

1 **Article Summary Line:** Ultraviolet C at a dose of 1.5 J/cm² applied to both sides is effective at
2 decontaminating SARS-CoV-2 on some types/models of N95 respirators.

3 **Running Title:** UVC Decontamination of SARS-CoV-2 N95 Respirators

4 **Key Words:** Ultraviolet C; N95; decontamination; SARS-Co-V2; healthcare personnel;
5 pandemic; reuse; filtering facepiece respirators; ultraviolet germicidal irradiation; COVID-19

6 **Title:** The Effect of Ultraviolet C Radiation Against SARS-CoV-2 Inoculated N95
7 Respirators

8 **Authors:**

9 David M. Ozog, Jonathan Z. Sexton, Shanthi Narla, Carla D. Pretto-Kernahan, Carmen
10 Mirabelli, Henry W. Lim, Iltefat H. Hamzavi, Robert J. Tibbetts, and Qing-Sheng Mi

11 **Affiliations:**

12 Henry Ford Health System, Detroit, Michigan, USA (D. Ozog, S. Narla, H. Lim, I. Hamzavi, R.
13 Tibbetts, Q. Mi)

14 University of Michigan Medical School, Ann Arbor, Michigan, USA (J. Sexton, C. Pretto-
15 Kernahan, C. Mirabelli)

16 University of Michigan College of Pharmacy, Ann Arbor, Michigan, USA (J. Sexton)

17 University of Michigan Center for Drug Repurposing, Ann Arbor, Michigan, USA (J. Sexton)

18

19

20

21

22

23

24 **Abstract**

25 Since March 31st, 2020, during the height of the pandemic, we have decontaminated
26 thousands of 3M 1860 respirators with Ultraviolet C (UVC) for our frontline workers. There is
27 no published peer-reviewed data regarding the dose required to effectively disinfect SARS-CoV-
28 2 on N95 filtering facepiece respirators (FFRs). Four different locations (facepiece and strap) on
29 5 different N95 FFR models (3M 1860, 8210, 8511, 9211; Moldex 1511) were inoculated with a
30 10 µL drop of SARS-CoV-2 viral stock (8×10^7 TCID₅₀/mL). The outside-facing and wearer-
31 facing surfaces of the respirators were each irradiated with a dose of 1.5 J/cm² UVC (254 nm).
32 Viable SARS-CoV-2 was quantified by a median tissue culture infectious dose assay (TCID₅₀).
33 UVC delivered using a dose of 1.5 J/cm², to each side, was an effective method of
34 decontamination for the facepieces of 3M 1860 and Moldex 1511, and for the straps of 3M 8210
35 and the Moldex 1511. This dose is an appropriate decontamination method to facilitate reuse of
36 respirators for healthcare personnel when applied to certain models/materials. Increasing the
37 dose may improve decontamination for the other models and straps; however, UVC radiation can
38 degrade certain polymers in a dose dependent manner, and the effects may vary greatly between
39 different models. Therefore, fit-testing of UVC decontaminated respirators must be performed
40 each time a new model and/or dose is introduced into the healthcare system.

41

42

43

44

45

46

47 **Introduction**

48 The shortage of personal protective equipment (PPE) is affecting healthcare workers
49 worldwide during the coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) pandemic. The ability to
50 decontaminate and reuse N95 filtering facepiece respirators (FFRs) is a partial solution to the
51 current shortage.(1) We recently proposed decontaminating respirators with repurposed
52 dermatology office phototherapy devices, which serve as a platform for ultraviolet C (UVC)
53 germicidal disinfection.(2) On March 31st, during the height of the pandemic, Henry Ford Health
54 System (HFHS) began decontaminating 3M 1860 respirators with UVC and returning them to
55 their original users. Since then, several thousand respirators have been decontaminated.

56 Previous studies have shown that UVC can inactivate other coronaviruses including
57 Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome coronavirus (SARS-CoV) and Middle East Respiratory
58 Syndrome coronavirus (MERS-CoV).(3, 4) However, there is no peer-reviewed published data
59 showing the effective disinfection of the causative agent of COVID-19, SARS-CoV-2 by UVC,
60 on intact N95 filtering facepiece respirators (FFRs). Consequently, this was causing significant
61 anxiety in our frontline workers using decontaminated PPE.

