611 [pulsedxenon-ultraviolet-lightimplications-for-environmental-covid19-](https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/infection-control-and-hospitalepidemiology/article/deactivation-of-sarscov2-with-pulsedxenon-ultraviolet-lightimplications-for-environmental-covid19-control/AD5CF52419E27E86E0114059FBA78D4C)
612 [control/AD5CF52419E27E86E0114059FBA78D4C](https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/infection-control-and-hospitalepidemiology/article/deactivation-of-sarscov2-with-pulsedxenon-ultraviolet-lightimplications-for-environmental-covid19-control/AD5CF52419E27E86E0114059FBA78D4C)
- 613 27. Baluja A, Arines J, Vilanova R, Cortiñas J, Bao-Varela C and Flores-Arias MT. UV light
614 dosage distribution over irregular respirator surfaces. Methods and implications for
615 safety. *medRxiv preprint* 2020. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.04.07.20057224>.
616 Available at: [https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.04.07.20057224v3.full](https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.04.07.20057224v3.full.pdf+html)
617 [.pdf+html](https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.04.07.20057224v3.full.pdf+html)
- 618 28. Card Kyle J, Crozier D, Dhawan A, Dinh MN, Dolson, Emily, Farrokhian N, et al. U V
619 Sterilization of Personal Protective Equipment with IdleLaboratory Biosafety Cabinets
620 During the COVID-19 Pandemic. *medRxiv preprint* 2020. doi:
621 <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.03.25.20043489>. Available at: [https://www.researchgate.](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/340244763_UV_Sterilization_of_Personal_Protective_Equipment_with_Idle_Laboratory_Biosafety_Cabinets_During_the_Covid-19_Pandemic)
622 [net/publication/340244763_UV_Sterilization_of_Personal_Protective_Equipment_with_I](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/340244763_UV_Sterilization_of_Personal_Protective_Equipment_with_Idle_Laboratory_Biosafety_Cabinets_During_the_Covid-19_Pandemic)
623 [dle_Laboratory_Biosafety_Cabinets_During_the_Covid-19_Pandemic](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/340244763_UV_Sterilization_of_Personal_Protective_Equipment_with_Idle_Laboratory_Biosafety_Cabinets_During_the_Covid-19_Pandemic)
- 624 29. Rathnasinghe R, Karlicek RF, Schotsaert M, Koffas MA, Arduini B, Jangra S, et al.
625 Scalable, effective, and rapid decontamination of SARSCoV-2 contaminated N95
626 respirators using germicidal ultra-violet C (UVC) irradiation device. *medRxi preprint*
627 2020. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.10.05.20206953> Available at [https://www.](https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.10.05.20206953v1)
628 [medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.10.05.20206953v1](https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.10.05.20206953v1)

- 629 30. Zhang D, Ling H, Huang X, Li J, Li W, Yi C, et al. Potential Spreading Risks and
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 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.140445>. Available at: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S004896972033967X?via%3Dihub>
634
- 635 31. Monge FA, Jagadesan P, Bondu V, Donabedian PL, Ista L, Chi EY, et al. Highly
636 Effective Inactivation of SARS-CoV-2 by Conjugated Polymers and Oligomer. *medRxiv*
637 *preprint* 2020. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.09.29.20204164>.
638 Available at: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC7553178>
- 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: <https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.05.10.20097329v1>
- 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: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.09.18.20197178>.
646 Available at: <https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.09.18.20197178v1>
- 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: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhin.2020.01.022>
- 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: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC7413047/>

- 654 36. La Rosa G, Bonadonna L, Lucentini L, Kenmoe S and Suffredini E. Coronavirus in Water
655 Environments: Occurrence, Persistence and Concentration Methods: A Scoping Review.
656 *Water Research* 2020; 179. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.watres.2020.115899>. Available
657 at: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S004313542030436X>
- 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 <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1111/codi.15138>
- 661 38. Riddell S, Goldie S, Hill A, Eagles D and Drew TW. The Effect of Temperature on
662 Persistence of SARS-CoV-2 on Common Surfaces. *Virology Journal* 2020. DOI:
663 <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12985-020-01418-7>.
664 Available at: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC7538848>
- 665 39. Cervino GF, Luca S, Giovanni P, Valeria F, Maria TDS, Rosa L, et al. SARS-CoV-2
666 Persistence: Data Summary up to Q2 2020. *MDPI* 2020; 5(3): 81. DOI:
667 <https://doi.org/10.3390/data5030081>.
- 668 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 from
670 Environmental matrices and surfaces. *Environ Pollute* 2020; 265. DOI:
671 [10.1016/j.envpol.2020.115010](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envpol.2020.115010).
672 Available at: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC7280109/>

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/>