

1 Low-cost, local production of a safe and effective disinfectant
2 for resource-constrained communities
3

4 Andrea Naranjo-Soledad^{1¶*}, Logan Smesrud^{1¶}, Siva RS Bandaru^{1&}, Dana Hernandez^{1,2&}, Meire
5 Mehare³, Sara Mahmoud¹, Vijay Matange⁴, Bakul Rao⁵, Chandana N⁶, Paige Balcom^{7,8}, David
6 Olugbenga Omole⁹, Cesar Alvarez-Mejia¹⁰, Varinia Lopez-Ramirez¹¹, Ashok Gadgil¹

7
8 ¹Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, University of California, Berkeley,
9 Berkeley, California, United States of America

10 ²The Molecular Foundry, Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory, Berkeley, California, United
11 States of America

12 ³Department of Chemical and Nuclear Engineering, University of California, Berkeley,
13 Berkeley, California, United States of America

14 ⁴VINYAS Architects, Urban Designers, Landscape Architects, Delhi, India

15 ⁵Centre for Technology Alternatives for Rural Areas, Indian Institute of Technology Bombay,
16 Mumbai, Maharashtra, India

17 ⁶Centre for Emerging Technologies for Sustainable Development, Indian Institute of Technology
18 Jodhpur, Jodhpur, Rajasthan, India

19 ⁷Engineering R&D, Takataka Plastics, Gulu, Uganda

20 ⁸Biosystems Engineering, Gulu University, Gulu, Uganda

21 ⁹Department of Civil Engineering, Covenant University, Ota, Ogun State, Nigeria

22 ¹⁰Department of Environmental Engineering, Tecnológico Nacional de México, ITS de Abasolo,
23 Abasolo, Guanajuato, Mexico

24 ¹¹Department of Biochemical Engineering, Tecnológico Nacional de México/ITS de Irapuato,
25 Irapuato, Guanajuato, Mexico

26
27 *Corresponding author

28 E-mail: andrea.ns@berkeley.edu

29
30 ¶These authors contributed equally to this work.

31 &These authors also contributed equally to this work

1 **Abstract**

2 Improved sanitation and hygiene depend on the accessibility and availability of effective
3 disinfectant solutions. These disinfectant solutions are unavailable to many communities
4 worldwide due to resource limitations, among other constraints. Safe and effective chlorine-
5 based disinfectants can be produced via simple electrolysis of salt water, providing a low-cost
6 and reliable option for on-site, local production of disinfectant solutions to improve sanitation
7 and hygiene. We report on a system (herein called “Electro-Clean”) that can produce
8 concentrated solutions of hypochlorous acid (HOCl) using only low-cost and now widely
9 accessible materials. Using only table salt, water, graphite welding rods, and a DC power supply,
10 HOCl solutions (~1.5 liters) of 0.1% free chlorine (i.e. 1000 ppm) can be safely produced in less
11 than two hours at low potential (5 V DC) and modest current (~5 A). Rigorous testing of free
12 chlorine production and durability of the Electro-Clean system components, described here, have
13 been verified to work in multiple locations around the world by our project team, including
14 microbiological tests conducted in two different countries to confirm the biocidal efficacy of the
15 Electro-Clean solution as a surface disinfectant. We provide cost estimates for making HOCl
16 locally with this method in the USA, India, and Mexico. Our findings show that Electro-Clean is
17 an affordable alternative to off-the-shelf commercial chlorinator systems in terms of first costs
18 (or capital costs), and cost-competitive relative to the unit cost of the disinfectant produced. By
19 minimizing dependence on supply chains and allowing for local production, the Electro-Clean
20 production process has the potential for improving public health by addressing the need for high-
21 strength disinfectant solutions in resource-constrained communities.

22 **Introduction**

23 Chlorine-based disinfectants are widely used in a variety of settings, including hospitals, public
24 spaces, food preparation, and drinking water disinfection (1–3). The use of disinfectants
25 dramatically reduces the risk of disease transmission and has many positive public health
26 benefits, yet more than 25% of the world’s population does not have access to basic sanitation
27 (4). Even when disinfectants are available, due to cost and limited supply chains, disinfectant
28 solutions are often diluted excessively as a way to ration the solution, in turn making it a less
29 effective disinfectant (5,6). On-site chlorine production and its utilization locally circumvents
30 risks associated with chlorine storage and transport in bulk quantities (7). Electrochlorination is
31 an electrochemical technique that enables the on-site production of chlorine-based disinfectants
32 such as sodium hypochlorite and hypochlorous acid with ordinary table salt (sodium chloride)
33 and electricity as inputs, thus avoiding supply chain issues (8). However, most commercially
34 available electrochlorinators use expensive electrode materials, such as dimensionally stable
35 mixed metal oxide (MMO) electrocatalyst anodes consisting of iridium and ruthenium oxides
36 such as RuO_2^- and IrO_2^- (9). Limited global reserves of Ir and Ru and an increase in demand for
37 MMO electrodes in the Chlor-Alkali industry and other novel electrochemical applications are
38 responsible for the high prices of these metals (\$100,000 per Kg of Ir and \$20,000 per kg of Ru),
39 resulting in limited availability, even in industrialized countries (10). While MMO anodes have
40 high efficiency in electrochemical chlorine generation, they make electro-chlorinators costly and
41 inaccessible to resource-limited communities. Additionally, electrochlorination studies and
42 efforts have primarily focused on applications to drinking water disinfection and thus the
43 production of dilute concentrations of free chlorine that are insufficient for surface-disinfection
44 applications (11,12).

45
46 Prior efforts to produce chlorine-based disinfectant solutions using low-cost materials include a
47 student team from MIT that focused on the use of carbon rods obtained from carbon-zinc
48 batteries, a simple saline solution, and a recycled plastic cup as the container (13). Although this
49 design was quite inexpensive and effective at producing free chlorine, it required the extraction
50 of carbon rods from zinc-carbon batteries. In our experience with collaborators in various
51 countries in non-academic settings, we found significant resistance and concern by lay people to
52 breaking open a carbon-zinc battery to extract the carbon rod, despite reassurances of its
53 harmlessness. This user feedback highlighted the importance of minimal complexity, one of the
54 key characteristics of adoption rate as defined by Rogers and other researchers on the Diffusion
55 of Innovations (14). We abandoned further improving the design developed by the team at MIT
56 since its complexity would significantly lower the rate of adoption. To overcome potential
57 resistance, we put our focus on a reactor design that would minimize complexity to the end-user,
58 even if that slightly increased the cost of production.

59
60 In this paper, we report on a simple electrochemical process (herein called “Electro-Clean” for
61 short) that strives to eliminate these economic and accessibility barriers, improving access to best
62 practices of hygiene and sanitation in resource-poor environments. Electro-Clean has low capital
63 and operating costs, and produces a powerful, safe-to-use hypochlorous acid disinfecting
64 solution that has been approved for such use by WHO, EPA, and CDC (15–17). The Electro-
65 Clean process can produce HOCl solutions at concentrations sufficient for addressing surface
66 disinfection in high-contamination settings such as hospitals, producing 1.5 liters solution with
67 0.1% free chlorine (i.e. 1000 ppm) in less than two hours, operating at low potential (5V DC)

68 and modest current (around 5A). The development and testing of Electro-Clean involved
69 collaboration with our co-authors and other project partners in seven countries spanning three
70 continents, exemplifying how this process can be replicated in a variety of contexts with locally
71 available materials.

72 **Electrolysis for chlorine generation**

73 Chlorine-based disinfectants such as sodium hypochlorite or hypochlorous acid can be produced
74 via the electrolysis of sodium chloride (NaCl) solutions (herein referred to as “salt water”) (18).
75 The Electro-Clean production system, schematically shown in Fig 1, uses graphite welding rods,
76 salt water, and a switched mode power supply (SMPS) to produce a high-concentration of
77 chlorine-based disinfectant that can be pH adjusted for maximum biocidal activity.

78

79 **Fig 1. Schematic of Electro-Clean reactor system.** The Electro-Clean reactor system consists
80 of two carbon gouging rods as electrodes, 30,000 mg/L sodium chloride dissolved in tap water as
81 the electrolyte solution, and an externally applied potential that drives the reaction to produce
82 chlorine gas on the anode, which gets immediately hydrolyzed to produce hypochlorous acid
83 and/or hypochlorite in the electrolyte.

84

85 Design considerations and material selection for creating an effective disinfectant at an
86 affordable price involved making trade-offs between efficiency of free-chlorine production,
87 electrode durability, and cost. Lower cost and more readily available materials that we
88 recommend are associated with moderately reduced chlorine production compared to more high-
89 end electrodes and have shorter lifetimes than costly electrode materials. However, even with

90 these disadvantages, the HOCl produced with this process is highly effective and both capital
91 cost and total cost remain affordable compared to its alternatives. Other design considerations
92 included optimizing parameters that lead to higher electrical currents (i.e. Amperes delivered) to
93 the reactor, without increasing the cost too significantly, and are summarized in Section S5. High
94 current can be achieved with high salinity and/or reducing interelectrode distance. A high current
95 is desirable as it leads to shorter electrolysis times. Operating the reactor at a high current also
96 comes with trade-offs as it leads to a more rapid degradation of the electrodes. High salinity on
97 the other hand requires high salt content and dramatically increases the cost of production. These
98 trade-offs were considered in our extensive preliminary testing (not reported here) leading to the
99 selection of materials and configurations that we recommend and report on for reactor design.

100

101 The carbon graphite welding rods, as shown in Fig 1, allow for chlorine production at the anode
102 with continuous subtle degradation due to oxidation of the electrode material over time (19–21).
103 Although disintegration of the electrode is undesirable, using a low-cost, widely available
104 consumable electrode material such as carbon is still preferred. Other common electrode
105 materials, such as stainless steel, are undesirable as they are not stable in the presence of the
106 chloride ion and will rust when a current is applied (22–24). Therefore, stainless steel electrodes
107 can only be used as the cathode, limiting the operational flexibility and ability to reverse polarity
108 to prolong the longevity of the electrodes. Other high-performing electrodes, such as Iridium-
109 Ruthenium Mixed Metal Oxides (MMO), are not only quite expensive, but also locally
110 unavailable in most parts of the world, and thus not considered viable for the Electro-Clean
111 system.