62 The objective of this study was to determine the effect of UVC on decontamination of
63 SARS-CoV-2-innoculated N95 respirators using a variety of FFRs that are available to
64 healthcare employees at Henry Ford Health System (HFHS) in Detroit, MI.

65 **Methods**

66 The study was performed as a collaboration between the HFHS and the University of
67 Michigan. All study procedures were approved and conducted according to the University of
68 Michigan Institutional Biosafety Committee BSL3 (Biosafety Level 3). The appropriate training
69 and medical surveillance for experimental procedures and manipulations performed in the BSL3

70 facility were satisfied by all individuals directly involved in laboratory testing at University of
71 Michigan.

72 **Virus and Preparation of Viral Stocks**

73 The SARS-CoV-2 strain used was USA-WA1/2020 NR-52281. Viral stocks of SARS-
74 COV-2 were obtained from the Biodefense and Emerging Infections Research Resources
75 Repository and were propagated in Vero-E6 cells grown in Dulbecco's Modified Eagle Medium
76 (DMEM) without phenol red, with 2% Fetal Bovine Serum (FBS), L-glutamine,
77 penicillin/streptomycin, non-essential amino acids, and hydroxyethyl piperazineethanesulfonic
78 acid (HEPES). The virus stock was purposely produced in a phenol red-free medium to avoid
79 photodegradation or photooxidation that may affect the results. For stock virus titration, aliquots
80 of viral stock were applied on confluent Vero-E6 cells in 96-well plates for a 50% tissue culture
81 infectious dose (TCID₅₀) assay. Viral stocks were determined to be 8×10^7 TCID₅₀/mL.

82 **Test respirators and UVGI device**

83 Respirators were tested 100% intact and included the following models: 3M 1860 (St.
84 Paul, MN); 3M 8210 (St. Paul, MN); Moldex 1511 (Culver City, CA); 3M 8511 (St. Paul, MN);
85 and 3M 9211 (St. Paul, MN). The low-pressure mercury lamp ultraviolet germicidal irradiation
86 device (UVGI) (254 nm, 1 series) was manufactured by Daavlin (Byron, OH), with custom
87 dimensions (22 in. x 10 in. x 8 in) to fit under the BSL3 biosafety hood. The irradiance of the
88 device was approximately 16.5 mW/cm² at a distance of 11.5 cm from the lamps (approximately
89 at the apex of the N95 respirator). The UVGI device used 4 lamps, spaced 4.5 cm apart. In
90 comparison, the devices used by HFHS to decontaminate respirators for healthcare personnel had
91 an irradiance of approximately 10 mW/cm² at a distance of 11.5 cm from the lamps. This UVGI
92 device had 10 lamps, spaced 11 cm apart. Despite the differences, the units are similar in

93 performance. Prior to initiating the experiment, the irradiance of the device was measured, and a
94 built-in dosimeter was calibrated to adjust the irradiation.

95 **Decontamination studies**

96 Intact FFRs in a donned position were inoculated on the outside-facing surface with a
97 single 10 μ L drop of viral stock (8×10^7 TCID₅₀/mL) on 4 areas to account for differing received
98 doses on complex surfaces: nosepiece, apex, chin-piece, and strap (**Figure 1A**). Inoculated
99 respirators were dried in a biosafety cabinet at room temperature for 40 minutes. For each N95
100 respirator model, FFRs were UVC-irradiated or left untreated as positive controls for viral load
101 recovery. The respirators were then placed under the UVGI device, in the center, and were
102 individually treated with a dose of 1.5 J/cm². Then, they were rotated and the wearer-facing side
103 of the N95 was again irradiated with 1.5 J/cm². The irradiation time for each side was
104 approximately 60-70 seconds. The device does not generate any heat; as such, all FFRs were
105 exposed to UVC at room temperature. Immediately after the completion of the irradiation, 4 mm
106 circles containing the inoculated surface were obtained with a leather belt eyelet hole punch tool
107 and were placed in 300 μ L (microliters) of PBS for 1 hour at room temperature.

