

1 **Comparative Effectiveness of Standard and Contingency-based Cleaning in Acute and**
2 **Long-Term Care Facilities amidst Staff Shortages and a COVID-19 Surge**

3 Emil Lesho¹, Donna Newhart¹, Lisa Reno¹, Scott Sleeper¹, Julia Nary¹, Jennifer Gutowski¹,
4 Stephanie Yu¹, Edward Walsh², Roberto Vargas¹, Dawn Riedy¹, Robert Mayo¹

5 ¹Rochester Regional Health, 1425 Portland Avenue, Rochester, NY, 14621, USA

6 ²University of Rochester School of Medicine and Dentistry, 601 Elmwood Ave, Rochester, NY
7 14642, USA

8

9

10 Abstract:

11 Background: Cleanliness of hospital surfaces helps prevent healthcare-associated infections, but
12 larger evaluations of the effectiveness of various cleaning strategies during SARS-CoV-2 surges
13 and worker shortages are scarce.

14 Methods: In an acute care hospital (ACH) and a long-term care facility (LTCF), 417 surfaces
15 were tested for SARS-CoV-2 and adenosine triphosphate before and after various cleaning
16 strategies, including ultraviolet light (UV-C), electrostatic spraying, and room fogging.

17 Results: ACH surface contamination differed among outbreak and non-outbreak wards ($p =$
18 0.001). RNA was detected on 66% of surfaces before cleaning and on 23% of those surfaces
19 immediately after terminal cleaning, for a 65% post-cleaning reduction ($p = 0.001$). UV-C
20 resulted in an 87% reduction ($p = 0.023$), while spraying with electrostatic bleach resulted in a
21 47% reduction ($p = 0.010$). LTCF contamination rates differed between the dementia,
22 rehabilitation, and the residential units ($p = 0.005$). 67% of surfaces had RNA after room fogging
23 without terminal-style wiping. Fogging with wiping led to an 11% reduction in the proportion of
24 positive surfaces.

25 Discussion: Baseline contamination varied by type of unit and outbreak conditions, but not
26 facility type. Removal of viral RNA varied according to strategy. Unlike previous reports, time
27 spent cleaning was associated with cleaning thoroughness.

28

29

30

31 **Introduction:**

32 Cleanliness of hospital surfaces helps prevent healthcare-associated infections [1, 2].

33 Contamination of environmental surfaces with SARS-CoV-2 has been reported from various
34 countries, under experimental conditions in the laboratory, or in facilities with bio-containment
35 units [3-11]. However, larger, controlled, pre and post cleaning evaluations, particularly from
36 U.S. health care facilities dealing with nosocomial outbreaks during the height of the pandemic
37 are scarce.

38 Healthcare associated (HA) transmission of SARS-CoV-2 results from of a complex
39 interplay of several factors, including patient census, nurse-to-patient ratio, adherence to
40 isolation guidelines and policies for using personal protective equipment, patient acuity, and the
41 prevalence of presymptomatic/asymptomatic carriers. However, we hypothesize that these
42 factors may not fully account for large or prolonged nosocomial outbreaks. Environmental
43 contamination could also be an overlooked contributor to HA- transmission.

44 In addition, the shortage of environmental service (EVS) workers and their concerns
45 regarding cleaning rooms of patients infected with SARS-CoV-2 further complicated cleaning
46 and disinfection efforts [12-15]. This forced some healthcare facilities to use contingency-based
47 approaches such as professional remediation companies. Moreover, long-term care facilities
48 (LTCF) have experienced inordinately high infection and mortality rates [16-18]. The potential
49 contribution of environmental contamination with SARS-CoV-2 to this is uncertain.

50 Adding to the challenge of investigating the role of environmental SARS-CoV-2 is that
51 fact that the vast majority of studies, including this one, do not have the biosafety level necessary
52 for the cultivation of live virus and must rely on viral RNA as a surrogate. Even though nucleic

53 acid isolated from healthcare surfaces may not represent infectious or cultivable virus, and the
54 infectious potential of environmental nucleic acid, including RNA, is not fully understood, we
55 have shown that environmental nucleic acid from another common pathogen was correlated with
56 nosocomial infections of that species [19].

57 Our objectives were to assess baseline environmental contamination with SAR-CoV-2
58 RNA at an acute-care hospital (ACH) and a LTCF and compare contamination rates between
59 different wards or units and between outbreak and non-outbreak settings. Attempting to maintain
60 cleaning standards and quality measures in the midst of critical environmental service worker
61 shortages, the LTCF hired a commercial cleaning and remediation company as a contingency
62 measure. Therefore, we also sought to evaluate the effectiveness of that approach.

