medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.11.07.22282040; this version posted November 15, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. This article is a US Government work. It is not subject to copyright under 17 USC 105 and is also made available for use under a CC0 license.

# Efficacy of a Filtered Far-UVC Handheld Disinfection Device on Reducing Microbial Bioburden of Hospital Surfaces

**Authors:**

Thanuri Navarathna, BS[1]; Brandon A. Corona, BS[1]; John David Coppin, MPH[1]; Chetan Jinadatha, MD, MPH[1], Hosoon Choi, PhD[1]; Morgan R. Bennett, BS[1]; Gautam S. Ghamande[1], Marjory D. Williams, PhD, RN[1]; Robin E. Keene, PhD, RN[1]; Piyali Chatterjee, MS, PhD[1*]

[1]Central Texas Veterans Health Care System – Temple, TX, USA

*All authors have seen and approved the manuscript, contributed significantly to the work.*

Running Title: Efficacy of Filtered Far-UVC Handheld Disinfection device

Word Count: Abstract: 235 Manuscript: 2252

**Corresponding Author:**

Piyali Chatterjee, MS, PhD

Central Texas Veterans Health Care System

Address: 1901 South 1st Street, Temple, TX 76504

Phone: 254-743-2461

Email: Piyali.Chatterjee@va.gov

**NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.**

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.11.07.22282040; this version posted November 15, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. This article is a US Government work. It is not subject to copyright under 17 USC 105 and is also made available for use under a CC0 license.


## Abstract

**Objectives:** The Filtered Far-UVC (FFUV) handheld disinfection device is a small portable device that emits far UVC at 222nm. The objective of this study was to evaluate the device's ability to kill microbial bioburden on hospital surfaces and compare it to manual cleaning using germicidal sodium hypochlorite wipes.

**Methods:** A total of 344 surfaces (86 observations per group) were sampled with 2 pairs of samples per surface- a pre- and a post-sodium hypochlorite sample, and a pre- and a post-FFUV sample. The results were analyzed via a Bayesian multilevel model that account for the correlation between sample pairs and within surfaces. Additionally, the bacterial flora recovered was identified.

**Results:** The estimated mean colony counts for the sodium hypochlorite control and treatment groups were 20.5 (11.7 – 36.0) and 0.1 (0.0 – 0.2) colony forming units (CFUs) respectively. The FFUV control and treatment groups had mean colony counts of 22.2 (12.5 – 40.1) and 4.1 (2.3 – 7.2) CFUs. The sodium hypochlorite samples had an estimated 99.4% (99.0% – 99.7%) reduction in colony counts, while those from the FFUV group an estimated 81.4% (76.2% - 85.7%) reduction.

**Conclusions:** The findings from this study suggest the FFUV handheld device effectively reduced microbial bioburden on real-world hospital surfaces; however, a manual clean using sodium hypochlorite was more effective in reducing bioburden. Several healthcare-associated infections (HAIs) causing pathogens (gram positive and negative bacteria) were retrieved from the pre-clean surfaces indicating a potential for onward transmission.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.11.07.22282040; this version posted November 15, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. This article is a US Government work. It is not subject to copyright under 17 USC 105 and is also made available for use under a CC0 license.

**Introduction:**

Prevention of healthcare-associated infections (HAIs) has proven challenging, as the occurrence of HAIs among patients continues despite several initiatives undertaken to curb them. Earlier studies have shown that improved surface disinfection can decrease environmental contamination of healthcare-associated pathogens and subsequently decrease the likelihood of patients acquiring HAIs.[1]

The current methods of disinfecting healthcare surfaces mainly rely on manual processes using appropriate disinfectant wipes. In recent years, manual disinfection of inpatient rooms is often followed by use of no-touch disinfection (NTD) technologies such as ultraviolet (UV) light emitting devices.[2] The NTD technologies used in conjunction with manual cleaning can improve the overall disinfection of the surfaces. However, both manual and NTD methods have drawbacks. Manual methods of disinfection are prone to human errors, and studies have shown that up to 50% of surfaces may not receive adequate levels of disinfection during the cleaning process.[3] NTD technologies, such as the pulsed-xenon or mercury bulb-based technologies, can only be used in unoccupied patient rooms due to adverse effects of UV, predominantly on the human skin and eyes.[4,5] Hence, disinfection of surfaces in occupied patient rooms or common areas such as nurses' stations, breakrooms, and portable medical equipment (PME) rely on manual disinfection and cannot benefit from disinfection by whole room UV devices or other NTD devices due to the risk of personnel exposure.