108 Recovered viral loads were determined by TCID₅₀ assay of the absorbed samples.
109 Briefly, 25 μ L aliquots of serially 10-fold diluted samples were inoculated into 96-well plates
110 with a Vero-E6 cell monolayer in sextuplicate and cultured in DMEM with 2% FBS, L-
111 glutamine, penicillin/streptomycin, non-essential amino acids, and HEPES. The plates were
112 observed for cytopathic effects for 4 days. Viral titer was calculated with the Reed and Muench
113 endpoint method.⁽⁵⁾ Viral yields were expressed as total TCID₅₀ recovered in 300 μ L or TCID₅₀/
114 4mm punch. TCID₅₀ negative controls were cells with media only and were included on each
115 plate assayed. All negative controls had no cytopathic effect (CPE). The limit of detection (LOD)

116 for the TCID₅₀ assay was determined to be 10^{1.3} TCID₅₀ / 4 mm punch. If the amount of viral
117 particles was below the LOD, then a theoretical, yet low content of viruses may be present.(6)
118 However, an absence of CPE in the Vero E6 cells at 4 days post inoculation indicates a loss of
119 infectivity and is evidence of inactivation of the SARS-CoV-2 samples (**Figure 1B**).(6) We
120 considered effective decontamination to be results below the LOD with no CPE, the elimination
121 of all infectious SARS-CoV-2.

122 **Results**

123 Following preliminary testing (**Appendix Figure 1, Appendix Table 1**), virus
124 inoculation was performed on all 5 types of respirators. For each type, three were irradiated with
125 UVC, and one was not irradiated to serve as positive control. Similar results were seen for the
126 3M 1860 respirators as in the preliminary study. All facepiece locations were below the LOD
127 with absent CPE. Two straps were above the LOD, and one strap was below the LOD with
128 absent CPE. Sufficient virus (≤ 1 log reduction) was recovered from the untreated positive
129 controls on all facepiece locations; however, a lower yield was recovered from the untreated
130 control strap (**Figure 2, Appendix Table 2**).

131 On the 3M 8210 respirators, location 1 had two respirators above the LOD, and one
132 respirator below the LOD with absent CPE. Location 2 had one FFR at the LOD, and two FFRs
133 below the LOD with absent CPE. Location 3 and all the straps were below the LOD with absent
134 CPE. Lower virus yields were recovered from the untreated positive control on all facepiece
135 locations. In contrast, the strap did not absorb the droplet and a sufficient yield was obtained.
136 (**Figure 2, Appendix Table 2**). Of note, the amount of virus recovered from the strap on the
137 untreated positive control was higher than the untreated control virus stock (10 μ L in PBS

138 control). This could have been due to a loss of viral titer of the stock as the control sat in PBS
139 solution for an hour during the experiment.

140 On the Moldex 1511, all facepiece locations and straps were below the LOD with absent
141 CPE. However, there was a lower virus recovery from certain facepiece locations (1 and 3) on
142 the untreated positive respirator (**Figure 2, Appendix Table 2**).

143 For the 3M 8511 and 3M 9211, locations 1 and 2 had FFRs all below the LOD with
144 absent CPE. Location 3 had one FFR at the LOD, and two respirators below the LOD with
145 absent CPE. All the straps were above the LOD. All facepiece locations and the strap on the
146 untreated control had lower virus recovery as compared to the 10 μ L in PBS control (**Figure 2,**
147 **Appendix Table 2**).

148 Discussion

149 Five N95 respirator models were inoculated with SARS-CoV-2 and tested. UVC
150 delivered using a dose of 1.5 J/cm², to each side, was an effective method of decontamination for
151 the facepieces of 3M 1860 and Moldex 1511, and for the straps of 3M 8210 and the Moldex
152 1511. This is consistent with previous results using H1N1 influenza demonstrating that UVC
153 decontamination is dependent on model and material type. Mills et al(7) and Heimbuch et al(4)
154 reported 1 J/cm² dose may not be adequate to kill H1N1 influenza depending on the N95
155 respirator used. Mills et al found that only facepieces on 12 of 15 models and straps on 7 of 15
156 models showed a significant (≥ 3 log) reduction of H1N1 influenza viability. Similarly,
157 Heimbuch et al found that only facepieces on 11 of 15 models and straps on 4 of 15 models
158 showed a significant (≥ 3 log) reduction of H1N1 influenza viability.(8)

159 Some respirator models have materials, such as the straps of the 3M 1860, that
160 demonstrate hydrophilic characteristics when inoculated. Moreover, these seemingly hydrophilic

