Fast and easy disinfection of coronavirus-contaminated face masks using ozone gas produced by a dielectric barrier discharge plasma generator

Jinyeop Lee[1+], Cheolwoo Bong[1+], Pan K. Bae[2], Abdurhaman T. Abafogi[1], Seung H. Baek[1], Yong-Beom Shin[2,3,4], Moon S. Bak[1,5,*], and Sungsu Park[1,5,6,*]

[1]School of Mechanical Engineering, Sungkyunkwan University, Suwon 16419, Korea

[2]BioNano Health Guard Research Center (H-GUARD), Daejeon 34141, Korea

[3]Bionanotechnology Research Center, Korea Research Institute of Bioscience and Biotechnology (KRIBB),

Daejeon 34141, Korea

[4]Department of bioengineering, KRIBB School, University of science and Technology (UST), Daejeon 34141,

Korea

[5]Biomedical Institute for Convergence at SKKU (BICS), Sungkyunkwan University, Suwon 16419, Korea

[6]Institute of Quantum Biophysics (iQB), Sungkyunkwan University, Suwon 16419, Korea

[+] Each contributed equally to the work.

*Correspondence and requests for materials should be addressed to M. S. Bak (moonsoo@skku.edu)/S. Park (nanopark@skku.edu).

Abstract

Face masks are one of the currently available options for preventing the transmission of the severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2), which has caused the 2019 pandemic. However, with the increasing demand for protection, face masks are becoming limited in stock, and the concerned individuals and healthcare workers from many countries are now facing the issue of the reuse of potentially contaminated masks. Although various technologies already exist for the sterilization of medical equipment, most of them are not applicable for eliminating virus from face masks. Thus, there is an urgent need to develop a fast and easy method of disinfecting contaminated face masks. In this study, using a human coronavirus (HCoV-229E) as a surrogate for SARS-CoV-2 contamination on face masks, we show that the virus loses its infectivity to a human cell line (MRC-5) when exposed for a short period of time (1 min) to ozone gas produced by a dielectric barrier discharge plasma generator. Scanning electron microscopy and particulate filtration efficiency (PFE) tests revealed that there was no structural or functional deterioration observed in the face masks even after they underwent excessive exposure to ozone (five 1-minute exposures). Interestingly, for face masks exposed to ozone gas for 5 min, the amplification of HCoV-229E RNA by reverse transcription polymerase chain reaction suggested a loss of infectivity under the effect of ozone, primarily owing to the damage caused to viral envelopes or envelope proteins. Ozone gas is a strong oxidizing agent with the ability to kill viruses on hard-to-reach surfaces, including the fabric structure of face masks. These results suggest that it may be possible to rapidly disinfect contaminated face masks using a plasma generator in a well-ventilated place.

Keyword: face mask, coronavirus, ozone gas, disinfection.

70

71 **Introduction**

72 Face masks are serving as one of the options for preventing severe acute respiratory
73 syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2), which has caused the 2019 international pandemic of
74 the coronavirus disease.[1] However, with increasing demands for protection, face masks are
75 becoming limited in stock; concerned individuals and healthcare workers from many
76 countries are now facing the issue of the reuse of potentially contaminated masks in many
77 countries. Thus, there is an urgent need to develop a fast and easy method of disinfecting
78 contaminated face masks. There already exist technologies for the sterilization of medical
79 equipment, including personal protective equipment (PPE); these technologies include
80 autoclave treatment, ethylene oxide gassing, ionized hydrogen peroxide fogging and
81 hydrogen peroxide vaporization.[2] However, most of them are not practical for disinfecting
82 face masks with SARS-CoV-2.[2] It was reported that ozone gas produced by plasma generators
83 can inactivate various types of viruses on different surfaces, including porous ones.[3-6] Ozone
84 is a powerful oxidizing agent, but it does not linger. Its production, involving the use of
85 electricity and a normal atmosphere, is easy and inexpensive. However, it has not been
86 determined whether ozone gas can disinfect face masks contaminated with SARS-CoV-2
87 without compromising the filtration efficiency of the masks.

