

Photochemical & Photobiological Sciences

An international journal

Accepted Manuscript

View Article Online
View Journal

This article can be cited before page numbers have been issued, to do this please use: A. E. Torres, A. B. Lyons, S. Narla, I. Kohli, A. Parks-Miller, D. Ozog, I. H. Hamzavi and H. W. Lim, *Photochem. Photobiol. Sci.*, 2020, DOI: 10.1039/D0PP00131G.



This is an Accepted Manuscript, which has been through the Royal Society of Chemistry peer review process and has been accepted for publication.

Accepted Manuscripts are published online shortly after acceptance, before technical editing, formatting and proof reading. Using this free service, authors can make their results available to the community, in citable form, before we publish the edited article. We will replace this Accepted Manuscript with the edited and formatted Advance Article as soon as it is available.

You can find more information about Accepted Manuscripts in the [Information for Authors](#).

Please note that technical editing may introduce minor changes to the text and/or graphics, which may alter content. The journal's standard [Terms & Conditions](#) and the [Ethical guidelines](#) still apply. In no event shall the Royal Society of Chemistry be held responsible for any errors or omissions in this Accepted Manuscript or any consequences arising from the use of any information it contains.

**ULTRAVIOLET-C AND OTHER METHODS OF DECONTAMINATION OF
FILTERING FACEPIECE N-95 RESPIRATORS DURING THE COVID-19 PANDEMIC**

Angeli Eloise Torres, MD, DPDS^{a, b}, Alexis B. Lyons, MD^b, Shanthi Narla, MD^b, Indermeet
Kohli, PhD^{b, c}, Angela Parks-Miller, CCRP, CWCA^b, David Ozog, MD, FAAD^b, Iltefat H.
Hamzavi, MD, FAAD^b, Henry W. Lim, MD, FAAD^b

^aManila, Philippines
^bPhotomedicine and Photobiology Unit, Department of Dermatology, Henry Ford Health System,
Detroit, MI
^cDepartment of Physics and Astronomy, Wayne State University, Detroit, MI

CORRESPONDING AUTHOR: Henry W. Lim, MD; Address: Department of Dermatology,
Henry Ford Hospital, 3031 West Grand Boulevard, Suite 800, Detroit, Michigan 48202; Phone:
313-916-4060; Fax: (313) 916-2093; Email: hlim1@hfhs.org

16 ABSTRACT

17 During global health emergencies such as the current COVID-19 pandemic, the
18 decontamination of single-use personal protective equipment (PPE) becomes a necessary means
19 to keep up with the growing demand from health care workers and patients alike. Many unverified
20 methods are being considered, which can pose the risk of incomplete decontamination and lead to
21 catastrophic results. Several factors come into play when determining the suitability of such
22 methods including qualities related to the decontamination technique itself, the targeted pathogen,
23 cost, ease of installation and use, rate of sterilization, and the surface or material to be sterilized.
24 The germicidal property of ultraviolet-C is well known. This review will cover the most commonly
25 described methods for sterilization of N95 respirators, namely, ultraviolet germicidal irradiation,
26 hydrogen peroxide vaporization, microwave generated steaming, and dry heating. These
27 techniques have been tested previously and have demonstrated efficacy in reducing or inactivating
28 viral and bacterial pathogens, although testing against SARS-CoV-2 specifically has not been
29 done. Moreover, it must be emphasized that proper disposal after a single use is still ideal under
30 normal circumstances.

31 INTRODUCTION

32 The unprecedented global pandemic of the novel 2019 coronavirus (COVID-19) opened
33 humanity to the vulnerability of our health care systems, particularly in our readiness to face a
34 contagion of this magnitude. The shortage of personal protective equipment (PPE), specifically
35 N95 or filtering facepiece respirators (FFR), is a universal problem amidst the increasing demand
36 from healthcare workers and patients alike. FFRs are designed to fit snugly over the wearer's nose
37 and mouth. They are capable of filtering airborne pathogens, as opposed to a regular surgical mask
38 that protects against large droplets or splashes only. The terms FFR and N95 respirators will be
39 used interchangeably throughout this review.

