

Germicidal Ultraviolet Light Does Not Damage or Impede Performance of N95 Masks Upon Multiple Uses

Zhe Zhao, Zhaobo Zhang, Mariana Lanzarini-Lopes, Shahnaz Sinha, Hojung Rho, Pierre Herckes, and Paul Westerhoff*



Cite This: <https://dx.doi.org/10.1021/acs.estlett.0c00416>



Read Online


ACCESS |

Metrics & More

Article Recommendations

Supporting Information

ABSTRACT: The COVID-19 pandemic is increasing the need for personal protective equipment (PPE) worldwide, including the demand for facial masks used by healthcare workers. Disinfecting and reusing these masks may offer benefits in the short term to meet urgent demand. Germicidal ultraviolet light provides a nonchemical, easily deployable technology capable of achieving inactivation of H1N1 virus on masks. Working with N95-rated masks and nonrated surgical masks, we demonstrated that neither 254 nor 265 nm UV-C irradiation at 1 and 10 J/cm² had adverse effects on the masks' ability to remove aerosolized virus-sized particles. Additional testing showed no change in polymer structure, morphology, or surface hydrophobicity for multiple layers in the masks and no change in pressure drop or tensile strength of the mask materials. Results were similar when applying 254 nm low-pressure UV lamps and 265 nm light-emitting diodes. On the basis of the input from healthcare workers and our findings, a treatment system and operational manual were prepared to enable treatment and reuse of N95 facial masks. Knowledge gained during this study can inform techno-economic analyses for treating and reusing masks or lifecycle assessments of options to reduce the enormous waste production of single-use PPE used in the healthcare system, especially during pandemics.



INTRODUCTION

Personal protective equipment (PPE) rose to the forefront of global concern during the recent COVID-19 pandemic. However, while single-use of PPE has been a common practice to maximize protection of healthcare workers and patients, it generates large tonnage and volumes of biomedical waste annually.¹ For example, the United States alone uses 1.5 billion N95 respiratory facial masks per year.² Current disposal practices for biomedical waste, including facial masks, includes disinfection (e.g., injected with steam, shredded, heating to 200 °C in microwaves) and then placing in landfills. While shortages of PPE, including facial masks, have accelerated during the 2019/2020 pandemic caused by SARS-CoV-2, a longer-term strategy for on-site disinfection may allow safe reuse of PPE and provide a reliable disposal alternative, thereby reducing annual waste production.

Numerous disinfection strategies for facial masks have been proposed, but it was not until the middle of April 2020 that the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) provided guidelines for three processes targeting decontamination and reuse of filtering facepiece respirators (FFRs).³ The CDC identified ultraviolet (UV) germicidal irradiation, vaporous hydrogen peroxide, and moist heat as the most promising methods to decontaminate FFRs. A common feature of other disinfection treatments (e.g., liquid or aerosol hydrogen peroxide, autoclave-like treatments with moist air, and various

gas treatments (e.g., ozone)^{4–8}) is the need for chemical handling, air monitoring, and centralized treatment. In contrast, UV treatment offers a chemical-free strategy and could take less than 5 min to achieve.^{9,10} UV treatment can be performed anywhere power is available and can be scaled to treat different numbers of masks, and thus, UV treatment is the focus of this paper.

Germicidal light in the UV-C range (100–280 nm) disrupts DNA and RNA, forming pyrimidine dimers, thus inactivating viruses and other microorganisms.^{11–14} Studies show greater than 99.9% inactivation for several influenza viruses and coronaviruses when applying UV dosages ranging from 0.5 to 1.8 J/cm².^{2,6,9,10,15–17} For a study with 15 different N95 masks that were soiled with H1N1 influenza virus, 1 J/cm² UV dose incident on the fabric achieved over a 3 log reduction in recoverable virus.^{16,18} On other surfaces, much lower UV-C dosages (<50 mJ/cm²) are reported to inactivate similar virus types.¹⁷ While most studies evaluated UV treatment's ability to disinfect masks, there is a paucity of information about impacts

