

Povidone iodine, hydrogen peroxide and chlorhexidine mouthwashes reduce SARS-CoV2 burden in whole mouth fluid and respiratory droplets

Bagavad Gita Jayaraman^{1*}, Gunaseelan Rajan¹, Priya Kannian^{2*}, Chandra Lavanya⁴, Kritika Ravichandran¹, Nagalingeswaran Kumarasamy³, Kannan Ranganathan⁴, Veeraraghavan Aswini², Pasuvaraj Mahanathi², Stephen Challacombe⁵, Jennifer Webster-Cyriaque⁶, Newell W Johnson^{1,3,5,7}

¹ Chennai Dental Research Foundation, Chennai, India

² VHS Laboratory Services, Department of Clinical Research, VHS Hospital, Chennai, India

³ VHS-Infectious Diseases Medical Centre, VHS Hospital, Chennai, India

⁴ Department of Oral Pathology, Ragas Dental College and Hospital, Chennai, India

⁵ Faculty of Dentistry, Oral & Craniofacial Sciences, King's College London, UK

⁶ University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, USA

⁷ Menzies Health Institute Queensland, Griffith University, Queensland, Australia

Address for Correspondence:

* Dr. Bagavad Gita Jayaraman

Research Scientist

Chennai Dental Research Foundation

No. 56, Dr. R. K. Salai

6th Floor, Mylapore

Chennai – 600004

Tamil Nadu, India

Ph: 91-44-42103440

Email: gita70.geetha@gmail.com

* Dr. Priya Kannian

Scientist & Head

Department of Clinical Research

VHS Hospital

Rajiv Gandhi Salai

Taramani, Chennai – 600113

Tamil Nadu, India

Ph: 91-44-22541972

Email: priyakannian@gmail.com

Word count: 599 words

Introduction

Whole mouth fluid (WMF) and respiratory droplets (RD) primarily transmit SARS-CoV2. *In vitro* cell culture and RT-PCR studies in WMF have shown that commercial mouthwashes - chlorhexidine (CHX), povidone iodine (PI) and hydrogen peroxide (HP) have significant virucidal activity against SARS-CoV2.^{1,2} However, RT-PCR of RNA viruses will detect both live and dead viruses, and should be interpreted cautiously. We have previously used rapid antigen testing (RAT) to detect SARS-CoV2 proteins in WMF thereby depicting its infectious state.⁴ This study evaluates SARS-CoV2 burden in WMF and RD samples before and after the use of PI, HP or CHX mouthwashes in hospitalized COVID-19 patients using RT-PCR and RAT.

Methods

The study was approved by VHS-Institutional Ethics Committee (VHS-IEC/60-2020). Thirty-six SARS-CoV2 RT-PCR-positive (nasopharyngeal swab [NPS] and WMF) in-patients were randomly assigned after written informed consent to one of the four groups – 20 and 60 minutes after 1% w/v PI or 1.5% HP; 90 and 180 minutes after 1.5% HP or 0.2% w/v CHX. Early morning unstimulated drooled WMF samples and RD exhaled onto Whatman No.1 filter paper discs contained within surgical face masks were collected at baseline and at the two different time points after the corresponding mouthwash. Quantitative SARS-CoV2 RT-PCR was done using the automated QIAamp Viral RNA kit (QIAGEN, Germany), Lightcycler 96 (Roche, USA) and a validated standard curve. SARS-CoV2 antigen in the WMF was tested in a subset of six patients before and after HP by RAT (SD Biosensor, Korea).⁴ Analyses (mean and standard deviations [SD]) and statistics (t-test and Fisher exact) were done using Microsoft Excel, VassarStats and Social Science Statistics.

Results

Among the 36 patients, 13 (36%) were RT-PCR positive in RD samples at baseline. A 50% or greater decrease in the SARS-CoV2 copies from the baseline was considered significant. The reduction was significantly higher in RD (92%; 12/13) than WMF samples (50%; 18/36; $p=0.008$), perhaps due to lower baseline burden in RD samples (Table 1). Compared to the baseline, the mean copy numbers were statistically lower at both 20 minutes ($p=0.02$) and 60 minutes ($p=0.03$) with PI; at 20 minutes with HP ($p=0.0001$); and 90 minutes with CHX ($p=0.04$). The overall and individual mean logarithmic reductions (MLR) in the WMF and RD samples were greater than 1.0 at 20, 60 and 90 minutes after PI, HP or CHX (Table 1).

WMF samples from six patients were tested for SARS-CoV2 antigens by RAT at baseline and at either 20 minutes ($n=3$) or 90 minutes ($n=3$) after HP. Six baseline samples were RAT-positive. Patients who remained RAT-positive at 90 minutes post-treatment ($n=3$) demonstrated a one log increase in virus copies (Table 2). Among the three patients who became RAT-negative post-treatment, in two individuals the SARS-CoV2 burden declined by one log. However, in the third patient a slight increase in RNA copies was detected.