40 As stockpiles around the world are rapidly depleting, health care workers are resorting to
41 repeated use of single-use, disposable FFR. In these circumstances, decontamination of FFR could
42 be an option to minimize the risk of viral transmission while facilitating conservation of scarce
43 resources provided that the FFR is not visibly soiled or worn out. At the time of this writing, three
44 hydrogen peroxide decontamination systems – namely, STERRAD Sterilization System
45 (Advanced Sterilization Products, Inc., California), STERIS Sterilization System (STERIS
46 Corporation, Ohio), and Battelle Decontamination System (Battelle Memorial Institute, Ohio) –
47 have been granted Emergency Usage Authorization (EUA) by the United States Food and Drug
48 Administration (US FDA) for decontamination of N95 respirators.¹ EUA approval for ultraviolet
49 germicidal irradiation (Daavlin Desktop UVC Germicidal Lamp, Daavlin, Ohio) is underway.

50 According to the Institute of Medicine (IOM), simple decontamination techniques must be
51 evaluated based on several factors. These include efficacy in removing or inactivating pathogens,
52 potential hazard to the wearer from chemical residues or noxious fumes (off-gassing), cost, and
53 ease of implementation in the workplace.² In many cases, the efficacy of decontamination does

not depend solely on the utilized method alone but also on the surface or material being sterilized. In addition, the ability of the target pathogen to survive on surfaces is an important consideration. SARS-CoV-2, the causative agent of COVID-19, has been found to remain viable on stainless steel and plastic surfaces for up to 72 hours, on copper for up to 4 hours, and on cardboard for up to 24 hours.³

Another important element to consider is the effect of the decontamination procedure on the integrity of the FFR. Certain sterilization techniques may degrade the polymers in FFR thereby decreasing its ability to filter out aerosols.⁴ Still, others may leave filtration capacity intact but cause loosening of the elastic bands. This is nonetheless significant as proper fit is key in FFRs.

This article will review available recent evidence on different methods of FFR decontamination that may potentially be applied during this pandemic or future emergencies.

DISCUSSION

Ultraviolet Germicidal Irradiation

Ultraviolet germicidal irradiation (UVGI) is a method to disinfect disposable N95 FFR for reuse. This technique employs the germicidal property of ultraviolet-C (UVC), which has been utilized in the decontamination of water, air, and various surfaces.⁵ In the hospital setting, UVC systems are often used to disinfect objects which cannot be immersed in liquid biocides as well as for disinfecting high touch surfaces.⁶⁻⁸ The mechanism underlying UVGI is the absorption of photons by microbial nucleic acids, causing formation of pyrimidine photoproducts⁵ which subsequently damage deoxyribonucleic acid (DNA),⁹ prevent replication, and inactivate microorganisms.^{10, 11}

UVGI is commonly produced from a low-pressure mercury lamp source which emits short-wave UVC (100-290 nm), mostly at 254 nm. This is close to the peak emission for bacterial killing which is 265 nm.⁵ Mercury lamps produce ozone as a byproduct, which itself is a reactive oxygen species that can further inactivate bacteria.¹⁰ These lamps are often used for water and air purification systems. Ozone and free radicals can diffuse into places which are shielded from direct exposure of UV radiation to further inhibit microorganisms.¹⁰ Studies have found that the disinfection time required to inactivate bacteriophage MS2 is much lower with light sources emitting UVC and ozone combined than with UVC alone.¹² These systems are limited due to the restrictions for ozone emission and the toxic effects of ozone on human health. In addition, due to concerns for mercury pollution, the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) convened in 2013 to propose a ban on export and import of mercury-containing lamps and have them be replaced by UV light emitting diode (UV-LED) light sources,¹³ however, countries can still manufacture mercury-based products for their own use. UV-LED sources have a more diverse wavelength capability compared to the traditional mercury-based UV devices.¹⁴⁻¹⁶ Studies comparing UVC mercury light sources versus UVC-LED have demonstrated comparable results for killing microorganisms.¹⁷ However, UVC-LED light sources have lower irradiance levels compared to mercury lamps. Although this can be compensated by adding appropriate number of LEDs arranged in a desired pattern, it can significantly impact the cost of the unit. Currently, most UVGI systems still utilize mercury-based sources.