Received: May 20, 2020

Revised: June 23, 2020

Accepted: June 24, 2020

Published: June 24, 2020



ACS Publications

© XXXX American Chemical Society

of UV treatment on polymer properties (chemistry, structure) that influence removal of aerosolized particles during reuse. Therefore, with the eventual aim of understanding the viability of safely reusing facial masks, this paper first quantified the ability of masks to remove virus-sized aerosol particles and then characterized potential detrimental impacts of UV-C exposure on representative N95 and surgical mask materials' physical and chemical properties (e.g., polymer structure, morphology, surface contact angle). Second, to design and fabricate reactors suitable to irradiate facial masks, we compared commonly used UV-C light sources (254 nm from UV low-pressure mercury lamps as well as 265 nm from light emitting diodes (LEDs)) to provide equivalent UV-C dosages to masks. Light source selection and final reactor design is considered based on the comparison results for time to achieve target UV dosage and cost. The exposure dose in this study ranged from 1–10 J/cm² to account for the CDC recommendation for irradiation dose (1 J/cm²) and potential multiple treatment cycles. It should be noted that 1 J/cm² is at the high end of UV dosages recommended and is much higher than reported UV dosages required for coronavirus inactivation in water.¹⁷ This article is not intended to quantify the safety of masks or the ability of UV light to disinfect used masks but is intended to understand how reported ranges of UV-C dosages required for coronavirus inactivation potentially impact facial mask material properties and performance to remove aerosolized virus-sized particles. Findings from this study contribute to developing shorter-term strategies to safely reuse PPE materials that are in limited supply during pandemics and also provide longer-term strategies to reuse PPE materials with the intended aim of reducing PPE biohazard waste and disposal.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Figure 1 shows three facial masks containing different polymers: (1) surgical mask (47567, O&M Halyard, Inc.,



Figure 1. Photographs of the three masks studied in this research.

GA), (2) N95 Mask A (1860 N95, 3M, MN), and (3) N95 Mask B (1500 N95, Moldex, CA). The two N95 mask brands were selected because a prior study showed the ability to disinfect influenza virus on the masks with 1 J/cm².¹⁶ Following approaches previously applied during UV irradiation

mask testing,⁷ coupons of the masks (4 cm × 4 cm) were used for physicochemical characterization and aerosol challenge tests; the thickness of the coupons was identical to the as-received new masks.

Two UV exposure apparatuses—a collimated beam reactor equipped with 265 nm LEDs and a box reactor equipped with 254 nm low pressure UV lamps—were used to irradiate mask coupons (Figures SI.1 and 2). UV dosages of zero (control) plus 1 and 10 J/cm² were selected based on ability to achieve greater than 3 log (i.e., > 99.9%) inactivation of H1N1 influenza.¹⁶ Irradiation experiments were conducted in triplicate on separate coupons. **Safety warning:** UV-C light can damage eyes and skin. Always wear appropriate eye, facial, and other PPE during experimentation.

Challenge aerosols were generated using either 100 nm polystyrene latex spheres (Nanospheres, Duke Scientific, Palo Alto, CA) or a broader distribution of silica particles (see SI for details). The challenge aerosols cover the size range used in the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH) test methods (75 ± 20 nm NaCl particles for N95 type masks¹⁹ and dioctyl phthalate (185 ± 20 nm) particles for P99 masks²⁰) are similar to the reported individual virus particle diameters of 60 to 140 nm.²¹ Material capture efficiency tests were performed on mask coupons using a scanning mobility particle sizer SMPS (TSI 3938NLS2, Shoreview, MN, USA), and efficiency calculations were based on number concentrations.

