

1 **Research article**

2

3 **Detailed Analysis of Surface Infection Barrier on Hands: Relationship with**
4 **Morbidity to Infection Diseases and Identification of Antimicrobial Components**

5

6 Yuki Nishioka^{a)}, Kenichi Nagano^{b)}, Yoshitaka Koga^{c)}, Yasuhiro Okada^{a)}, Ichiro Mori^{a)},
7 Atsuko Hayase^{c)}, Takuya Mori^{c)}, Kenji Manabe^{a),*}

8

9 a) Personal Health Care Products Research, Kao Corporation, 2-1-3, Bunka,
10 Sumida-ku, Tokyo 131-8501, Japan

11 b) Biological Science Laboratories, Kao Corporation, 2606 Akabane, Ichikai, Haga,
12 Tochigi, 321-3497, Japan

13 c) Analytical Science Laboratories, Kao Corporation, 2606 Akabane, Ichikai, Haga,
14 Tochigi, 321-3497, Japan

15

16 ***Correspondence :**

17 E-mail : manabe.kenji@kao.com

18 Address: Kao Corporation, 2-1-3, Bunka, Sumida-ku, Tokyo 131-8501, Japan

19 Phone: +81-70-4356-2711

20

21 **Running title:** Identification of antimicrobial components on hands

22 **Abstract**

23 Although the surface of hands in humans is known to harbor high levels of
24 antimicrobial activity, reports investigating the relationship between antimicrobial
25 activity and morbidity in infectious diseases are lacking. Additionally, the precise
26 components involved in this activity are not known. Therefore, in this study, a method
27 was developed to quantitatively measure the antimicrobial activity of the components
28 found on the surface of hands, which was then compared with the medical history of the
29 participants for infectious diseases. As a result, the antimicrobial activity of the surface
30 of the hands was found to be positively associated with the history of infection in
31 individuals. Furthermore, a comprehensive analysis of the components on the surface of
32 hands indicated that organic acids and antimicrobial peptides are highly correlated with
33 antimicrobial activity. The high amounts of lactic acid found on the surface of hands
34 suggested it is an important factor in the hand surface infection barrier. Here we showed
35 that the application of lactic acid within the range of the amounts present on the hand
36 surface was found to significantly improve the antimicrobial activity of the hands.
37 Taken together, these results demonstrate that this new method can be used to quantify
38 antimicrobial activity, which opens new avenues for the development of hand hygiene
39 practices by enhancing the antimicrobial activity on the surface of hands using natural

40 ingredients against pathogens.

41 **Keywords:** contact infection, antimicrobial activity, hand surface, lactic acid, infectious

42 disease, hand hygiene

43 **1. Introduction**

44 Contact infection is an important route in the transmission of pathogens. Pathogens
45 from one infected person can be transmitted either by direct contact with another person
46 or through surfaces. Thus, contact is a major infection route for many diseases and
47 requires control to prevent infection. Hand-washing with soap or the use of hand
48 sanitizers with alcohol are common hand hygiene practices. In particular, the preventive
49 effect of hand-washing on infectious diseases has been strongly demonstrated
50 epidemiologically [1].

51 However, existing hand hygiene practices are unable to fully prevent contact
52 infections, due to both the high frequency of self-inoculation and the high stability of
53 pathogens in the environment. Regarding self-inoculation, Kwok et al. found that
54 medical students at university touched their face an average of 23 times per hour, among
55 which 44% came into contact with mucous membranes, such as the mouth, eyes, and
56 nose [2]. Furthermore, in a recent survey of Iranian citizens in public places, non-mask
57 wearers (N = 432) touched the mucous membranes of the face an average of 11 times an
58 hour [3]. These results suggest that humans touch the mucous membranes of the face
59 once every 5 min. Regarding the stability of pathogens, influenza virus, for example,
60 has been reported to survive for approximately 2-8 h when normal droplets adhere to

61 environmental surfaces [4]. In addition, the coronavirus SARS-CoV-2, which is now
62 widespread and causing a pandemic, is even more stable than influenza and has been
63 found to be viable for up to 72 h on environmental surfaces [5]. Therefore, it is highly
64 possible that the virus excreted from the infected person remains on contact surfaces for
65 a long period of time, whereby infection is caused by the frequent repetition of
66 unknowingly touching infected surfaces and the face. In particular, in recent decades,
67 the risk of infection by invisible pathogens has increased due to the dramatic increase in
68 population densities and the development of transportation networks, and concerns
69 regarding the occurrence and spread of clusters of infection, due to the unconscious and
70 frequent transfer of pathogens from the environment to the mucous membranes of the
71 face, are increasing.

72 In a meta-analysis of intervention clinical trials of hand hygiene, White et al. reported
73 that non-alcoholic hand sanitizers using benzalkonium chloride, an antimicrobial agent,
74 have a higher preventive effect on respiratory diseases than alcoholic hand sanitizers [6].
75 The viral carrier for respiratory diseases is droplets, which are more difficult to observe
76 visually. Therefore, it is expected that unconscious self-inoculation is likely to occur in
77 many places. The target of this survey was elementary school students, who often have
78 a low hygiene awareness. Under these conditions, leave-on hand hygiene products with

79 benzalkonium chloride are more likely to have a higher effectiveness for the prevention
80 of infection compared to volatile alcohol hand sanitizers.

81 Hand hygiene is a common practice in daily life, wherein the excessive use of
82 antimicrobial agents poses a risk to the development of resistant bacteria, as well taking
83 its toll on the skin [7]. Since humans have evolved while coexisting with bacteria and
84 viruses, it is inferred that the hands, which are closely related to infection in daily life,
85 acquired antimicrobial ability in the process. In fact, previous studies have found that
86 the surface of human hands has high levels of antimicrobial activity. For example,
87 applying *E. coli* to the hands of healthy adults was found to reduce the number of
88 bacteria by about 3 orders in 30 min [8]. Additionally, it has also been reported that the
89 number of influenza viruses transferred to the hands decreases by 2 orders after about 5
90 minutes [4]. These results indicate that hands have a strong surface infection barrier,
91 which effectively reduces bacteria and viruses, compared to other environmental
92 surfaces. It also suggests that the identification of molecules involved in the inherent
93 antimicrobial ability of the skin could promote the development of new natural
94 antimicrobial agents with fewer side effects.

95 Several publications have proposed that the skin infection barrier involves peptides
96 that exert antimicrobial activity and initiate the host response, resulting in the release of

97 cytokines, inflammation, angiogenesis, and re-epithelialization [9]. Other components
98 present on the skin, such as lipids and organic acids, may also exhibit antibacterial
99 properties, however, their contribution to endogenous defenses remains poorly
100 understood [10]. In addition, studies investigating the effects of the activity of the hand
101 surface infection barrier on the morbidity of infectious diseases are lacking.

102 In this study, we developed a method to evaluate the inherent antimicrobial activity of
103 the skin in combination with the quantification of organic acids, amino acids, proteins,
104 and lipids present on the surface of hands to identify the crucial components of this
105 barrier. Our results showed that this new method enables the precise quantification of
106 the antimicrobial activity of the skin on the hands, which was used to successfully
107 identify lactic acid as a crucial component of the hand surface infection barrier.

108

109 **2. Material & Methods**

110 **2.1 Bacterial strains and culture medium**

111 *Escherichia coli* NBRC3301 strain (NBRC, National Institute of Technology and
112 Evaluation Biological Resource Center) and *Staphylococcus aureus* NBRC13276 strain
113 (NBRC) were used. As a pre-culture, a single colony was grown on Soybean Casein
114 Digest (SCD) agar medium (Nihon Pharmaceutical. Co., Ltd), and then inoculated into

115 4 mL of Luria-Bertani (LB) liquid medium (Nihon Pharmaceutical. Co., Ltd) and
116 cultured overnight (37°C, 180 rpm). Next, 1% of the obtained culture solution was
117 inoculated into LB liquid medium, cultured for 15 h, washed twice with sterile water,
118 and stored on ice.

