

1 TITLE

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

5 RUNNING TITLE

6 Coronavirus mask and FFR decontamination

8 AUTHORS

9 Louisa F. Ludwig-Begall^{1,*}, Constance Wielick^{1,*}, Lorène Dams¹, Hans Nauwynck², Pierre-Francois
10 Demeuldre³, Aurore Napp³, Jan Laperre⁴, Eric Haubruge⁵, Etienne Thiry^{1,#}

12 AUTHOR AFFILIATIONS

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

15 ²Laboratory of Virology, Faculty of Veterinary Medicine, Ghent University, Merelbeke, Belgium

16 ³ Department of Hospital Pharmacy, The University Hospital Center, University of Liège, Liège,
17 Belgium

18 ⁴ Centexbel Textile Research Centre, Grace-Hollogne, Belgium

19 ⁵ TERRA Research Centre, Gembloux Agro-Bio Tech, University of Liège, Gembloux, Belgium

21 *These authors contributed equally to this work.

22 #Corresponding author: etienne.thiry@uliege.be

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

25 WORD COUNT

26 3944 (excluding Summary and References) + two figures

Non-standard abbreviations:

FFR: filtering facepiece respirator

SM: surgical mask

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

PRCV: positive pressure respirator

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

27 ABSTRACT

28

29 Background

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

34

35 Aim

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

39

40 Methods

41 Surgical masks and filtering facepiece respirator coupons and straps were inoculated with infectious
42 PRCV and submitted to three decontamination treatments, UV irradiation, vaporised H₂O₂, and dry
43 heat treatment. Viruses were recovered from sample materials and viral titres were measured in swine
44 testicle cells.

45

46 Findings

47 UV irradiation, vaporised H₂O₂ and dry heat reduced infectious PRCV by more than three orders of
48 magnitude on mask and respirator coupons and rendered it undetectable in all decontamination assays.

49

50 Conclusion

51 This is the first description of stable disinfection of face masks and filtering facepiece respirators
52 contaminated with an infectious SARS-CoV-2 surrogate using UV irradiation, vaporised H₂O₂ and dry
53 heat treatment. The three methods permit demonstration of a loss of infectivity by more than three
54 orders of magnitude of an infectious coronavirus in line with the FDA policy regarding face masks and
55 respirators. It presents advantages of uncomplicated manipulation and utilisation in a BSL2 facility,
56 therefore being easily adaptable to other respirator and mask types.

57

58

59 KEYWORDS

60 SARS-CoV-2; PRCV; decontamination (UV; H₂O₂; dry heat); respirator; surgical mask

61 INTRODUCTION

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

72

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

83

84 Amongst a variety of different methods under investigation, vaporisation of the oxidizing agent
85 hydrogen peroxide (H_2O_2), already a standard hospital sterilisation technology due to its broad
86 antimicrobial activity and efficacy in surface decontamination [7], has garnered attention as a cost-
87 effective and practical option for mask decontamination [5,6,8]. Mask shape and fit of unused 3M
88 FFP2 NR D face masks (type 8822) were shown to remain intact subsequent to two cycles of
89 vaporised H_2O_2 low pressure gas sterilisation in a study by the Dutch National Institute for Public
90 Health and the Environment [5]; further studies have since demonstrated integrity of other respirator
91 models after numerous cycles of H_2O_2 treatment and have shown virucidal and bactericidal activity of
92 the method on a number of respiratory pathogens and/or biological indicators [8,9]. To our knowledge,
93 no study has yet reported the effect of H_2O_2 treatment on SARS-CoV-2, although vaporised H_2O_2
94 decontamination trials of SARS-CoV-2 inoculated masks are reportedly underway [8].