The Filtered Far-UV-C (FFUV) handheld disinfection device produces UV light at a wavelength of 222nm that is germicidal with short contact time but without the drawbacks of traditional UV devices. At 222nm wavelength, FFUV has been shown in numerous studies to be

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.11.07.22282040; this version posted November 15, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. This article is a US Government work. It is not subject to copyright under 17 USC 105 and is also made available for use under a CC0 license.

germicidal and safe for human exposure because of the very low penetration depth of FFUV to human skin and eyes at 222nm.[6-12] *In vitro* evaluations indicate 222nm wavelengths are effective in deactivating a multitude of pathogens including methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* (MRSA), *Bacillus cereus, Bacillus subtilis, Bacillus thuringiensis, Clostridioides difficile* and Herpesvirus.[13,14] However, no data are available that attempt to determine if the FFUV handheld disinfection device will be effective or practical to use on different types of surfaces in healthcare settings to eliminate bacterial pathogens.

In this study, we evaluated the ability of a FFUV handheld disinfection device to kill bacteria on commonly used hospital objects in the healthcare setting and compared the FFUV device to that of a manual disinfection using disposable germicidal sodium hypochlorite disinfectant wipes. In addition, we identified the bacterial flora present on the surfaces studied.

**Methods:**

This study was conducted in accordance with institutional regulatory approvals received from the Research and Development committee at a Veterans Affairs Health Care Center.

*The FFUV handheld disinfection device:*

The FFUV handheld disinfection device used for the study was developed by Freestyle Partners, LLC, and its affiliate, FSP Innovations, LLC which included the Ushio Care222 lamp technology (Figure 1A-D). The 222 nm emitting lamps, produced by Ushio Inc are Care222 excimer lamps containing a chamber filled with a noble gas mixture (Kr-Cl gas) that does not use inner electrodes or contain mercury. When high voltage is applied across the outside of the glass, it “excites” the gaseous mixture inside, causing UV light to be emitted which is then filtered to allow any wavelength below 230nm. The devices emit ~3.6 mW/cm$^2$ at 1 inch

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.11.07.22282040; this version posted November 15, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. This article is a US Government work. It is not subject to copyright under 17 USC 105 and is also made available for use under a CC0 license.

distance. A green light (Figure 1D) on the handheld device indicates when the intended operating distance of 1" inch (2.54 cm) from the target surface is reached. Prior to each use, both the dosage and the wavelength of emission of the FFUV handheld disinfection device were validated.




Figure 1. The portable battery-operated FFUV handheld disinfection device A) side view showing the “on” button (round black) on the device that needs to be held down during operation B) side view of the device showing the glass surface area in the bottom that emanates the UV-C light C) The “red indicator light” suggests the correct distance for the surface to be disinfected has been not yet achieved. D) The “green indicator light” indicates the correct distance has been reached.

*Study setting and design:*

The study setting was a single acute care facility at the Central Texas Veterans Health Care System (CTVHCS) in Temple, TX. The study was conducted between June-July 2022 in different medical surgical units/wards throughout the facility. All samples were collected from

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.11.07.22282040; this version posted November 15, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. This article is a US Government work. It is not subject to copyright under 17 USC 105 and is also made available for use under a CC0 license.

non-isolation rooms to prevent any disruption of patient care and reduce the need for additional contact precautions necessary for the research personnel. To evaluate the efficacy of FFUV handheld disinfection device's ability to kill bacteria compared to manual chemical disinfection, different types of high-touch surfaces on objects were selected including surfaces such as patient room bedrails, computer keyboards at nurse's stations, simulation manikins, breakroom tables, and workstations-on-wheels (WOWs). If visual debris was noted, such areas were not sampled and adjacent areas free of visual debris or soiling were identified for sampling. The study consisted of 100 experiments (400 observations) performed on 5 different object types, in a balanced design. Two of the experiments were removed from the analysis dataset due to higher contamination after UV exposure indicating potential sampling error, and 12 experiments were removed due to control (pre-treatment) samples in the FFUV group that were by chance much higher (up to 2X higher) than the control samples in the sodium hypochlorite group. After this adjustment for lack of overlap, the subsequent analysis dataset consisted of 86 experiments (344 observations), and was well matched, making inference on the two groups possible. Each experiment consisted of 4 observations: a control sample and treatment sample pair for each of the two treatment types, disinfection wipe (1:10 dilution of 6300 ppm sodium hypochlorite, Sani-Cloth$^{R}$, PDI, wet dwell time 4 mins) and FFUV (30 secs). Thus, the study consisted of a matched-pairs within-object design, such that the effect of the two treatment types could be compared with each other. Sensitivity analysis was conducted such that the analysis was also run on the full dataset (98 experiments; excluding the 2 experiments with error) and is included in the Supplementary Material.