Details are provided in the SI for pressure drop testing and material characterization (Fourier transform infrared spectroscopy (FTIR), scanning electron microscopy (SEM), optical microscopy, and surface contact angle measurements) and structural tensile testing (Figure SI.3).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Removal of Aerosolized Particles by UV-Treated Masks. Figure 2A shows representative data for filter capture efficiency using a broad distribution of silica particles for masks with and without UV treatment (Figures SI.4 and 5 show distributions for other masks). Particles are well captured by the mask materials, with only a slight (1%–2%) decrease in capture efficiency toward the smaller (<100 nm) particles. The average capture efficiency for the N95 masks over the test range (50–200 nm) was well above 95%, while the efficiency was lower (~82% on average) for the surgical mask; Figure SI.6 shows the filtration efficiency for each measured size range. UV-C doses of 1 or 10 J/cm² did not change ($p < 0.05$) this removal efficiency for any of the masks. Likewise, for an equivalent UV-C dose, there was no difference in particle removal efficiency between irradiation with 254 nm (lamp) or 265 nm (LED) light. Separate experiments were performed using a second, more narrowly distributed challenge aerosol composed of different particles (polystyrene latex spheres), and the UV treatment also had no effect on particle removal efficiencies (Figure SI.6–7). Collectively, these observations demonstrate that the applied UV treatments do not significantly reduce the particle capture efficiency of the N95 masks, and the masks would likely pass an official NIOSH test.

UV-C Irradiation Has Negligible Impact on Material and Physical Properties of Masks. N95 masks are made of multiple layers of polymeric materials. Figure 3 shows optical microscopy, SEM, and FTIR data for each layer in Mask A. On the basis of FTIR vibrational wavelengths,^{22,23} layers 1 and 3 were primarily polypropylene, while layer 2 was polyester. To




Figure 2. Filtration efficiency comparisons using aerosolized silica particles for three facial masks without UV treatment or with a 1 or $10\text{ J}/\text{cm}^2$ UV dose delivered by 265 nm LED or 254 nm mercury lamps. (A) Data for particle removal efficiency between 50 and 220 nm for Mask B. (B) Particle removal efficiencies for all particles between 50 and 220 nm. Error bars show one standard deviation in each direction from the average. Different letters (a, b, c, d) above each bar identify experiments that are statistically different ($p > 0.05$) based upon a two-tail paired Student's *t* test.

enhance facial fitting, an aluminum nose clip coated with polyurethane foam is used. Elastic straps are composed of braided polyisoprene. Layer 1 differs morphologically from the other layers in Mask A (Figure 3A). Layer 1 has a checkerboard configuration of bundled smaller fibers. Similar to layer 1 in Mask A, an inner polymer layer in Mask B also exhibited a checkerboard configuration of bundled smaller fibers; otherwise, the polymer fibers were uniform and contiguous (Figure SI.8). Mask B contained multiple polypropylene layers and an additional hard-plastic mesh on its outer layer, intended to resist collapsing. The surgical mask contained three layers, two outer cellulose acetate layers and an inner polypropylene layer, which the vendor claims important for aerosol removal.

As illustrated in Figure 3 and Figure SI.9, there was no decrease in FTIR peaks or formation of new peaks after irradiation at 1 or $10\text{ J}/\text{cm}^2$ of UV-C. This is not surprising because photooxidation can only occur when the polymer contains chromophores (e.g., aromatic, C=O, and N=N), which absorb short wavelengths. Even though FTIR showed that layer 2 of the N95 Mask A contained chromophores (aromatic and C=O vibrations), it could be protected from UV irradiation by layers 1 and 3 of Mask B. Optical microscopy and SEM analysis showed no apparent changes in morphology (fiber diameter, distribution, distribution of indentations, etc.) after UV irradiation (Figures SI.8 and SI.10).