88 Here we show that a human coronavirus (HCoV-229E)[7,8] as a surrogate for SARS-CoV-2
89 on face masks lost its infectivity to a human cell line (MRC-5) when exposed to gaseous
90 ozone produced by a dielectric barrier discharge (DBD) plasma generator[9] for a short time (1
91 min) (Figure 1). Neither structural nor functional deterioration of the face masks even with
92 excessive exposures (5 times, 5 min per each time) to the ozone were observed by scanning
93 electron microscopy (SEM) and a particulate filtration efficiency (PFE) test. Interestingly, RNA
94 of HCoV-229E on the face masks by the ozone for 5 min was amplified by reverse
95 transcription polymerase chain reaction (RT-PCR). This is the first demonstration of the
96 potential of using ozone gas for disinfecting face masks contaminated with a coronavirus.



Figure 1. A schematic diagram describing the disinfection of a face mask contaminated by a coronavirus using ozone produced by a DBD plasma generator. It consists of a high-voltage, high-frequency power supply and two electrodes separated by a 1 mm-thick alumina dielectric barrier. Plasma was produced on the face of the device with the perforated electrode, along the rims of the holes.

■ RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Inhibitory effect of ozone gas on virus and bacteria on face masks. Among the numerous types of plasma generators, the dielectric barrier discharge (DBD) plasma generator is considered the most energy-efficient and cost-effective plasma generator for ozone production; it forms ozone through the dissociation of molecular oxygen (O_2) by collisions with excited electronic nitrogen populated by electron impacts and the ensuing combination between the atomic oxygen and O_2.[9]

When face masks, experimentally contaminated with a human coronavirus (HCoV-229E)[7,8] as a surrogate, were exposed to ozone gas (about 120 ppm) produced by the plasma generator for either 1 or 5 min, no viable HCoV-22E was recovered from the face masks (Table 1). Corresponding untreated face masks showed the recovery of about 3 log units of tissue culture infective dose 50% (log $TCID_{50}$) per mL following 15 min of air drying. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first demonstration of the potential of using ozone

118 gas for disinfecting face masks contaminated with a coronavirus. Similar results were
119 obtained for face masks experimentally contaminated with either influenza A virus (H1N1)[10]
120 (Table S1) or Gram-positive bacteria *Staphylococcus aureus* (Table S2 and Figure S1) when
121 exposed to ozone gas. These results suggest that virus and bacteria on face masks can be
122 inactivated by ozone gas at a concentration of about 120 ppm within a short time (1-5 min).

123

124 Table 1. HCoV-229E titer recovered from contaminated face masks with and without
125 exposure to ozone gas.

Treatment of face masks[a] contaminated with HCoV-229E	Recovered virus[b] (log $TCID_{50}$ ± S.D.)
None	3.0 ± 0.2 (n = 4)
Ozone gas (120 ppm[c], 1 min)	0 (n = 3)
Ozone gas (120 ppm, 5 min)	0 (n = 3)

126 [a] Samples (30 mm × 35 mm in size) were cut from face masks (Kleenguard®; product number
127 Y2-44015, Kimberly-Clark Worldwide, Inc., Irving, TX, USA) with 3-layers filtering. The front
128 side was sprayed with about 250 µL of HCoV-229E culture (about 4.5 log $TCID_{50}$ per mL) and
129 dried at room temperature for 15 min in a biosafety cabinet before exposed to ozone gas.

130 [b] Virus particles on the samples were collected by washing the sample surface with 5 mL of
131 PBS (phosphate buffered saline, pH 7.4) and measured using MRC-5 cells (ATCC, Bethesda,
132 MD, USA).[11]

133 [c] The ozone concentrations produced by the DBD plasma generator were measured via UV
134 absorption spectroscopy.[12]

135 n: sample number.