63 **Settings:**

64 The ACH is a 528-bed teaching hospital in the Finger Lakes Region of New York State.
65 The baseline configuration pre-pandemic surge is such that 42% of the rooms are semi-private.
66 There are 48 intensive care beds and 14 special care nursery beds. It has the eleventh busiest
67 emergency department and the second largest ventricle assist device program in the country. The
68 LTCF has 201 beds and eight wards including a dementia unit. There was an outbreak of
69 nosocomial cases on one of the wards in the ACH and one of the buildings that contained several
70 wards at the LTCF.

71 **Methods:**

72 To ensure the sampling method could reliably detect environmental RNA before formal
73 sampling began, 100 cm² test surfaces in vacated patient rooms were spotted with 1250 copies of
74 SARS-CoV-2 genomic RNA (BEI Resources). After 10 minutes of drying time, these surfaces

75 were sampled as positive controls. All such controls tested positive using the commercial assay
76 described below.

77 From 15 May 2020 to 15 Jun 2020, environmental surface sampling and assessments of
78 cleaning thoroughness (adenosine triphosphate (ATP)). and effectiveness (reduction of viral
79 RNA) were performed as previously described [19-20]. Briefly, swabs were streaked over
80 targeted high-touch surfaces for a minimum of 20 seconds in a rolling motion to ensure contact
81 with the entire swab surface. cobas® PCR Media Uni Swabs (Roche Molecular Systems, Inc.
82 Branchburg, NJ) were pre-moistened with the transport media (sterile 40% guanidine
83 hydrochloride Tris-HCl buffer) and analyzed on the cobas® 6800 System (Roche Molecular
84 Systems, Inc. Branchburg, NJ). ATP testing of surfaces was performed using 3M™ Clean-Trace
85 ATP monitoring system.) Sampling at both long-term and acute care facilities was performed
86 using same equipment and in an identical manner by the same authors (DN, LR, EL).

87 At the ACH and the LTCF, for both random and controlled sampling, dedicated COVID-
88 19 units were used as ‘positive control wards’, and wards which had zero COVID-19 patients
89 identified were uses as ‘negative control wards’. Those that housed both COVID-19 and non-
90 COVID patients were considered ‘mixed wards’. Inpatient dialysis units were considered
91 separately.

92 Random Sampling: Assessment of Baseline Environmental Contamination

93 Eight stationary surfaces sampled in rooms on the outbreak and on the negative and
94 positive ‘control’ wards. These included bed rails, call button/remote control, in-room telephone,
95 over-bed tray table, sink and soap dispenser, chair, windowsill, and the floor. Walking computer
96 workstations, hand-held glucometers, and vital sign machines represented shared surface samples

97 and microwaves and refrigerator samples were taken from the staff common areas. Sampling
98 occurred randomly throughout the daytime hours, without regard to the timing of daily or
99 terminal cleaning. However, since most of these surfaces are cleaned daily, the time from last
100 cleaning to sampling was most often less than 36 hrs.

101 Controlled Sampling: Evaluation of Cleaning Effectiveness

102 At the ACH, immediately after a SARS-CoV-2 infected patient was discharged or
103 transferred out of their room, nursing notified the authors who coordinated with EVS. The same
104 eight stationary surface types were sampled immediately before and after terminal cleaning with
105 a non-bleach sporicidal disinfectant containing hydrogen peroxide and peracetic acid (OxyCide
106 TM). Additionally, at the ACH, three types of terminal cleaning enhancements were also
107 evaluated: UV-C treatment at 60,000 mJ/cm² (RDTM UVC Mobile System), adding electrostatic
108 spraying (Clorox® Total 360®) following terminal cleaning, and adding both UV-C and
109 electrostatic spraying. These enhancements were applied in addition to terminal cleaning when
110 terminal was completed. To ensure each enhancement had an equal amount of RNA
111 contamination present before cleaning, 100 cm² surfaces in vacated patient rooms were spotted
112 with 1250 copies of SARS-CoV-2 genomic RNA (BEI Resources) before terminal cleaning.
113 During the post-cleaning sample collection, those spotted areas were included in the streaking of
114 the target surface type (floor, bed rail, etc.).