Discussion

WMF and RD are primary modes of SARS-CoV2 transmission. Studies are reporting the efficacy of mouthwashes in reducing SARS-CoV2 burden in WMF. In this study, we report for the first time, reduction of SARS-CoV2 burden in RD for 20-90 minutes after PI, HP or CHX in addition to the concurrently collected WMF. This is consistent with *in vitro* cell culture and RT-PCR studies that have shown reduction in SARS-CoV2 burden.^{2,3,5,6} We also demonstrated for the first time that RAT is superior to RT-PCR for determining the efficacy of interventions designed to decrease oral transmission. The unbiased detection of viral RNA by RT-PCR irrespective of active viral infection can be problematic. The detection of antigen using RAT or ELISA based technologies allows mitigation of non-infectious/non-viable RNA that may be detected by RT-PCR.

Funding: The study was funded by the intramural funds of Chennai Dental Research Foundation, Chennai, India.

References

1. Carrouel F, Goncalves LS, Conte MP, et al. Antiviral Activity of Reagents in Mouth Rinses against SARS-CoV-2. *J Dent Res*.2020 Oct 22 : 0022034520967933.
2. Guenezan J, Garcia M, Strasters D, et al. Povidone Iodine Mouthwash, Gargle, and Nasal Spray to Reduce Nasopharyngeal Viral Load in Patients With COVID-19: A Randomized Clinical Trial. *JAMA Otolaryngol Head Neck Surg*. Published online February 04, 2021. doi:10.1001/jamaoto.2020.5490
3. Kannian P, Lavanya C, Ravichandran K, et al. SARS-CoV2 antigen in whole mouth fluid may be a reliable rapid detection tool. *Oral Dis* 2021; doi: 10.1111/odi.13793.
4. Lamas M, Dios PD, Rodriguez MTP et al. Is povidone iodine mouthwash effective against SARS-CoV-2? First in vivo tests. *Oral Dis*. 2020 Jul 2;10.1111/odi.13526. doi: 10.1111/odi.13526
5. Seneviratne CJ, Balan P, Ki KKK et al. Efficacy of commercial mouthrinses on SARS-CoV-2 viral load in saliva: Randomized Controlled Trial in Singapore. *MedRxiv* 2020.09.14.20186494; doi:10.1101/2020.09.14.20186494

Table 1: Mean logarithmic reduction in SARS-CoV2 copies in the whole mouth fluid (WMF) and respiratory droplet (RD) samples by RT-PCR after the mouthwash

Mouthwash	Baseline Log copies Mean±SD	Mean logarithmic reduction in SARS-CoV2 copies			
		20 minutes n/N (%)	60 minutes n/N (%)	90 minutes n/N (%)	180 minutes n/N (%)
		Mean±SD	Mean±SD	Mean±SD	Mean±SD
<i>Whole mouth fluid (WMF)</i>					
PI	4.47±1.35	5/10 (50) 1.78±1.08	5/10 (50) 1.26±0.87	ND	ND
HP	5.03±0.79	6/10 (60) 1.17±0.27	5/10 (50) 1.62±1.64	2/8 (25) 1.45±1.45	2/8 (25) 0.93±0.82
CHX	5.18±1.89	ND	ND	5/8 (63) 1.62±1.23	2/8 (25) 0.43±1.51
Overall	4.89±1.34	11/20 (55) 1.48±0.68	10/20 (50) 1.44±1.26	7/16 (44) 1.53±1.34	4/16 (25) 0.68±1.17
<i>Respiratory droplet (RD)</i>					
PI	2.50±0.40	3/3 (100) 2.5±0.40	2/3 (67) 1.58±1.87	ND	ND
HP	3.70±1.83	3/3 (100) 3.36±3.66	2/3 (67) 2.45±2.75	2/3 (67) 1.90±1.58	2/3 (67) 3.03±0.03
CHX	1.76±0.68	ND	ND	4/4 (100) 1.15±0.82	3/4 (75) 0.59±1.66
Overall	2.65±0.97	6/6 (100) 2.93±2.03	4/6 (67) 2.02±2.31	6/7 (86) 1.53±1.20	5/7 (71) 1.81±0.85

n – number of patients with a 50% or greater reduction in SARS-CoV2 copies compared to the baseline; N – number of patients tested with that particular mouthwash; % - percentage; ND – not done; PI – Povidone Iodine; HP – Hydrogen Peroxide; CHX – Chlorhexidine

Table 2: Comparison between RAT and RT-PCR for the determination of the reduction of SARS-CoV2 burden in whole mouth fluid samples before and after the use of hydrogen peroxide (HP)

Patient No.	Time (minutes)	RAT		RT-PCR		Log difference*
		Baseline	After HP	Baseline	After HP	
1	20	Positive	Negative	3.10×10^3	2.50×10^2	-1.1
2	20	Positive	Negative	2.12×10^5	6.36×10^5	+0.5
3	20	Positive	Negative	5.47×10^4	3.87×10^3	-1.1
4	90	Positive	Positive	1.98×10^3	3.77×10^5	+2.3
5	90	Positive	Positive	2.04×10^7	3.25×10^8	+1.2
6	90	Positive	Positive	5.03×10^6	1.22×10^9	+2.4

HP – Hydrogen peroxide; RAT – rapid antigen test; RT-PCR – reverse transcriptase-polymerase chain reaction

*A minus value in the log difference indicates decrease and a plus value indicates increase.