Several studies have been performed examining the use of UVGI for disinfecting N95 FFRs. This is recommended for used but not visibly soiled FFRs in order to achieve the sufficient 3-log reduction for disinfection reported in the literature.¹¹ A study comparing the survival of bacteria on an N95 FFR after decontamination with UVC, UVA, ethanol, bleach, and autoclave

found that UVC, bleach, and autoclave provided better germicidal efficacy than ethanol and UVA.¹⁸ A study of H1N1 influenza A infected N95 FFRs found a ≥ 3 log reduction after a UVGI dose of 1 J/cm² administered over 60-70 seconds.¹⁹ This dose has been supported by additional studies, and higher doses (>1 J/cm²) provided diminished benefit.^{20, 21} UVGI has also been shown to effectively inactivate coronaviruses including severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus (SARS-CoV) and Middle East respiratory syndrome coronavirus (MERS-CoV).²² Of note, although categorized as ≥ 3 log, 3.5 through 9 log reductions have been reported in the literature which can be relevant in higher initial viral load situations.^{8, 19-21} This can be one potential explanation of the variation in the UVC dosing reported in the literature. Other potential explanations of variations in reported UVC dosing can be the pathogen itself, the substrate or surface being irradiated, the distance from, and the uniformity of the UVC radiation source.

In general, all viruses and almost all bacteria are vulnerable to UVGI, however, the degree of susceptibility is highly species-specific.²³ Larger microorganisms such as spores tend to be more resistant to UVGI though are easier to filter out, while the opposite is true for smaller microbes like viruses.²³ According to a study by Tseng et al., double-stranded (ds) DNA and dsRNA viruses required twice the UVGI dose as those of single-stranded (ss) DNA and ssRNA viruses in order to achieve 90% inactivation. Moreover, conditions of high relative humidity (85%) rendered viruses more resistant to UVGI-induced DNA damage due to water adsorption onto the viral surface.²⁴

The configuration of the surface being treated is also an important factor that influences UVC dosage. Since UVC is primarily a surface decontaminant, shadowed areas may not be adequately reached by the light source thereby receiving suboptimal doses of UVC.¹⁹ For FFRs, this corresponds to the curved edges, angulated areas, and ridges in certain models, as well as areas

122 soiled with make-up. Accordingly, any obstruction between the radiation source and the target can
123 absorb UVC and decrease the effective dose received by the target. The dose received by the target
124 also decreases with increasing distance from the source.²⁵

125 Because UVC radiation degrades polymers, there exists the possibility for UVGI to
126 decrease the efficacy of FFR and therefore the afforded protection.¹¹ A study in which four
127 different N95 FFRs underwent UVGI doses of 120-950 J/cm² revealed a small increase in particle
128 penetration (up to 1.25%) with little effect on flow resistance.⁴ In addition, at higher doses, the
129 respirator material strength was significantly reduced (sometimes >90%), but this varied greatly
130 between the different models. At a dose of 2360 J/cm², 100-1000x higher than the dose known to
131 disinfect H1N1, the breaking strength of the straps were reduced by 20-51%.⁴