Virus removal in N95 PPE is not limited to a “sieve” effect (i.e., particle interception). Other processes such as impaction, electrostatic interactions, or diffusion can also be important or even dominant depending on the particle size and filtering material.²⁴ The above morphological and surface chemistry measurements suggest negligible changes to the mask materials at the UV doses applied, consistent with the negligible effect on particle removal. Changes in the morphology of the polymer layers could also manifest in changing the pressure drop across mask materials.⁷ In all cases, relative to the nonirradiated controls, we observed no significant difference in pressure drop across any of the masks after irradiation up to $10\text{ J}/\text{cm}^2$. Thus, morphological assessment and pressure drop measurements confirmed negligible impacts created by UV-C irradiation.

Viruses tend to be shaded in droplets or present as wet aerosol particles. The hydrophobicity of polymers present in any mask layer may impact aerosol removal. Therefore, surface contact angle measurements were performed as an indicator of hydrophobicity. The outer layers of Masks A ($\theta = 125.3 \pm 3.1$ to $\theta = 119.3 \pm 4.4$; $n = 5$) and B ($\theta = 123.5 \pm 3.1$ to $\theta = 124.9 \pm 1.4$; $n = 5$) exhibited surface contact angles greater than 90° , indicating hydrophobic materials. The inner layers of Masks A and B and the surgical mask were hydrophilic and wetted easily ($\theta < 90^\circ$). After $10\text{ J}/\text{cm}^2$ of UV-C irradiation, the surface contact angle measurements were not significantly different ($p < 0.05$).

Mechanical strength and deformation testing of the masks and elastics were conducted. Results (summarized in Figure SI.11) showed that $10\text{ J}/\text{cm}^2$ UV irradiation had negligible impact on mechanical properties for N95 and surgical masks. Mask A had a higher strength (110–125 lbf) than Mask B (50–52 lbf), and both were stronger than the surgical mask (18–20 lbf). Mask B had a higher deformation (4–5 in.) compared with Mask A (2–3 in.) and the surgical mask (<0.5 in.). Prior work using a bursting strength test with N95 masks similarly concluded that 11 of 13 masks showed no change in strength at a UV-C dose of $120\text{ J}/\text{cm}^2$, but 90% of the masks showed differences between new and UV-C treated masks at very high dosages ($950\text{ J}/\text{cm}^2$).⁷ Compared with the mask itself, the elastic straps failed at a much lower strength (5–15 lbf). However, there was no effect of UV irradiation on the strength or deformation of the elastic straps.

Design Considerations for UV Light Disinfection Reactors to Enable Reuse of N95 Masks. Upon the basis of the (a) feasibility to disinfect masks with UV light from the literature, (b) validation of virus-size aerosol removal by the masks after UV treatment in this study, and (c) confirmation that material characteristics, morphology, and strength were unchanged by UV treatment, we concluded reuse of masks following UV treatment should be viable. During our testing, it was clear that all surfaces of the N95 mask could be exposed to UV light, albeit perhaps not equal dosages on all surfaces. Because the pleated folds in the surgical mask (Figure 1) resulted in sections of the mask not being directly exposed to UV-C light, UV-C treatment was deemed appropriate for the N95 masks tested but not for masks with pleated folds. The curved surfaces and metal grating (Figure SI.1) impart some reduction in the UV dose. We based the delivered UV dose on a spatially averaged series of measurements using a radiometer across multiple locations in the reactor. Future work could use ray-trace modeling in the reactor or use photosensitive “paper




Figure 3. Material characterization for different layers in Mask A using (A) optical microscopy where the yellow dashed circle shows a checkerboard pattern of bundled fibers, (B) SEM, and (C) FTIR. (D) Photograph of Mask A showing three polymer layers that were separately characterized.

test patches” to quantify the minimum UV dosage reaching any surface of the N95 masks.