136

137 **Partial degradation of viral RNA by ozone gas**

138 To understand the mechanism underlying the viral inactivation of face masks by ozone gas,
139 the experimentally contaminated face masks (Kleenguard®; product # Y2-44015, Kimberly-
140 Clark Worldwide, Inc., Irving, TX, USA)—with and without exposure to ozone gas for 5 min—
141 were washed, and the washing solutions were assayed with the quantitative reverse
142 transcription polymerase chain reaction (qRT-PCR).[13] Surprisingly, there was no significant

143 difference ($p > 0.05$; student's t-test) in the amount of amplifiable RNAs between the
144 unexposed and exposed masks, indicating that the short exposure may not fully degrade the
145 viral RNA (Table 2). Similarly, the RNA of either H1N1 (Table S3) or *S. aureus* (Table S4) on the
146 face masks was not totally degraded by the exposure to ozone gas. These results suggest
147 that the loss of infectivity could be due to the damage to the viral envelope or envelope
148 proteins, resulting in failure of the virus to attach itself to host cells.[14]

149

150 Table 2: qRT-PCR of HCoV-229E in washing solutions obtained from contaminated face
151 masks with and without exposure to ozone gas.

Treatment of face masks contaminated with HCoV-229E	Ct value[a] (mean ± S.D.)
None	22.7 ± 0.4 (n = 6)
Ozone gas (120 ppm, 5 min)	23.1 ± 0.6 (n = 6)

152 [a] cycle threshold (Ct) is defined as the number of cycles required for the fluorescent signal to
153 exceed the background signal level (threshold). n: sample number.

154

155 **No structural damage on the filter layer of face masks**

156 To test if the exposure of face masks (Kleenguard®) to either plasma or ozone gas causes
157 any damage to their filter layer, uncontaminated face masks were exposed to ozone gas for
158 5 min (five 1-minute exposures). We did not see any noticeable damage on the front and
159 back side of the face masks with eyes and under a light microscope, either (data not shown).
160 Their inner filter layer composed of polypropylene meltblown non-woven fabric was further
161 examined under a SEM. As shown in Figure 2, there was no detectable structural damage
162 caused to the filter layer of the exposed face masks. The result showed that the repeated
163 exposures (5 times) of face masks to ozone gas did cause structural damage to the face
164 masks.



Figure 2. Scanning electron microscopy images of the filter layer of uncontaminated face masks (Kleenguard®) with and without exposures to ozone gas for 5 min (five 1-minute exposures). The images were taken by a field-emission scanning electron microscope (FE-SEM-EDS, JSM7500F, JEOL Ltd., Tokyo, Japan).

No functional deterioration on face masks

The electrocharged filter is an essential component of dust masks such as N95 and KF94 masks and there was a concern that the charge on the filter could be lost with its exposure to ozone gas. The functioning of KF94 masks (registration number: F1-28712011; Kleannara Co., Seoul, Korea) which are certified to filter out 94% of particulate matter (about 0.4 µm diameter), after exposed to ozone gas for 5 min (five 1-minute exposures) was thus assessed using a standard test for measuring PFE with paraffin oil mists.[15] There was no statistical difference in PFE between the exposed and unexposed face masks (Table 3). Taken together with the SEM images, it is suggested that the repeated exposures (5 times) of face masks to ozone gas do not cause structural or functional damage to the face masks.

184 Table 3: PFE of uncontaminated face masks (KF94) with and without exposure to ozone gas.

Certified testing lab[a]	Ozone gas treatment on uncontaminated face masks	PFE (%)[b] (Mean ± S.D.)
FITI Testing & Research Institute	None	98.5 ± 1.3 (n=3)
	Ozone gas (120 ppm, 5 min)	99.3 ± 1 (n=3)
Korea Mask Laboratory	None	98.4 ± 0.5 (n=6)
	Ozone gas (120 ppm, 5 min)	98.6 ± 0.5 (n=6)

185 [a] The lab is certified and registered as a testing lab by the ministry of food and drug safety
186 (MFDS) in Korea.