112

113 Overall, the Electro-Clean process is simple, requiring only affordable materials and minimal
114 operator knowledge. This allows for on-site generation as opposed to dependency on supply
115 chains, market availability, and financial capacity to meet high up-front costs. The hypochlorous
116 acid solution, once generated using the Electro-Clean process, slowly returns to salt and water
117 over a period of months. The rate of returning back to a salt solution is higher at elevated storage
118 temperatures, exposure to strong UV light, and higher HOCl concentrations (25–27). Due to this
119 instability, the use of the solution for disinfection is recommended within a week or so from its
120 production date. This ensures its high disinfectant potency and limits the conversion of the
121 disinfectant back to a salt solution.

122 **pH dependence of chlorine-based disinfectants**

123 The efficacy of chlorine-based disinfectants is pH dependent. At a pH below 4, chlorine exists
124 primarily as dissolved chlorine gas. As shown in Fig 2, at a pH of 6, chlorine exists in water
125 mostly as hypochlorous acid (HOCl), and as pH increases above 8, the dominant species shifts to
126 hypochlorite (OCl⁻) ions. These different species have varying disinfecting powers, with HOCl
127 being 80 to 100 times more effective at bacterial inactivation than the hypochlorite ion (OCl⁻)
128 (28). The amplification of biocidal properties in HOCl compared to NaOCl illustrates the
129 importance of pH adjustment for chlorine-based disinfectants (29).

130

131 **Fig 2. Speciation of aqueous chlorine species (represented by the fractional alpha value) as**
132 **a function of pH, around circumneutral pH values.** In the pH range shown above, the
133 predominant species is hypochlorous acid at the lower end and shifts to the hypochlorite ion at
134 the upper end. The vertical line shown at pH 6 is the target pH value for the disinfectant solution


135 produced by the Electro-Clean process, where hypochlorous acid is the predominant species.

136 This figure was produced using published chlorine speciation equations (30). Alpha represents

137 the fractional concentration of a chlorine species over the total chlorine concentration.

138

139 Chlorine gas hydrolyzes to hypochlorous acid quite rapidly, and proceeds as follows:



141 Hypochlorous acid can proceed to dissociate to the hypochlorite ion, as follows:



143

144 Graphite electrodes were historically used as anodes in the Chlor-Alkali industry for chlorine

145 generation. After the development of MMO anodes, graphite electrodes were discontinued in the

146 Chlor-Alkali industry because of their high overpotential and gradual anodic consumption by

147 parasitic oxygen evolution reactions at the industry-relevant current densities ($>100 \text{ mA/cm}^2$)

148 (31–34). In this work, we employed graphite anodes for on-site chlorine generation over MMO

149 anodes because of their low cost and widespread availability. Furthermore, low operating current

150 densities ($<10 \text{ mA/cm}^2$) and low cell voltage ($<6 \text{ V}$) are chosen in the Electro-Clean process to

151 preferentially promote Cl_2 released at the anode.

152 **Multi-use of produced hypochlorous acid solution**

153 **Surface disinfection**

154 Disinfecting high-touch surfaces is common practice in many public spaces. Upon the arrival of

155 the COVID-19 pandemic in early 2020, this cleaning measure became an important way to

156 reduce the risk of fomite transmission of the virus. Preventing nosocomial infections acquired in

157 healthcare settings is another relevant application for chlorine-based disinfectants. Especially in
158 low-resource settings where supply chains may be unreliable and disinfectants in short supply,
159 on-site generation of chlorine-based disinfectants has been shown to dramatically improve
160 essential hygiene practices (35). These practices include regular disinfection of surfaces, regular
161 hand washing and sanitizing, and always having high-strength disinfectants readily available for
162 the prevention of hospital-acquired infections which are particularly relevant to safe births for
163 women and their newborns (35,36).

164 **Topical applications**

165 The high-strength disinfectant produced by the Electro-Clean process can be diluted to
166 appropriate lower concentrations and then used as a non-alcohol-based hand sanitizer. Numerous
167 studies have explored the use of dilute (0.01%, or 100 ppm) solutions of hypochlorous acid as an
168 antiseptic for wound healing, and in dental and eye-care settings, among other clinical
169 applications (37–39).

170 **Drinking water disinfection**

171 Chlorine has been used to disinfect drinking water for many decades, and current drinking water
172 standards stress the importance of pH as it relates to its bactericidal and virucidal properties
173 (40,41). An important parameter for calculating disinfectant dosage for the chlorination of
174 drinking water is the “CT” value, typically expressed in units of mg-min/L, where “CT” is the
175 product of the residual disinfectant concentration “C”, and the contact time “T”, in the water
176 being disinfected (42). For the context of this work, when added to contaminated, non-turbid
177 source water in an amount equal to 1/250 (v/v) of the source water volume, and held for 4 hours,
178 the high-strength (1000 ppm) hypochlorous acid solution could be used to disinfect drinking

179 water from some bacterial and viral contaminants. This dosing would yield a CT value of 960
180 mg-min/L. Assuming temperatures are no less than 10 degrees Celsius, source water pH is in the
181 range of 6 to 9, and at least half of the free chlorine dosed remains present as residual, then this
182 CT value of 960 mg-min/L would be sufficient for 3-log inactivation of Giardia cysts, which are
183 some of the most resistant to chlorination (43).

184
185 All the above uses of HOCl could be accessible to resource-limited communities via the Electro-
186 Clean production process for low-cost, on-site generation of the chlorine-based disinfectant.
187 Instructions for how to produce Electro-Clean are open-access and available online and have
188 been translated into at least four languages (44). Public seminars and global communities of
189 practice also exist on the topic of decentralized chlorine production (45).

190 **Materials and methods**

191 After several months of iteration and experimentation with different materials and designs, we
192 arrived at the materials and methods described here. All sub-optimal designs are omitted for
193 brevity. Larger, more complex designs can be found in Section S5.

194 **Reactor materials and designs**

195 **Electrolyte**

196 The electrolyte solutions were prepared using either reagent-grade NaCl, or commercial-grade
197 NaCl, and local municipal tap water. To mimic real-world conditions, electrolytic chlorine
198 generation with solutions prepared using commercially available iodized (Morton iodized salt in

199 the USA) and non-iodized (Diamond Crystal granulated plain salt in the USA) salts were
200 compared, and the resulting chlorine production showed no significant difference. To ensure
201 easy reproducibility of our results by others, non-iodized salt was used in all experiments
202 reported here.

203
204 Local tap water was used for all experiments. In the Berkeley area, tap water is supplied by the
205 East Bay Municipal Utility District, and its composition is cited in their water quality report (46).
206 An electrolyte solution of 30,000 mg/L NaCl (a similar salinity to that of seawater) was used for
207 all experiments unless stated otherwise.

208 **Power supply**

209 With the advent of computers, the internet, and LED lighting, Switched-Mode Power Supplies
210 (SMPS), have become ubiquitous. They perform high-efficiency conversion of grid power into a
211 5-Volt supply with high current capacity (e.g. 20 A or 40 A). With mass production, their prices
212 have rapidly come down. We chose SMPS supplies over dry-cell batteries and full wave
213 rectifiers because the SMPS are lower cost, higher efficiency, higher reliability, and also have
214 higher safety compared to a home-built full wave rectifier. A Switched-Mode Power Supply
215 (SMPS) was used to supply the low potential required to drive the electrolysis reaction. The
216 SMPS (MEISHILE brand, Amazon.com) supplied 5 Volts DC, with a maximum output current
217 of 40 Amperes.

218 **Electrodes**

219 Although MMO electrodes produce chlorine with nearly 100% Faradaic efficiency, they are
220 unavailable and highly expensive in the context of our intended users. We chose consumable

221 graphite gouging electrodes due to their low cost and widespread availability, even though their
222 Faradaic efficiency is significantly lower, at about 20%.

223

224 We selected uncoated bare carbon gouging rods to serve as both the anode and cathode. To
225 remove the loose carbon particles on the electrode surface, they were rinsed with tap water and
226 brushed with a nylon brush before use. The carbon gouging electrodes had a diameter of 9.52
227 mm (3/8 in) and a length of 30.5 cm (12 in) (McMaster-Carr).

228

229 In some countries, like Mexico and Nigeria, carbon gouging rods were only found with copper
230 coating. Therefore, chlorine production using copper-coated carbon gouging rods was also
231 investigated in this study. We found that the copper coating could be simply peeled off with
232 small pliers (Fig 3), leaving copper coating only at the tip of the rod where the electrical
233 connections are made. A small section of the stripped copper coating could also be repurposed
234 for use at other electrical connection points given that the smooth, conductive material facilitates
235 a strong electrical connection and thus a stable current delivery.

236

237 **Fig 3. Copper peeled off as a winding strip from the copper-coated carbon gouging rod.**

238

239 **Filtration of carbon slurry**

240 During electrolysis, electrodes gradually disintegrate and particles from the disintegrating carbon
241 gouging rod form a visible slurry. Multiple filter materials were tested to remove these
242 suspended carbon particles from the final hypochlorous acid solution. The materials tested were
243 nylon cloth, geotextile, and coffee filters. For the nylon cloth and geotextile, the filter material

244 was secured around the anode during electrolysis to prevent the carbon particles from escaping
245 into the bulk solution. For the coffee filter, the solution at the end of electrolysis was poured over
246 the filter for particle removal. The concentration of free chlorine was measured with and without
247 the use of filters for comparison.

248 **Reactor assembly and operation**

249 The simplest reactor assembly for the Electro-Clean process consisted of a 1.5-liter soda bottle,
250 carbon gouging electrodes, a multimeter, an SMPS, and a 30,000 mg/L table salt electrolyte
251 solution prepared from tap water. A 12-gauge power cord with a three-prong plug on one side
252 was used to connect the SMPS to the power outlet. The multimeter was connected in series to
253 measure current, and a 12 AWG insulated electrical wire was used for making connections
254 between the electrodes and the SMPS. The Electro-Clean reactor assembly is shown in Fig 4A.
255 The two carbon gouging electrodes were aligned in parallel and held tightly together with rubber
256 bands; and rubber bands were also used as spacers between the electrodes to prevent short-
257 circuiting, as shown in Fig 4B.

258

259 **Fig 4. Digital picture of the Electro-Clean assembly.** (A) Electro-Clean batch reactor
260 assembly, and (B) Carbon gouging electrode assembly.