The next step was to design and fabricate a “reactor” suitable to deliver the germicidal UV dose. A “treating room” has been suggested,²⁵ where large numbers of hanging masks are treated by mobile towers of UV-C lamps. We conducted individual discussions with physicians and first responders who suggested desirable characteristics of a mask treatment system would be (1) a treatment time of less than 5 min, (2) the ability to treat 5–25 masks at a time during shift changes, and (3) the ability to treat and reuse masks multiple times. Ten daily treatment and reuse cycles were considered reasonable, along with weekly disposal of the masks, as other factors (sweat, humidity, etc.) would likely limit additional use of current N95 masks.

Achieving a 1 J/cm² dose within 5 min requires greater than 3 mW/cm² of UV-C light to all surfaces of between 5 and 25 N95 masks. While 265 to 280 nm LEDs can disinfect¹⁴ SARS-CoV-2 and they are rapidly improving in output, efficiency, and cost,^{26–28} preliminary assessments of reactor designs to meet end-user treatment time and number of masks treated in a reactor deemed LEDs to be less feasible at this time than the lower cost, higher output, and readily available 254 nm low-pressure mercury lamps. A benefit of LED technology could be their ability to be placed in unique, nonlinear geometries that could more effectively provide uniform irradiation of all surfaces on curved masks.¹⁴ Figure SI.12 illustrates a metallic tool storage box “reactor” (30 cm × 152 cm × 30 cm) equipped with four 120W 254 nm lamps with a grated metal rack that supports roughly 20 N95 masks. The mask-treatment prototype reactor includes several safety features and was fabricated in less than 1 week during the pandemic using

materials readily available from home-supply stores. Figure SI.12 shows irradiance measurements using a radiometer throughout this reactor, confirming that greater than 9 mW/cm² was achieved everywhere. This design enabled delivery of at least 1 J/cm² UV-C to both the top and bottom of the masks within ~2 min. The Supporting Information includes designs for the system and safety features and also includes an operational manual.

Assuring the system delivers the intended UV-C dose was, and remains, a challenge. Although it would technically provide additional assurance that a consistent UV-C dose was delivered, the cost to purchase and install sensor electronics was nearly equivalent to the entire UV-C reactor cost and thus precluded installation of a real-time radiometer. A lower cost option was to include a timer and thermometer attached to the reactor surface, which heats by 4–8 °C when all four lamps are operating properly. The temperature measurements serve as an assessment of system performance. Additionally, we recently procured color-change paper test strips for germicidal light (Intellevo Technologies) and validated them against radiometer-based measurements from 50 to 200 mJ/cm² using irradiation times from 1 to 20 s, using the reactor shown in Figure SI.1b. To our knowledge, there have been few studies on the validation of UV-C paper “test strips” that could meet this need, but these appear limited to UV-C dosages less than 200 mJ/cm².²⁹ A research need is a low-cost strategy to measure surface UV-C dosage.

Reusing facial masks will help reduce biomedical waste tonnage. Future research should fill critical technical gaps and conduct both techno-economic (TEA) and life cycle analysis (LCA) to understand the extent to which treating and reusing

facial masks is beneficial and sustainable in normal healthcare operations (i.e., nonshortage situations). With a functional unit of a facial mask, one critical factor includes the energy associated with deliver a disinfecting UV-C dose and the number of times a mask can be reused.¹⁸ There remains considerable uncertainty in the required UV-C dosage, ranging from 1–10 J/cm² to achieve greater than 99.9% reduction in recoverable virus using N95 masks to less than 50 mJ/cm² for similar inactivation reported for other surfaces.^{13,14,30} Research is needed to quantify surface effects and determine if higher UV-C dosages penetrate the polymer layers used in the N95 masks. Some papers suggest UV-C exposures exceeding 950 J/cm² impart little change in N95 mask pressure drops⁷ and thus could be an upper limit on the cumulative lifetime of exposures before masks need to be disposed. Studying effects of multiple, sequential UV-C treatments is needed for LCA to be conducted. Robust LCAs would likewise contrast UV-C treatment against other disinfection modalities (e.g., heat, aerosolized H₂O₂, ClO₂). As an alternative to masks designed *a priori* for single use, numerous creative designs emerging during the pandemic suggest that N95 masks could be redesigned for intentional treatment and reuse. LCAs on strategies to decrease biomedical waste would lessen the environmental impacts of PPE.