187 [b] Measured by a standard method using paraffin mist. n: sample number.

188

189 ■ **CONCLUSIONS**

190 In this study, using a human coronavirus (HCoV-229E) as a surrogate for SARS-CoV-2
191 contamination on face masks, the virus is shown to lose its infectivity to a human cell line
192 (MRC-5) when exposed for a short period of time (1 min) to ozone gas produced by the DBD
193 plasma generator. SEM and PFE tests revealed that there was no structural or functional
194 deterioration observed in the face masks even after they underwent excessive exposure to
195 ozone (five 1-minute exposures).

196 Ozone gas is a strong oxidizing agent with the ability to kill viruses on hard-to-reach
197 surfaces, including the fabric structure of face masks. Inexpensive consumer-grade ozone
198 generators are widely available. Our results suggest that it may be possible to rapidly
199 disinfect face masks contaminated with SARS-CoV-2 using a plasma generator in a well-
200 ventilated place.

201

202 ■ **MATERIALS AND METHODS**

203 **DBD plasma generator**

204 The plasma generator consists of a high-voltage, high-frequency generator (Minipuls 2.2;
205 GBS Elektronik GmbH, Großerkmannsdorf, Germany) and two electrodes separated by a 1
206 mm -thick alumina dielectric barrier. Each electrode was made of a perforated stainless-steel
207 plate and bare aluminum tape. The plasma was produced only at the perforated electrode,
208 along the rims of the holes. As the dielectric barrier allows electrons and ions to accumulate
209 on the surface, preventing the transition from a cold plasma to an arc, a sinusoidal voltage
210 was applied to steadily produce the plasma (Figure S2). The plasma was turned on for 1 min

211 after every 4 min to avoid any damage resulting from thermal heating.

212 **UV absorption spectroscopy**

213 The ozone concentrations produced by the DBD plasma generator were measured via UV
214 absorption spectroscopy.[16] Light from a mercury lamp (BHK 90-0005-01, spectral line: 253.65
215 nm) was collimated using lenses and an optical fiber and sent through a gas medium, 4.3 cm
216 above the electrode surface where the plasma is produced. The transmitted light intensity
217 was then measured using a spectrometer (AvaSpec-2048L). As the wavelength-dependent
218 absorption cross section of ozone is broad near 253.65 nm and known as $1.137 \cdot 10^{-17}$
219 $cm^2 molecule^{-1}$, the ozone concentration can be evaluated by the Beer-Lambert law
220 described as follows:

$$n_{O_3} = -\frac{1}{\sigma_{O_3} L} ln\left(\frac{I}{I_0}\right) \quad (1)$$

221 where I and I_0 are the transmitted and incident light intensities; n_{O3} is the number density of
222 ozone; σ_{O_3} is the ozone absorption cross-section near 253.65 nm; L is the optical path
223 length. The ozone concentrations under the test conditions were determined to be
224 approximately 120 ppm.

225 **Coronavirus culture**

226 HCoV-229E was cultured using human fetal lung fibroblast cell (MRC-5; ATCC, Bethesda, MD,
227 USA) in a 96-well plate.[11]

228 **Exposure of face masks experimentally contaminated with HCoV-229E to ozone gas**

229 Samples (n = 6) were cut (30 mm × 35 mm in size) from face masks and sprayed with about
230 250 µL of HCoV-229E culture (4.5 log $TCID_{50}$ per mL) in a biosafety cabinet at a biosafety
231 level-2 (BSL-2) laboratory while wearing face masks and gloves. The samples were then
232 dried for 15 min at 25 °C and were individually exposed to ozone for both 1 and 5 min using
233 the plasma generator (Figure 1) in a chemical hood.