115 At the LTCF, rooms were sampled before and after routine daily cleaning and also after a
116 professional remediation service using three different proprietary room fogging agents.
117 Adenosine triphosphate (ATP) testing of surfaces was also performed using 3MTM Clean-Trace
118 ATP monitoring system.

119 The proportion of sampled surfaces with detectible RNA were compared using the 2-
120 sample percent defective tests or Chi squared tests. The mean cycle threshold values of SARS-
121 CoV-2 genes were compared using 2-sample t-test of means.

122 **Results:**

123 Overall Level of Baseline Contamination

124 417 surface samples were collected: 214 from the ACH; and 203 from the LTCF. The
125 sampling breakdown and number of positive surfaces is presented in Figures 1 and 2. Of
126 surfaces swabbed, 24% (n = 59) at the ACH, and 23% (n = 47) at the LTCF had detectable RNA.
127 Based on the proportion of positive surfaces, the difference between the overall contamination
128 rates at the ACH and LTCF was not significant (p = 0.313). Similarly, surface contamination
129 based on mean PCR mean cycle threshold values of the *ORF1ab* gene was also similar between
130 the ACH and the LTCF. Mean cycle threshold value at the ACH was 35.4 compared to 35.9 at
131 the LTCF (p = 0.179) (Figure 3).

132 Randomized Sampling: Contamination on COVID-19, Non-COVID-19, and Inpatient Dialysis

133 Units

134 At the ACH, 20% of 134 randomly sampled surfaces had detectible RNA (Figure 1). The
135 proportion of surfaces with detectable RNA was not significantly different on the outbreak ward
136 as compared to the dedicated COVID-19 ward (positive control): 7/33 versus 13/33 (p = 0.180).
137 However, there was a significant difference (p = 0.001) when the outbreak ward was compared
138 to the negative control ward, which only had 3% detectable surfaces (1/33).

139 At the LTCF, 21% of 116 randomly sampled surfaces had viral RNA, which was not
140 significantly different that that seen at the ACH (p = 1.000) (Figure 2). The COVID-19 positive

141 resident rooms had a significantly higher proportion of surfaces with RNA than those of the
142 mixed wards, 7/11 versus 14/83 ($p = 0.002$). The mixed ward had a higher proportion of surfaces
143 with RNA (17%) than the target of non-COVID-19 ward (10%) ($p = 0.035$). Stratifying the units
144 further, there was a significant difference between the dementia unit, rehabilitation unit, and the
145 residential unit ($p = 0.005$) (Figure 4).

146 Overall (inpatient dialysis at the ACH combined with inpatient dialysis at the LTCF),
147 29% (7/24) of randomly sampled surfaces had viral RNA. A higher proportion of surfaces were
148 positive at the ACH (5/12) compared to the LTCF (2/12).

149 Controlled Sampling: Cleaning Assessments

150 At the ACH, 437 surfaces throughout the facility including on the outbreak wards,
151 dedicated COVID-19 units, and negative control wards, underwent post cleaning ATP testing as
152 part of routine protocols and quality assessments. The average ATP value was 32 (SD 16.8)
153 RLU. 35 surfaces had both adenosine triphosphate and PCR testing. The mean ATP value of the
154 two PCR positive surfaces was 666 (SD 2.12) RLU, and the mean ATP of 33 negative surfaces
155 was 1274 (SD 2216) RLU; 95% CI for difference -1394 –178) p -value = 0.125.

156 At the LTCF, 16 surfaces were tested before, and 16 were tested after cleaning. Their
157 mean ATP value was 2308 RLU (SD 2782) (pre-cleaned), and 384 (SD 724; 95% CI 408-3441)
158 post cleaning, $p = 0.016$.

159 On the dedicated COVID-19 wards, RNA was detected on 21/32 (66%) of surfaces
160 immediately before cleaning and on 11/48 (23%) of those surfaces immediately after terminal
161 cleaning using a non-bleach sporicidal disinfectant containing hydrogen peroxide and peracetic
162 acid (OxyCide™) for a 65% post-cleaning reduction ($p = 0.001$).

163 UV-C combined with terminal cleaning resulted in an 87% reduction in the proportion of
164 RNA- positive surfaces (50% positive pre-cleaning vs. 6.3% positive after cleaning, $p = 0.023$)
165 (Figure 1). Terminal cleaning combined with electrostatic spraying (Clorox Pro Total 360 ®)
166 resulted in a 47% reduction (100% vs. 53%, $p = 0.010$) in detectable target RNA. Spraying plus
167 UV-C led to an 85% reduction (44% precleaned vs. 6.7 % post cleaning, $p=0.047$) (Figure 5).
168 When UV-C was used, there was zero detectable RNA positive surfaces for the spotted samples
169 (0/12) as compared to electrostatic spraying with 50% of the spotted samples (3/6).