*Sampling method:*

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.11.07.22282040; this version posted November 15, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. This article is a US Government work. It is not subject to copyright under 17 USC 105 and is also made available for use under a CC0 license.

Rodac tryptic soy agar (Hardy Diagnostics, Santa Maria, CA, USA) contact plates ($25cm^2$ surface area) were used to collect samples. Equal number of samples (up to 4 contact plates) were collected per day for 2 weeks from each of the previously mentioned surfaces of the 5 objects at pre-cleaning, at post-FFUV, and at post-manual disinfection with disposable sodium hypochlorite disinfectant wipes from adjacent areas of each surface. Plates were subsequently incubated in aerobic conditions at 35°C for 24 hours and colony counts were enumerated.

*Matrix-assisted laser desorption ionization-time of flight mass spectrometry (MALDI-TOF MS) method:*

MALDI-TOF MS (Biomeriux, Belgium) was used to identify the various types of bacterial flora from the sampling plates. Based on the bacterial colony morphology, one representative sample from each morphology type grown on a blood agar plate (TSA with sheep blood, Thermofisher Scientific) was subjected to MALDI-TOF MS identification. All samples were then identified using the following manufacturer's instructions. Colonies grown on Columbia CNA agar w/ 5% sheep blood plates (Remel) was identified as MRSA by using two different kits PBP2a SA culture colony test (Abbott) and Sure-Vue color staph ID latex test kit (Fisher Healthcare) following manufacturer's instructions.

*Statistical methods:*

Analysis was conducted using a Bayesian multilevel negative binomial regression model. The model was specified with the outcome variable as colony counts and the predictors specified as an intercept, binary control/treatment variable, binary sodium hypochlorite/FFUV treatment type variable, and an interaction for the treatment and treatment type variable.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.11.07.22282040; this version posted November 15, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. This article is a US Government work. It is not subject to copyright under 17 USC 105 and is also made available for use under a CC0 license.

Varying intercepts for the hierarchical matched pairs within experiment within object design were also included. The model was run in the 'brms' package version 2.17.0 in R version 4.1.3. All plots were created in the 'ggplot2' package. The detailed results of the model comparison and sensitivity analysis are included in the Supplementary Material.

**Results:**

*Efficacy of Disinfection*

The distribution of colony counts in the analysis dataset is shown in Figure 2. For an average surface and experiment, the model-estimated mean colony counts for the sodium hypochlorite control & treatment groups were 20.5 (11.7 – 36.0) and 0.1 (0.0 – 0.2) colony forming units (CFUs), respectively. Similarly, for the UV control & treatment groups the mean colony counts were 22.2 (12.5 – 40.1) and 4.1 (2.3 – 7.2) CFUs, respectively (Figure 2). Samples in the sodium hypochlorite group had an estimated 99.4% (99.0% – 99.7%) reduction in colony counts, while the samples in the FFUV group had an estimated 81.4% (76.2% - 85.7%) reduction in colony counts.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.11.07.22282040; this version posted November 15, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. This article is a US Government work. It is not subject to copyright under 17 USC 105 and is also made available for use under a CC0 license.




Figure 2. Histogram of colony counts per treatment group, sodium hypochlorite and FFUV. Dark blue indicates the colony counts after treatment and light blue the colony counts in the control group. The left panel is the sodium hypochlorite and the right panel the FFUV groups, respectively.

Based on this data both treatments had a large effect in reducing bioburden, but the FFUV was comparatively less effective than the sodium hypochlorite (Figure 3).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.11.07.22282040; this version posted November 15, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. This article is a US Government work. It is not subject to copyright under 17 USC 105 and is also made available for use under a CC0 license.




Figure 3. Model estimated mean (points) and 95% Uncertainty Intervals (whiskers) for the sodium hypochlorite (red) and UV (green) control (left) and treatment (right) groups.