95

96 As alternatives to chemical vaporised H_2O_2 , two physical decontamination methods, the application of
97 dry heat and ultraviolet (UV) irradiation, show promise for decontamination of SARS-CoV-2

98 contaminated masks in various settings. Heat treatment acts via denaturation of protein secondary
99 structures thereby altering conformation of viral proteins involved in attachment to and replication
100 within host cells and has long been recognised as an efficient method of virus inactivation [10].
101 Temperatures of over 65°C have previously been shown to inactivate SARS-CoV in suspension [11];
102 more recently, dry heat treatment of 70°C was identified to inactivate SARS-CoV-2 in solution [12]
103 and was shown to not significantly alter filtration efficiency of N95 respirators within 20 cycles of
104 application [13]. Easily scalable, dry heat allows mass treatment of large sample sizes and thus
105 potentially presents a fast and efficient decontamination alternative to vaporised H₂O₂ in decentralised
106 hospital centres or industrial settings. Ultraviolet germicidal irradiation with a highly energetic short-
107 wave (254 nm) acts via viral disruption of viral DNA or RNA and constitutes a physical surface
108 treatment for contaminated masks or FFRs. A useful sterilisation technique in a variety of applications,
109 UV irradiation has been implemented to effectively decontaminate influenza virus (H5N1) from two
110 different models of FFRs (3M models 1860s and 1870) [14] and does not degrade respirator
111 performance even after multiple applications [13,15]. It is a promising option for rapid
112 decontamination of smaller, individual sample contingents and is as such easily adaptable to point-of-
113 care applications. A possible concern relates to UV penetration depth, necessitating studies that not
114 only investigate viral inactivation of decontaminated surfaces but that address a potential worst-case
115 scenario in which viruses penetrate deeper layers of contaminated face masks and FFRs [13].

116

117 Since the utilisation, concentration and cultivation of infectious SARS-CoV-2 necessary for analyses
118 investigating its inactivation, pose obvious problems in terms of the availability and equipping of
119 BSL3 facilities, the use of conservative surrogates to test decontamination efficacy of various methods
120 is justified and crucial to gain an as accurate as possible insight into SARS-CoV-2 decontamination. A
121 recent (non-peer reviewed) publication describes inactivation of murine hepatitis virus (MHV), a
122 SARS-CoV-2 surrogate of the same *Betacoronavirus* genus, via vaporised H₂O₂, heat treatment, UV
123 exposure and other decontamination methods on FFRs; regrettably, the limited dynamic range of the
124 MHV model (at most 10¹-10² inactivation) fell short of demonstrating a 10³ reduction [16].

125

126 In the present investigation into filtering facepiece respirator and surgical mask decontamination via
127 UV irradiation, H₂O₂ and application of dry heat, we implemented porcine respiratory coronavirus
128 (PRCV), a spike gene deletion mutant of transmissible gastroenteritis virus (TGEV) and a member of
129 the *Alphacoronavirus 1* species [17,18], as SARS-CoV-2 surrogate. While PRCV, which infects the
130 respiratory tract of swine [19], is not in the same genus as SARS-CoV-2, the two members of the
131 subfamily *Coronavirinae* in the family *Coronaviridae* show sufficient similarities as to genome length
132 and virion structure (notwithstanding differences in envelope glycoproteins), for them to be expected
133 to behave similarly outside their hosts. Indeed, TGEV has previously been utilised as a surrogate for
134 another *Betacoronavirus*, SARS-CoV, in studies investigating the persistence of coronaviruses on

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

139

140 This is the first description of stable disinfection of FFRs and surgical masks contaminated with an
141 infectious SARS-CoV-2 surrogate using UV irradiation, vaporised H₂O₂ and dry heat treatment. The
142 three methods permit demonstration of a loss of infectivity by more than three orders of magnitude of
143 an infectious coronavirus in line with the FDA policy regarding face masks and respirators. It presents
144 advantages of uncomplicated manipulation and utilisation in a BSL2 facility, therefore being easily
145 adaptable to other respirator and mask types to which any of the three or other decontamination
146 methods may be applied.

147

148 METHODS

149 **Virus and cells**

150 PRCV strain 91V44 [22] was passaged three times on confluent cell monolayers of the ST continuous
151 cell line. A virus stock with a titre of 10^{7.8} TCID₅₀/ml was used.