170 At the LTCF, RNA was detected on 10/15 surfaces after professional remediation
171 company fogged patient rooms with a proprietary chlorine dioxide-based disinfectant. In this
172 process, terminal-style surface wiping was not performed. Overall, room fogging combined with
173 terminal-style surface wiping, as routine daily cleaning, led to an 11% reduction in the
174 proportion of positive surfaces. Detectable RNA was present on 19% of surfaces before cleaning
175 versus 17% after cleaning. However, the amount of reduction depended on the time spent wiping
176 and the spraying agent used (Figure 6).

177 **Discussion:**

178 At both the ACH and LTCF, viral RNA was detected more often on dedicated COVID-
179 19 units, and on wards or units that were experiencing an outbreak or nosocomial transmission.
180 Almost 30% of randomly sampled surfaces in dialysis units, including terminally cleaned
181 dialysis machines, had detectible viral RNA. The overall facility level contamination was no
182 different between an ACH and a corresponding LTCF. The room cleaning protocols used at the
183 ACH significantly reduced environmental RNA, with UV -C light appearing to degrade RNA
184 more than electrostatic spraying. Recognizing: 1) the challenges in cleaning the LTCF because
185 rooms cannot be completely vacated for terminal styled-wiping; and 2) that the ATP values at

186 the LTCF where on average higher than the ACH ATP values, our healthcare system made a
187 considerable investment in UV-C for LTCF.

188 Commercial cleaning services that spent more time per room cleaning resulted in a larger
189 reduction in contamination, unlike previously published reports that showed time spent cleaning
190 did not translate into more bioburden reduction [21], cleaning by this commercial remediation
191 company that relied on room fogging to be less effective than environmental service employees
192 of the hospital.

193 Given the scarcity of testing supplies, this study is noteworthy for its sample size. To our
194 knowledge, it is the largest such U.S. study to date. It is also notable for the pragmatic,
195 controlled assessments of cleaning practices under ‘real world’ conditions of staffing shortages
196 during the height of the pandemic. Prior SARS-CoV-2 studies did not have a controlled
197 assessment of cleaning, did not include shared equipment and ATP measurements [3-11].

198 Our study has several limitations. First, safety concerns and the lack of a BSL-3 level
199 resources precluded the use of viral cultures to determine viability of virus, but nucleic acid of
200 target pathogens can be consequential [19]. Furthermore, lack of culture-based assessments is not
201 unique to our study [4-9]. Second, sponge sticks may be better at capturing pathogens from
202 larger environmental surfaces such as floors and tray tables. These collection devices were
203 unavailable and could not be used in automated PCR reaction tubes. Third, the commercial
204 remediation service and EVS were not compared under identical conditions, but our main
205 objective was not a direct head-to-head comparison of EVS vs contracted remediation service.

206 Despite these limitations, this report is relevant to nursing homes and hospitals as the
207 findings can assist in allocation of scarce cleaning and disinfection resources for maximum

208 impact. Furthermore, studies of the survivability of the virus on fomites have been criticized as
209 lacking real-life generalizability [22, 23]. Data in this report were obtained from a ‘typical’
210 general hospital and nursing home, representative of the type of settings (i.e.
211 general/community/non-university-based hospitals) where much of health care is delivered.
212 Studies for these settings may be underrepresented in research because most are carried out in
213 large university-based hospitals.

214 In summary, surface contamination with SARS-CoV-2 RNA significantly differed based
215 on type of unit, disinfectant, and cleaning regimen. Analysis according to surface, unit, and
216 cleaning regimen, was more informative than facility-level analysis. Additionally, none of the
217 PCR-positive surfaces had Ct values less than 29. Just as patients who remain positive by PCR
218 weeks after infection but with high CTs are not considered to be contagious, the environment
219 viral load we encountered may also place the inanimate surfaces as unlikely source of contagion.