261

262 Batch experiments reported in this section used two 30.5 cm (12 inches) long uncoated carbon
263 rods with 1 cm (3/8 inch) diameter; 25.4 cm (10 inches) of their length submerged into a 1.5-liter
264 bottle with 1.35 L of 30,000 mg/L NaCl solution. As seen in Fig 4A, we cut an opening near the
265 top part of the bottle's sidewall to insert the carbon electrode rods. The reactor was operated for

266 90 minutes with an externally supplied direct current of 5 Volts. This resulted in a supplied
267 current of about 5 Amps, depending on the internal resistance of the circuit connections.

268 **Other size scales considered for Electro-Clean**

269 In addition to the 1.5-liter soda bottle design, four other designs were explored: 1) a smaller,
270 household-scale design producing 250 mL of concentrated HOCl solution, 2) a larger,
271 community-scale design capable of producing 15 L of dilute HOCl solution, 3) a co-axial
272 electrodes assembly, and 4) a reactor using a 1.5-liter soda bottle, but with multiple, parallel
273 electrode assemblies, capable of producing the concentrated HOCl in a shorter time. For both the
274 250 mL and 15 L designs, stainless steel, and carbon rods were studied as the cathode and anode,
275 respectively. A more detailed description of these designs is in Section S5.

276 **Quantitative measurements**

277 **Chlorine concentration measurements**

278 The UV-Vis spectrophotometer (Hach DR6000) was used to measure the free chlorine
279 concentration in the generated disinfectant through colorimetry at a wavelength of 530 nm. The
280 N,N-diethyl-p-phenylenediamine, or DPD, reagent sachet (Hach brand) was added to 10 mL of
281 the diluted disinfectant solution, producing a pink color when free chlorine is present. The
282 intensity of the pink color, accurately measured with the spectrophotometer, led to the
283 quantitative accurate measurement of free chlorine in the solution.

284 **pH adjustment**

285 Various materials were tested for their suitability to adjust the pH of the electrolyte and/or
286 disinfectant solution, including distilled white vinegar (Heinz, 5% acidity), lemon juice, and lime
287 juice. Early experiments showed that although the natural acidity of the lemon and lime juice
288 could decrease the pH of the disinfectant solution to the desired value of 6, they were unsuitable
289 due to their high content of organic matter which leads to the disappearance of free chlorine (47).
290 In these preliminary experiments where lemon or lime juice were used to lower the pH, complete
291 disappearance of free chlorine was observed in as little as five minutes, reducing the disinfectant
292 solution to only a simple salt solution with a lemon essence, and thus further investigation with
293 lemon and lime juice was not pursued nor recommended. This rapid consumption of free
294 chlorine by lemon and lime solutions has been well documented by others (12).

295
296 For all experiments presented herein, unless stated otherwise, distilled white vinegar (i.e. dilute
297 acetic acid) was used to adjust the pH. Acetic acid was selected for these experiments due to its
298 wide market availability. Hydrochloric acid (HCl, also known as muriatic acid), is a less
299 expensive and equally effective alternative for lowering pH when distilled white vinegar is
300 unavailable. However, in many communities, hydrochloric acid is a widely regulated chemical
301 due to safety concerns. We acknowledge that muriatic acid may have yielded slightly different
302 observations and conclusions than ours with acetic acid in regards to pre and post pH adjustment,
303 due to the possible interaction of acetic acid with electrolysis products. We also acknowledge
304 that vinegar is likely more expensive than dilute HCl. Nevertheless, we accept these limitations
305 given that vinegar is more widely available and therefore more suitable for the intended Electro-
306 Clean users.

307 **Faradaic efficiency tests**

308 Faradaic efficiency of an electrode is calculated as the ratio between the observed free-chlorine
309 production (measured with the UV-Vis spectrophotometer) and the theoretical free chlorine
310 production (calculated using Faraday's Law). This parameter provides unique insight into the
311 efficiency of chlorine production by the Electro-Clean process. A thorough explanation of the
312 Faradaic efficiency calculations is presented in Section S1.

313 **Durability of electrodes over time**

314 During the electrolysis of a brine solution, carbon anode electrodes undergo oxidation, slow
315 mechanical disintegration, and eventual failure (19,20). This process occurs not only on the
316 surface of the electrodes but also within their high-porosity structure. In order to slow the
317 disintegration of the carbon rods during electrolysis, a technique of filling the pores with light
318 mineral oil (commercial name Johnson & Johnson Baby Oil) was explored. Each carbon gouging
319 electrode was submerged in light mineral oil for 20 hours prior to use. Only the tips of the
320 electrodes, where the connections to the power supply were made, were left unsubmerged.

321
322 The two performance parameters used to evaluate the durability of the electrode rod were 1) free
323 chlorine concentration, and 2) current. The 1.5-liter reactor system design was used to observe
324 the durability of the bare carbon rods as well as mineral-oil-soaked carbon rods. The electrolyte
325 was a 30,000 mg/L NaCl solution. The electrolyte volume in the reactor was 1.35 L. A peristaltic
326 pump was used to continuously feed the reactor with electrolyte, and excess electrolyte was
327 continuously removed from the reactor. The flow rate of 0.25 mL/s led to a hydraulic residence

328 time of 90 minutes for the electrolyte in the reactor volume. All samples were taken at the outlet.
329 See Fig S10 for more detail on the continuous-flow assembly.

330 **Effect of electrolyte pH on free chlorine production**

331 The effect of electrolyte pH pre-electrolysis on free chlorine generation was studied. We
332 compare an electrolyte solution with a semi-neutral pH of 8 to one with a slightly acidic pH of 5.
333 Distilled white vinegar was used to adjust the pH of the slightly acidic electrolyte. For both
334 conditions (electrolysis at pH 5, and electrolysis at pH 8), the post-electrolysis pH was measured
335 and adjusted to 6 using distilled white vinegar to ensure that all available chlorine was present as
336 HOCl. The 1.35-liter Electro-Clean process assembly in batch mode was used for this study. The
337 electrolysis time was 90 minutes and the electrolyte was 30,000 mg/L NaCl.

338 **Free chlorine decay over time**

339 Prior literature has noted that HOCl solutions are best stored in a dark, cool place, and in glass or
340 plastic (not metal) containers to slow down the loss of free chlorine over time due to
341 reconversion back to a salt solution (25–27). We studied free chlorine decay over time of the
342 produced disinfectant solution when stored at room temperature in a dark closet. We also
343 considered the material of the storage container (glass versus plastic), and the presence of
344 vinegar (used for pH adjustment).

345

346 The disinfectant solution was produced following the Electro-Clean process in a 2-liter plastic
347 soda bottle using tap water (local to Berkeley). The free chlorine concentration of the produced

348 disinfectant was 915 ± 35 ppm as Cl_2 . This was then diluted in half (~440 ppm), which is the
349 concentration at which the chlorine decay experiments began.

350

351 The diluted HOCl solution (440 ppm, 500 mL in each container) was stored in two glass bottles
352 and two plastic bottles. About 3 mL of vinegar was added to one plastic bottle and one glass
353 bottle. This lowered the pH from 8.8 to 6.4 ± 0.1 in the plastic bottle and glass bottle. All four
354 bottles were closed to prevent evaporative loss and periodically monitored for free chlorine over
355 a month duration (34 days).

356 **Reproducibility in other communities worldwide**

357 To ensure that the Electro-Clean process performed similarly in other contexts worldwide, co-
358 authors in India, Mexico, Nigeria, and Uganda replicated the Electro-Clean process using
359 reasonable substitution of locally available materials. While the main components of the Electro-
360 Clean process remained the same (i.e., gouging-carbon electrodes, 5-Volt/20-Amp SMPS, tap
361 water, salt, vinegar, and a plastic container), the manufacturer of each component varied from
362 community to community. In the case of Nigeria, the co-authors used dilute HCl for pH
363 adjustment instead of white vinegar. Table S2 summarizes the manufacturer specifications of the
364 materials used by co-authors outside the USA.

365 **Microbiological assays to evaluate the biocidal effect of the produced** 366 **hypochlorous acid solution**

367 To validate the disinfecting capabilities of the Electro-Clean solution, microbiological assays were
368 conducted for its application on various high-touch material surfaces in public spaces and

369 laboratory settings in Mexico, and laboratory settings in India. In each case, a hypochlorous acid
370 solution was prepared by the Electro-Clean process, as described in Section 2.1.5. It was then
371 diluted to the concentration of intended use (in this case, of approximately 250 ppm for surface
372 disinfection), and subsequently adjusted with distilled white vinegar to pH 6. The materials and
373 methods used for the microbiological studies performed in Mexico and India can be found in
374 Sections S7 and S8.

375 **Comparative cost analysis**

376 To quantify the cost of the Electro-Clean disinfectant production system, and to understand
377 which items contribute to that total cost, an analysis evaluated both the capital and operating
378 costs of Electro-Clean. To conduct this economic assessment and comparative analysis, costs
379 were obtained from three countries (USA, India, Mexico) for all reactor components. The
380 Electro-Clean system was also compared against commercially available electro-chlorinators and
381 locally available chlorine-based disinfectant products.

382 **Results and discussion**

383 **Chlorine production by carbon electrodes in batch processes**

384 In a single anode/cathode configuration, repeated and averaged over triplicates, the following
385 values were observed: 3.82 ± 0.14 Ampere average current, 17.1 ± 0.3 percent Faradaic
386 efficiency for free chlorine production, and 962 ± 20 ppm of total free chlorine production over
387 90-minute electrolysis times in 1.35 L batch volumes.

388 **Repeated batch experiments for insight on electrode durability**

389 Prior to conducting the long-term durability experiments on the electrodes, the batch process was
390 repeated to gain insight into electrode lifespan and facilitate experiential planning for the long-
391 term experiments. These preliminary experiments were set up in a 1.75 L electrolyte volume
392 made from tap water and 30,000 mg/L dissolved salt. The power supply was an SMPS providing
393 a constant 5 Volts. The wires from the SMPS were wrapped around a piece of the peeled-off
394 copper coating that was still attached to the welding rod. The initial pH was 8.71 ± 0.06 . The
395 average concentration of free chlorine after 10 batches (each of 30 min electrolysis time) was
396 459 ± 38 ppm as Cl_2 . The turbidity was the highest in the first experiment at 9.73 NTU. After the
397 first batch, the turbidity was 1.35 ± 0.29 NTU, with an average current of 4.36 ± 0.16 Amperes.
398 Results for Carbon-Copper welding rods are presented in Fig S8. These results were obtained
399 prior to those presented in Section 3.2.