119

120 **2.2. Measurement of viable bacterial counts by culture method using a plate reader**

121 The viable bacterial counts were measured by monitoring growth using a Bio
122 Microplate Reader HiTS (Sinic Corporation). A dilution series was prepared from the
123 sample, and the bacterial numbers were measured by plating on SCD agar medium and
124 incubating for 18 h at 37°C . Then, both the sample and the dilution series were
125 shake-cultured at 37°C. The absorbance (OD₆₀₀) was measured every 15 min to create a
126 growth curve. Based on the resulting growth curve, the time required to reach OD₆₀₀ =
127 0.02, which is the middle stage of the logarithmic growth phase, was obtained, and the
128 number of viable bacteria in the sample was calculated using the calibration curve
129 obtained from the dilution series.

130

131 **2.3. Viral strain, cells, and culture medium**

132 Influenza virus A/Memphis/1/71 (H3N2) was cultured and propagated in serum-free

133 medium (SFM) (Thermo Fisher Scientific). The virus was purified by centrifugation
134 after proliferation using Madin-Darby Canine Kidney (MDCK) cells (ATCC CCL-34).
135 As the cells to be infected, MDCK-II cells passaged to subconfluent on a 96-well plate
136 were used.

137

138 **2.4. Antiviral evaluation method**

139 A sample containing the virus was added to MDCK cells cultured on a 96-well plate.
140 The cells were infected with the virus by incubating for 15 min at 37°C and 5% CO₂.
141 Then, the solution was sucked using an ejector and washed twice with phosphate
142 buffered saline (PBS) (FUJIFILM Wako Pure Chemical Co.) at 100 µL/well. These
143 cells were incubated at 37°C under 5% CO₂ in SFM (100 µL/well) for 14 h, and the
144 amount of propagated virus was calculated from the neuraminidase activity in the
145 supernatant. Next, 20 µL of 250 µM 4-Methylumbelliferyl N-Acetyl- α -D-Neuraminic
146 Acid (Funakoshi Co.) was added to 30 µL of supernatant and incubated at 37°C for 30
147 min. The reaction was terminated by the addition of 200 µL of 100 mM sodium
148 carbonate buffer, and the fluorescence value was measured using a plate reader (Ex: 355
149 nm/Em: 460 nm, gain: 70) (TECAN M200). The number of viruses in the reaction
150 solution was calculated from a calibration curve obtained from the dilution series of the

151 virus solution measured using the same procedure. It has been confirmed that Dimethyl
152 Sulfoxide (DMSO) has no effect on the influenza virus and MDCK-II cells under the
153 dilution conditions used in this study.

154

155 **2.5. *In vivo* qualitative and quantitative evaluation of surface infection barrier on**
156 **hands**

157 The antimicrobial activity was measured using a hand stamp for qualitative evaluation
158 and a liquid cultivation method using a plate reader for quantitative evaluation. For
159 qualitative evaluation, *E. coli* solution (200 mL) with an optical density (OD) = 0.1 was
160 placed in a 500 mL vat. Both hands were soaked for 5 s and the left hand was dried for 3
161 min. Residual bacteria were qualitatively observed by placing the hand on a hand petri
162 dish (Nissui Pharmaceutical Co., Ltd.) containing X-Gal agar medium (Nissui
163 Pharmaceutical Co., Ltd.) for 10 s (loading about 2 kg) and culturing in a 37°C
164 incubator for 15 h. The other hand was stamped after drying for 30 s as a control. For
165 quantitative evaluation, 10 µL of cultured *E. coli* solution (OD = 1.0) was applied to 4
166 cm² on the palm of the hand, and was collected 3 min later using a swab (BD-BBL
167 culture swab EZ; Becton Dickinson) soaked in physiological saline. Collection by
168 swabbing was performed twice and then incubated in 1 mL of Lecithin and polysorbate

169 80 (LP) medium (FUJIFILM Wako Pure Chemical Co.). One hundred microliters of this
170 sample were mixed with 100 μ L of 2 \times SCD medium (Nihon Pharmaceutical Co., Ltd.)
171 and cultivated in a 96-well microplate in a 37°C incubator for 24 h. Quantification was
172 performed using a microplate reader (Bio Microplate Reader HiTS; Sinic Corporation),
173 and the antimicrobial effect was evaluated by calculating the number of surviving
174 bacteria relative to the initial viable bacterial number.

175

176 **2.6. *In vitro* antimicrobial activity evaluation of hand surface components**

177 The extraction and preparation of the hand components are shown below. A 2.5 \times 5 cm
178 region of the hand was rubbed 8 times with a swab 1K1501 (J.C.B. Industry Co.)
179 soaked in 50% ethanol. This procedure was repeated 3 times on the same region for all
180 subjects. Then, the swab tips were cut off, placed in a microtube, and 600 μ L of 50%
181 ethanol was added. The samples were then sonicated for 5 min using an ultrasonic
182 cleaner SW5800 (CITIZEN Watch Co.) and pooled into one microtube (a total of 1800
183 μ L per subject). After centrifugation at 15,000 rpm for 5 min, the supernatant was split
184 in 2 to evaluate the antibacterial and antiviral activity. Then, the samples were dried
185 using a centrifugal evaporator CVE-3000 (TOKYO RIKAKIKAI CO, LTD), dissolved
186 in 10 μ L of dimethyl sulfoxide (DMSO) (FUJIFILM Wako Pure Chemical Co.), and

187 stored at -20°C. For antimicrobial activity, an undiluted solution of surface components
188 on hands was used against *E. coli*, and an 8-fold diluted sample with PBS was used
189 against *S. aureus*. The sample and the bacterial solution (OD₆₀₀ = 1.0) were mixed in
190 equal amounts and reacted at 37°C for 1 h. Quenching was performed by adding 135 µL
191 of Lecithin and Polysorbate 80 (LP) diluent to 15 µL of the reaction solution, and then
192 standing it on ice. Next, 100 µL of this sample was mixed with 100 µL of 2 x SCD
193 medium and cultivated in a 96-well microplate in a 37°C incubator for 24 h, before
194 performing quantification on a microplate reader (Bio Microplate Reader HiTS; Sinic
195 Corporation). The antimicrobial effect was evaluated by calculating the number of
196 surviving bacteria relative to the initial viable bacterial number. For antiviral evaluation,
197 surface components extracted from the hand were diluted 100-fold with PBS and 100
198 µL were incubated with 100 µL of virus solution (8.0×10^4 pfu/mL) at 37°C for 30 min.
199 After the reaction, 100 µL of serum free medium (SFM) at a double concentration was
200 added and placed on ice for quenching. The antiviral effect was calculated from the
201 relative fluorescence values.

202

203 **2.7. Blood sample collection and measurement of natural killer cell activity**

204 Blood samples were collected in heparinized tubes with a lymphocyte preservation

205 solution (Nipro Co.). Peripheral blood molecular cells (PBMCs) were isolated by
206 density gradient centrifugation using Isolymp (CTL Scientific Supply Co.), according
207 to the manufacturer's instructions. The natural killer (NK) cell activity of the PBMCs
208 was determined using the chromium-51 (^{51}Cr) release method, as previously described
209 [11]. Briefly, PBMCs isolated as effector cells and K-562 tumor cells labeled with ^{51}Cr
210 as target cells were incubated at a ratio of 1:50 for 4 h at 37°C. Then, the ^{51}Cr released
211 in the supernatant was measured with a γ -counter (ARC-370M, Aloka). The maximum
212 ^{51}Cr release was ensured by adding 1 N hydrochloric acid, and the minimum ^{51}Cr
213 release was confirmed by adding only complete medium to the target cells. NK cell
214 activity was expressed as the percentage cytotoxicity, calculated using the following
215 formula:

216
$$\text{NK cell activity} = [(\text{experiment cpm} - \text{minimum cpm}) / (\text{maximum cpm} - \text{minimum cpm})] \times 100.$$

218

219 **2.8. Saliva sample collection**

220 Saliva samples were collected in a quiet room in the morning between 9:00 and 10:00,
221 at least 60 min after eating. The participants were instructed to accumulate saliva in
222 their mouths and spit it into a sterile plastic tube at the desired time. Saliva samples

223 were collected for 10 min. The saliva volume (g) was calculated by subtracting the
224 weight of the empty tube from the collected tube.

225

226 **2.9. Measurement of oral mucosal moisture**

227 The oral mucosal moisture was measured using an oral moisture-checking device
228 (Mucus, Life Co.), performed according to the manufacturer's instructions. Briefly, the
229 sensor surface of the device was placed in vertical contact with the lingual mucosa, and
230 the pressure of the sensor was controlled to approximately 200 mg. During the
231 measurement, the participants were instructed to put their tongue out. The
232 measurements were conducted three times, and the mean value was calculated.