152

153 **Surgical masks and filtering facepiece respirators**

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

168

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

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

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

192

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

194 PRCV-inoculated surgical masks and FFRs were decontaminated utilising three different
195 decontamination methods, UV irradiation, vaporised H₂O₂, and dry heat. Three FFRs and three surgical
196 masks were subjected to each of the three decontamination methods. Three additional inoculated
197 masks or respirators (positive controls) and the negative control mask or respirator remained
198 individually packaged and cooled before and after each decontaminating treatment to account for the
199 effect of time-dependent surface absorption and/or interaction on virus recovery.

200

201 **UV germicidal irradiation**

202 Surgical masks and FFRs were individually irradiated using a LS-AT-M1 (LASEA Company, Sart
203 Tilman, Belgium) equipped with 4 UV-C lamps of 5.5W (@UV-C). Hung vertically on a metal frame,
204 masks and FFRs were inserted into a safety enclosure. A 2 min UV-C treatment (surgical masks) led
205 to a fluence of 2.6J/cm² per mask (1.3J/cm² per side), 4 min UV-C irradiation (FFRs) led to a fluence
206 of 5.2J/cm² per mask. Power and irradiation time (120 s) were monitored and recorded throughout.
207 Following irradiation, surgical masks and FFRs were unloaded and placed in individual bags.

208

209 **Vaporised H₂O₂**

210 Surgical masks, FFRs and a chemical indicator were placed in individual Mylar/Tyvek pouches.
211 Vaporised hydrogen peroxide (VHP) treatment was performed with the V-PRO Max Sterilizer (Steris,
212 Mentor, OH) which uses 59% liquid H₂O₂ to generate hydrogen peroxide vapor. A 28-minute non
213 lumen cycle was used, consisting of 2 min 40 sec conditioning (5 g/min), 19 min 47 sec
214 decontamination (2.2 g/min) and 7 min 46 sec aeration. Peak VHP concentration was 750 ppm.

215

216 **Dry heat**

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

222

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

225 Upon completed decontamination, the three previously determined square coupons with the focal
226 point of PRCV inoculation at their centres were cut from the masks; the inoculated elastic strap was
227 severed from the masks in its entirety (Supplementary Figure 2). Thus, per mask, three coupons and
228 one elastic strap were sampled. The different layers of the coupons were separated to facilitate viral
229 recovery and the separated layers of each individual coupon were placed together in a 15 mL Falcon
230 tube containing 4 mL elution medium (Eagle's MEM (Sigma)) supplemented with 2 % of an
231 association of penicillin (5000 SI units/mL) and streptomycin (5 mg/mL) (PS, Sigma)). Pilot
232 experiments (results not reported) indicated a cytotoxicity of eluate from H₂O₂-treated masks. To
233 combat this effect, presumably due to residual H₂O₂ in the suspension, the elution medium was
234 supplemented with 20% FCS and 0.1% β-mercaptoethanol in a total volume of 4 mL for virus elution
235 subsequent to vaporised H₂O₂ treatment. Sterile sets of scissors and tweezers were used for each

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

241

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

244 Titres of infectious PRCV recovered from individual coupons and straps of decontaminated surgical
245 masks and respirators were determined separately using a TCID₅₀ assay in ST cells. Briefly, tenfold
246 dilutions were made from each sample and 50µl of each dilution were inoculated in each of four wells
247 of a 96-well plate. After one hour of incubation, 100µl of medium (MEM supplemented with 10%
248 FCS and antibiotics) were added to each well. Due to toxicity in the undiluted inoculum, the inoculum
249 was completely removed and 150µl of medium were added. Four days after inoculation, monolayers
250 were analysed for the presence of cytopathic effect by light microscopy. Virus titres were calculated
251 using the Reed and Muench method [23]. Back titrations of virus inoculum stocks were performed in
252 parallel to each series of decontamination experiments.