161 surfaces showed consistently lower mean log reduction $< 3 \log_{10} \text{TCID}_{50}$.(4) In contrast,
162 seemingly hydrophobic materials, such as the 3M 1860 facepiece, were found to demonstrate a $>$
163 $3 \log_{10} \text{TCID}_{50}$ reduction.(4) In our study using SARS-CoV-2, we observed similar results with
164 the 3M 1860 facepiece and strap. Further, the facepieces of the 3M 8210 have hydrophilic
165 properties which were reflected in the reduced decontamination results, while the straps did not
166 readily absorb the droplets, and hence were adequately disinfected. The Moldex 1511 facepiece
167 and straps also appeared to be hydrophobic and did not absorb the droplets.

168 Some straps are prone to twisting. Consequently, when the respirator is flipped during
169 the irradiation process, care must be taken to make sure the appropriate surface of the strap is
170 exposed to UVC. Also, straps should not inadvertently lay on top of the respirator, hence
171 creating a shadowing effect. Reduced decontamination seen amongst the straps may not only be
172 a result of material but secondary to receiving a reduced dosage. UVC devices which provide
173 360 degrees of irradiation may obviate this issue. Possible respirator-based solutions include a
174 secondary disinfection step (e.g. Environmental Protection Agency recommended cleansers)
175 applied only to the straps. Further, ancillary disinfection testing was performed on the 3M 1860
176 straps using over-the-counter 70% isopropyl alcohol prep pads (TopCare, Elk Grove Village,
177 IL). The straps were inoculated with SARS-CoV-2 and wiped three times with the alcohol pad.
178 Results of the study showed that regardless of UVC irradiation, alcohol alone was sufficient to
179 decontaminate the 3M 1860 straps (**Appendix Figure 2, Appendix Table 3**). Additionally,
180 manufacturers may consider using, for example, the same material as the straps of the 3M 8210
181 for all the other models of FFRs to improve UVC decontamination.

182 Our dosage for this study was partially based on previous work with Influenza A (H1N1),
183 Avian influenza A virus (H5N1), Influenza A (H7N9) A/Anhui/1/2013, Influenza A (H7N9)

184 A/Shanghai/1/2013, MERS-CoV, and SARS-CoV,(4, 7-9) where it was determined that all areas
185 of a respirator should receive at least 1 J/cm^2 . Preliminary unpublished data from the
186 Photomedicine and Photobiology Unit at HFHS demonstrated through theoretical and measured
187 models that the curvature and the distance of the 3M 1860 N95 respirator from the light source
188 affected the dosage delivered in a predictable way. Moreover, extrapolating from this model,
189 after irradiating one side of the respirator with 1.5 J/cm^2 , some of the lateral aspects may only
190 receive 900 mJ/cm^2 while the apex of the respirator may receive almost 3 J/cm^2 . Further, it was
191 also observed that a certain percentage of the dosage received in an area ($\sim 10\%$) permeates to the
192 other side (I. Kohli, unpub. data). Therefore, 1.5 J/cm^2 was chosen as the lowest irradiance to
193 ensure that all areas received at least 1 J/cm^2 . Increasing the dosage delivered may improve
194 decontamination, but UVC radiation can degrade certain polymers in a dose dependent manner,
195 and the effects may vary greatly between different models.(10) Therefore, fit-testing of UVC
196 decontaminated respirators must be performed each time a new model and/or dose is introduced
197 into the healthcare system.(11)

198 Our study sampled different areas of each respirator to ensure that all ranges of dosages
199 were accounted for in a real-world setting against SARS-CoV-2. Other strengths included the
200 testing of different model types. Of note, the hydrophilic surfaces (e.g. 3M 8210 facepiece and
201 3M 1860 strap) of untreated positive controls demonstrated a lower virus recovery than control.
202 Additional testing was performed to determine if the droplet was drying larger than the 4 mm
203 area tested. The results showed that there was limited to no virus in the periphery of the 4 mm
204 area tested, and that no virus could be detected on the wearer-facing surface. Moreover, the
205 lower yield reflects a diminished ability to resuspend the virus after drying. Limitations of the
206 study include that no soiling agents were used. However, at Henry Ford Health System, as in

207 other healthcare facilities, personnel are instructed not to reuse respirators that are visibly soiled.
208 Further, it is still unclear what the infectious dose is for SARS-CoV-2; therefore, it is unknown if
209 a significant reduction in viral load eliminates contagious risk.