233

234 **2.10. Measurement of nasal mucociliary clearance**

235 The nasal mucociliary clearance time was evaluated using the saccharine test, as
236 previously described [10]. A tablet was placed in the nasal cavity of the participants,
237 who were instructed to settle into a comfortable sitting position and not sneeze, cough,
238 sniffle, blow their nose, talk, or take deep breaths during the test [12]. The time taken
239 from the placement of the tablet to the perception of sweet taste was recorded as the
240 nasal mucociliary clearance time.

241

242 **2.11. Sample collection method for hand surface component analysis**

243 For the collection of water-soluble components, 9 sheets of ϕ 2.1 cm filter paper (AS
244 ONE Co.) were attached to the palm of the left hand for 5 min, and 60 μ L of ultrapure
245 water was added dropwise to each filter paper. The filter paper was divided into 3 sheets
246 (for low-molecular-weight compounds) and 6 sheets (for antimicrobial peptides), and
247 each was collected in a screw tube. For lipid collection on the skin surface, a 5 \times 5 cm
248 area of the left palm was scraped with a swab soaked in ethanol (three times from the
249 same site) and collected into a screw tube.

250

251 **2.11.1. Analysis of low molecular weight water soluble components on the skin** 252 **surface**

253 Three filter papers sampled from the hand surface were dried by spraying with nitrogen.
254 Subsequently, ultrapure water was added, and the supernatant was subjected to liquid
255 chromatography mass spectrometry. An AQUITY LC system (Waters) equipped with
256 LTQ Orbitrap Velos Pro (Thermo Fisher Scientific) was used, and samples were
257 separated using a Discovery HS F5 column (3 μ m beads, 2.1 mm i.d., 150 mm long)
258 (Sigma-Aldrich) at 0.2 mL/min. The elution buffer was composed of buffer A (0.1%

259 formic acid) and buffer B (acetonitrile containing 0.1% formic acid). The mobile phases
260 were programmed consecutively, as follows: an isocratic elution of A 95% (B 5%)
261 between 0 and 5 min, a linear gradient of A 95-0% (B 5-100%) between 5 and 20 min,
262 an isocratic elution of A 0% (B 100%) between 20 and 25, and an isocratic elution of A
263 95% (B 5%) from 25.1 to 40 min for column equilibrium. The scan measurements were
264 performed in positive and negative ion mode.

265

266 **2.11.2. Analysis of water-soluble proteins on the skin surface**

267 The identification of superficial water-soluble proteins was carried out as previously
268 described [13]. Briefly, protein extracts from 6 filter papers were dissolved in MPEX
269 PTS Reagents (GL Sciences) containing 7 M urea and 2 M thiourea. Then, 1/100
270 amount of 50 mM ammonium bicarbonate (NH_4HCO_3) buffer containing 1 M
271 dithiothreitol was added to the sample solution, and the mixture was incubated for 16 h
272 at 35°C. Subsequently, 1/20 amount of 50 mM NH_4HCO_3 buffer containing 1 M
273 iodoacetamide was added to the sample solution, and the mixture was incubated for 30
274 min at room temperature. The amount of protein was quantified using the EZQ protein
275 assay kit (Thermo Fisher Scientific). The solution was diluted 3 times with 50 mM
276 NH_4HCO_3 before degrading using lysyl endopeptidase (FUJIFILM Wako Pure

277 Chemical Co.) and trypsin (FUJIFILM Wako Pure Chemical Co.). The amount of lysyl
278 endopeptidase and trypsin was 1/100 of the amount of protein in each sample. Then,
279 ethyl acetate and trifluoroacetic acid (0.5% of final concentration) were added to the
280 mixture. Then, after centrifugation at $15,700 \times g$ for 2 min, the supernatant was
281 removed and dried under reduced pressure at 50°C to obtain a pellet. The resulting
282 pellet was dissolved in water containing 0.1% trifluoroacetic acid and 5% acetonitrile
283 and applied to the GL-Tip SDB column (GL Sciences, Tokyo). After washing once with
284 water containing 0.1% trifluoroacetic acid and 5% acetonitrile, it was eluted with 80%
285 acetonitrile containing 0.1% trifluoroacetic acid. The eluate was dried under reduced
286 pressure at 35°C, dissolved in water containing 0.1% formic acid and 2% acetonitrile,
287 and subjected to liquid chromatography tandem-mass spectrometry. The samples were
288 concentrated with Acclaim PepMap 100 C18 Nano-TrapColumn (3 μm beads, 75 μm id,
289 20 mm long; Thermo Fisher Scientific) and separated using a nanoACQUITY BEH130
290 C18 (1.7 μm beads, 100 μm id, 100 mm long; Waters). Proteins were identified by
291 cross-referencing the obtained spectrum with the Swiss-Prot protein sequence database.
292 The concentration of the identified protein was estimated using the empAI method [14].

293

294 **2.11.3. Analysis of lipids on the skin surface**

295 Superficial lipids were quantified as previously described [15]. After immersing a
296 cotton swab with scraped hands in chloroform/methanol (1/1 solution), the supernatant
297 was collected and internal standard substances (TAG-C39: 0: tritridecanoin, DAG-C26:
298 0: ditridecanoin, FFA-C12: 0- d3: lauric acid (Methyl-d3), WE-C28: 1: lauryl
299 palmitoleate, ChE-C10: 0: cholesteryl caprate, ChE-C2: 0:cholesteryl acetate) were
300 added to samples that were then subjected to liquid chromatography tandem-mass
301 spectrometry. An Agilent 1200 series LC system equipped with an Agilent 6460 set ESI
302 source was used. Chloroform/methanol (50:50, v/v) containing 15 mmol/L ammonium
303 acetate was used as the mobile phase and analyzed at a flow rate of 0.2 mL.
304 Quantification was performed using the internal standard method. For the quantification
305 of compounds of different types and chain lengths, differences in intermolecular
306 sensitivity were as corrected from the relative molar sensitivity with the internal
307 standard substance, and the absolute quantification value was calculated.

308

309 **2.12. Study design**

310 The following four surveys were conducted regarding the surface infection barrier of the
311 hand: (1) a preliminary study to understand the antimicrobial activity of hands using *in*
312 *vivo* and *in vitro* methods; (2) a retrospective study investigating the relationship

313 between antimicrobial activity of hand and morbidity to infection; (3) the identification
314 of antimicrobial components on hands using comprehensive analysis; (4) the
315 verification of the effect of lactic acid application.

316

317 **2.12.1. A preliminary study to understand the antimicrobial activity of hands using**
318 ***in vivo* and *in vitro* methods**

319 This study was conducted as a pilot study, and volunteers were recruited randomly. The
320 subjects were healthy adult men and women (aged 25 to 49 years). The participants
321 performed standard hand washing with test soap formulated with alkyl ether carboxylic
322 acid, sodium salt (AEC), alkyl ether sulfate (AES), and alkyl glucoside (AG) without
323 antimicrobial compounds [16], rinsed with tap water for 30 seconds, and then washed
324 using purified water for 10 seconds. To avoid contact with the evaluation site, they wore
325 polyethylene gloves (AS ONE Co.) for 2 h of acclimation. Subsequently, the qualitative
326 and quantitative evaluation of the antimicrobial ability of the hand was performed
327 according to the method described separately.

328

329 **2.12.2. A retrospective study investigating the relationship between the**
330 **antimicrobial activity of hands and morbidity to infection**

331 The relationship between the antimicrobial activity of hands, other physiological
332 functions known to act against infectious diseases (saliva volume, oral mucosal
333 moisture, NK cell activity in PBMCs, and nasal mucociliary clearance), and morbidity
334 to infection was investigated in a retrospective study. This survey was conducted in June
335 2018. Thirty-eight healthy men and 71 women between the ages of 20 and 49 years who
336 lived with children under elementary school age were recruited. Based on the responses
337 to questionnaires on infectious diseases (Table S1), we constructed 2 groups: (1) a “high
338 morbidity” group, comprised of 55 subjects; (2) a “low morbidity” group, comprised of
339 54 subjects (Table S1). The restrictions on the subjects were as follows: (1) avoid
340 excessive drinking, eating, and strenuous exercise the day before the test; (2) smoking is
341 prohibited on the day of the test until the end of the test; (3) have breakfast and brush
342 teeth for at least 1 hour before starting the test; (4) only drink water from 1 hour before
343 starting the test; (5) avoiding washing hands during the test.