400 **Durability of electrodes over time**

401 Three long-term experiments were carried out in the laboratory to quantify the longevity of the
402 bare carbon gouging electrodes, and to study the effect of soaking the carbon electrodes in
403 mineral oil to minimize disintegration. The results showed Faradaic efficiency remained
404 relatively constant, even right before the anode ruptured. Current, on the other hand, gradually
405 decreased over time as the anode degraded. A reduction in current and visual thinning of the
406 anode (due to disintegration) were indicators that the anode was soon to rupture.

407
408 The data as a function of charge passed (Coulombs) for the bare and mineral oil-soaked
409 electrodes from all three trials can be found in Section S6. The average values for the three trials

410 for bare and mineral-oil-soaked carbon electrodes are shown in Fig 5. Although the mineral-oil-
411 soaked electrodes seemed to operate at a slightly higher average current as seen in Fig 5A, the
412 difference in current is within the margin of error. Soaking the carbon rods in mineral oil allowed
413 for a higher amount of charge to be sustained, resulting in a longer useful lifetime for the carbon
414 electrode. Fig 5C demonstrates that the mineral-oil-soaked carbon rods can last approximately 20
415 hours (about 45%) longer than the bare carbon rods when operated at the same current. However,
416 soaking the rods in mineral oil lowered the free chlorine concentration by 31%, as seen in Fig
417 5D. Correspondingly, soaking the rods in the mineral oil also lowered the Faradaic efficiency.
418 This could be due to the mineral oil promoting other side reactions, such as oxygen evolution, at
419 the anode.

420

421 **Fig 5. Long-term (~50 hours) performance of 1.5-liter Electro-Clean set-up using bare**
422 **carbon electrodes (dashed column) and mineral-oil-soaked carbon electrodes (solid**
423 **column).** (A) Average current during long-term operation, (B) Average charge passed in
424 Coulombs on the electrodes before failure, (C) Average time in hours of the anode lifespan, (D)
425 Average free chlorine concentration produced for a residence time of 90 minutes in a 1.35-liter
426 volume, (E) Average Faradaic efficiency for producing free chlorine throughout the long-term
427 operation.

428

429 Findings from the long-term experiments described here and presented in Fig 5 suggest that
430 although the electrode life can be prolonged by submerging the anode in mineral oil, the
431 advantage is offset by a reduction in production efficiency of free chlorine. As a result, we do not
432 recommend this approach. However, future studies could investigate other low-cost, readily
433 available materials to enhance the durability of carbon gouging electrodes, as it is an important

434 aspect of improving the sustainability and cost-effectiveness of this disinfectant production
435 process.

436 **Electrode disintegration during electrolysis**

437 As noted earlier, the electrolysis reaction causes anodic carbon rod disintegration, which releases
438 carbon particles in the electrolyte solution (20,48–50). In this process, the amount of free
439 chlorine produced was not affected, yet the cloudy physical appearance was undesirable for a
440 cleaning product.

441
442 We found that a fine-mesh nylon cloth wrapped around the anode carbon rod does not hold the
443 carbon particles within the cloth for the allotted reaction time. A fine-mesh geotextile wrapped
444 around the carbon rod during the reaction successfully prevented the carbon particles from
445 dispersing into the solution, however, the free chlorine yield was greatly reduced. Filtering the
446 electrolyte post-electrolysis through two layers of ordinary coffee filter paper effectively
447 separated the slurry particles from the electrolyte, and this filtering did not significantly affect
448 the concentration of free chlorine. After passage through the double coffee filters, the visibly
449 cloudy solution became visibly clear and the chlorine concentration slightly decreased from its
450 initial value of 450 ± 77 ppm as Cl_2 to a final value of 438 ± 50 ppm.

451
452 **Fig 6. Digital images of Electro-Clean solutions after electrolysis.** (A) Freshly generated
453 HOCl solution, (B) produced HOCl solution after 1 hour of settling, and (C) produced HOCl
454 solution after filtering through two coffee paper filters.

455

456 **Effect of electrolyte pH on free chlorine production**

457 As shown in Table 1, regardless of the initial solution pH, at the end of each electrolysis, the
458 final solution pH increased to the same value of approximately 8.4 for both the neutral and
459 slightly acidic initial electrolysis conditions. As a result, the total amount of acetic acid required
460 for pH adjustment for a final solution with pH 6 remained about the same between the two
461 conditions, in the range of 25 to 28 mL of acetic acid for 1.35 L electrolyzed or to-be
462 electrolyzed salt water, as noted in Table 1. This observation is likely due to the buffering
463 capacity of NaOH that is created during the 90-minute electrolysis. Relative to the standard
464 deviations, a modest (20%) increase is observed in chlorine production under slightly acidic
465 conditions relative to neutral conditions, as seen in Table 2. Vinegar usage was relatively
466 unchanged between the two set-ups, and chlorine production did not differ significantly.

467

468 **Table 1. White distilled vinegar usage for pH adjustments before and after electrolysis in**
469 **acidic and neutral conditions.**

	Electrolysis at a near-neutral pH (8.4)	Electrolysis at a slightly acidic pH (5.0)
pH before electrolysis	8.4 (no adjustment)	5.0 (adjusted with acetic acid)
pH after electrolysis	8.5 ± 0.2	8.3 ± 0.1
pH of final HOCl solution	5.8 ± 0.2 (adjusted with acetic acid)	5.8 ± 0.2 (adjusted with acetic acid)
Total volume of vinegar added (mL)	28 ± 1.2	25 ± 4.7

470

471

472 **Table 2. Chlorine production in neutral and slightly acidic electrolysis conditions.**

	Average Current (Amp)	Faradaic Efficiency for Free Cl₂ (%)	Total Cl₂ (ppm) immediately after electrolysis (pH ~8.4)
Electrolysis at a near-neutral pH (8.0)	4.87 ± 0.76	18% ± 1.9	1297 ± 113
Electrolysis at a slightly acidic pH (5.0)	4.46 ± 0.85	15% ± 1.0	982 ± 177

473

474 Our results suggest that regardless of a neutral or slightly acidic solution pre-electrolysis, pH
475 adjustment after electrolysis may be crucial to ensuring a final pH of ~6 in chlorine solution
476 disinfectants. This step is missed by many commercially available electro-chlorinators that direct
477 users to adjust the pH only before electrolysis.

478

479 With the aim for Electro-Clean to be an easy, user-friendly process, it is recommended to
480 conduct the electrolysis at neutral pH and make pH adjustments after electrolysis to minimize the
481 number of pH adjustment steps required. It is also recommended to make pH adjustments closer
482 to the time of use to minimize chlorine decay over time as HOCl is less stable than NaOCl.

483 **Free chlorine decay over time**

484 For the non-acidified storage in both plastic and glass containers, the loss of free chlorine was
485 less than 5% after 34 days, and the pH stayed about the same at 8.7 and 8.8, respectively. In the
486 case of vinegar-acidified storage, the loss of free chlorine was 20% in the plastic bottle, and 16%
487 in the glass bottle after 34 days. This is consistent with the prior literature stating that HOCl
488 (present at an acidic pH value) is more prone to decay than the OCl⁻ ion (present at a higher pH

489 value). At the end of the 34 days, the pH levels were 5.7 for the plastic bottle and 5.9 for the
490 glass bottle.

491
492 **Fig 7. Free chlorine decay over time for stored Electro-Clean solutions.** (A) Free chlorine in
493 Electro-Clean solution without acidification, at approximately pH 8.7 stored in glass and plastic
494 bottles, and (B) Free chlorine in Electro-Clean solution with vinegar-acidification, at
495 approximately pH 6.4 stored in glass and plastic bottles.

496
497 As shown in Fig 7, over the duration of one month, the decay of the free chlorine concentration
498 never exceeded 20% in the plastic or glass containers stored in a dark space. However, to
499 maximize the disinfectant strength and maintain freshness, it is recommended that either the
500 hypochlorous acid solution be stored in a dark, cool storage room, or that the solution's pH be
501 lowered only upon use.

502 **Microbial assays**

503 The results of the microbial assays can be found in Sections S7 and S8, along with a detailed
504 discussion of the findings. The results in Table S4 and Figure S19 suggest that the ~250 ppm
505 hypochlorous acid solution had similar disinfecting power to bleach 1% (v/v) and ethanol 70%
506 (v/v) on various material surfaces.

507
508 Although the literature suggests that 300 ppm of HOCl is an adequate concentration for surface
509 disinfection, due to the limited quality assurance and control of a DIY product outside controlled,
510 laboratory conditions, like the Electro-Clean process performed outside a laboratory, it is

511 recommended to use a higher concentration of the HOCl solution to perform disinfection
512 comparably to ethanol 70% and bleach 1%.

513 **Implications of reactor design and reproducibility of the Electro-** 514 **Clean process**

515 The design of the Electro-Clean process was an iterative process that involved careful
516 consideration of technical and social barriers that could affect the diffusion of the technology in
517 various regions, communities, and contexts. It also included substantial user feedback during the
518 design process. This critical step of technology design and innovation was done in partnership
519 with our co-authors in communities and at universities across the globe.

520
521 Throughout these iterations, a handful of other alternative reactor components were considered.
522 Although the final design for the Electro-Clean reactor uses an SMPS for the power supply, other
523 options such as power supplies for LED lights or simple phone chargers were also considered.
524 These alternatives were ultimately rejected due to lower market availability, or due to the low
525 current they could deliver (i.e. less than 1 Ampere), which led to a very low chlorine production
526 rate. Extraction of the graphite core in dry-cell batteries was also initially considered for use as
527 electrodes. However, user feedback quickly led us to conclude that people were uncomfortable
528 with the safety of cutting open dry-cell batteries.

529
530 Alternative electrode materials were also considered in response to feedback on the difficulty of
531 procuring certain electrode materials in some countries. Ultimately, graphite electrodes, also
532 known as carbon gouging rods, were selected for use in the Electro-Clean process. Carbon

533 gouging rods are widely used, even in small workshops (e.g. for automobile body repair shops),
 534 wherever steel welding is practiced. They were found to be low-cost and widely available for our
 535 project team members in India and Mexico, and could also be ordered via web-based suppliers
 536 like Amazon. Stainless steel plates were considered for use as the cathode, and most applicable
 537 for scaled-up applications of the Electro-Clean system. More details on these scaled-up and
 538 alternative reactor configurations are presented in Section S5.