210 In conclusion, UVC at a dose of 1.5 J/cm² applied to both sides is effective at
211 decontaminating SARS-CoV-2 on some N95 respirators. This dose may only be an appropriate
212 decontamination method to facilitate reuse of PPE for healthcare personnel when applied to
213 certain models/materials. In addition, some straps may require additional disinfection to
214 maximize the safety to the frontline workers. Implementation of widespread UVC
215 decontamination methods requires a careful consideration of model, material type, design, and
216 fit-testing following irradiation. It should also be emphasized that similar cautions should be
217 practiced for all other methods of respirator decontamination.

218

219

220

221

222

223

224

225

226

227

228

229

230 **References**

- 231 1. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Decontamination and Reuse of Filtering
232 Facepiece Respirators. 2020 [cited 9 April 2020]; Available from:
233 [https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/hcp/ppe-strategy/decontamination-reuse-](https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/hcp/ppe-strategy/decontamination-reuse-respirators.html)
234 [respirators.html](https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/hcp/ppe-strategy/decontamination-reuse-respirators.html)
- 235 2. Hamzavi IH, Lyons AB, Kohli I, Narla S, Parks-Miller A, Gelfand JM, et al. Ultraviolet
236 germicidal irradiation: possible method for respirator disinfection to facilitate reuse
237 during COVID-19 pandemic. *J Am Acad Dermatol*. 2020 Apr 1.
- 238 3. Bedell K, Buchaklian AH, Perlman S. Efficacy of an Automated Multiple Emitter
239 Whole-Room Ultraviolet-C Disinfection System Against Coronaviruses MHV and
240 MERS-CoV. *Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol*. 2016;37(5):598-9.
- 241 4. Heimbuch BK, Harnish, D. Research to Mitigate a Shortage of Respiratory Protection
242 Devices During Public Health Emergencies. 2019 [cited 9 April 2020]; Available from:
243 [https://www.ara.com/news/ara-research-mitigate-shortage-respiratory-protection-devices-](https://www.ara.com/news/ara-research-mitigate-shortage-respiratory-protection-devices-during-public-health-emergencies)
244 [during-public-health-emergencies](https://www.ara.com/news/ara-research-mitigate-shortage-respiratory-protection-devices-during-public-health-emergencies)
- 245 5. Reed LJ, Muench H. A SIMPLE METHOD OF ESTIMATING FIFTY PER CENT
246 ENDPOINTS¹². *American Journal of Epidemiology*. 1938;27(3):493-7.
- 247 6. Darnell MER, Taylor DR. Evaluation of inactivation methods for severe acute respiratory
248 syndrome coronavirus in noncellular blood products. *Transfusion*. 2006;46(10):1770-7.
- 249 7. Mills D, Harnish DA, Lawrence C, Sandoval-Powers M, Heimbuch BK. Ultraviolet
250 germicidal irradiation of influenza-contaminated N95 filtering facepiece respirators.
251 *American journal of infection control*. 2018 Jul;46(7):e49-e55.

- 252 8. Narla S, Lyons AB, Kohli I, Torres AE, Parks-Miller A, Ozog DM, et al. The importance
253 of the minimum dosage necessary for UVC decontamination of N95 respirators during
254 the COVID-19 pandemic. *Photodermatol Photoimmunol Photomed*. 2020 Apr 14.
- 255 9. N95DECON. Technical Report for UV-C-Based N95 Reuse Risk Management. 2020
256 [cited 9 April 2020]; Available from:
257 [https://static1.squarespace.com/static/5e8126f89327941b9453eeef/t/5e854176021146762](https://static1.squarespace.com/static/5e8126f89327941b9453eeef/t/5e8541760211467623b1e4e4/1585791351199/200401_N95DECON_UV_technicalreport_v1.2_final.pdf)
258 [3b1e4e4/1585791351199/200401_N95DECON_UV_technicalreport_v1.2_final.pdf](https://static1.squarespace.com/static/5e8126f89327941b9453eeef/t/5e8541760211467623b1e4e4/1585791351199/200401_N95DECON_UV_technicalreport_v1.2_final.pdf)
- 259 10. Torres AE, Lyons AB, Narla S, Kohli I, Parks-Miller A, Ozog D, et al. Ultraviolet-C and
260 other methods of decontamination of filtering facepiece N-95 respirators during the
261 COVID-19 pandemic. *Photochemical & photobiological sciences : Official journal of the*
262 *European Photochemistry Association and the European Society for Photobiology*. 2020
263 May 15.
- 264 11. Ozog D, Parks-Miller A, Kohli I, Lyons AB, Narla S, Torres AE, et al. The Importance
265 of Fit-Testing in Decontamination of N95 Respirators: A Cautionary Note. *Journal of the*
266 *American Academy of Dermatology*.