ASSOCIATED CONTENT

Supporting Information

The Supporting Information is available free of charge at <https://pubs.acs.org/doi/10.1021/acs.estlett.0c00416>.

Supplementary methods, experimental reactor designs and light flux measurements, tensile strength testing, filtration efficiency data, SEM images, FTIR spectra and data interpretation, Figures SI.1–12, and UV-disinfection system operation manual ([PDF](#))

AUTHOR INFORMATION

Corresponding Author

Paul Westerhoff — NSF Nanosystems Engineering Research Center for Nanotechnology-Enabled Water Treatment, School of Sustainable Engineering and the Built Environment, Ira A. Fulton Schools of Engineering, Arizona State University, Tempe, Arizona 85287-3005, United States; orcid.org/0000-0002-9241-8759; Phone: 480-965-2885; Email: p.westerhoff@asu.edu

Authors

Zhe Zhao — NSF Nanosystems Engineering Research Center for Nanotechnology-Enabled Water Treatment, School of Sustainable Engineering and the Built Environment, Ira A. Fulton Schools of Engineering, Arizona State University, Tempe, Arizona 85287-3005, United States

Zhaobo Zhang — School of Molecular Sciences, Arizona State University, Tempe, Arizona 85297-1604, United States

Mariana Lanzarini-Lopes — NSF Nanosystems Engineering Research Center for Nanotechnology-Enabled Water Treatment, School of Sustainable Engineering and the Built Environment, Ira A. Fulton Schools of Engineering, Arizona State University, Tempe, Arizona 85287-3005, United States

Shahnawaz Sinha — NSF Nanosystems Engineering Research Center for Nanotechnology-Enabled Water Treatment, School of Sustainable Engineering and the Built Environment, Ira A.

Fulton Schools of Engineering, Arizona State University, Tempe, Arizona 85287-3005, United States

Hojung Rho — NSF Nanosystems Engineering Research Center for Nanotechnology-Enabled Water Treatment, School of Sustainable Engineering and the Built Environment, Ira A. Fulton Schools of Engineering, Arizona State University, Tempe, Arizona 85287-3005, United States

Pierre Herckes — School of Molecular Sciences, Arizona State University, Tempe, Arizona 85297-1604, United States; orcid.org/0000-0002-0205-3187

Complete contact information is available at: <https://pubs.acs.org/10.1021/acs.estlett.0c00416>

Notes

The authors declare no competing financial interest.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors acknowledge Peter Goguen, Barzin Mobasher, and Subramaniam Rajan for conducting tensile tests and data analysis. We thank Stan Klonowski for obtaining optical microscope images and Laurel Passantino for technical editing. This work was partially funded by the National Science Foundation Nanosystems Engineering Research Center on Nanotechnology-Enabled Water Treatment (EEC-1449500) and RAPID program (CBET- 2028074).