344 In addition to measuring the biological parameters, a lifestyle-related questionnaire
345 was also provided (Table S2). Statistical analysis was performed using the Statistical
346 Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) software for Windows. The data were first
347 tested for normality using the Shapiro–Wilk test. Data showing normality were assessed
348 for variability using an f-test and t-test, in accordance with variability (body temperature,

349 NK cell activity in PBMCs, and nasal mucociliary clearance). Data that did not show
350 normality were tested using the Mann-Whitney U test (saliva volume, oral mucosa
351 moisture, and antimicrobial activity of hand for *E. coli* and *S. aureus*). In addition, we
352 performed decision tree analysis to assess the biological parameters (age, sex, and body
353 temperature) and physiological functions (antimicrobial activity of hand, saliva volume,
354 oral mucosal moisture, NK cell activity in PBMCs, and nasal mucociliary clearance)
355 associated with morbidity to infection. In this analysis, we start with a core node
356 consisting of the entire sample, and then recursively partition each node into two child
357 nodes to create a tree-like structure. Odds ratios (ORs) and 95% confidence intervals
358 (CIs) were obtained using the cross-tabulation method.

359

360 **2.12.3. Identification of antimicrobial components on hands using comprehensive** 361 **analysis**

362 The participants were 27 healthy men and 27 women aged 20 to 49 years, resulting in a
363 total of 54 subjects. The test was conducted in January 2018. Subjects performed
364 standard hand washing with test soap formulated with AEC, AES, and AG without
365 antimicrobial compounds [16], rinsed with tap water for 30 seconds, and then washed
366 using purified water for 10 seconds. To avoid contact with the evaluation site, they wore

367 polyethylene gloves (0950; SHOWA GLOVE Co.) for 2 h of acclimation (20°C, 40%
368 humidity). The hand components were collected at the sites shown in Figure S1. The
369 correlation coefficient between each compound and antimicrobial activity was
370 calculated using the corr.test function in R.

371

372 **2.12.4. Verification of the effect of lactic acid application on the antimicrobial**
373 **activity of hands**

374 A test site of 2 × 2 cm on the palm of the subjects' hands was used. After hand washing,
375 as described above, 10 µL of 0.2, 1.0, 5.0, 10, and 23.5 g/L lactic acid aqueous solution
376 (FUJIFILM Wako Pure Chemical Corporation) was added dropwise to the test site,
377 spread over 30 s using a 0.2 mL round tube (AS ONE Co.), and dried for 5 min. During
378 this process, 5.6, 27.8, 138.8, 277.5, and 652.5 nmoL/cm² of lactic acid remained on the
379 hands, respectively. Next, 10 µL of the bacterial solution (*E. coli*, OD = 1) was added
380 dropwise to the test site, spread for 30 s using a 0.2 mL round tube, and dried for 3 min.
381 The test site was scraped with a swab immersed in LP-PBS containing PBS with LP
382 solution to collect the residual bacteria. Collection by swabbing was performed twice
383 and suspended in 1 mL of LP-PBS solution. Then, 100 µL of this sample was mixed
384 with 100 µL of 2× SCD medium (Nihon Pharmaceutical Co.) and cultivated in a

385 96-well microplate in a 37°C incubator for 24 hours, followed by quantification on a
386 microplate reader (Bio Microplate Reader HiTS; Sinic Corporation). To determine if the
387 effect of lactic acid is mediated by pH, we used aqueous hydrochloric acid (HCl)
388 solution (Kanto Chemical Co., Inc.), in which the pH was adjusted to the same value of
389 lactic acid as the control.

390

391 **3. Results**

392 **3.1. Preliminary study to characterize the antimicrobial activity of hands using *in*** 393 ***vivo* and *in vitro* methods**

394 As a first pilot study, we examined various methods for measuring the antimicrobial
395 activity found on hands. After immersing the hands of our subjects in an *E. coli*
396 suspension, the palms were allowed to air-dry for 30 s or 3 min before being pressed
397 against agar medium, which was cultured overnight (Figure 1A). Blue colonies
398 indicated where *E. coli* was degrading X-gal in the medium. No blue colonies were
399 observed in the imprints of hands not immersed in *E. coli* solution, suggesting that the
400 microorganisms that formed the blue colonies were not found in the normal skin
401 microbiota (data not shown). As shown in Figure 1A, regarding subject (a), the number
402 of bacteria decreased remarkably in 3 min compared to the control (30 s), indicating the

403 ability of the human hand to inactivate *E. coli* over time. On the other hand, regarding
404 subject (b), no significant difference was observed between 30 s (control) and 3 min,
405 indicating that there are individual differences in the antimicrobial ability of hands. In
406 addition, the phenomenon of *E. coli* inactivation observed in subject (a) was not
407 observed immediately after washing hands, suggesting that the components existing on
408 the surface of the hands are a contributing factor (Figure S2).

409 To further evaluate the antimicrobial activity of compounds on the surface of the
410 hands, we developed a quantitative method by collecting these components and testing
411 their effects on bacterial or viral proliferation *in vitro*. The samples were collected using
412 a swab and extracted with 50% ethanol and dried before being concentrated to 0.8
413 $\mu\text{L}/\text{cm}^2$ with DMSO. Figure 1B shows the correlation of the log reduction rate against *E.*
414 *coli in vivo* method and the *in vitro* method for 7 participants, indicating a positive
415 correlation ($r = 0.66$ and $P = 0.1$; Pearson correlation test). This result suggests that the
416 components found on the surface of hands are important factors in defining the hand
417 surface infection barrier. Furthermore, these findings indicate that this *in vitro* method is
418 appropriate to evaluate the function of this infection barrier. Figure 1C shows the
419 antimicrobial activity of the hand surface components of 6 participants against *E. coli*
420 and *S. aureus*, as well as the antiviral activity against influenza A virus. For this,

421 undiluted, 8-fold diluted, and 100-fold diluted solutions of extracted samples against *E.*
422 *coli*, *S. aureus*, and influenza A virus were used. As a result, positive correlations ($r =$
423 0.970 and $P = 0.001$ (*E. coli* vs. *S. aureus*), $r = 0.667$ and $P = 0.147$ (*E. coli* vs.
424 influenza A virus), and $r = 0.662$ and $P = 0.152$ (*S. aureus* vs. influenza A virus)) were
425 observed, using the Pearson correlation test. These results suggest that the components
426 found on the surface of hands could act on a wide range of microbial species. However,
427 taking into account the differences in the dilution rate, the susceptibility of the hand
428 surface components was around one order lower against *E. coli* than against *S. aureus*
429 and influenza virus.

430

431 **3.2. Relationship between antimicrobial activity on the surface of hands and** 432 **morbidity to infection**

433 Next, in order to assess the influence of the antimicrobial activity of hands on morbidity
434 to infection, subjects with similar lifestyles (Table S2), corresponding to the low and
435 high morbidity group (Table S1), were recruited and various physiological functions
436 known to act against infectious diseases (mentioned in the Materials and Methods
437 section) were measured, including the antimicrobial activity of the surface of hands.
438 Figure 2 shows the antimicrobial activity of the hand surface components of each group

439 against *E. coli* (Fig. 2A) and *S. aureus* (Fig. 2B). The antimicrobial activity against *E.*
440 *coli* was significantly lower in the high morbidity group than in the low morbidity group
441 (median of low morbidity group: 0.466; median of high morbidity group: 0.159; $P =$
442 0.001). Similar results were observed in the antimicrobial activity against *S. aureus*
443 (median of low morbidity group: 1.137; median of high morbidity group: 0.191; $P <$
444 0.001). In addition, our study showed that not only the antimicrobial activity on hands,
445 but also oral mucosal moisture, was associated with infection prevalence ($P = 0.006$)
446 (Table 1). On the other hand, there was no difference between the groups in terms of
447 their NK cell activity and saliva volume (Table 1). These results are not related to
448 hygiene behaviors, such as hand hygiene, mask, and vaccination frequency, since the
449 frequency of these behaviors was higher in the high morbidity group than in the low
450 morbidity group (Table S2).