234 **Determination of $TCID_{50}$ value**

235 Immediately after the exposure, the virus particles on the samples were collected by
236 washing the samples with 5 mL of PBS (phosphate buffered saline, pH 7.4). $TCID_{50}$ was
237 determined by adding serial 10-fold dilutions of HCoV-229E collected from each mask into a

238 human fetal lung fibroblast cell (MRC-5, ATCC, Bethesda, MD, USA) monolayer in a 96-well
239 plate.[11] The plates were observed for cytopathic effects for 4 days. The viral titer was
240 calculated via the Reed and Munch endpoint method.[11] Viral titer collected from the face
241 masks was measured using MRC-5 cells (ATCC, Bethesda, MD, USA).[11]

242 **RT-PCR**

243 Immediately after the exposure, the virus particles on the samples were collected by
244 washing the samples with 5 mL of PBS. qRT-PCR was performed using StepOne™ Real-Time
245 PCR system (Applied biosystems, CA, USA) and MG 2X One Step RT-PCR SYBR® Green Master
246 Mix reagents (Cancer Rop Co Ltd., Seoul, Korea). A segment of the *N* gene of HCoV229E was
247 amplified using a forward primer (CGCAAGAATTCAGAACCAGAG) and a reverse primer
248 (GGCAGTCAGGTTCTTCAACAA)[13] with an amplicon size of 83 bp (Bioneer, Daejeon, Korea).
249 The thermocycler conditions were as follows: reverse transcriptase at 50 °C for 30 min and
250 an initial denaturation at 95 °C for 5 min, followed by 45 cycles of denaturation at 95 °C for
251 15 s, annealing at 52 °C for 30 s, and an extension at 72 °C for 30 s. To confirm that the target
252 amplicon was properly formed, a melting curve analysis was conducted. The fluorescence
253 intensity was measured within the range of 60–95 °C at a rate of 0.2 °C/s.

254 **SEM**

255 A field-emission scanning electron microscope (FE-SEM-EDS, JSM7500F, JEOL Ltd., Tokyo,
256 Japan) was used to take images of untreated and treated masks (n=4). To obtain the
257 morphology of the electrostatic melt blown filter layer, which is the middle layer of the face
258 mask, the melt blown filter was cut to obtain a 5 mm x 5 mm sample that was coated with
259 iridium (Ir) for 15 minutes via the ion sputtering method. The FE-SEM-EDS was operated at
260 15 kV, and the working distance (WD) was 8 mm. All the sample images were acquired with
261 magnification factors of 25, 50, and 200.

262 **Paraffin Oil Test**

263 The standard test for measuring the filtration efficiency with paraffin oil mist was performed
264 on masks at FITI Testing & Research Institute (Cheongju, Korea) and Korea Mask Laboratory
265 (KML; Hanam city, Korea), the authorized testing organizations in Korea. In this test, a tester
266 first produces paraffin oil mist with a particle size ranging from 0.05 to 1.7 μm, 0.4 μm on
267 average.[15] The flow containing the paraffin oil aerosol at a concentration of 20 ± 5 mg/m^3 is

268 then blown towards the mask at a flow rate of 95 L/min. The filtration efficiency, given by Eq.
269 (2), is then evaluated by measuring the concentrations of paraffin oil mist upstream and
270 downstream of the mask. The efficiency is a value averaged over 30 s and must be measured
271 within 3 min after the test starts.

$$P = \frac{C_1 - C_2}{C_1} \times 100 \quad (2)$$

272 where P is the filtration efficiency; C_1 and C_2 are the concentrations of paraffin oil mist
273 upstream and downstream of the mask, respectively.

274

275 **Supplementary Materials:** Supplementary materials can be found at
276 www.mdpi.com/xxx/s1.

277 **Acknowledgements**: We thank Ms. J. So for giving an idea for the project.

278 **Funding:** S.P. was supported by the BioNano Health-Guard Research Centre as a Global
279 Frontier Project (H-guard 2018M3A6B2057299) through the National Research Foundation
280 (NRF) of Ministry of Science and ICT (MSIT) in Korea. M.S.B. was supported by a grant
281 through a future integration program of Kangbuk Samsung Hospital-Biomedical Institute for
282 Convergence (BICS) at Sungkyunkwan University.