REFERENCES

- (1) Nichols, A.; Manzi, S. Physical space and its impact on waste management in the neonatal care setting. *Journal of Infection Prevention* **2014**, *15*, 134–138.
- (2) Patel, A.; D'Alessandro, M.; Ireland, K.; Burel, W.; Wencel, E.; Rasmussen, S. Personal Protective Equipment Supply Chain: Lessons Learned from Recent Public Health Emergency Responses. *Health Security* **2017**, *15*, 244–252.
- (3) CDC Decontamination and Reuse of Filtering Facepiece Respirators. <https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/hcp/ppe-strategy/decontamination-reuse-respirators.html> (accessed May 1, 2020).
- (4) Bergman, M. S.; Viscusi, D. J.; Heimbuch, B. K.; Wander, J. D.; Sambol, A. R.; Shaffer, R. E. Evaluation of Multiple (3-Cycle) Decontamination Processing for Filtering Facepiece Respirators. *J. Eng. Fibers Fabr.* **2010**, *5*, 33–41.
- (5) Fisher, E. M.; Williams, J. L.; Shaffer, R. E. Evaluation of Microwave Steam Bags for the Decontamination of Filtering Facepiece Respirators. *PLoS One* **2011**, *6*, No. e18585.
- (6) Heimbuch, B. K.; Wallace, W. H.; Kinney, K.; Lumley, A. E.; Wu, C. Y.; Woo, M. H.; Wander, J. D. A pandemic influenza preparedness study: Use of energetic methods to decontaminate filtering facepiece respirators contaminated with H1N1 aerosols and droplets. *Am. J. Infect. Control* **2011**, *39*, E1–E9.
- (7) Lindsley, W. G.; Martin, S. B.; Thewlis, R. E.; Sarkisian, K.; Nwoko, J. O.; Mead, K. R.; Noti, J. D. Effects of Ultraviolet Germicidal Irradiation (UVGI) on N95 Respirator Filtration Performance and Structural Integrity. *J. Occup. Environ. Hyg.* **2015**, *12*, 509–517.
- (8) Viscusi, D. J.; Bergman, M. S.; Eimer, B. C.; Shaffer, R. E. Evaluation of Five Decontamination Methods for Filtering Facepiece Respirators. *Ann. Occup. Hyg.* **2009**, *53*, 815–827.
- (9) Moore, G.; Ali, S.; Cloutman-Green, E. A.; Bradley, C. R.; Wilkinson, M. A. C.; Hartley, J. C.; Fraise, A. P.; Wilson, A. P. R. Use of UV-C radiation to disinfect non-critical patient care items: a laboratory assessment of the Nanoclave Cabinet. *BMC Infect. Dis.* **2012**, *12*, 174.
- (10) Rowan, N. J.; Laffey, J. G. Challenges and solutions for addressing critical shortage of supply chain for personal and protective equipment (PPE) arising from Coronavirus disease (COVID19)