451 To evaluate the importance of parameters associated with infectious disease
452 morbidity, we performed a hierarchical decision tree analysis, containing all the
453 measured biological parameters (Figure 3). The tree comprised a total of eight nodes
454 and five terminal nodes (nodes that have no child nodes). The antimicrobial activity of
455 the hand (*E. coli*) was identified as the main contributing factor for morbidity to
456 infection. The odds ratio based on the reference value (log reduction value for *E. coli*:

457 0.154) calculated by the decision tree analysis was 7.2 times (95% CI, 2.64-19.50). For
458 subjects with a log reduction value for *E. coli* of 0.154 or higher, the OR based on the
459 reference value of mucosal moisture was 5.7 times (95% CI, 2.08-15.60). With regards
460 to age, cross-tabulation based on 41 and 38 years of age showed that the results were
461 significant with respect to 41 years of age. However, the 95% CI ranged from 0.01-1.08,
462 indicating that the reliability of the results was low. These results are shown in detail in
463 Table S3.

464

465 **3.3. Identification of antimicrobial components on hands using comprehensive** 466 **analysis**

467 Additionally, we conducted another clinical study to identify the factors involved in the
468 antimicrobial activity of hands. In this survey, we analyzed the components of the
469 surface of the hands and calculated their correlation with antimicrobial activity against
470 *E. coli*, *S. aureus*, and influenza A virus. The components analyzed were organic acids,
471 amino acids, lipids, and some antimicrobial proteins (Table 2). First, in terms of the
472 amounts found on the hand surface, lactic acid was prominently present among all
473 compounds (Table 2). Next, we analyzed the correlation between antimicrobial activity
474 and surface components using Holm-corrected Pearson correlation coefficients, as

475 shown in Table 2. Bold numbers denote statistically significant data ($P < 0.05$), while
476 compounds in bold indicate compounds that were significantly correlated with all
477 antimicrobial activities. Regarding organic acids, lactic acid was found to have a
478 significant correlation with all microbial species (Table 2, Figure S3). In addition to
479 lactic acid, malic acid, 2-hydroxybutyric acid, citric acid, ascorbic acid, azelaic acid,
480 2-oxoglutarate, suberic acid, and fumaric acid showed a high positive correlation with
481 antimicrobial activities. In the amino acid group, alanine, creatinine, taurine, choline,
482 creatine, and p-aminobenzoic acid were confirmed as components with high levels of
483 correlation. Subsequently, free fatty acids (FFA), wax ester (WE), cholesteryl ester
484 (ChE), squalene (SQ), squalene epoxide (squalene epoxide), squalene
485 monohydroperoxidperipheral (SQOOH), DAG, and TAG were analyzed. As a result of
486 the measurement, small amounts of lipids were found on the hands. Among them, fatty
487 acids were relatively abundant, among which C16: 0, C14: 0, and C12: 0 were
488 abundantly detected (Table 2). However, none had a significant positive correlation with
489 the antimicrobial activity of hand surface components, and only a negative correlation
490 with DAG. Lastly, antimicrobial proteins were analyzed using shotgun proteomics
491 analysis, including dermcidin, prolactin-inducible protein (PIP), and lysozyme C,
492 among which prolactin-inducible protein was significantly correlated with antimicrobial

493 activity.

494

495 **3.4. Verification of the effect of lactic acid application on the antimicrobial activity**
496 **of hands**

497 Lactic acid is abundant on the hands and is highly correlated with the antimicrobial
498 activity of the surface layer component. In fact, lactic acid has also been shown to have
499 antimicrobial activity in test tube experiments [17]. However, these results are based on
500 the evaluation of liquid contact, and it is unclear whether the amount of lactic acid in
501 this study can enhance the levels of antimicrobial activity on hands. Therefore, based on
502 the amount of lactic acid found for the 54 participants in this study (Figure 4A), a lactic
503 acid solution was added to the hands of four subjects to verify whether it improved the
504 antimicrobial activity. To reduce the contribution of natural lactic acid to the skin, the
505 subjects washed their hands just before the experiment. Immediately after the hand
506 washing, we confirmed that the amount of lactic acid on the hands was $<30 \text{ nmoL/cm}^2$
507 in each subject (Figure 4B). Although individual differences were observed in all four
508 subjects, an improvement in antimicrobial activity was confirmed within the range of
509 the amount of lactic acid on the hands, suggesting that lactic acid is important for hand
510 antimicrobial activity. Furthermore, hydrochloric acid (HCl) solution with an equivalent

511 pH (pH = 2.24) to that of the maximum amount of lactic acid in Figure 4B (652
512 mol/cm²) was applied to the hands of subjects S2 and S4. As a result, HCl was also
513 found to improve the antimicrobial activity ($P < 0.05$), although not as much as lactic
514 acid ($P < 0.05$) (Figure S4).

515

516 **4. Discussion**

517 In this study, we developed a novel methodology to quantify and characterize the
518 function of the surface infection barrier on the hands that inactivates bacteria and
519 viruses. For the first time, we demonstrated that the infection barrier found on the
520 surface of hands plays a crucial role in quantifying the risk of the transmission of
521 infectious diseases. In addition, we identified a list of components found on the hand
522 surface that was correlated with antimicrobial activity, and demonstrated that lactic acid
523 is a key component of this infection barrier.

524 We confirmed the reliability of these methods by identifying a positive correlation
525 between the *in vitro* and *in vivo* methods in which bacteria are applied to hands. The
526 data suggest that surface components are associated with the antimicrobial activity of
527 hands. However, the correlation coefficient value was not high ($r = 0.66$, $P = 0.1$),
528 suggesting that the antimicrobial activity of hands is not only due to the surface

529 components but also to other factors, especially skin properties. such as pH and
530 temperature [18].

531 Interestingly, in this study, despite exhibiting higher antimicrobial activity on the
532 hands, the low morbidity group conducted hand washing and sanitizing less frequently
533 than the high morbidity group. This may simply be due to a greater hygiene awareness
534 in the high morbidity group, since these individuals are more susceptible to infection.
535 Although there is no doubt that hand washing and sanitizing are effective for the
536 instantaneous removal of pathogens [19], these actions cannot control the high
537 frequency at which individuals unconsciously touch their face or potentially
538 contaminated objects in their immediate environment. It is worth noting that the
539 subjects in this study, who were part of the general public, appeared to have a lower
540 hygiene awareness than medical professionals. This suggests that the inherent
541 antimicrobial activity of hands plays a role in preventing infections *via* unconscious
542 transmission.

543 In addition, our study showed that not only the antimicrobial activity on hands, but
544 also oral mucosal moisture (and saliva volume) was associated with infection
545 prevalence. Oral mucosal moisture is used as an objective indicator of the amount of
546 saliva secretion [20], and a similar tendency was observed in the actual saliva volume.

547 Saliva exerts a protective function against infection and is known to be important in
548 preventing attack by pathogens [21, 22]. The results of this study strongly suggest that
549 not only the hands, but also the oral cavity, exert a first-line of defense against bacterial
550 and viral infections, and thus are important for preventing infection. On the other hand,
551 there was no significant difference in NK cell activity and nasal mucosa clearance
552 between the low morbidity and high morbidity groups. Many studies have shown that
553 these biological functions are important in the prevention of infectious diseases [23, 24].
554 This study was conducted for subjects living with children under elementary school age,
555 which is an environmental factor that greatly affects the prevalence of infectious
556 diseases [25]. Limiting the attributes of the participants, the two groups in this study had
557 similar lifestyles, such as commuting style, working style, sleep time, and stress level,
558 among others. Thus, the population studied is unlikely to make a difference in the levels
559 of NK cell activity and nasal mucosa clearance. The main limitation of this retrospective
560 study is the small size of the study. Large-scale and prospective trials will be needed to
561 better clarify the association between the antimicrobial activity of hands and morbidity.

562 Next, a comprehensive analysis was performed to identify the factors that control
563 hand surface barrier activity. In previous study, sebum-containing components,
564 especially fatty acids, on the skin were found to exhibit antimicrobial properties [29].