539 Our co-authors and some of their collaborators within their countries, in both academic and non-
 540 academic settings, reproduced the Electro-Clean process using materials from local
 541 manufacturers and with local tap water, noting only small differences from those tested at the
 542 laboratory at UC Berkeley.

543 These slight differences in materials, as outlined in Table S2, used by our project team produced
 544 hypochlorous acid solutions at concentrations high enough for surface disinfection (i.e., 300 ppm
 545 as HOCl), if not higher. Table 3 summarizes the free chlorine concentrations achieved by our co-
 546 authors with their DIY Electro-Clean reactors before dilution and pH adjustment.

547 **Table 3. Results of production of hypochlorous acid solution using Electro-Clean by co-**
 548 **authors in India, Mexico, Nigeria, and Uganda.**

	Soda Bottle Scale (1.5-liter)			Community Scale (15-liter)			
	India ^(a)	Mexico	U.S.A.	India ^(b)	Nigeria	Uganda	U.S.A.
Electrolysis time (min)	94	30	90	240	240	180	90
Volume of Electrolyte (L)	1.5	1.3	1.35	15	15	15	15
Average	9.42 ^(c)	1.2	3.02	15.8	4.82	7.5	6.65

current (A)							
Average Free Chlorine Concentration (ppm)	1896 ^(d)	486	769	500	514	640	259
Volume of vinegar to lower pH ~6.0 (mL)	90	5	30	75	5 ^(e)	110	75

549 ^aResults from co-author Vijay Matange.

550 ^bResults from co-authors in IIT Bombay.

551 ^cHigher current was likely achieved due to larger diameter (1.5-cm) rods. See Table S2 for
552 details.

553 ^dResult estimated assuming 18% Faradaic efficiency. Free chlorine measuring kit not available.

554 ^eHydrochloric acid (HCl) was used for pH adjustment.

555

556 It should also be noted that the availability of chemicals for pH adjustment varied among co-
557 authors and other project partners. Dilute muriatic (i.e., hydrochloric) acid, was an attractive
558 choice for lowering pH without introducing other functional groups that could potentially
559 interfere with chlorine production. However, this chemical proved difficult to obtain in non-
560 academic settings due to safety concerns and was thus ruled out for recommended use in the
561 Electro-Clean process. Vinegar is a very weak acid that is marketed as a food product and thus
562 widely available in most countries and contexts. Vinegar does introduce the carboxylic acid
563 group, but no effects on the disinfectant solution's potency were observed.

564 **Cost analysis of disinfectant production with Electro-Clean**

565 Table 4 and 5 show the detailed capital and operating costs of the 1.5-liter scale Electro-Clean
566 system. As expected, a significant fraction (more than 50%) of capital costs for Electro-Clean are
567 attributed to the SMPS. A higher amperage (5 V, 20 A) power supply costs were used in the cost
568 estimates; however, a lower amperage power supply can decrease the capital costs significantly.
569 In the USA, operating costs to yield the Electro-Clean solution was \$0.15 per liter at 800 ppm
570 free chlorine concentration. The 800 ppm is representative of an average free chlorine
571 concentration produced during the long-term experiments presented in Fig 5. Corresponding
572 operating costs in India and Mexico are \$0.09 per liter and \$0.11 per liter, respectively. In India
573 and Mexico, consumable costs of carbon rods contributed significantly (more than 50%),
574 whereas in the USA, the operating costs are dominated by the costs of salt.

575
576 A small variability in the capital and operating costs of Electro-Clean between India, Mexico,
577 and the USA is attributed to the relative price differences in the various components as shown in
578 Tables 5 and 6, respectively. With a 1.5-liter scale Electro-Clean system, nearly 60 liters of
579 Electro-Clean solution at 800 ppm of free chlorine can be produced before the pair of carbon
580 rods (with periodic polarity reversal) are completely exhausted. Electro-Clean is an affordable
581 technology, with its capital costs being among the lowest for existing electro-chlorinator
582 technologies in the market for personal, household, and large-scale applications. Table 6 shows
583 the comparative cost analysis of Electro-Clean with other electro-chlorinator technologies.

584
585 To reinforce the affordability of on-site chlorine generation compared to the purchase of ready-
586 to-use commercial bleach products, we compare the cost of the Electro-Clean solution against

587 the cost per liter of the commercial bleach product. When comparing these costs, it is important
588 to note that the disinfecting properties of HOCl (the active ingredient in Electro-Clean) is much
589 stronger than that of NaOCl (the active ingredient in bleach), and thus greater volumes of the
590 bleach solution are needed to meet the same levels of disinfection. When using chlorine-based
591 disinfectants for surface disinfection, it is typically recommended to use 200 ppm as HOCl or
592 2000 ppm (0.2%) as NaOCl (1,51).

593
594 The standard price of bleach in the USA is approximately \$1 USD per liter (Clorox, 7.5% as
595 sodium hypochlorite, Amazon) (52). When diluting the bleach stock to 0.2% for use as a surface
596 disinfectant, the cost becomes \$0.03 per liter. This can be compared to \$0.04 per liter of the
597 diluted 200 ppm HOCl solution produced by Electro-Clean (i.e., a fourth of \$0.15 per liter of 800
598 ppm, as shown in Table 5). In Mexico, the price of bleach is approximately \$0.65 USD per liter
599 (Clorox, 7.5% as sodium hypochlorite, Mercado Libre) (53). After dilution, the price lowers to
600 \$0.018 USD per liter. It is important to note that cost is not the only barrier to accessing
601 disinfectants in low-resource or rural areas, and that vulnerable supply chains and transportation
602 can play a role in accessibility. As such, comparisons in Tables 4 through 6 are between Electro-
603 Clean and other electro-chlorinators, as opposed to the chlorine-based disinfectant itself (e.g.
604 diluted bleach).

605
606 Commercially available electro-chlorinators were compared against Electro-Clean on the basis of
607 capital cost. A comparison of operating and maintenance costs would be challenging due to most
608 products not making that information publicly available to the public.

609

610 **Table 4. Capital Costs of 1.5-liter Scale Electro-Clean System.**

Item	India (Indian Rupees)	Mexico (Mexican Pesos)	United States (Dollars)
2-liter Water Bottle	77	44	2
SMPS Power Supply (5 V, 20 A)	735	400	20
Electrical wire (2x) (12 AWG, 1 meter long)	96	172	8
Multimeter	243	169	12
Total (in local currency)	1151	785	42
Total (in USD)	\$14	\$42	\$42

611

612 **Table 5. Operating Costs of 1.5-liter Scale Electro-Clean System for producing 1.35 L**

613 **solution of 800 ppm Free Chlorine.**

Item	India (INR per L)	Mexico (Pesos per L)	United States (USD per L)
Carbon Welding rods (2x) (~5 mm diameter, 30 cm long)	4.93	1.15	0.02
Vinegar	0.75	0.65	0.10
Sodium Chloride	1.69	0.31	0.03
Electricity	0.12	0.03	0.00
Total (in local currency per L)	7.48	2.14	0.15
Total (in USD per L)	\$0.09	\$0.11	\$0.15

614

615 **Table 6. Capital cost comparison of available existing electro-chlorinators. Prices as of**

616 **April 2023.**

Product Name	Brand	Cost	Type
---------------------	--------------	-------------	-------------

		(USD)	
Electro-Clean	Electro-Clean	42	Personal/Household/Small-Scale
Personal Disinfectant Generator (does not include power supply)	WaterStep	46	Personal/Household/Small-Scale
Force of Nature Starter Kit	Force of Nature	80	Personal/Household/Small-Scale
EcoOne Electrolyzed Water System	EcoloxTech	150	Personal/Household/Small-Scale
Drop-In Saltwater Chlorine Generator	Saltron	300	Swimming Pools
Saltwater Chlorinator	BHDD	333	Swimming Pools
Hayward W3T-CELL-15	Hayward	429	Swimming Pools
XtremepowerUS 90146	XtremepowerUS	460	Swimming Pools
Commercial BleachMaker Kit	WaterStep	500	Personal/Household/Small-Scale
Salt Chlorine Generator	WestaHo	660	Swimming Pools
Saltwater Generator Chlorinator BLH20	BLUE WORKS	785	Swimming Pools
CORE55 Salt Chlorinator System	CircuPool	1799	Swimming Pools
STREAM Disinfectant Generator	Aqua Research	3931	Drinking Water Treatment/ Surface Disinfection/Small Communities

617
 618 The low capital cost of the Electro-Clean system in comparison to other commercial alternatives,
 619 as shown in Table 6, increases accessibility to on-site chlorine generating devices.

620 **Understanding the context of intended application in communities**

621 Collaborations were critical to the success of this project, as they allowed for rapid two-way
 622 exchange of knowledge, and allowed sharing of findings in a variety of contexts. We deployed
 623 the production and scale-up of Electro-Clean in more than five countries, in settings that
 624 included classrooms, households, and community organizations. Furthermore, collaboration

625 among co-authors led to a collective awareness and understanding of the complex social and
626 technical barriers associated with technology adoption of Electro-Clean. The availability of
627 electrode materials, for example, varied greatly and presented challenges for selecting suitable
628 substitutes where the recommended materials were unavailable.

629
630 Although low-cost disinfectants have always been in demand, the Electro-Clean project was
631 initiated in response to the COVID-19 pandemic. The timeliness of these efforts is highlighted
632 by the very rapid scale-up by some of our co-authors at their respective institutions. For example,
633 at Covenant University in Ota, Nigeria, co-author Omole, and his students rapidly obtained
634 permissions and administrative support for substantial scale-up efforts of Electro-Clean for
635 practical use at the height of the COVID-19 pandemic in early 2020. Nigeria went in and out of
636 lockdowns in 2020 as the different waves of the pandemic raged, and the demand for hand
637 sanitizers and disinfectants soared. Thus, the advent of Electro-Clean as an affordable and safe
638 disinfectant was a welcome contribution. The team at Covenant University responded to the
639 sudden increased demand for surface disinfectants with a rapid scale-up of Electro-Clean, and
640 also used the opportunity for community health promotion. They scaled up the Electro-Clean
641 reactor design to a community scale, using 20-liter (5-gallon) plastic buckets, further described
642 in Section S9, to meet the large quantities of disinfectant in demand.