132 The ongoing COVID-19 pandemic and imminent threat to FFR supplies has triggered a
133 rapid emergence of many different UVGI devices and manufacturers. Some involve hanging of
134 the N95 FFRs in an enclosed UVC unit (Orbitform Mask Sanitizer, Orbitform Medical, Michigan),
135 while others utilize a tray to irradiate FFRs under a desktop UVC unit and require flipping of the
136 FFR in order to expose both exterior and interior surfaces (Daavlin Desktop UVC Germicidal
137 Lamp, Daavlin, Ohio).¹¹ It is important to emphasize that only UVC units with validated dosimetry
138 should be used. As not all devices are built the same, incorrect dosing may confer the risk of
139 inadequately killing viral pathogens and pose serious hazards to health care workers.²⁶ The effects
140 of UVC on human health must also be considered. Unlike UVA and UVB, UVC does not penetrate
141 deep into the tissue, hence, adverse effects are confined to the superficial layers of the skin and
142 eyes. These include erythema, photokeratitis, and conjunctivitis.^{5, 23} Although the long-term effects
143 of excessive UVC exposure has not been fully established, the possibility of UV-induced
144 carcinogenesis, cataract formation, and photoaging should be emphasized.²³

Hydrogen Peroxide Vaporization

Hydrogen peroxide (H_2O_2) has long been proven to be highly effective against bacteria, viruses, fungi, and spores.²⁷⁻²⁹ Decontamination using H_2O_2 is typically carried out aurally either through a vapor or an aerosolized system. The former involves the generation of gas from 30-35% H_2O_2 through heat, while the latter utilizes ultrasonic nebulization or pressure to produce aerosols from 5-6% H_2O_2 .³⁰ In the hospital setting, this provides an effective “hands-free” method of decontaminating hospital rooms, while leaving as little as 0-5% of pathogenic residua. However, it must be noted that H_2O_2 is deactivated by organic debris (i.e. dirt); hence, prior to disinfection, all dirt and visible residue must be removed.^{30, 31}

In a head to head comparison of the two systems, H_2O_2 vapor (HPV) was found to be more effective at deactivating microbial particles (6-log reduction) of methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* (MRSA), *Clostridium difficile*, and *Acinetobacter baumannii* as compared to aerosolized H_2O_2 (aHP) (less than 4-log reduction). HPV was likewise noted to have a more uniform delivery of germicidal activity throughout the room, whereas aHP exhibited greater microbial inactivation in areas near to the machine.³²

HPV has been shown to effectively reduce or inactivate enteric and respiratory viruses on various surfaces. In a study by Tuladhar et al., the utilization of HPV 127 parts per million (ppm) for 1 hour at room temperature resulted in a >4-log reduction of poliovirus, rotavirus, adenovirus and murine norovirus from stainless steel and wood panel, while a reduction of 3.5-log and 3.1-log was observed on stainless steel and wood panel, respectively, for influenza A. A >2-log reduction was shown for all of the above viruses on gauze.³³

A proposed protocol for HPV system sterilization of N95 respirators was recently reported by Schwartz et al. (**Table 1**). The process allows sterilization of one hundred 3M brand 1860 N95 respirators that are hung from stainless steel racks in an HPV room. Utilizing 35% of H₂O₂ solution, each decontamination cycle would last 45 minutes. Efficacy was evaluated based on a 6-log reduction of biological indicators (*Geobacillus stearothermophilus* spores). Although N95 respirators were found to maintain functional integrity after 50 cycles, some degradation of elastic material has been reported; hence, a reuse cycle of 30 times has been recommended.³⁴ Similar efficacy was demonstrated by the Battelle Decontamination System (Battelle Memorial Institute, Ohio) utilizing a gassing time of 20 minutes, dwell time of 150 minutes, and a decontamination cycle of 50 times with no FFR degradation.³⁵

Microwave Generated Steaming

Microwave ovens are user-friendly and often readily available in the home or hospital setting, making them an attractive option for FFR sterilization. An important caveat is the requirement of the presence of moisture.³⁶