565 However, none had a significant positive correlation with the antimicrobial activity of
566 the hands, and only a negative correlation with DAG. Compared with previous reports,
567 the amount of lipid detected was very small, and since there are no sebaceous glands in
568 the palm, it is highly likely that the lipids analyzed were mainly derived from sources
569 other than the hands. On the other hand, prolactin-inducible protein was significantly
570 correlated with antimicrobial activities among the water-soluble antimicrobial proteins,
571 and was suggested to also be involved in the surface infection barrier of the hands.
572 Furthermore, several amino acids were also found to be positively correlated, however,
573 there are no prior report related to their antimicrobial properties, and the details
574 underlying this action remain unknown.

575 Lactic acid is prominently present on hands. Although the hands do not have any
576 sebaceous glands, there are many sweat glands ($518/\text{cm}^2$) compared to other sites [26].
577 In addition to lactic acid, several organic acids were also highly correlated with
578 antimicrobial activity, which are known to exert antimicrobial activity [27]. In general,
579 organic acids are non-dissociative and pass through the cell membrane of the bacterium,
580 before becoming dissociated and releasing protons to damage the bacterium from within
581 [28]. The antimicrobial properties of organic acids depend on their pH [17].
582 Interestingly, almost all organic acids that exhibit a significant correlation with

583 antimicrobial activity are key metabolites of metabolic pathways (e.g. malic acid,
584 fumaric acid, and citric acid). This suggests that, in addition to lowering the pH of the
585 hands, their presence on the surface of hands may give rise to a metabolic environment
586 that is not favorable for microbial proliferation. This is supported by the fact that lactic
587 acid exhibits a higher antimicrobial activity than a HCl solution with a similar pH.

588 However, the application of lactic acid solutions raises several issues: (1) skin
589 damage, since it is an alpha hydroxylic acid and a highly acidic solution [31]; (2)
590 variations in the pH of the skin between individuals, ranging from 4.0 to 7.0, which
591 would affect the efficacy of lactic acid against antimicrobial activity [30]; (3) unknown
592 long-lasting antimicrobial effects. Therefore, a more complex formulation will need to
593 be identified to solve these issues and enhance the antimicrobial properties of lactic acid
594 for the development of a novel hand hygiene technology to reduce contact infection risk
595 in daily life.

596

597 **Authors' contributions**

598 All authors have read and approved the manuscript. YN, TM, and KM wrote the
599 manuscript. YK and AH conducted a clinical survey to analyze the relationship between
600 high morbidity and low morbidity to infection. KN performed the investigations related

601 to analyzing hand surface components. YN, YO, and IM designed and executed other
602 experiments and analyzed the data. TM and KM supervised the study and reviewed the
603 results.

604 **Conflicts of interest**

605 All authors are employees of the study sponsor, Kao Corporation, Tokyo, Japan.

606 **Ethical approval**

607 The study protocol, including sample collection, was reviewed, and approved by the
608 Ethical Committee of the Kao Corporation. (1) and (4) were approved as S311-200807,
609 (2) was approved as T116-18032, and (3) was approved as S108-171024. Informed
610 written consent was obtained from all research participants after the procedures had
611 been explained with documentation. All experiments were conducted according to the
612 principles of the Declaration of Helsinki.

613 **Funding**

614 This study was funded by Kao Corporation, Tokyo, Japan. The Kao Corporation played
615 a role in the design of the study, the collection, analysis, and interpretation of data, and
616 the writing of the manuscript.

617 **Acknowledgements**

618 The authors would like to thank Yuuki Yanagisawa (Kao Corp.) for their useful
619 comments and discussions throughout the research. We also thank Akira Fuji (Kao
620 Corp.) for their valuable discussions. This study was performed in collaboration with
621 Chihiro Tamoto (Kao Corp.), Kaori Hayashi (Kao Corp.), Yuki Sakamoto (Kao Corp.),
622 Toshiya Morikawa (Kao Corp.), and Yukihiisa Hashimoto (Kao Corp.). Editorial
623 support, in the form of medical writing, assembling tables, and creating high-resolution
624 images based on authors' detailed directions, collating author comments, copyediting,
625 fact-checking, and referencing, was provided by Editage.

626 **References**

- 627 1. Luby, S.P., et al., *Effect of handwashing on child health: a randomised*
628 *controlled trial*. Lancet, 2005. **366**(9481): p. 225-33.
- 629 2. Kwok, Y.L., J. Gralton, and M.L. McLaws, *Face touching: a frequent habit that*
630 *has implications for hand hygiene*. Am J Infect Control, 2015. **43**(2): p. 112-4.
- 631 3. Shiraly, R., Z. Shayan, and M.L. McLaws, *Face touching in the time of*
632 *COVID-19 in Shiraz, Iran*. Am J Infect Control, 2020.
- 633 4. Bean, B., et al., *Survival of influenza viruses on environmental surfaces*. J Infect
634 Dis, 1982. **146**(1): p. 47-51.
- 635 5. van Doremalen, N., et al., *Aerosol and Surface Stability of SARS-CoV-2 as*
636 *Compared with SARS-CoV-1*. N Engl J Med, 2020. **382**(16): p. 1564-1567.
- 637 6. White, C.G., et al., *Reduction of illness absenteeism in elementary schools using*
638 *an alcohol-free instant hand sanitizer*. J Sch Nurs, 2001. **17**(5): p. 258-65.
- 639 7. Aiello, A.E. and E. Larson, *Antibacterial cleaning and hygiene products as an*
640 *emerging risk factor for antibiotic resistance in the community*. Lancet Infect Dis,
641 2003. **3**(8): p. 501-6.
- 642 8. Lingaas, E. and M. Fagernes, *Development of a method to measure bacterial*
643 *transfer from hands*. J Hosp Infect, 2009. **72**(1): p. 43-9.


- 644 9. Schaubert, J. and R.L. Gallo, *Antimicrobial peptides and the skin immune defense*
645 *system*. J Allergy Clin Immunol, 2009. **124**(3 Suppl 2): p. R13-8.
- 646 10. Turner, R.B., et al., *Efficacy of organic acids in hand cleansers for prevention of*
647 *rhinovirus infections*. Antimicrob Agents Chemother, 2004. **48**(7): p. 2595-8.
- 648 11. Iketani, R., et al., *The Effect of Tea Catechins on Natural Killer Cell Activity in*
649 *the Elderly: A Pilot Study*. Clinical Pharmacology, 2019. **50**(4): p. 139-145.
- 650 12. Ito, J.T., et al., *Nasal Mucociliary Clearance in Subjects With COPD After*
651 *Smoking Cessation*. Respir Care, 2015. **60**(3): p. 399-405.
- 652 13. Ishii, S., et al., *Identification of the Catechin Uptake Transporter Responsible*
653 *for Intestinal Absorption of Epigallocatechin Gallate in Mice*. Sci Rep, 2019.
654 **9**(1): p. 11014.
- 655 14. Ishihama, Y., et al., *Exponentially modified protein abundance index (emPAI) for*
656 *estimation of absolute protein amount in proteomics by the number of sequenced*
657 *peptides per protein*. Mol Cell Proteomics, 2005. **4**(9): p. 1265-72.
- 658 15. Han, X., K. Yang, and R.W. Gross, *Multi-dimensional mass spectrometry-based*
659 *shotgun lipidomics and novel strategies for lipidomic analyses*. Mass Spectrom
660 Rev, 2012. **31**(1): p. 134-78.
- 661 16. Fukui, S., et al., *A mild hand cleanser, alkyl ether sulphate supplemented with*

- 662 *alkyl ether carboxylic acid and alkyl glucoside, improves eczema on the hand*
663 *and prevents the growth of Staphylococcus aureus on the skin surface.* Int J
664 Cosmet Sci, 2016. **38**(6): p. 599-606.
- 665 17. Kim, S.A. and M.S. Rhee, *Marked synergistic bactericidal effects and mode of*
666 *action of medium-chain fatty acids in combination with organic acids against*
667 *Escherichia coli O157:H7.* Appl Environ Microbiol, 2013. **79**(21): p. 6552-60.
- 668 18. Maliyar, K., R. Persaud-Jaimangal, and R.G. Sibbald, *Associations Among Skin*
669 *Surface pH, Temperature, and Bacterial Burden in Wounds.* Adv Skin Wound
670 Care, 2020. **33**(4): p. 180-185.
- 671 19. Aiello, A.E., et al., *Effect of hand hygiene on infectious disease risk in the*
672 *community setting: a meta-analysis.* Am J Public Health, 2008. **98**(8): p.
673 1372-81.
- 674 20. Takahashi, F., T. Koji, and O. Morita, *The Usefulness of an Oral Moisture*
675 *Checking Device (Moisture Checker for Mucus^R).* Nihon Hotetsu Shika Gakkai
676 Zasshi, 2005. **49**(2): p. 283-289.
- 677 21. Heo, S.M., et al., *Host defense proteins derived from human saliva bind to*
678 *Staphylococcus aureus.* Infect Immun, 2013. **81**(4): p. 1364-73.
- 679 22. Limsuwat, N., et al., *Sialic acid content in human saliva and anti-influenza*