*Types of Bacterial Flora*

The recovered bacteria on the surfaces of the 5 objects chosen for our study prior to use of either intervention belonged to multiple genera and were grouped into gram-positive, gram-negative, and gram variable categories (Table 1). Common gram-positive bacteria such as *Staphylococcus, Bacillus,* and *Micrococcus* were recovered from surfaces of all 5 objects. Different gram-negative bacteria from surfaces of each object such as *Acinetobacter, Citrobacter, Pseudomonas, Klebsiella, Escherichia* among others were also found as shown in Table 1. Out of the total bacterial flora recovered, the common HAI causing bacteria (both gram-positive and gram-negative) were plotted, and Figure 4 shows the percentage of objects

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.11.07.22282040; this version posted November 15, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. This article is a US Government work. It is not subject to copyright under 17 USC 105 and is also made available for use under a CC0 license.

that were sampled that the organism was found on. For example, *Staphylococcus hominis* was found on 90% of WOWs that were sampled.

| | Object | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Bedrail | Keyboard | Manikin | Table | WOW | **TOTAL** |
| **Gram-positive Bacteria** | | | | | | |
| *Bacillus cereus group* | + | + | + | + | + | 5 |
| *Bacillus flexus* | | | + | | + | 2 |
| *Bacillus megaterium* | + | | + | + | + | 4 |
| *Bacillus simplex* | | | + | + | | 2 |
| *Bacillus subtilis/amyloliquefaciens/vallismortis* | | + | + | | | 2 |
| *Exiguobacterium aurantiacum* | | | | | + | 1 |
| *Kocuria rhizophila* | | | | + | | 1 |
| *Lysinibacillus fusiformis* | + | | + | | + | 3 |
| *Micrococcus luteus* | + | + | + | + | + | 5 |
| *Paenibacillus lautus* | | | | + | | 1 |
| *Paenibacillus polymyxa* | | | | | + | 1 |
| *Staphylococcus aureus* | | | + | + | | 2 |
| *Staphylococcus aureus (MRSA)* | | + | | | + | 2 |
| *Staphylococcus capitis* | + | | | | + | 2 |
| *Staphylococcus epidermidis* | + | + | + | + | + | 5 |
| *Staphylococcus haemolyticus* | + | + | + | + | + | 5 |
| *Staphylococcus hominis* | + | + | + | + | + | 5 |
| *Staphylococcus pasteuri* | | | | + | | 1 |
| *Staphylococcus saprophyticus* | | | + | + | | 2 |
| *Staphylococcus warneri* | | | + | | + | 2 |
| *Virgibacillus proomii* | | | | + | | 1 |
| **Gram-negative Bacteria** | | | | | | |
| *Acinetobacter lwoffii* | | + | | | | 1 |
| *Citrobacter freundii* | | | | | + | 1 |
| *Enterobacter hormaechei* | | | + | | | 1 |
| *Escherichia coli* | | + | | | | 1 |
| *Klebsiella aerogenes* | + | | | | | 1 |
| *Paenibacillus provencensis* | | | | | + | 1 |
| *Pseudomonas oryzihabitans* | | | | + | | 1 |
| *Pseudomonas putida* | | | + | | | 1 |
| **Gram Variable Bacteria** | | | | | | |
| *Bacillus altitudinis/pumilus* | + | + | + | | + | 4 |
| **TOTAL** | 10 | 10 | 16 | 14 | 16 | **66** |

Table 1. A list of all organisms recovered from surfaces of the 5 objects sampled: bedrails, computer keyboards at nurse's stations, simulation manikins, breakroom tables, and workstation-on-wheels (WOWs).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.11.07.22282040; this version posted November 15, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. This article is a US Government work. It is not subject to copyright under 17 USC 105 and is also made available for use under a CC0 license.




Figure 4. Organisms recovered from surfaces of the 5 objects grouped by gram stain and ordered by percentage in descending order within genus.

**Discussion:**

The FFUV handheld disinfection device used in this study demonstrated for the first time the ability to reduce microbial bioburden on surfaces in a real hospital environment. The FFUV handheld disinfection device detects the exact distance from the surface with an indicator for application resulting in a consistent dose during use while providing guidance to the end users for optimal results. In addition, the FFUV dose administered for this study is known to be safe for use.[6,7] Therefore, the FFUV handheld disinfection device has the potential to act as an adjunct to current methods of disinfection for healthcare surfaces, especially for surfaces that are not amenable to the use of sodium hypochlorite or other disinfectant wipes.