643
644 Over a six-month period, the Covenant University team produced over 45 liters of the
645 concentrated Electro-Clean disinfectant (i.e., >800 ppm as HOCl), which was diluted by adding
646 three parts water (thus totaling 180 liters of ready-to-use disinfectant at 200 ppm as HOCl). The
647 team distributed over five hundred 250-mL labeled spray bottles to the University faculty and

648 students for use on high-touch surfaces in homes, classrooms, and offices. The labels contained
649 brief user instructions, a statement of regulatory approval by the University authorities, and
650 information on where the disinfectant solution could be refilled. The contents of every spray
651 bottle were quality controlled, with a final step of measuring the free chlorine concentration prior
652 to distribution. Photos of the scale-up effort at Covenant University can be found in Section S9.
653
654 User acceptance of the disinfectant was promoted with attractive labeling of the spray bottles.
655 Use and popularity of the high-touch surface disinfectant noticeably declined as the COVID-19
656 pandemic waned, airborne transmission was identified as the overwhelmingly dominant route of
657 transmission, and people mostly returned to business as usual.
658
659 Hurdles associated with regulatory approval by local governments and public perception were
660 encountered by the co-author and team from Takataka Plastics in Gulu, Uganda, where the on-
661 site generated hypochlorous acid was not officially recognized as an effective and approved
662 disinfectant. Because the new disinfectant was not approved by the country's National Bureau of
663 Standards, some prospective users did not believe the new disinfectant was effective.
664 Furthermore, the local prospective users often did not trust the chlorine-based disinfectant
665 because it did not smell like the alcohol-based disinfectants to which they were accustomed. This
666 challenge emerged during the scale-up of the Electro-Clean production and distribution efforts
667 since the Uganda National Bureau of Standards only has a category for alcohol-based
668 disinfectants and does not have tests or procedures for evaluating non-alcohol-based
669 disinfectants. To address these regulatory hurdles, that team's future work involves developing a

670 test protocol that could be proposed to the Bureau for testing of the chlorine-based disinfectant
671 product for approval.

672

673 As noted earlier, COVID-19-related interest in Electro-Clean surged during the early months of
674 the pandemic and declined as it became clear that aerosol transmission was the dominant mode
675 of transmission. Nevertheless, the large unmet need among resource-poor communities and
676 healthcare facilities for reliable access to surface disinfection was emphasized in the series of
677 open virtual workshops organized starting in 2022 by PATH (45). Establishing partnerships with
678 hospitals and health clinics operating in rural, low-resource settings could be a next step as the
679 demand for low-cost disinfectants will always be relevant.

680 **Conclusions**

681 The development of the Electro-Clean process was not a "top-down" or "isolated" approach, but
682 instead a culmination of rapid design feedback from our partners (some of them co-authors of
683 this paper), as we experimented with different materials and reactor sizes, landing on a design
684 that made the most sense for a large fraction of our intended users. The selection of reactor
685 components built off known knowledge of salt electrolysis for chlorine production, but
686 prioritized criteria such as availability, cost, and simplicity over achieving maximum free
687 chlorine production. The health benefits of a safe and effective disinfectant, even when produced
688 with only a moderately efficient method (like Electro-Clean), vastly outweigh the costs when
689 compared to the "do nothing" approach. Although the Electro-Clean system uses commonplace
690 welding carbon rods for electrodes, instead of expensive state-of-the-art materials, substantial
691 concentrations of free chlorine (more than 1000 ppm as Cl_2) can be produced with this approach

692 at affordable costs. Prior to pH adjustment, the Electro-Clean process makes bleach (i.e., sodium
693 hypochlorite, a chlorine-based disinfectant) at about five times less efficiency (Faradaic
694 efficiency of ~20%) than off-the-shelf chlorine generator products, causing electricity costs to
695 jump five-fold. However, electricity costs are a small fraction of the operating cost. So, a
696 Faradaic efficiency of only ~20% (translating into 5 times more electricity use) is a great tradeoff
697 against much lower cost of electrodes (graphite versus Mixed-Metal-Oxide electrodes). Because
698 the final product is so low-cost and can be locally made, Electro-Clean is a worthwhile and
699 accessible alternative.

700
701 In terms of biocidal activity and disinfectant performance, the hypochlorous acid solution
702 produced by the Electro-Clean process was observed to be effective in reducing colony-forming
703 units of bacteria on contaminated high-touch surfaces. Its effectiveness was comparable to
704 standard disinfectant solutions (e.g. diluted bleach, and 70% ethanol). The low-cost, widely
705 available carbon gouging electrodes used in the Electro-Clean process were shown to be
706 reasonably durable, with a lifetime of 45 operating hours per anode and the solution
707 concentration remained relatively stable for up to a month when properly stored in the dark and
708 at room temperature.

709
710 Even though the Electro-Clean process is robust, effective, and low-cost, there are still inevitable
711 challenges and social barriers to technology adoption. Through collaboration with our co-authors
712 and partners in communities around the world, we consistently observed that people are reluctant
713 to adopt “complex” technologies - “the simpler the better”. We also observed that implementing
714 this technology at a household level is quite challenging, while technology adoption at a
715 community level where one person is in charge of producing the disinfectant for other users is

716 more well-received. To lower the barrier of entry to comfortably interact with this technology,
717 public access to instructional documents and videos on how to replicate this work were placed
718 online as a small stride towards addressing the large-scale problem of limited availability and
719 accessibility to disinfecting solutions (44).

720

721 By further developing this on-site HOCl production technology, using locally available
722 materials, and bulking up outreach efforts, we hope that the Electro-Clean process can be a
723 reliable solution for communities and organizations in need of a low-cost disinfectant to improve
724 public health.

725 **Acknowledgments**

726 We sincerely thank the collaborating institutions who made this work possible, for allowing
727 Electro-Clean to reach a larger audience and potentially empower communities around the world
728 to produce commercial-strength disinfectants in low-resource settings. Those institutions include
729 Covenant University in Nigeria, Higher Technological Institute of Abasolo Mexico, Higher
730 Technological Institute of Irapuato Mexico, IIT Bombay, Jadavpur University, Potential Energy,
731 Baobab Learning Center in Mali, Gulu University in Uganda, and Takataka Plastics. For the
732 work carried out in IIT Bombay, we sincerely thank and recognize the in-kind support from IIT
733 Bombay CTARA (Prof. Bakul Rao, Sushma Kulkarni, Dr. Chandana N, and Hemlata
734 Suryawanshi).

735

736 We are thankful to the UC Berkeley students of Spring 2021 and 2022 cohorts who participated
737 in the Sustainable Design for Developing Communities course and facilitated the development of

738 user-friendly instruction guides for open access availability on the Gadgil Lab’s website. We are
739 thankful to Michael Gee for his assistance on laboratory experiments at UC Berkeley, and to
740 Emilie Kathol-Voilleque for her input on the Electro-Clean project. We would also like to
741 recognize and thank Amba Moses and Bridget Adoch from Takataka Plastics for operating and
742 testing the Electro-Clean process in Uganda. Finally, we would like to thank Jun Yu who helped
743 us with the design of the Electro-Clean logo through the Catchafire platform.

744
745 We would like to acknowledge the students Denisse Montes-Arias, Norma-Patricia Alvarez-
746 Vargas, and Sonia-Fernanda Torres-Flores from the Higher Technological Institutes of Abasolo
747 (ITESA) and Irapuato (ITESI) in Mexico for conducting the Electro-Clean process at a
748 household scale and for creating Youtube tutorials on the process. Many thanks to the students at
749 the Higher Technological Institute of Irapuato (ITESI) who participated in the Biochemistry
750 class in the year 2020, taught by Professor Varinia Lopez-Ramirez, in further improving the
751 Electro-Clean process. Finally, we would like to acknowledge the students David Emmanuel,
752 Boma Bill Odor, and Godwin Adams at Covenant University in Nigeria for conducting
753 laboratory experiments on the Electro-Clean process; and the technicians Mr. Stephen Ayegbo
754 and Mr. Ayo Akindele for their support in making the Electro-Clean process possible at
755 Covenant University.

756 **References**

- 757 1. Block MS, Rowan BG. Hypochlorous Acid: A Review. J Oral Maxillofac Surg. 2020
758 Sep;78(9):1461–6.
- 759 2. Rationale and Considerations for Chlorine Use in Infection Control for Non- U.S. General

- 760 Healthcare Settings [Internet]. 2020 [cited 2023 Jan 29]. Available from:
761 <https://www.cdc.gov/vhf/ebola/clinicians/non-us-healthcare-settings/chlorine-use.html>
- 762 3. McGlynn W. Guidelines for the Use of Chlorine Bleach as a Sanitizer in Food Processing
763 Operations [Internet]. Oklahoma State University - Food and Agricultural Products Research
764 and Technology Center; Available from:
765 <https://ucfoodsafety.ucdavis.edu/sites/g/files/dgvnsk7366/files/inline-files/26437.pdf>
- 766 4. CDC. Global WASH Fast Facts [Internet]. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. 2022
767 [cited 2023 Jan 23]. Available from:
768 https://www.cdc.gov/healthywater/global/wash_statistics.html
- 769 5. Lindmark M, Cherukumilli K, Crider YS, Marcenac P, Lozier M, Voth-Gaeddert L, et al.
770 Passive In-Line Chlorination for Drinking Water Disinfection: A Critical Review. Environ
771 Sci Technol. 2022 Jul 5;56(13):9164–81.
- 772 6. Drolet A. Global Community of Practice (CoP) on decentralized chlorine production. PATH;
773 2021 Aug.
- 774 7. Abdul-Wahab SA, Al-Weshahi MA. Brine Management: Substituting Chlorine with On-Site
775 Produced Sodium Hypochlorite for Environmentally Improved Desalination Processes.
776 Water Resour Manag. 2009 Sep 1;23(12):2437–54.
- 777 8. Choi J, Shim S, Yoon J. Design and operating parameters affecting an electrochlorination
778 system. J Ind Eng Chem. 2013 Jan 25;19(1):215–9.
- 779 9. Snowdon MR, Rathod S, Fattahi A, Khan A, Bragg LM, Liang R, et al. Water Purification
780 and Electrochemical Oxidation: Meeting Different Targets with BDD and MMO Anodes.
781 Environments. 2022 Nov;9(11):135.
- 782 10. Hubert MA, King LA, Jaramillo TF. Evaluating the Case for Reduced Precious Metal