- 680 *activity against human and avian influenza viruses*. Arch Virol, 2016. **161**(3): p.
- 681 649-56.
- 682 23. Wilson, R., et al., *Upper respiratory tract viral infection and mucociliary*
- 683 *clearance*. Eur J Respir Dis, 1987. **70**(5): p. 272-9.
- 684 24. Hazeldine, J. and J.M. Lord, *The impact of ageing on natural killer cell function*
- 685 *and potential consequences for health in older adults*. Ageing Res Rev, 2013.
- 686 **12**(4): p. 1069-78.
- 687 25. Sakurai, R., et al., *Long-term effects of an intergenerational program on*
- 688 *functional capacity in older adults: Results from a seven-year follow-up of the*
- 689 *REPRINTS study*. Arch Gerontol Geriatr, 2016. **64**: p. 13-20.
- 690 26. Taylor, N.A. and C.A. Machado-Moreira, *Regional variations in transepidermal*
- 691 *water loss, eccrine sweat gland density, sweat secretion rates and electrolyte*
- 692 *composition in resting and exercising humans*. Extrem Physiol Med, 2013. **2**(1):
- 693 p. 4.
- 694 27. Brul, S. and P. Coote, *Preservative agents in foods. Mode of action and*
- 695 *microbial resistance mechanisms*. Int J Food Microbiol, 1999. **50**(1-2): p. 1-17.
- 696 28. Mani-López, E., H.S. García, and A. López-Malo, *Organic acids as*
- 697 *antimicrobials to control Salmonella in meat and poultry products*. Food

- 698 Research International, 2012. **45**(2): p. 713-721.
- 699 29. Takigawa, H., et al., *Deficient production of hexadecenoic acid in the skin is*
700 *associated in part with the vulnerability of atopic dermatitis patients to*
701 *colonization by Staphylococcus aureus*. *Dermatology*, 2005. **211**(3): p. 240-8.
- 702 30. Lambers, H., et al., *Natural skin surface pH is on average below 5, which is*
703 *beneficial for its resident flora*. *Int J Cosmet Sci*, 2006. **28**(5): p. 359-70.
- 704 31. Tang, S.C. and J.H. Yang, *Dual Effects of Alpha-Hydroxy Acids on the Skin*.
705 *Molecules*, 2018. **23**(4).
- 706
- 707

708 **Figures**




709

710 **Figure 1. Individual differences in hand antimicrobial activity and the importance**

711 **of surface components.**

712


713



714

715 **Figure 2. Relationship between antimicrobial activity and morbidity to infection.**

716




717

718 **Figure 3. Decision tree analysis to assess the biological parameters and**

719 **physiological functions.**

720

721



722

723 **Figure 4. Verification of the effect of lactic acid application on the antimicrobial**

724 **activity of hands.**

725 **Tables**

726

727 **Table 1. Physiological functions in a retrospective study investigating the relationship between the antimicrobial activity of**

728 **hands and morbidity to infection.** The data were first tested for normality using the Shapiro-Wilk test. Data showing normality were

729 assessed for variability by f-test and t-test, in accordance with variability. Data that did not show normality were tested with the

730 Mann-Whitney U test.

	Low morbidity group			High morbidity group			<i>p</i> -value ²
	n ¹	Mean	SD	n ¹	Mean	SD	
body temperature (°C)	54	37.0	0.3	55	37.0	0.3	0.666
saliva volume (g)	54	2.4	1.5	55	2	1.4	0.153
oral mucosal moisture (%)	54	30	3.3	55	27.8	4.4	0.006

NK cells activity in PBMCs (%)	54	49.2	18.4	55	50.7	18	0.756
nasal mucociliary clearance (sec.)	48	700	339	42	638	307	0.371
Antimicrobial activity of hand (log reduction)							
for <i>E. coli</i>	54	0.7	0.8	55	0.5	0.7	0.001
for <i>S.aureus</i>	54	1.5	1.3	55	0.9	1.5	< 0.001

731 ¹Parameters for which the number of samples is lower than all subjects indicate the parameters for which the corresponding number of
 732 samples was not determined.

733 ²P-values were calculated using Mann-Whitney U test.

Table 2. Relationship between hand surface components and antimicrobial activity.

	Components ³	Value ¹			Correlation coefficient ²			p-value ²		
		Maximum	Minimum	Mean	<i>E.coli</i>	<i>S.aureus</i>	<i>Influenza A Virus</i>	<i>E.coli</i>	<i>S.aureus</i>	<i>Influenza A Virus</i>
organic acid (nmol/cm ²)	Lactic_acid	906	6	212	0.5561	0.6836	0.6689	0.000	0.000	0.000
	Urocanic_acid	14.90	0.17	3.25	0.3080	0.2514	0.1816	0.023	0.067	0.189
	Malic_acid	1.308	0.150	0.585	0.5834	0.6339	0.6272	0.000	0.000	0.000
	Asparagine	1.710	0.062	0.570	0.0487	0.0611	0.1931	0.726	0.661	0.162
	2-hydroxybutyricacid	0.223	0.029	0.116	0.5170	0.6253	0.6325	0.000	0.000	0.000
	Glycolic_acid	0.2140	0.0144	0.0652	0.0841	-0.0392	-0.0738	0.545	0.778	0.596
	Citric_acid	0.2138	0.0027	0.0487	0.5335	0.5568	0.5353	0.000	0.000	0.000
	Ascorbic_acid	0.1167	0.0000	0.0270	0.5750	0.6948	0.6946	0.000	0.000	0.000
	Azelaic_acid	0.1136	0.0023	0.0203	0.4100	0.3013	0.3391	0.002	0.027	0.012
	2-oxoglutarate	0.0698	0.0000	0.0202	0.5981	0.7455	0.7537	0.000	0.000	0.000
	Suberic_acid	0.0426	0.0016	0.0127	0.3889	0.2933	0.3232	0.004	0.031	0.017
	Succinic_acid	0.1403	0.0006	0.0113	-0.0095	0.1295	0.0238	0.946	0.351	0.864
	Fumaric_acid	0.0375	0.0000	0.0105	0.5234	0.7057	0.6669	0.000	0.000	0.000
	Sebacic_acid	0.01209	0.00008	0.00161	0.1328	0.2002	0.1262	0.339	0.147	0.363
amino acid (nmol/cm ²)	Pyridoxine	0.024862	0.000000	0.000845	-0.0890	-0.0661	-0.0938	0.522	0.635	0.500
	Nicotinic_acid	0.002420	0.000000	0.000257	0.0638	0.0492	0.0635	0.647	0.724	0.648
	Panthothenic_acid	0.0019567	0.0000000	0.0000642	-0.0262	-0.0580	-0.0776	0.851	0.677	0.577
	Serine	53	1	18	0.2210	0.2003	0.1883	0.108	0.146	0.173
	Glycine	33	1	12	0.2161	0.1950	0.2063	0.117	0.158	0.134