253

254 **Data analysis and statistics**

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

258

259 **RESULTS**

260 Back titrations of virus inoculums performed in parallel to each series of experiments confirmed
261 PRCV inoculum titres to be within a range of 6.31×10^6 to 2×10^7 TCID₅₀/mL for all experiments.

262

263 The cell culture limit of detection (LOD) was 6.31×10^0 TCID₅₀/mL for all assays. An initially
264 observed H₂O₂ cytotoxicity and correspondingly elevated LOD of 6.31×10^1 TCID₅₀/mL of H₂O₂-
265 treated coupon eluates was corrected via β-mercaptoethanol and FCS supplementation of elution
266 medium; elevated cytotoxicity of H₂O₂-treated strap eluates (SM and FFR) could not be neutralised
267 and remained at 6.31×10^1 TCID₅₀/mL. Values below the LOD were considered as $\leq 6.31 \times 10^0$
268 TCID₅₀/mL, with the exception of measurements concerning H₂O₂-treated straps.

269

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

273 Recovery of infectious PRCV from inoculated untreated surgical masks and FFRs was analysed in ST
274 cells. Comparable high levels of infectious virus were recovered from PRCV-inoculated, untreated
275 left, right and middle coupons of all surgical masks. Mean values were $2.83 \times 10^5 (\pm 2.0)$ TCID₅₀/mL,
276 $1.69 \times 10^5 (\pm 1.81)$ TCID₅₀/mL and $4.25 \times 10^5 (\pm 2.88)$ TCID₅₀/mL for recovery from positive control
277 coupons of the UV, H₂O₂ and dry heat assays, respectively. Mean strap recovery values were also
278 similar between experiments, however they were lower by two to three orders of magnitude than
279 surgical mask coupon recovery values, with mean values of $5.88 \times 10^3 (\pm 2.80)$ TCID₅₀/mL, 1.21×10^2
280 (± 0.71) TCID₅₀/mL, and $3.92 \times 10^2 (\pm 4.56)$ TCID₅₀/mL for straps utilised as positive controls in the
281 UV, H₂O₂ and dry heat assays, respectively (Figure 1). Recovery from FFR coupons yielded mean
282 infectious virus at $6.96 \times 10^4 (\pm 13.27)$ TCID₅₀/mL, $1.80 \times 10^5 (\pm 1.58)$ TCID₅₀/mL and $2.16 \times 10^4 (\pm 3.28)$
283 TCID₅₀/mL for positive controls of the UV, H₂O₂ and dry heat assays, respectively. Recovery values
284 for infectious virus from FFR straps remained below the LOD for UV and dry heat positive controls;
285 recovery from straps used as positive control in the H₂O₂ experiments was $1.75 \times 10^3 (\pm 0.43)$
286 TCID₅₀/mL (Figure 1).

287

288 **UV irradiation, vaporised H₂O₂ and dry heat treatment reduce infectious PRCV by more than**
289 **three orders of magnitude on surgical mask and filtering facepiece respirator coupons and**
290 **render it undetectable in all decontamination assays.**

291 Following UV irradiation (2 minutes exposure time), exposure to vaporised H₂O₂, and dry heat
292 treatment of surgical masks, all titres for virus recovered from coupons and straps remained below the
293 respective LOD of the assay, showing a total loss of infectivity of more than five orders of magnitude
294 for all three treatments on coupons ($2.83 \times 10^5 (\pm 2.0)$ TCID₅₀/mL, $1.69 \times 10^5 (\pm 1.81)$ TCID₅₀/mL and
295 $4.25 \times 10^5 (\pm 2.88)$ TCID₅₀/mL, respectively); titres of virus recovered from treated surgical mask straps
296 were reduced by three orders of magnitude post UV irradiation ($5.88 \times 10^3 (\pm 2.80)$ TCID₅₀/mL), by two
297 orders of magnitude for heat-treated straps ($3.85 \times 10^2 (\pm 4.56)$ TCID₅₀/mL), and by one order of
298 magnitude for H₂O₂-treated straps ($5.78 \times 10^1 (\pm 7.10)$ TCID₅₀/mL).