- 783 Catalysts in Proton Exchange Membrane Electrolyzers. ACS Energy Lett. 2022 Jan
784 14;7(1):17–23.
- 785 11. Hand S, Cusick RD. Electrochemical Disinfection in Water and Wastewater Treatment:
786 Identifying Impacts of Water Quality and Operating Conditions on Performance. Environ Sci
787 Technol. 2021 Mar 16;55(6):3470–82.
- 788 12. Deborde M, von Gunten U. Reactions of chlorine with inorganic and organic compounds
789 during water treatment—Kinetics and mechanisms: A critical review. Water Res. 2008 Jan
790 1;42(1):13–51.
- 791 13. Adjodah D, Kwan J, Lichtblau S, Talsma A. Chlorine Generation: The Do-it-Yourself
792 Approach [Internet]. p. 19. Available from: [https://silo.tips/download/chlorine-generation-](https://silo.tips/download/chlorine-generation-the-do-it-yourself-approach#)
793 [the-do-it-yourself-approach#](https://silo.tips/download/chlorine-generation-the-do-it-yourself-approach#)
- 794 14. Rogers EM, Singhal A, Quinlan MM. Diffusion of Innovations. In: An Integrated Approach
795 to Communication Theory and Research. 2nd ed. Routledge; 2008.
- 796 15. Chemical Disinfectants | Disinfection & Sterilization Guidelines | Guidelines Library |
797 Infection Control | CDC [Internet]. 2019 [cited 2023 May 4]. Available from:
798 [https://www.cdc.gov/infectioncontrol/guidelines/disinfection/disinfection-](https://www.cdc.gov/infectioncontrol/guidelines/disinfection/disinfection-methods/chemical.html)
799 [methods/chemical.html](https://www.cdc.gov/infectioncontrol/guidelines/disinfection/disinfection-methods/chemical.html)
- 800 16. Cleaning and disinfection of environmental surfaces in the context of COVID-19 [Internet].
801 [cited 2022 Mar 3]. Available from: [https://www.who.int/publications-detail-](https://www.who.int/publications-detail-redirect/cleaning-and-disinfection-of-environmental-surfaces-inthe-context-of-covid-19)
802 [redirect/cleaning-and-disinfection-of-environmental-surfaces-inthe-context-of-covid-19](https://www.who.int/publications-detail-redirect/cleaning-and-disinfection-of-environmental-surfaces-inthe-context-of-covid-19)
- 803 17. US EPA O. About List N: Disinfectants for Coronavirus (COVID-19) [Internet]. 2020 [cited
804 2022 Mar 3]. Available from: [https://www.epa.gov/coronavirus/about-list-n-disinfectants-](https://www.epa.gov/coronavirus/about-list-n-disinfectants-coronavirus-covid-19-0)
805 [coronavirus-covid-19-0](https://www.epa.gov/coronavirus/about-list-n-disinfectants-coronavirus-covid-19-0)

- 806 18. Electrolytic Cells [Internet]. Bodner Research Web. [cited 2023 Jan 29]. Available from:
807 <http://chemed.chem.purdue.edu/genchem/topicreview/bp/ch20/faraday.php>
- 808 19. Rabah MA, Nassif N, Azim AAA. Electrochemical wear of graphite anodes during
809 electrolysis of brine. *Carbon*. 1991 Jan 1;29(2):165–71.
- 810 20. Hine F, Yasuda M, Sugiura I, Noda T. Effects of the Active Chlorine and the pH on
811 Consumption of Graphite Anode in Chlor-Alkali Cells. *J Electrochem Soc*. 1974 Feb
812 1;121(2):220.
- 813 21. Entwisle JH. Consumption of graphite anodes in chlorine manufacture by brine electrolysis.
814 *J Appl Electrochem*. 1974 Nov 1;4(4):293–303.
- 815 22. Ryan MP, Williams DE, Chater RJ, Hutton BM, McPhail DS. Why stainless steel corrodes.
816 *Nature*. 2002 Feb;415(6873):770–4.
- 817 23. Ibrahim MAM, Abd El Rehim SS, Hamza MM. Corrosion behavior of some austenitic
818 stainless steels in chloride environments. *Mater Chem Phys*. 2009 May 15;115(1):80–5.
- 819 24. Freire L, Carmezim MJ, Ferreira MGS, Montemor MF. The electrochemical behaviour of
820 stainless steel AISI 304 in alkaline solutions with different pH in the presence of chlorides.
821 *Electrochimica Acta*. 2011 May 30;56(14):5280–9.
- 822 25. Lister MW. The decomposition of hypochlorous acid. *Can J Chem*. 1952 Nov;30(11):879–
823 89.
- 824 26. Ishihara M, Murakami K, Fukuda K, Nakamura S, Kuwabara M, Hattori H, et al. Stability of
825 Weakly Acidic Hypochlorous Acid Solution with Microbicidal Activity. *Biocontrol Sci*.
826 2017;22(4):223–7.
- 827 27. Adam LC, Fabian I, Suzuki K, Gordon G. Hypochlorous acid decomposition in the pH 5-8
828 region. *Inorg Chem*. 1992 Aug 1;31(17):3534–41.

- 829 28. Percival SL, Yates MV, Williams DW, Chalmers RM, Gray NF. Microbiology of
830 Waterborne Diseases. 2nd ed. Elsevier; 2014.
- 831 29. Wang L, Bassiri M, Najafi R, Najafi K, Yang J, Khosrovi B, et al. Hypochlorous Acid as a
832 Potential Wound Care Agent. *J Burns Wounds*. 2007 Apr 11;6:e5.
- 833 30. Benjamin MM. *Water Chemistry*. Vol. 2nd Edition. 2015.
- 834 31. Electrolysis of acidic NaCl solution with a graphite anode—I. The graphite electrode -
835 ScienceDirect [Internet]. [cited 2023 May 8]. Available from:
836 <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/001346866980037X?via%3Dihub>
- 837 32. Wang Y, Liu Y, Wiley D, Zhao S, Tang Z. Recent advances in electrocatalytic chloride
838 oxidation for chlorine gas production. *J Mater Chem A*. 2021 Sep 14;9(35):18974–93.
- 839 33. Choi S, Choi WI, Lee JS, Lee CH, Balamurugan M, Schwarz A, et al. A Reflection on
840 Sustainable Anode Materials for Electrochemical Chloride Oxidation. *Adv Mater*.
841 n/a(n/a):2300429.
- 842 34. Trasatti S. Electrocatalysis: understanding the success of DSA®. *Electrochimica Acta*. 2000
843 May 3;45(15):2377–85.
- 844 35. Duvernay PG, de Laguiche E, Campos Nogueira R, Graz B, Nana L, Ouédraogo W, et al.
845 Preventing nosocomial infections in resource-limited settings: An interventional approach in
846 healthcare facilities in Burkina Faso. *Infect Dis Health*. 2020 Aug 1;25(3):186–93.
- 847 36. Nogueira RC, Nigro M, Veuthey J, Tigalbaye C, Bazirutwabo B, Thior MDF, et al. Can
848 Locally Produced Chlorine Improve Water Sanitation & Hygiene (WASH) Indicators in
849 Health Care Facilities (HCF) in Rural Chad? *Health Sci Dis* [Internet]. 2021 Nov 1 [cited
850 2023 Jan 29];22(11). Available from: <http://hsd-fmsb.org/index.php/hsd/article/view/3016>
- 851 37. Kubota A, Goda T, Tsuru T, Yonekura T, Yagi M, Kawahara H, et al. Efficacy and safety of

- 852 strong acid electrolyzed water for peritoneal lavage to prevent surgical site infection in
853 patients with perforated appendicitis. *Surg Today*. 2015 Jul 1;45(7):876–9.
- 854 38. Anagnostopoulos AG, Rong A, Miller D, Tran A, Head T, Lee MC, et al. 0.01%
855 Hypochlorous Acid as an Alternative Skin Antiseptic: A... : *Dermatologic Surgery*. *Dermatol*
856 *Surg*. 2018 Dec;44(12):1489–93.
- 857 39. Fam A, Finger PT, Tomar AS, Garg G, Chin KJ. Hypochlorous acid antiseptic washout
858 improves patient comfort after intravitreal injection: A patient reported outcomes study.
859 *Indian J Ophthalmol*. 2020 Nov;68(11):2439.
- 860 40. CDC. Household Water Treatment [Internet]. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.
861 2022 [cited 2023 Jan 29]. Available from:
862 <https://www.cdc.gov/healthywater/global/household-water-treatment.html>
- 863 41. The effect of pH on the efficiency of chlorine disinfection and virus enumeration. *Water Res*.
864 1975 Oct 1;9(10):869–72.
- 865 42. Suslow T. A Practical Approach to Calculating Dose Values for Water Disinfection
866 [Internet]. University of California - Vegetable Research and Information Center; Available
867 from: [https://onfarmfoodsafety.rutgers.edu/wp-content/uploads/2018/02/A-Practical-](https://onfarmfoodsafety.rutgers.edu/wp-content/uploads/2018/02/A-Practical-Approach-to-Calculating-Dose-Values-for-Water-Disinfection.pdf)
868 [Approach-to-Calculating-Dose-Values-for-Water-Disinfection.pdf](https://onfarmfoodsafety.rutgers.edu/wp-content/uploads/2018/02/A-Practical-Approach-to-Calculating-Dose-Values-for-Water-Disinfection.pdf)
- 869 43. Disinfection Profiling and Benchmarking Technical Guidance Manual [Internet]. U.S.E.P.A.
870 Office of Water (4606M); 2020. Available from:
871 https://www.epa.gov/system/files/documents/2022-02/disprof_bench_3rules_final_508.pdf
- 872 44. Electro-Clean - Gadgil Lab for Energy & Water Research | UC Berkeley [Internet]. [cited
873 2023 Jan 29]. Available from: <https://gadgillab.berkeley.edu/electro-clean/>
- 874 45. PATH launches Global Community of Practice on decentralized chlorine production