	Ornithine	14.4	0.1	3.4	-0.1398	-0.2774	-0.2370	0.314	0.042	0.084
	Alanine	11.2	0.3	4.2	0.3305	0.3134	0.2961	0.015	0.021	0.030
	Threonine	8.3	0.3	3.1	0.1930	0.1564	0.1532	0.162	0.259	0.269
	Valine	7.7	0.1	1.8	0.1422	0.0986	0.1655	0.305	0.478	0.232
	Aspartic_acid	7.5	0.2	2.3	0.1044	0.0872	0.1288	0.452	0.531	0.353
	Pyroglutamic_acid	5.7	0.5	2.6	0.2458	0.2263	0.2500	0.073	0.100	0.068
	Histidine	5.4	0.1	1.4	-0.0442	-0.1346	-0.1292	0.751	0.332	0.352
	Proline	4.3	0.2	1.7	0.0711	-0.0097	0.0188	0.609	0.945	0.893
	Leucine	3.8	0.1	1.5	0.2086	0.1871	0.2667	0.130	0.175	0.051
	Arginine	2.88	0.03	0.22	0.1072	0.0915	0.0976	0.441	0.511	0.482
	Isoleucine	2.7	0.1	1.4	0.2340	0.2241	0.2921	0.089	0.103	0.032
	Lysine	2.47	0.07	0.80	-0.0441	-0.1526	-0.1133	0.751	0.271	0.415
	Tyrosine	2.38	0.02	0.86	0.1571	0.1038	0.1342	0.257	0.455	0.333
	Phenylalanine	2.07	0.03	0.79	0.1926	0.1703	0.2416	0.163	0.218	0.078
	Glutamic_acid	1.43	0.07	0.50	0.1637	0.1392	0.1938	0.237	0.316	0.160
	Citrulline	1.26	0.00	0.13	0.0808	0.0029	-0.0742	0.561	0.984	0.594
	Creatinine	0.68	0.03	0.21	0.4436	0.5107	0.4907	0.001	0.000	0.000
	Tryptophan	0.62	0.01	0.19	0.2870	0.2385	0.2443	0.035	0.082	0.075
	Taurine	0.54	0.02	0.17	0.4780	0.5491	0.4796	0.000	0.000	0.000
	Methionine	0.47	0.01	0.15	0.2076	0.1733	0.3055	0.132	0.210	0.025
	Choline	0.274	0.014	0.092	0.3986	0.4507	0.4518	0.003	0.001	0.001
	Uric_acid	0.094	0.000	0.022	-0.1869	-0.3912	-0.4526	0.176	0.003	0.001

	Xanthine	0.083	0.001	0.031	0.1577	0.2513	0.2818	0.255	0.067	0.039
	Creatine	0.060	0.002	0.026	0.4442	0.4391	0.4126	0.001	0.001	0.002
	Cystine	0.0190	0.0002	0.0058	0.2032	0.1808	0.2010	0.141	0.191	0.145
	Carnitine	0.0145	0.0009	0.0058	0.4661	0.4594	0.4257	0.000	0.000	0.001
	Tyramine	0.01071	0.00000	0.00062	0.1585	0.0731	0.2147	0.252	0.599	0.119
	Inosine	0.000397	0.000000	0.000028	-0.0376	-0.1101	-0.1011	0.787	0.428	0.467
	p-Aminobenzoic_acid	0.000397	0.000000	0.000074	0.4637	0.3999	0.3039	0.000	0.003	0.025
lipid ($\mu\text{g}/\text{cm}^2$)	FFA[C14:0]	1.01	0.00	0.06	-0.1633	-0.1392	-0.0382	0.238	0.316	0.784
	TAG	0.34	0.00	0.05	-0.1961	-0.1308	-0.2086	0.155	0.346	0.130
	FFA[C12:0]	0.23	0.01	0.04	-0.2586	-0.2410	-0.1374	0.059	0.079	0.322
	FFA[C16:0]	0.20	0.02	0.07	-0.1985	-0.1849	-0.1729	0.150	0.181	0.211
	SQ	0.18	0.01	0.04	-0.0874	-0.0706	-0.0919	0.530	0.612	0.509
	FFA[C18:0]	0.15	0.01	0.03	-0.2934	-0.3120	-0.2542	0.031	0.022	0.064
	FFA[C18:1]	0.10	0.00	0.02	0.0688	-0.0405	0.0740	0.621	0.771	0.595
	WE	0.10	0.00	0.01	-0.2548	-0.2342	-0.2209	0.063	0.088	0.109
	FFA[C16:1]	0.06	0.00	0.01	0.0188	-0.1093	-0.0826	0.893	0.432	0.553
	SQepo	0.05	0.00	0.01	-0.0573	0.0238	-0.0126	0.681	0.864	0.928
	FFA[C15:0]	0.03	0.00	0.01	-0.0093	-0.1336	-0.1445	0.947	0.335	0.297
	DAG	0.030	0.000	0.004	-0.2956	-0.3269	-0.3575	0.030	0.016	0.008
	ChE	0.020	0.000	0.005	0.0221	0.0224	0.0261	0.874	0.872	0.851
	SQOOH	0.010	0.000	0.001	-0.0947	-0.0545	-0.2466	0.496	0.695	0.072
protein (emPAI)	Dermeidin	113	1	28	0.2139	0.3793	0.3379	0.120	0.005	0.012

	Prolactin-inducible protein	4.2	0.0	1.4	0.3179	0.3862	0.3093	0.019	0.004	0.023
	Lysozyme C	1.5	0.0	0.3	-0.0090	-0.0957	-0.1007	0.948	0.491	0.469

735 ¹The numbers correspond to the amounts that exist on the hand surface and are arranged in order of average value.

736 ²Correlation and P-value between each compound and antimicrobial activity was calculated using Holm-corrected Pearson correlation

737 coefficients. Bold numbers show statistically significant differences (P-value less than 0.05).

738 ³Bold indicates the compounds that were significantly correlated with all antibacterial and antiviral activities.

739 **Figures Legends**

740

741 **Figure 1. Individual differences in hand antimicrobial activity and the**
742 **importance of surface components. A: Qualitative comparison results using agar**
743 **medium for (a) hands with high antimicrobial activity and (b) hands with low**
744 **antimicrobial activity.** Results for 30 s (control) and 3 min after applying *E. coli* (OD =
745 0.2) to the hand. **B: Correlation between the antimicrobial activity of the hands (*in***
746 ***vivo*) and the antimicrobial activity of the surface components of the hands (*in***
747 ***vitro*).** The antimicrobial activity of the hands was measured by applying an *E. coli*
748 solution (OD = 0.2) and swabbing after 3 min. The surface components of the hands
749 were collected with a cotton swab, extracted with ethanol, mixed with an equal amount
750 of *E. coli*, and concentrated to 0.8 $\mu\text{L}/\text{cm}^2$. The antimicrobial activity was measured by
751 mixing the sample and an equal amount of *E. coli* (OD = 0.02) and reacting for 30 min.
752 The log reduction value denotes the relative logarithmic reduction of viable bacteria.
753 The value of Pearson's correlation coefficient is indicated in the graph. **C: Correlation**
754 **of the antimicrobial activity of the surface components of the hands against *E. coli*,**
755 ***S. aureus*, and influenza A virus.** Symbols with the same color indicate individual
756 participants between the three graphs. *E. coli*, *S. aureus*, and influenza A virus were

757 evaluated using undiluted samples, 8-fold diluted samples, and 100-fold diluted samples,
758 respectively, due to the toxicity of DMSO. The log reduction value denotes the relative
759 logarithmic reduction of the bacterial or viral number. The value of Pearson's
760 correlation coefficient is indicated in each graph.

761

762 **Figure 2. Relationship between antimicrobial activity and morbidity to infection.**

763 Result of antimicrobial activity against *E. coli* and *S. aureus*. Left (red) and right (blue)
764 denotes the high morbidity group (N=55) and the low morbidity group (N=54),
765 respectively. Antimicrobial activity was measured using an *in vitro* method, where the
766 log reduction value denotes the relative logarithmic reduction of viable bacteria.
767 Comparison between the groups was performed using the Mann-Whitney U test.

768

769 **Figure 3. Decision tree analysis to assess the biological parameters and**

770 **physiological functions.** The biological parameters (age, sex, and body temperature)
771 and physiological functions (antimicrobial activity of hand, saliva volume, oral mucosal
772 moisture, NK cells activity in PBMCs, and nasal mucociliary clearance) were used.
773 Odds ratio (ORs) and a 95% confidence interval were obtained from the
774 cross-tabulation method.

775

776 **Figure 4. Verification of the effect of lactic acid application on the antimicrobial**

777 **activity of hands.** A: Amount of lactic acid on the surface of the hands of the

778 participants (N = 54). B: Bactericidal effect of applying lactic acid onto the hands of the

779 participants. The test site was 2 × 2 cm on the palm. After hand washing, lactic acid

780 aqueous solution was added the test site, followed by drying for 5 min. Then, 10 µl of

781 the bacterial solution (*E. coli*, OD = 1) was added to the test site, spread for 30 s,

782 followed by drying for 3 min. The log reduction value denotes the relative logarithmic

783 reduction of viable bacteria.