299 Decontamination treatment effects followed a similar pattern of viral inactivation for FFR coupons
300 decontaminated via H₂O₂ and dry heat, reducing viral titres by over five orders of magnitude
301 ($1.80 \times 10^5 (\pm 1.58)$ TCID₅₀/mL) and four orders of magnitude ($2.16 \times 10^4 (\pm 3.28)$ TCID₅₀/mL,
302 respectively. While UV irradiation was sufficient to deactivate PRCV on surgical masks with an
303 exposure time of 2 minutes, it was shown to be insufficient to achieve viral inactivation by more than
304 three orders of magnitude on a different lot of FFRs in a trial run (results not shown); a 4 minute
305 exposure time was thus tested for FFRs, reducing viral titres by over four orders of magnitude, from

306 $6.96 \times 10^4 (\pm 13.27)$ TCID₅₀/mL to below the LOD (Figure 2). The impact of decontamination could not
307 be measured for UV- or dry heat-treated FFR straps due to insufficient recovery of infectious virus in
308 positive FFR strap controls. Hydrogen peroxide treatment of FFR straps resulted in a reduction of
309 infectious virus load by $1.69 \times 10^3 (\pm 0.43)$ TCID₅₀/mL.

310

311 DISCUSSION

312 This is, to our knowledge, the first description of stable disinfection of filtering facepiece respirators
313 and surgical masks contaminated with an infectious SARS-CoV-2 surrogate using UV irradiation,
314 vaporised H₂O₂, and dry heat treatment. While other reports have described efficacy of various
315 decontamination methods on a range of biological indicators, few studies report on the validated
316 decontamination of masks or respirators inoculated with SARS-CoV-2 or a conservative surrogate
317 virus, the former being limited by the availability of BSL3 facilities, the latter by the lack of a stable
318 high-titre model virus with an adequate dynamic range to fulfil FDA policy requirements of
319 demonstrating a loss of infectivity by more than three orders of magnitude [8,16].

320

321 PRCV, a SARS-CoV-2 surrogate and fellow member of the *Coronavirinae* subfamily, is classed as a
322 BSL2 pathogen. It can be cultured to high viral titres in permissive ST cells, thus possessing
323 advantages of uncomplicated manipulation and utilisation in a BSL2 facility and a wide dynamic
324 range. Here we demonstrate successful recovery of high quantities of infectious PRCV from
325 inoculated, otherwise untreated surgical masks and FFR coupons, with recovery titres stably averaging
326 over 10^5 TCID₅₀/mL for elution from mask coupons and ranging between values of over 10^3 to 10^5
327 TCID₅₀/mL for elution from FFR coupons. Slightly lower recovery values of the dry heat assay are
328 probably attributable to longer delays between inoculation and elution of infectious virus. Three
329 decontamination methods, chemical vaporised H₂O₂, physical inactivation via UV irradiation and dry
330 heat treatment, were tested for their ability to inactivate infectious PRCV on inoculated surgical masks
331 or FFRs. All three methods rendered PRCV inoculated under the outer surface layer of mask and
332 respirator coupons undetectable, successfully reducing the infectious load by more than three orders of
333 magnitude.

334

335 Since carrier surfaces likely influence decontamination efficacy, we aimed to examine viral
336 inactivation not only on the *de facto* respirators or masks themselves but on their elastic straps that
337 may become equally contaminated. We compared titres of infectious virus recovered from inoculated,
338 untreated straps and those inoculated and subsequently decontaminated via either UV irradiation,
339 vaporised H₂O₂, or dry heat treatment. All decontamination methods rendered PRCV undetectable
340 following recovery from straps; however, owing to insufficient virus recovery from untreated mask
341 straps, only UV decontamination of surgical mask straps could be successfully validated as reducing
342 viral loads by more than three orders of magnitude. Recovery of infectious virus applied to FFR straps