Microwave generated steaming (MGS) decontamination involves placement of the FFR over a water reservoir, allowing microwave radiation to generate heat from the water and subsequently release steam. The steam is made to pass through the FFR, allowing the heat from the vapor to denature enzymes and other microbial components.³⁷ In a study by Heimbuch et al., MGS decontamination of FFRs inoculated with H1N1 influenza virus at 1250 Watts for 2 minutes resulted in viable influenza reduction by as much as 5-log. No gross signs of mask degradation were noted post-MGS, except for a minor separation of the foam nose cushion in one N95 surgical FFR out of the six that were tested.^{28, 36} Similarly, Lore et al. noted undetectable levels of influenza

A/H5N1 on viral culture of FFR following MGS decontamination, although trace amounts of viral elements were detected on polymerase chain reaction (PCR) in some. MGS decontamination did not affect the filtration capacity of the FFR. Of note, the viral load applied to the FFR in this trial was well above what is expected in actual encounters.³⁷ A modified set-up was utilized in one study where FFRs were placed in microwave steam bags typically used for cleaning infant feeding accessories. In this experiment, heating for 90 seconds at 1100 W (steam bag package instructions) resulted in a >3-log reduction of bacteriophage MS2, with no adverse effect on FFR filtration performance after 3 cycles.² One study revealed that the filtration capacity of propylene fibers from N95 respirators was maintained above 95% when steamed for 10 minutes for 3 cycles, but dropped by 15% and 20% after 5 and 10 cycles, respectively (Y. Cui et al., unpublished data, March 2020).

The disadvantage of this method is the non-uniformity of steam, which may not evenly penetrate the FFR material, thereby altering the efficacy of decontamination. Exposure times needed to generate the steam may also differ depending on the surface area of the liquid (smaller area will require longer exposure), volume of the liquid (more volume will require longer exposure), and power of the microwave (less than 1250W will require longer exposure).³⁷ In addition, the dimensions of most microwave oven units may only accommodate one FFR at a time, making this less than ideal in situations where rapid turnover of PPE is warranted.

Dry Heating

The efficacy of decontamination via dry heat may be extrapolated based on the knowledge that many viruses are sensitive to high temperatures. For instance, SARS-CoV titers have been found to fall below detectable levels when exposed to 56 degrees Celsius for 30 minutes, and be

completely eliminated at 60 degrees Celsius applied over the same amount of time.³⁸ One recent review recommended dry heating of respirators in a laboratory oven at 60 degrees Celsius for 30 minutes, but reported a slight reduction in filtration capacity after heating. Of note, the temperature refers to that of the respirator and not of the oven.²⁸ Since temperatures above 100 degrees Celsius have been shown to destroy FFR performance,³⁶ this method entails the need for direct supervision to facilitate the accurate measurement of FFR surface temperature.

Microwave oven irradiation (“dry microwaving”) has been shown to partially melt FFR, rendering them unwearable.³⁹ However, in one study comparing the effect of dry heat (rice cooker without water), moist heat (autoclave), and liquid submersion methods (ethanol, isopropanol, and bleach) on FFR integrity, it was noted that dry heat and moist heat had little effect on the overall filter quality, while chemical methods tended to reduce them.⁴⁰ Moreover, dry heating at 75 degrees Celsius for 30 minutes has been shown in one study to maintain N95 filtration fiber capacity above 95% even after 20 cycles (Y. Cui et al., unpublished data, March 2020). Further studies are needed to corroborate these results.

Tables 1 and 2 summarize the different decontamination protocols discussed above, as well as their advantages and limitations.

CONCLUSION

Given the current COVID-19 pandemic, extreme measures are needed to keep those on the front line protected. UVC, hydrogen peroxide, microwave, and dry heat systems are all viable options to kill microorganisms on N95 FFRs to enable their reuse. These options are cost-effective, quick to employ, and have the potential to save many lives and valuable resources. These methods

have demonstrated good biocidal activity against many viruses including influenza, SARS-CoV, and MERS-CoV; however, their efficacy against the novel coronavirus SARS-CoV-2 specifically has not been tested. Given their novel use and development, further studies on these methods are needed. Additionally, many unverified variations of these techniques are being considered by health care institutions and individual providers, which can yield catastrophic results if incomplete decontamination is rendered to contaminated FFRs. Lastly, it must be emphasized that such measures should be employed only when absolutely necessary, and that proper discarding of disposable PPEs after a single use is still ideal.

CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

Angeli Torres, Indermeet Kohli, and Angela Parks-Miller have no relevant disclosures. Alexis Lyons and Shanthi Narla are sub-investigators for Biofrontera. David Ozog is an investigator for Biofrontera. Iltefat Hamzavi is an investigator for LITE study, which is funded by PCORI with phototherapy units provided by Daavlin. Henry Lim is an investigator for LITE study, which is funded by PCORI with phototherapy units provided by Daavlin, and has participated as a speaker in general educational session for Ra Medical System.

REFERENCES

1. U.S. Food and Drug Administration Emergency Use Authorizations, <https://www.fda.gov/medical-devices/emergency-situations-medical-devices/emergency-use-authorizations-covid19ppe>, (accessed April 2020).
2. E. M. Fisher, J. L. Williams and R. E. Shaffer, *PLoS One*, 2011, **6**, e18585.
3. N. van Doremalen, T. Bushmaker, D. H. Morris, M. G. Holbrook, A. Gamble, B. N. Williamson, A. Tamin, J. L. Harcourt, N. J. Thornburg, S. I. Gerber, J. O. Lloyd-Smith, E. de Wit and V. J. Munster, *N Engl J Med*, 2020, DOI: 10.1056/NEJMc2004973.
4. W. G. Lindsley, S. B. Martin, Jr., R. E. Thewlis, K. Sarkisian, J. O. Nwoko, K. R. Mead and J. D. Noti, *J Occup Environ Hyg*, 2015, **12**, 509-517.
5. N. G. Reed, *Public Health Rep*, 2010, **125**, 15-27.
6. B. Casini, B. Tuvo, M. L. Cristina, A. M. Spagnolo, M. Totaro, A. Baggiani and G. P. Privitera, *Int J Environ Res Public Health*, 2019, **16**, 1-10.
7. A. Guridi, E. Sevillano, I. de la Fuente, E. Mateo, E. Eraso and G. Quindos, *Int J Environ Res Public Health*, 2019, **16**, 1-11.
8. J. H. Yang, U. I. Wu, H. M. Tai and W. H. Sheng, *J Microbiol Immunol Infect*, 2019, **52**, 487-493.
9. A. J. K. Pefoyo, S. E. Bronskill, A. Gruneir, A. Calzavara, K. Thavorn, Y. Petrosyan, C. J. Maxwell, Y. Bai and W. P. Wodchis, *BMC Public Health*, 2015, **15**, 415-415.
10. W. Szeto, W. C. Yam, H. Huang and D. Y. C. Leung, *BMC Infect Dis*, 2020, **20**, 1-9.
11. I. H. Hamzavi, A. B. Lyons, I. Kohli, S. Narla, A. Parks-Miller, J. M. Gelfand, H. W. Lim and D. Ozog, *J Am Acad Dermatol*, 2020, DOI: 10.1016/j.jaad.2020.03.085.
12. J. Kim and J. Jang, *Aerosol Science and Technology*, 2018, **52**, 557-566.