Our results indicate that sodium hypochlorite treatment effectively reduced the recovery of bacterial flora on all surfaces of 5 objects studied. In comparison, the FFUV

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.11.07.22282040; this version posted November 15, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. This article is a US Government work. It is not subject to copyright under 17 USC 105 and is also made available for use under a CC0 license.

handheld disinfection device also ensured disinfection, albeit not complete, of the contaminated surfaces. Additional factors should be considered when assessing the results of this study. Due to low penetrability of FFUV light, some organisms that may have been clumped together could remain viable. This may have contributed to the slightly higher recovery of bacterial flora on each surface when the FFUV handheld disinfection device was used. The disinfectant sodium hypochlorite wipes have an inherent advantage because of mechanical wiping action which contributes to removal of microbial bioburden. However, the FFUV handheld disinfection device can be used on objects and areas where disinfectant sodium hypochlorite wipe use is not feasible due to non-compatibility or risk of the manufacturer voiding the warranty of equipment if a chemical disinfectant wipe is used.

Several studies have associated surface contamination to transmission of HAIs.[15-18] Bacterial pathogens that can contribute to HAIs, including MRSA, have been recovered from the WOWs and computer keyboards at nurse's stations in our study. Subsequent studies are needed to confirm the possibility of transmission of pathogens from a contaminated surface to a patient and is not within the scope of this study. Overall gram-positive bacteria were recovered at a higher frequency from the surfaces of all 5 different objects compared to gram-negative bacteria. The pre-and post-disinfection surfaces were adjacent to each other in this study to avoid errors when culturing and processing the samples. For this reason, we have not included data for the bacterial flora recovered following treatment.

Microbial bioburden in the hospital environment may be largely a product of the frequency of touches, thus increased frequency of use of cleaners and disinfectants may have more impact on the bioburden at any given time.[19] Whether more frequent use of a UV device

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.11.07.22282040; this version posted November 15, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. This article is a US Government work. It is not subject to copyright under 17 USC 105 and is also made available for use under a CC0 license.

may be more convenient for end users than use of chemical disinfectants, needs to be further evaluated in a larger study. These are questions for future studies but should not be considerations in the evaluation of results here.

Our study has some limitations. The contact plates used for our study to recover viable bacteria from different surfaces may not have been able to capture all bacteria, especially from any uneven surfaces. Moreover, the study data was collected by trained research personnel (not end users) to have consistency of device use but not in a blinded manner.

**Conclusions:**

The FFUV handheld disinfection device can effectively reduce bioburden on surfaces. Sodium hypochlorite disinfectant was more effective than that of a FFUV handheld disinfection device as expected. Additional large-scale studies are needed to determine if the FFUV handheld disinfection device may be useful as an adjunct to standard environmental cleaning measures in healthcare facilities or can be used especially for the surfaces where use of chemical disinfectant wipes may not be possible.

Acknowledgements:

The authors appreciate the support from all the nursing unit managers and staff for allowing research personnel to conduct study activities planned in this manuscript. Special thanks to Kristy N. Causey and the Center for Innovation and Learning and Gracia M. Boseman, Infection Prevention and Control for their support of our study. The authors thank Freestyle Partners, LLC, and its affiliate, FSP Innovations, LLC for providing the devices and for use of the calibration verification device.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.11.07.22282040; this version posted November 15, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. This article is a US Government work. It is not subject to copyright under 17 USC 105 and is also made available for use under a CC0 license.

Author contributions:

TN, BAC performed research; PC and JDC provided detailed guidance on performing the experiments, JDC analyzed data and prepared figures, HC, MRB, GG, MDW, REK assisted with interpretation of the data, PC, JDC, CJ designed research, PC wrote the manuscript and all authors edited and approved the manuscript.

Funding Statement:

This manuscript is the result of work supported with resources and the use of facilities at the Central Texas Veterans Health Care System, Temple, TX. The device and funding to conduct the study was provided by Freestyle Partners, LLC, and its affiliate, FSP Innovations, LLC to PC. The study sponsor did not have a role in the study design, data collection, data analysis, data interpretation, or writing of this manuscript. The corresponding author has full access to all the data in the study and had final responsibility for the decision to submit for publication.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.11.07.22282040; this version posted November 15, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. This article is a US Government work. It is not subject to copyright under 17 USC 105 and is also made available for use under a CC0 license.

**References:**


1. Thomas RE, Thomas BC, Conly J, Lorenzetti D. Cleaning and disinfecting surfaces in hospitals and long-term care facilities for reducing hospital- and facility-acquired bacterial and viral infections: a systematic review. *J Hosp Infect*. 2022;122:9-26.

2. Zeber JE, Coppin JD, Villamaria FC, et al. Use of Ultraviolet Irradiation in Addition to Commonly Used Hospital Disinfectants or Cleaners Further Reduces the Bioburden on High-Touch Surfaces. *Open Forum Infectious Diseases*. 2019;6(12):ofz529.