- pandemic — Case study from the Republic of Ireland. *Sci. Total Environ.* **2020**, *725*, 138532.
- (11) Beck, S. E.; Hull, N. M.; Poepping, C.; Linden, K. G. Wavelength-Dependent Damage to Adenoviral Proteins Across the Germicidal UV Spectrum. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* **2018**, *52*, 223–229.
- (12) Beck, S. E.; Wright, H. B.; Hargy, T. M.; Larason, T. C.; Linden, K. G. Action spectra for validation of pathogen disinfection in medium-pressure ultraviolet (UV) systems. *Water Res.* **2015**, *70*, 27–37.
- (13) Tseng, C. C.; Li, C. S. Inactivation of viruses on surfaces by ultraviolet germicidal irradiation. *J. Occup. Environ. Hyg.* **2007**, *4*, 400–405.
- (14) Inagaki, H.; Saito, A.; Sugiyama, H.; Okabayashi, T.; Fujimoto, S. Rapid inactivation of SARS-CoV-2 with Deep-UV LED irradiation. *bioRxiv*, 2020. DOI: [10.1101/2020.06.06.138149](https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.06.138149).
- (15) Fisher, E. M.; Shaffer, R. E. A method to determine the available UV-C dose for the decontamination of filtering facepiece respirators. *J. Appl. Microbiol.* **2011**, *110*, 287–295.
- (16) Mills, D.; Harnish, D. A.; Lawrence, C.; Sandoval-Powers, M.; Heimbuch, B. K. Ultraviolet germicidal irradiation of influenza-contaminated N95 filtering facepiece respirators. *Am. J. Infect. Control* **2018**, *46*, E49–E55.
- (17) Silverman, A. I.; Boehm, A. B. Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis of the Persistence and Disinfection of Human Coronaviruses and Their Viral Surrogates in Water and Wastewater. *Environ. Sci. Technol. Lett.* **2020**, DOI: [10.1021/acs.estlett.0c00313](https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.estlett.0c00313).
- (18) Fisher, E. M.; Noti, J. D.; Lindsley, W. G.; Blachere, F. M.; Shaffer, R. E. Validation and Application of Models to Predict Facemask Influenza Contamination in Healthcare Settings. *Risk Anal.* **2014**, *34*, 1423–1434.
- (19) NIOSH Determination of Particulate Filter Efficiency Level for N95 Series Filters against Solid Particulates for Non-Powdered, Air-Purifying Respirators, Standard Testing Procedure (STP); National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health: Pittsburgh, PA, December 13, 2019.
- (20) NIOSH Determination of Particulate Filter Efficiency Level for P99 Series Filters against Liquid Particulates for Non-Powdered, Air-Purifying Respirators, Standard Testing Procedure (STP); National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health: Pittsburgh, PA, 2019; p 8.
- (21) Zhu, N.; Zhang, D.; Wang, W.; Li, X.; Yang, B.; Song, J.; Zhao, X.; Huang, B.; Shi, W.; Lu, R.; Niu, P.; Zhan, F.; Ma, X.; Wang, D.; Xu, W.; Wu, G.; Gao, G. F.; Tan, W. A Novel Coronavirus from Patients with Pneumonia in China, 2019. *N. Engl. J. Med.* **2020**, *382*, 727–733.
- (22) Hedrick, S. A.; Chuang, S. S. C. Temperature programmed decomposition of polypropylene: in situ FTIR coupled with mass spectroscopy study. *Thermochim. Acta* **1998**, *315*, 159–168.
- (23) Abdel-Hamid, H. M. Effect of electron beam irradiation on polypropylene films—dielectric and FT-IR studies. *Solid-State Electron.* **2005**, *49*, 1163–1167.
- (24) Mittal, R.; Ni, R.; Seo, J. H. The flow physics of COVID-19. *J. Fluid Mech.* **2020**, *894*, 894.
- (25) Hao, L.; Wu, J.; Zhang, E.; Yi, Y.; Zhang, Z.; Zhang, J.; Qi, J. Disinfection efficiency of positive pressure respiratory protective hood using fumigation sterilization cabinet. *Biosafety and Health* **2019**, *1*, 46–53.
- (26) Chen, J.; Loeb, S.; Kim, J. H. LED revolution: fundamentals and prospects for UV disinfection applications. *Environ. Sci.-Wat. Res. Technol.* **2017**, *3*, 188–202.
- (27) Prasad, A.; Du, L. H.; Zubair, M.; Subedi, S.; Ullah, A.; Roopesh, M. S. Applications of Light-Emitting Diodes (LEDs) in Food Processing and Water Treatment. *Food Eng. Rev.* **2020**, na DOI: [10.1007/s12393-020-09221-4](https://doi.org/10.1007/s12393-020-09221-4).
- (28) Matafonova, G.; Batoev, V. Recent advances in application of UV light-emitting diodes for degrading organic pollutants in water through advanced oxidation processes: A review. *Water Res.* **2018**, *132*, 177–189.
- (29) Lindblad, M.; Tano, E.; Lindahl, C.; Huss, F. Ultraviolet-C decontamination of a hospital room: Amount of UV light needed. *Burns* **2020**, *46*, 842–849.
- (30) Woo, H.; Beck, S. E.; Boczek, L. A.; Carlson, K. M.; Brinkman, N. E.; Linden, K. G.; Lawal, O. R.; Hayes, S. L.; Ryu, H. Efficacy of Inactivation of Human Enteroviruses by Dual-Wavelength Germicidal Ultraviolet (UV-C) Light Emitting Diodes (LEDs). *Water* **2019**, *11*, 1131–1138.