- 275 13. D. K. Kim and D. H. Kang, *Appl Environ Microbiol*, 2018, **84**, 1-11.
- 276 14. K. Song, F. Taghipour and M. Mohseni, *Sci Total Environ*, 2019, **665**, 1103-1110.
- 277 15. P. O. Nyangaresi, Y. Qin, G. Chen, B. Zhang, Y. Lu and L. Shen, *Water Res*, 2019, **157**,
278 218-227.
- 279 16. K. Song, M. Mohseni and F. Taghipour, *Water Res*, 2019, **163**,
280 10.1016/j.watres.2019.114875.
- 281 17. S. S. Nunayon, H. Zhang and A. C. K. Lai, *Indoor Air*, 2020, **30**, 180-191.
- 282 18. T. H. Lin, F. C. Tang, P. C. Hung, Z. C. Hua and C. Y. Lai, *Indoor Air*, 2018, DOI:
283 10.1111/ina.12475.
- 284 19. D. Mills, D. A. Harnish, C. Lawrence, M. Sandoval-Powers and B. K. Heimbuch, *Am J*
285 *Infect Control*, 2018, **46**, e49-e55.
- 286 20. E. M. Fisher and R. E. Shaffer, *J Appl Microbiol*, 2011, **110**, 287-295.
- 287 21. S. Mills D, Lawrence C, Heimbuch B, Harnish DA, Ultraviolet Germicidal Irradiation of
288 Influenza-Contaminated N95 Filtering Facepiece Respirators. American Society for
289 Microbiology Poster Presentation 2016,
290 [https://www.fda.gov/downloads/EmergencyPreparedness/Counterterrorism/MedicalCoun](https://www.fda.gov/downloads/EmergencyPreparedness/Counterterrorism/MedicalCountermeasures/MCMRegulatoryScience/UCM505730.pdf)
291 [termeasures/MCMRegulatoryScience/UCM505730.pdf](https://www.fda.gov/downloads/EmergencyPreparedness/Counterterrorism/MedicalCountermeasures/MCMRegulatoryScience/UCM505730.pdf) (accessed April 2020).
- 292 22. K. Bedell, A. H. Buchaklian and S. Perlman, *Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol*, 2016, **37**,
293 598-599.
- 294 23. F. Memarzadeh, R. N. Olmsted and J. M. Bartley, *Am J Infect Control*, 2010, **38**, S13-24.
- 295 24. C. C. Tseng and C. S. Li, *J Occup Environ Hyg*, 2007, **4**, 400-405.
- 296 25. M. Lindblad, E. Tano, C. Lindahl and F. Huss, *Burns*, 2019, DOI:
297 10.1016/j.burns.2019.10.004.

298 26. S. Narla, A. B. Lyons, I. Kohli, A. E. Torres, A. Parks-Miller, D. M. Ozog, I. H. Hamzavi
299 and H. W. Lim, *Photodermatol Photoimmunol Photomed*, In press, DOI:
300 10.1111/phpp.12562.

301 27. A. Fraise, J. Y. Maillard and S. Sattar, *Russell, Hugo & Ayliffe's Principles and Practice*
302 *of Disinfection, Preservation and Sterilization*, Wiley-Blackwell, United Kingdom, 5th
303 edn., 2013.

304 28. J. Halamka and J. Schnitzer, COVID-19 Healthcare Coalition N95 Working Group
305 Evaluation of Decontamination Techniques for the Reuse of N95 Respirators,
306 [https://c19hcc.org/static/img/insights/Evaluation-of-Respirator-Decontamination-](https://c19hcc.org/static/img/insights/Evaluation-of-Respirator-Decontamination-Techniques.pdf)
307 [Techniques.pdf](https://c19hcc.org/static/img/insights/Evaluation-of-Respirator-Decontamination-Techniques.pdf), (accessed April 1, 2020).

308 29. W. A. Rutala, M. F. Gergen and D. J. Weber, *Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol*, 2012, **33**,
309 1159-1161.

310 30. D. J. Weber, H. Kanamori and W. A. Rutala, *Curr Opin Infect Dis*, 2016, **29**, 424-431.

311 31. S. Ali, S. Yui, M. Muzslay and A. P. R. Wilson, *J Hosp Infect*, 2018, **98**, 438-439.

312 32. T. Y. Fu, P. Gent and V. Kumar, *J Hosp Infect*, 2012, **80**, 199-205.

313 33. E. Tuladhar, P. Terpstra, M. Koopmans and E. Duizer, *J Hosp Infect*, 2012, **80**, 110-115.