220 Although the environment may not be a major driver of SARS-CoV-2 transmission at
221 least in community / public settings, the role that environmental contamination play in
222 nosocomial transmission in setting with heavy viral burdens and sick or physiologically
223 vulnerable persons remain less understood. Perhaps another argument for meticulous cleaning of
224 the environment of COVID-19 patients' rooms is the company that SARS-CoV-2 may keep
225 during the pandemic; e.g., *C. difficile*, *MDR-Acinetobacter*, or *MDR-Candida* that are known to
226 persist in the environment longer than SARS-CoV-2. Further studies are needed to understand
227 how environmental contamination, especially cleaning effectiveness and thoroughness might
228 contribute to SARS-CoV-2 acquisition.

229

230 **Footnotes:**

231 Funding Source: There was no funding source.

232 Conflicts of Interest: There are no conflicts of interest.

233 Corresponding Author: Emil Lesho, 1425 Portland Avenue, Rochester, NY 14621

234 Phone: (585) 922-4077, Fax: (585) 922-5168, carolinelesho@yahoo.com

235

236

237

238

239

240

241

242

243

244

245

246

247

248 **References:**

- 249 1. Dancer SJ. Controlling hospital-acquired infection: focus on the role of the environment
250 and new technologies for decontamination. *Clin Microbiol Rev* **2014** ; 27:665-90.
- 251 2. Carling PC, Parry MF, Von Beheren SM, et al. Identifying opportunities to enhance
252 environmental cleaning in 23 acute care hospitals. *Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol* **2008** ;
253 29:1-7.
- 254 3. Pastorino B, Touret F, Gilles M, de Lamballerie X, Charrel RN. Prolonged infectivity of
255 SARS-CoV-2 in fomites. *Emerg Infect Dis* **2020** ; 26:2256-7.
- 256 4. Feng B, Xu K, Gu S, et al. Multi-route transmission potential of SARS-CoV-2 in
257 healthcare facilities. *J Hazard Mater* **2021** ; 402:123771.
- 258 5. Wu S, Wang Y, Jin X, et al. Environmental contamination by SARS-CoV-2 in a
259 designated hospital for coronavirus disease 2019. *Am J Infect Control.* **2020** ; 48:910-4.
- 260 6. Guo ZD, Wang ZY, Zhang SF, et al. Aerosol and Surface Distribution of Severe Acute
261 Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 in Hospital Wards, Wuhan, China, 2020. *Emerg*
262 *Infect Dis* **2020** ; 26:1583-91.
- 263 7. Colaneri M, Seminari E, Piralla A, et al. Lack of SARS-CoV-2 RNA environmental
264 contamination in a tertiary referral hospital for infectious diseases in Northern Italy. *J*
265 *Hosp Infect* **2020** ; 105:474-6.
- 266 8. Ong SWX, Tan YK, Chia PY, et al. Air, surface environmental, and personal protective
267 equipment contamination by Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 (SARS-
268 CoV-2) from a symptomatic patient. *JAMA* **2020** ; 323:1610-2.
- 269 9. Ye G, Lin H, Chen S, et al. Environmental contamination of SARS-CoV-2 in healthcare
270 premises. *J Infect.* **2020** ; 81:e1-e5.

- 271 10. Chin AWH, Chu JTS, Perera MRA, et al. Stability of SARS-CoV-2 in different
272 environmental conditions. *Lancet Microbe* **2020** ; 1:e10.
- 273 11. Ryu BH, Cho Y, Cho OH, et al. Environmental contamination of SARS-CoV-2 during
274 the COVID-19 outbreak in South Korea. *Am J Infect Control* **2020** ; 48:875-9.
- 275 12. Memmott J. Keeping the hospital safe so people can heal. *Rochester Democrat and*
276 *Chronicle*. Available at:
277 <https://www.democratandchronicle.com/story/news/local/columnists/memmott/2020/09/13/keeping-hospital-safe-so-people-may-heal/5772158002/>. Accessed 12 April 2021.
- 278 13. Ducharme J. 'No One Mentions the People Who Clean It Up': What It's Like to Clean
279 Professionally During the COVID-19 Outbreak. Available at:
280 <https://time.com/5810911/covid-19-cleaners-janitors/>. Accessed 12 April 2021.
- 281 14. Brown N, Cooke K. In fight for masks, hospital janitors sometimes come last. Available
282 at: [https://www.reuters.com/article/us-health-coronavirus-housekeepers/in-fight-for-](https://www.reuters.com/article/us-health-coronavirus-housekeepers/in-fight-for-masks-hospital-janitors-sometimes-come-last-idUSKBN21O2JF)
283 [masks-hospital-janitors-sometimes-come-last-idUSKBN21O2JF](https://www.reuters.com/article/us-health-coronavirus-housekeepers/in-fight-for-masks-hospital-janitors-sometimes-come-last-idUSKBN21O2JF). Accessed 12 April
284 2021.
- 285 15. Litwin AS, Avgar AC, Becker ER. Superbugs versus outsourced cleaners: employment
286 arrangements and the spread of health care-associated infections. *ILR Review* **2017** ;
287 70:610-41.
- 288 16. Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services. Nursing Home COVID-19 Data. Available
289 at: [https://www.cms.gov/files/document/6120-nursing-home-covid-19-](https://www.cms.gov/files/document/6120-nursing-home-covid-19-data.pdf?_ga=2.220609944.1832926098.1598283932-535237757.1598283931)
290 [data.pdf?_ga=2.220609944.1832926098.1598283932-535237757.1598283931](https://www.cms.gov/files/document/6120-nursing-home-covid-19-data.pdf?_ga=2.220609944.1832926098.1598283932-535237757.1598283931). Accessed
291 12 April 2021.
- 292