- 875 [Internet]. DefeatDD. [cited 2023 Jan 29]. Available from:
876 [https://www.defeatdd.org/blog/path-launches-global-community-practice-decentralized-](https://www.defeatdd.org/blog/path-launches-global-community-practice-decentralized-chlorine-production)
877 [chlorine-production](https://www.defeatdd.org/blog/path-launches-global-community-practice-decentralized-chlorine-production)
- 878 46. Water quality data :: East Bay Municipal Utility District [Internet]. [cited 2023 Jan 29].
879 Available from: [https://www.ebmud.com/water/about-your-water/water-quality/water-](https://www.ebmud.com/water/about-your-water/water-quality/water-quality-data)
880 [quality-data](https://www.ebmud.com/water/about-your-water/water-quality/water-quality-data)
- 881 47. Westerhoff P, Chao P, Mash H. Reactivity of natural organic matter with aqueous chlorine
882 and bromine. *Water Res.* 2004 Mar 1;38(6):1502–13.
- 883 48. Wallén B, Wranglén G. Influence of pH and sulphate content of the solution on the corrosion
884 of graphite anodes in alkali chloride electrolysis. *Electrochimica Acta.* 1965 Jan 1;10(1):43–
885 8.
- 886 49. Saha J, Gupta SK. A novel electro-chlorinator using low cost graphite electrode for drinking
887 water disinfection. *Ionics.* 2017 Jul 1;23(7):1903–13.
- 888 50. Jeffery TC, Danna PA, Holden HS. Chlorine Bicentennial Symposium. Industrial
889 Electrolytic Division, Electrochemical Society; 1974. 420 p.
- 890 51. Bleach Dilution Ratio for Disinfecting | Clorox® [Internet]. 2021 [cited 2023 May 4].
891 Available from: <https://www.clorox.com/learn/bleach-dilution-ratio-chart/>
- 892 52. Clorox: Laundry & Bleach [Internet]. Amazon.com. [cited 2023 May 4]. Available from:
893 [https://www.amazon.com/stores/Clorox/LaundryBleach/page/2E893A5C-7B65-43EB-A741-](https://www.amazon.com/stores/Clorox/LaundryBleach/page/2E893A5C-7B65-43EB-A741-A140B67F07C4)
894 [A140B67F07C4](https://www.amazon.com/stores/Clorox/LaundryBleach/page/2E893A5C-7B65-43EB-A741-A140B67F07C4)
- 895 53. Blanqueador Clorox Triple Acción Original 5,8 Lt - \$ 51.07 [Internet]. [cited 2023 May 4].
896 Available from: [https://articulo.mercadolibre.com.mx/MLM-1868021657-blanqueador-](https://articulo.mercadolibre.com.mx/MLM-1868021657-blanqueador-clorox-triple-accion-original-58-lt-_JM)
897 [clorox-triple-accion-original-58-lt-_JM](https://articulo.mercadolibre.com.mx/MLM-1868021657-blanqueador-clorox-triple-accion-original-58-lt-_JM)

898 **Competing interests**

899 The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal
900 relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

901 **Supporting Information**

902 **S1. Faradaic Efficiency Theory and Calculations**

903 **S2. Electrolyte Composition**

904 **Table S1. Electrolyte Composition.** Water Quality Data from EBMUD, Orinda
905 Water Treatment Plant (accessed 06 February 2023).

906 **S3. Manufacturer information of materials used by co-authors**

907 **Table S2. Specifications of the locally available materials used by co-authors in**
908 **India, Mexico, Nigeria, and Uganda.** Two co-authors in India reproduced the
909 Electro-Clean process. The information in parentheses corresponds to co-authors at
910 IIT Bombay, while the information outside the parentheses corresponds to co-author
911 Vijay Matange.

912 **S4. Chlorine decay in storage containers**

913 **Fig S1. Free chlorine decay over time (~ 2 months) for produced HOCl solution**
914 **stored without acidification and with vinegar-acidification, in glass or plastic**
915 **containers.**

916 **Table S3. Decay of Free Chlorine in Stored HOCl Solution.**

917 **S5. Additional Electro-Clean Designs**

918 S5.1 Household Scale

919 S5.1.1 Carbon rod anode with stainless steel cathode

920 S5.1.2 Chlorine generation of household scale

921 **Fig S2. Free chlorine generated with carbon rod electrodes in synthetic tap**
922 **water and Faradaic Efficiency at increasing experiment durations.**

923 S5.2 Community Scale

924 S5.2.1 Bare carbon welding rods

925 **Fig S3. Digital images of stainless steel plate with two pieces of protective plastic**
926 **mesh.** (A) Front view of stainless steel plate with pieces of plastic mesh. (B) Back
927 view of stainless steel plate with pieces of plastic mesh. The two plastic mesh pieces
928 facing each other were secured using plumber's tape.

929 **Fig S4. Illustration of the plastic lid with 6 holes drilled with a 1-cm drill tip.** The
930 red circles represent the holes where the carbon welding rods (anode) go and the
931 orange circle represents the hole where the alligator clip connecting the stainless steel
932 plate (cathode) goes. The black circle represents the hole for preventing pressure
933 buildup.

934 S5.2.2 Chlorine generation and effect of poor connections

935 **Fig S5. Free chlorine concentration versus the number of electrolysis cycles.**

936 Each electrolysis cycle consisted of 90 minutes of electrolysis before cleaning the
937 electrodes with a brush and water, and a fresh batch of 30,000 ppm of NaCl in
938 synthetic tap water. The black vertical dashed line shows the before and after adding
939 new, fully insulated, nickel-steel alligator clips.

940 S5.3 Co-Axial Reactor Design

941 **Fig S6. Digital images of the co-axial designs.** (A) Co-axial design with carbon rods
942 in plastic pipe assembly, and (B) Co-axial design with carbon rod in copper pipe
943 assembly.

944 **Fig S7. Co-axial systems operated in batch** (A) and in continuous flow (B)
945 configurations.

946 S5.4 Two-Liter Scale

947 S5.4.1 Copper-Carbon welding rods as electrodes

948 **Fig S8. Comparison of free chlorine concentration over time of copper-coated**
949 **carbon cathode (C-Cu) and bare carbon cathode.**

950 S5.4.2 Multi-Electrode Configurations

951 **Fig S9. Performance of three electrode configurations.** (A) Average current
952 delivered in each reactor configuration. (B) Free Cl₂ production in each reactor
953 configuration. (C) Faradaic efficiency for free Cl₂ (%) in each reactor configuration.

954 **S6. Long-term Experiments**

955 **Fig S10. Assembly of continuous flow reactor system for testing the durability of**
956 **the carbon gouging anode.**

957 S6.1 Durability of Mineral-Oil-Coated Electrodes

958 **Fig S11. Free Chlorine concentration as a function of charge passed in Coulombs**

959 **Fig S12. Current as a function of charge passed in Coulombs**

960 **Fig S13. Faradaic efficiency as a function of charge passed in Coulombs**

961 S6.2 Durability of Bare Carbon Electrodes

962 **Fig S14. Free Chlorine concentration as a function of charge passed in Coulombs**

963 **Fig S15. Current as a function of charge passed in Coulombs**

964 **Fig S16. Faradaic efficiency as a function of charge passed in Coulombs**

965 **S7. Microbiological Tests in Mexico**

966 S7.1 Microbial assays on various material surfaces

967 S7.2 Evaluation of antimicrobial effect of produced HOCl solution on various materials

968 **Table S4. Effect of Electro-Clean on different materials.** Values shown in this
969 table have units of CFU per mL of strain solution on a 40 cm² area sampled, with
970 n=3. Percent removal is shown in parentheses for glass. Other materials showed
971 ~99.9% removal.

972 S7.3 Effect of produced HOCl solution on high-touch surfaces

973 S7.4 Effect of produced HOCl solution on high-touch surfaces at schools

974 **Table S5. Effect of produced HOCl used in school classrooms.**

975 **Table S6. Effect of produced HOCl used in school bathrooms.**

976 **S8. Microbiological Tests in India**

977 S8.1 Pathogen removal efficiency of produced HOCl solution

978 S8.2 Growth inhibitor evaluation

979 S8.3 Hypochlorous acid as a growth inhibitor for pathogenic bacterial strains

980 **Fig S17. Digital pictures of pathogenic bacterial growth inhibition by**
981 **hypochlorous acid and ethanol.** Growth inhibition of non-lactose fermenting
982 pathogen bacteria (Salmonella, Proteus species, Yersinia, Pseudomonas aeruginosa,
983 and Shigella) by (A) hypochlorous acid solution, (B) Ethanol 70% (v/v), and (C)

984 Water. Growth inhibition of lactose fermenting pathogenic bacteria: Escherichia coli,
985 Enterobacter, and Klebsiella by (D) hypochlorous acid solution, (E) Ethanol 70%
986 (v/v), and (F) Water.

987 S8.4 Evaluation of surface disinfection of pathogenic cultures

988 **Fig S18. Process flow diagram for the methodology of evaluation of surface**
989 **disinfection of pathogenic cultures.**

990 S8.5 Hypochlorous acid as a surface disinfectant on various material surfaces

991 **Fig S19. Bacterial growth of Escherichia coli and Salmonella enterica serotype**
992 **Choleraesuis on untreated and treated surfaces with 100 uL of HOCl (A-C), and**
993 **ethanol 70% v/v (D-F).**

994 **S9. Scale-up Efforts by Project Collaborators**

995 S9.1 Covenant University in Ota, Nigeria

996 **Fig S20. Digital images of Electro-Clean process developed in Nigeria. (A)**
997 Experimental set-up for Electro-Clean production at Covenant University, (B) More
998 than 500 labeled spray bottles of the ready-to-use disinfectant prepared for mass
999 distribution, and (C) Spray bottle labels included brief user instructions, statement of
1000 regulatory approval by University authorities, and information on where the
1001 disinfectant solution could be refilled.

1002 S9.2 ITS, Abasolo & ITS, Irapuato in Mexico

1003 **Fig S21. Digital images of Electro-Clean process developed in Mexico (A)** a large-
1004 scale reactor assembly with multiple electrodes, (B) a large-scale reactor assembly
1005 with all electrical components in an electrical box, (C) the electrical box with the

1006 electrical components inside, (D) the atomizer spray bottle used to disinfect larger
1007 areas.

1008 S9.3 Vijay Matange of Vinyas Architects in India

1009 **Fig S22. Digital images of Electro-Clean process developed in India.** (A) Standard
1010 Electro-Clean system at Vinyas Architects, (B) Dual-anode electrode configuration,
1011 and (C) Elevated current observed as a result of the dual-anode electrode
1012 configuration.

1013 S9.4. Takataka Plastics in Gulu, Uganda

1014 **Fig S23. Digital images of Electro-Clean disinfectant made in Uganda.** The
1015 surface disinfectant was locally rebranded with the name “Safi Safe”. (A) Spray
1016 bottles of the surface disinfectant solution pictured with plastic tiles manufactured by
1017 Takataka plastic, and (B) close-up image of surface disinfectant label.

1018 **S10. References for Supporting Information File**

1019

1020

1021




Fig1




Fig2



Fig3




Fig4




Fig5






Fig6





Fig7