314 34. A. Schwartz, M. Stiegel, N. Greeson, A. Vogel, W. Thomann, M. Brown, G. D.
315 Sempowski, T. S. Alderman, J. P. Condreay, J. Burch, C. Wolfe, B. Smith and S. Lewis,
316 *Applied Biosafety*, In press, DOI: 10.1177/15356760209.

317 35. Battelle CCDS Critical Care Decontamination System,
318 [https://www.battelle.org/docs/default-source/commercial-offerings/industry-](https://www.battelle.org/docs/default-source/commercial-offerings/industry-solutions/732_battelle-critical-care-decon-system_technical-summaryf.pdf)
319 [solutions/732_battelle-critical-care-decon-system_technical-summaryf.pdf](https://www.battelle.org/docs/default-source/commercial-offerings/industry-solutions/732_battelle-critical-care-decon-system_technical-summaryf.pdf), (accessed
320 April 2020).

- 321 36. B. K. Heimbuch, W. H. Wallace, K. Kinney, A. E. Lumley, C. Y. Wu, M. H. Woo and J.
322 D. Wander, *Am J Infect Control*, 2011, **39**, e1-9.
- 323 37. M. B. Lore, B. K. Heimbuch, T. L. Brown, J. D. Wander and S. H. Hinrichs, *Ann Occup*
324 *Hyg*, 2012, **56**, 92-101.
- 325 38. H. F. Rabenau, J. Cinatl, B. Morgenstern, G. Bauer, W. Preiser and H. W. Doerr, *Med*
326 *Microbiol Immunol*, 2005, **194**, 1-6.
- 327 39. D. J. Viscusi, M. S. Bergman, B. C. Eimer and R. E. Shaffer, *Ann Occup Hyg*, 2009, **53**,
328 815-827.
- 329 40. T. H. Lin, C. C. Chen, S. H. Huang, C. W. Kuo, C. Y. Lai and W. Y. Lin, *PLoS One*, 2017,
330 **12**, e0186217.
- 331

TABLES:

Table I. Methods of N95 FFR Decontamination			
Decontamination Method	No. of FFRs [†]	Intensity/ Dose/ Concentration	Treatment Time
Ultraviolet germicidal irradiation (UVGI)	Variable	1 J/cm ²	60-70 seconds
Hydrogen peroxide vaporization (HPV)	100	35% H ₂ O ₂ solution Required HPV level: 480+ ppm [‡]	Gassing time: 25 minutes Gassing dwell: 20 minutes
Microwave generated steaming (MGS)	1	1250 W	2 minutes
Dry heating	Variable	FFR [†] surface temperature: 60-75 degrees Celsius	30 minutes

[†]FFR – filtering facepiece respirator

[‡]ppm – parts per million

Table II. Advantages and limitations of decontamination methods		
Decontamination Method	Advantages	Limitations
Ultraviolet germicidal irradiation (UVGI)	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Good germicidal activity- Short treatment duration- Has activity against coronaviruses	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Not readily available- Degrades polymers- May decrease tensile strength of FFR[†] straps
Hydrogen peroxide vaporization (HPV)	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Proven effective sterilization method- Allows sterilization of large quantities at once- Uniform delivery- Intact FFR[†] integrity (30 cycles)	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Not readily available- Requires an enclosed space- Possible off-gassing- Possible degradation of elastic bands after 50 cycles
Microwave generated steaming (MGS)	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Readily available- Fast (2 minutes)- No chemical residue or off-gassing- No FFR[†] degradation (3 cycles)	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Non-uniform delivery may affect efficacy- One FFR[†] at a time only- Reduced filtration capacity after 5 cycles or more
Dry heating	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Readily available- No chemical residue or off-gassing- Maintained filtration capacity even after 20 cycles	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Insufficient efficacy data with regards to FFR[†] decontamination- May degrade FFR[†] (“dry microwaving”)

		- Requires direct supervision
--	--	-------------------------------

336 [†]*FFR – filtering facepiece respirator*