283 **Conflicts of Interest:** The authors declare no conflict of interest.

284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295

296

297

298 **References**

299 1. Leung NHL, Chu DKW, Shiu EYC, et al. Respiratory virus shedding in exhaled breath
300 and efficacy of face masks. *Nat Med.* 2020. doi:10.1038/s41591-020-0843-2.

301 2. Kumar A, Kasloff SB, Leung A, et al. N95 Mask Decontamination using Standard
302 Hospital Sterilization Technologies. Preprint. Posted online April 08, 2020. MedRxiv.
303 doi:10.1101/2020.04.05.20049346.

304 3. Hudson JB, Sharma M, Vimalanathan S. Development of a practical method for using
305 ozone gas as a virus decontaminating agent. *Ozone Sci Eng.* 2009;31(3):216-223.
306 doi:10.1080/01919510902747969.

307 4. Zimmermann JL, Dumler K, Shimizu T, et al. Effects of cold atmospheric plasmas on
308 adenoviruses in solution. *J Phys D Appl Phys.* 2011;44(50):505201. doi:10.1088/0022-
309 3727/44/50/505201.

310 5. Mastanaiah N, Johnson JA, Roy S. Effect of dielectric and liquid on plasma sterilization
311 using dielectric barrier discharge plasma. *PLoS One.* 2013;8(8):e70840
312 doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0070840.

313 6. Morfill GE, Shimizu T, Steffes B, Schmidt HU. Nosocomial infections—a new approach
314 towards preventive medicine using plasmas. *New J Phys.* 2009;11(11):115019..

315 7. Van Der Hoek L, Pyrc K, Berkhout B. Human coronavirus NL63, a new respiratory
316 virus. *FEMS Microbiol Rev.* 2006;30(5):760-773. doi:10.1111/j.1574-
317 6976.2006.00032.x.

318 8. Wentworth D, Holmes KV. Molecular determinants of species specificity in the
319 coronavirus receptor aminopeptidase N (CD13): influence of N-linked glycosylation. *J*
320 *Virol.* 2001;75(20):9741-9752. doi:10.1128/JVI.75.20.9741-9752.2001.

321 9. Stefanovic I, Bibinov N, Deryugin A, et al. Kinetics of ozone and nitric oxides in
322 dielectric barrier discharges in O2/NOx and N2/O2/NOx mixtures. *Plasma Sources Sci*
323 *Technol.* 2001;10(3):406.

324 10. Dotis J, Roilides EJH. H1N1 Influenza A infection. *Hippokratia*. 2009;13(3):135-138.

325 11. Reed LJ, Muench H. A simple method of estimating fifty per cent endpoints. *Am J*
326 *Epidemiol.* 1938;27(3):493-497. doi:10.1093/oxfordjournals.aje.a118408.

327 12. Reuter S, Winter J, Iseni S, et al. Detection of ozone in a MHz argon plasma bullet jet.
328 *Plasma Sources Sci Technol.* 2012;21(3):034015.

329 13. Lu R, Yu X, Wang W, et al. Characterization of human coronavirus etiology in Chinese
330 adults with acute upper respiratory tract infection by real-time RT-PCR assays. *PLoS*
331 *One*. 2012;7(6):e38638 doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0038638.

332 14. Tseng C, Li C. Inactivation of surface viruses by gaseous ozone. *J Environ Health*.
333 2008;70(10):56-63.

334 15. Choi HW, Yoon S, Lee JH, *et al.* Comparison of pressure drop and filtration efficiency
335 of particulate respirators using welding fumes and sodium chloride. *Ann. Occup. Hyg.*
336 2011;55(6):666-680. doi: 10.1093/annhyg/mer032.

337 16. Orphal J, Staehelin J, Tamminen J, et al. Absorption cross-sections of ozone in the
338 ultraviolet and visible spectral regions: Status report 2015. *J Mol Spectrosc.*
339 2016;327:105-121. doi: 10.1016/j.jms.2016.07.007.

340