267

268 Address for correspondence: David M. Ozog, MD, Photomedicine and Photobiology Unit,
269 Department of Dermatology, Henry Ford Medical Center New Center One, 3031 W. Grand Blvd
270 Suite 800, Detroit, MI 48202, USA; Phone: 313-916-0412; Fax: 313-916-0609; email:
271 DOZOG1@hfhs.org

272

273

274

275 **Appendix Table 1. Preliminary testing of 3M 1860 N95 respirator**

276 *SARS-CoV-2 = Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome coronavirus 2; PBS = phosphate-buffered-

277 saline; TCID₅₀ = 50% tissue culture infectious dose; LOD = limit of detection.

Log ₁₀ TCID ₅₀ / 4mm punch (300 μL)	Treated respirator A	Treated respirator B	Untreated respirator A	Untreated respirator B	10 uL of SARS-CoV-2 stock	SARS-CoV2-stock
Location 1	< LOD	< LOD	4.579181246	4.579181246		
Location 2	< LOD	< LOD	4.479181246	3.779181246		
Location 3	< LOD	< LOD	4.679181246	4.079181246		
Location 4	1.301029996	< LOD	2.479181246	2.379181246		
10 μL of SARS-CoV-2 stock diluted in 300 uL of PBS					4.679181246	
25 μL of SARS-CoV-2 stock						7.079181246
Limit of detection	1.301029996					

278

279

280

281

282

283

284

285

286

287

288

289

290

291

292

293 **Appendix Table 2. Recovered SARS-CoV-2 Log₁₀ TCID₅₀ / 4mm punch**

294 *SARS-CoV-2 = Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome coronavirus 2; PBS = phosphate-buffered-

295 saline; TCID₅₀ = 50% tissue culture infectious dose; LOD = limit of detection.

3M 1860						
Log ₁₀ TCID ₅₀ / 4mm punch (300 µL)	Treated respirator A	Treated respirator B	Treated respirator C	Untreated respirator A	10 uL of SARS-CoV-2 stock	SARS-CoV2-stock
Location 1	< LOD	< LOD	< LOD	5.479181246		
Location 2	< LOD	< LOD	< LOD	4.879181246		
Location 3	< LOD	< LOD	< LOD	5.379181246		
Location 4	1.602059991	2.279181246	< LOD	2.979181246		
10 µL of SARS-CoV-2 stock diluted in 300 uL of PBS					4.579181246	
25 µL of SARS-CoV-2 stock						7.379181246
Limit of detection	1.301029996					
3M 8210						
Log ₁₀ TCID ₅₀ / 4mm punch (300 µL)	Treated respirator A	Treated respirator B	Treated respirator C	Untreated respirator A	10 uL of SARS-CoV-2 stock	SARS-CoV2-stock
Location 1	< LOD	1.602059991	2.379181246	3.579181246		
Location 2	< LOD	1.301029996	< LOD	3.079181246		
Location 3	< LOD	< LOD	< LOD	2.379181246		
Location 4	< LOD	< LOD	< LOD	5.479181246		
10 µL of SARS-CoV-2 stock diluted in 300 uL of PBS					4.579181246	
25 µL of SARS-CoV-2 stock						7.379181246
Limit of detection	1.301029996					
Moldex 1511						
Log ₁₀ TCID ₅₀ / 4mm punch (300 µL)	Treated respirator A	Treated respirator B	Treated respirator C	Untreated respirator A	10 uL of SARS-CoV-2 stock	SARS-CoV2-stock
Location 1	< LOD	< LOD	< LOD	2.579181246		
Location 2	< LOD	< LOD	< LOD	4.379181246		
Location 3	< LOD	< LOD	< LOD	3.479181246		
Location 4	< LOD	< LOD	< LOD	4.679181246		
10 µL of SARS-CoV-2 stock diluted in 300 uL of PBS					5.779181246	
25 µL of SARS-CoV-2 stock						7.379181246
Limit of detection	1.301029996					
3M 8511						
Log ₁₀ TCID ₅₀ / 4mm punch (300 µL)	Treated respirator A	Treated respirator B	Treated respirator C	Untreated respirator A	10 uL of SARS-CoV-2 stock	SARS-CoV2-stock
Location 1	<LOD	<LOD	<LOD	4.479181246		
Location 2	<LOD	<LOD	<LOD	3.779181246		