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

353

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

365

366 CONCLUSIONS

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

378

379 ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

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

384

385 CONFLICTS OF INTEREST STATEMENT

386 The authors have no conflicts of interest to disclose.

387

388 FUNDING SOURCE

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

391 REFERENCES

392

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

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

FIGURES

Figure 1





Figure 2



464 LEGENDS

465


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

476


477 Figure 2. Effect of three decontaminating treatments on PRCV-inoculated surgical mask- and filtering
478 facepiece respirator coupons and straps. The infectivity of porcine respiratory coronavirus (PRCV)
479 recovered from surgical masks (SM) and filtering facepiece respirators (FFR) decontaminated via
480 exposure to ultraviolet light (UV), vaporised hydrogen peroxide (H_2O_2), or dry heat treatment was
481 analysed in swine testicular cells. The cell culture limit of detection (LOD) was $0.8 \log_{10} \text{TCID}_{50}/\text{ml}$
482 for all analyses except those concerning H_2O_2 -treated SM or FFR straps ($1.8 \log_{10} \text{TCID}_{50}/\text{ml}$). Per
483 decontamination method, nine PRCV-inoculated, decontaminated coupons ($n=9$) and three inoculated,
484 decontaminated straps ($n=3$) were analysed in parallel to inoculated, untreated, positive control
485 coupons ($n=9$) and straps ($n=3$). Sample size deviated for UV-decontaminated FFR respirators, where
486 $n=6$ coupons (left and right) were analysed. P-values were computed by using a two-sided independent
487 sample t-test, where **** $P < 0.0001$, *** $P < 0.001$, ** $P < 0.01$, * $P < 0.05$, and ns is $P \geq 0.05$.

SUPPLEMENTARY FIGURES


Supplementary Figure 1




Supplementary Figure 2



Supplementary Figure 3



Supplementary Figure 4



488 SUPPLEMENTARY FIGURE LEGENDS

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

492

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

496

497 Supplementary Figure 3

498 Scanning electron microscopy of a KN95 filtering facepiece respirator (FFR). Far left: Cross section
499 view of the FFR. The two top layers are polypropylene spunbound structures, the third layer from the
500 top is a polypropylene meltblown layer, the fourth layer is a polypropylene spunbound layer facing the
501 wearer (the inner layer). Group of four: Details of all four polypropylene layers of the FFR. The
502 outermost spunbound layer, the second spunbound layer, the intermediate meltblown layer, and the
503 inner spunbound layer (61.4, 27.5, 24.4, and 28.8 grams/m² from outer to inner layer) are shown in
504 clockwise direction. The dots in the spunbound layers show points where the fibres are melted
505 together to ensure layer integrity. Pictures were taken on a JEOL JSM-7600F Analytical Ultrahigh
506 resolution thermally assisted field-emission gun source scanning electron microscope at 40 times
507 magnification. Prior to taking the pictures, samples were coated with a platinum/palladium layer
508 (suited to non-conductive samples) using a JEOL JFC-2300 High Resolution sputter coater.

509

510 Supplementary Figure 4

511 Scanning electron microscopy of a SuninCare™, Protect Plus surgical mask. Top: Cross section view
512 of the surgical mask. The outer layer (blue) is a polypropylene spunbound structure, the middle layer
513 is a polypropylene meltblown structure (26.8 grams/m²) and the inner layer is a polypropylene
514 spunbound structure. Bottom: The outer, intermediate and inner surgical mask layers are depicted
515 from left to right. The dots in the outer and inner spunbound layers show points where the
516 polypropylene fibres are melted together to ensure layer integrity. Pictures were taken on a JEOL
517 JSM-7600F Analytical Ultrahigh resolution thermally assisted field-emission gun source scanning
518 electron microscope at 40 times magnification. Prior to taking the pictures, samples were coated with a
519 platinum/palladium layer (suited to non-conductive samples) using a JEOL JFC-2300 High Resolution
520 sputter coater.