- 293 17. Gaur S, Dumyati G, Nace DA, et al. Unprecedented solutions for extraordinary times:
294 Helping long-term care settings deal with the COVID-19 pandemic. *Infect Control Hosp*
295 *Epidemiol* **2020** ; 41:729-30.
- 296 18. Kwiatkowski M, Nadolny TL, Priest J, et al. ‘A national disgrace’: 40,600 deaths tied to
297 US nursing homes. Available at:
298 [https://www.usatoday.com/story/news/investigations/2020/06/01/coronavirus-nursing-](https://www.usatoday.com/story/news/investigations/2020/06/01/coronavirus-nursing-home-deaths-top-40-600/5273075002/)
299 [home-deaths-top-40-600/5273075002/](https://www.usatoday.com/story/news/investigations/2020/06/01/coronavirus-nursing-home-deaths-top-40-600/5273075002/). Accessed 12 April 2021.
- 300 19. Lesho E, Carling P, Hosford E, et al. Relationships between cleaning, environmental
301 DNA, and healthcare-associated infections in a new evidence-based design hospital.
302 *Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol* **2015** ; 36:1130-8.
- 303 20. Clifford R, Sparks M, Hosford E, et al. Correlating cleaning thoroughness with
304 effectiveness and briefly intervening to affect cleaning outcomes: How clean is cleaned?
305 *PLOS One* **2016** ; 11:e0155779.
- 306 21. Rupp ME, Adler A, Schellen M, et al. The time spent cleaning a hospital room does not
307 correlate with the thoroughness of cleaning. *Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol* **2013** ;
308 34:100-2.
- 309 22. Goldman E. Exaggerated risk of transmission of COVID-19 by fomites. *Lancet Infect Dis*
310 **2020** ; 20:892-3.
- 311 23. Lesho E, Laguio-Vila M, Walsh E. Stability and viability of SARS-CoV-2. *New Eng J*
312 *Med* **2020** ; 382:1963-4.
- 313
- 314
- 315

316 **Figure Titles and Legends:**

317 Figure 1: Sample Breakdown at the Acute Care Hospital

318 Legend: Gas = Electrostatic bleach fogger; UV light = Ultraviolet Light

319

320 Figure 2: Sample Breakdown at the Long-term Care Facility

321 Legend: Fog = room spraying with disinfecting chemicals

322

323 Figure 3: Mean Cycle Threshold Values of ORF1ab at the Acute and Long-term Care Facilities

324 Red = 95% Confidence Intervals

325

326 Figure 4: Percentage Profiles of RNA Positive Surfaces at Different Units of the Long-Term

327 Care Facility

328

329 Figure 5: Percent of RNA Positive Surfaces Following Terminal Cleaning Enhanced with


330 Chemical Spraying and Ultraviolet Light


331 Legend: Gas = Electrostatic bleach fogger; UV light = Ultraviolet Light

332

333 Figure 6: Effect of chemical type and cleaning time on percent of surfaces detected


334






Distribution of Data

Compare the data and means of the samples.




Percentage Profiles Chart

Compare the profiles.



Interval Plot of % RNA Positive Surfaces vs Enhancement Type at ACH

95% CI for the Mean



The pooled standard deviation is used to calculate the intervals.

Fitted Line Plot

$$\% \text{ RNA}(+) \text{ Surfaces} = 0.928 - 57.7 \text{ Minutes/Room}$$

Initial Fogging

Experimental Trial