Location 3	1.301029996	<LOD	<LOD	3.379181246		
Location 4	2.279181246	2.779181246	2.679181246	3.379181246		
10 µL of SARS-CoV-2 stock diluted in 300 µL of PBS					5.779181246	
25 µL of SARS-CoV-2 stock						7.379181246
Limit of detection	1.301029996					
3M 9211						
Log ₁₀ TCID ₅₀ / 4mm punch (300 µL)	Treated respirator A	Treated respirator B	Treated respirator C	Untreated respirator A	10 uL of SARS-CoV-2 stock	SARS-CoV2-stock
Location 1	<LOD	<LOD	<LOD	3.879181246		
Location 2	<LOD	<LOD	<LOD	3.479181246		
Location 3	1.301029996	<LOD	<LOD	2.279181246		
Location 4	2.279181246	2.779181246	2.679181246	2.379181246		
10 µL of SARS-CoV-2 stock diluted in 300 µL of PBS					5.779181246	
25 µL of SARS-CoV-2 stock						7.379181246
Limit of detection	1.301029996					

296

297

298

299

300

301

302

303

304

305

306

307

308

309 **Appendix Table 3. Recovered SARS-CoV-2 Log₁₀ TCID₅₀ / 4mm punch on the 3M 1860**

310 **strap after secondary disinfection testing.** *SARS-CoV-2 = Severe Acute Respiratory

311 Syndrome coronavirus 2; PBS = phosphate-buffered-saline; TCID₅₀ = 50% tissue culture

312 infectious dose; LOD = limit of detection.

313

3M 1860 Strap						
Log ₁₀ TCID ₅₀ / 4mm punch (300 μL)	Alcohol Wiped Location 1	Alcohol Wiped Location 2	No Alcohol Wiped Location 1	No Alcohol Wiped Location 2	10 uL of SARS-CoV-2 stock	SARS-CoV2-stock
UVC-Treated	< LOD	< LOD	2.379181246047625	2.579181246047625		
UVC-Untreated	< LOD		3.579181246047625			
10 μL of SARS-CoV-2 stock diluted in 300 uL of PBS					4.379181246047625	
25 μL of SARS-CoV-2 stock						5.779181246047625
Limit of detection	1.301029996					

314

315

Figure 1A. Locations 1-4 (Nosepiece, Apex, Chin, Strap) on models 1860 and 8210

*Similar locations were sampled on each of the five N95 respirators.





Figure 1B. Bright-field microscopy of wells with Vero-E6 cells and SARS-CoV-2

*CPE = cytopathic effect



Left: Representative field of inactivated virus (NO CPE).

Right: Virus-induced CPE in Vero E6 cells





Figure 2. Recovered SARS-CoV-2 TCID₅₀ / 4mm punch

*Wells that were below the limit of detection (LOD) and had no cytopathic effect were arbitrarily assigned the value of zero to represent this phenomenon in the above graphs.

Appendix Figure 1. Preliminary testing of 3M 1860 N95 respirator

*Wells that were below the limit of detection (LOD) and had no cytopathic effect were arbitrarily assigned the value of zero to represent this phenomenon in the above graphs. SARS-CoV-2 = Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome coronavirus 2; PBS = phosphate-buffered-saline; TCID₅₀ = 50% tissue culture infectious dose



Appendix Figure 2. 3M 1860 N95 Strap Secondary Disinfection Testing

*Wells that were below the limit of detection (LOD) and had no cytopathic effect were arbitrarily assigned the value of zero to represent this phenomenon in the above graphs. PBS = phosphate-buffered-saline; TCID₅₀ = 50% tissue culture infectious dose; UVC = ultraviolet C.

3M 1860 N95 Strap Secondary Disinfection Testing