3. Rutala WA, Weber DJ. Monitoring and improving the effectiveness of surface cleaning and disinfection. *American Journal of Infection Control*. 2016;44(5):e69-e76.

4. Mullenders LHF. Solar UV damage to cellular DNA: from mechanisms to biological effects. *Photochem Photobiol Sci*. 2018;17(12):1842-1852.

5. Kaidzu S, Sugihara K, Sasaki M, Nishiaki A, Igarashi T, Tanito M. Evaluation of acute corneal damage induced by 222-nm and 254-nm ultraviolet light in Sprague–Dawley rats. *Free Radical Research*. 2019;53(6):611-617.

6. Buonanno M, Ponnaiya B, Welch D, et al. Germicidal Efficacy and Mammalian Skin Safety of 222-nm UV Light. *rare*. 2017;187(4):493-501.

7. Kaidzu S, Sugihara K, Sasaki M, et al. Re-Evaluation of Rat Corneal Damage by Short-Wavelength UV Revealed Extremely Less Hazardous Property of Far-UV-C†. *Photochemistry and Photobiology*. 2021;97(3):505-516.

8. Narita K, Asano K, Morimoto Y, Igarashi T, Nakane A. Chronic irradiation with 222-nm UVC light induces neither DNA damage nor epidermal lesions in mouse skin, even at high doses. *PLOS ONE*. 2018;13(7):e0201259.

9. Fukui T, Niikura T, Oda T, et al. Exploratory clinical trial on the safety and bactericidal effect of 222-nm ultraviolet C irradiation in healthy humans. *PLOS ONE*. 2020;15(8):e0235948.

10. Barnard IRM, Eadie E, Wood K. Further evidence that far-UVC for disinfection is unlikely to cause erythema or pre-mutagenic DNA lesions in skin. *Photodermatology, Photoimmunology & Photomedicine*. 2020;36(6):476-477.

11. Yamano N, Kunisada M, Kaidzu S, et al. Long-term Effects of 222-nm ultraviolet radiation C Sterilizing Lamps on Mice Susceptible to Ultraviolet Radiation. *Photochemistry and Photobiology*. 2020;96(4):853-862.

12. Eadie E, Barnard IMR, Ibbotson SH, Wood K. Extreme Exposure to Filtered Far-UVC: A Case Study†. *Photochemistry and Photobiology*. 2021;97(3):527-531.

13. Narita K, Asano K, Morimoto Y, et al. Disinfection and healing effects of 222-nm UVC light on methicillin-resistant Staphylococcus aureus infection in mouse wounds. *Journal of Photochemistry and Photobiology B: Biology*. 2018;178:10-18.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.11.07.22282040; this version posted November 15, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. This article is a US Government work. It is not subject to copyright under 17 USC 105 and is also made available for use under a CC0 license.

14. Taylor W, Camilleri E, Craft DL, et al. DNA Damage Kills Bacterial Spores and Cells Exposed to 222-Nanometer UV Radiation. *Applied and Environmental Microbiology*. Published online February 7, 2020.

15. Weber DJ, Rutala WA, Miller MB, Huslage K, Sickbert-Bennett E. Role of hospital surfaces in the transmission of emerging health care-associated pathogens: Norovirus, Clostridium difficile, and Acinetobacter species. *American Journal of Infection Control*. 2010;38(5):S25-S33.

16. Otter JA, Yezli S, French GL. The Role Played by Contaminated Surfaces in the Transmission of Nosocomial Pathogens. *Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol*. 2011;32(7):687-699.

17. Otter JA, Yezli S, Salkeld JAG, French GL. Evidence that contaminated surfaces contribute to the transmission of hospital pathogens and an overview of strategies to address contaminated surfaces in hospital settings. *American Journal of Infection Control*. 2013;41(5):S6-S11.

18. Weber DJ, Rutala WA, Kanamori H, Gergen MF, Sickbert-Bennett EE. Carbapenem-Resistant *Enterobacteriaceae*: Frequency of Hospital Room Contamination and Survival on Various Inoculated Surfaces. *Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol*. 2015;36(5):590-593.

19. Jinadatha C, Villamaria FC, Coppin JD, et al. Interaction of healthcare worker hands and portable medical equipment: a sequence analysis to show potential transmission opportunities. *BMC Infect Dis*. 2017;17(1):800.


Sodium Hypochlorite
FFUV
Frequency
100
75
50
25
0
0
50
100
150
Colony Count
Treatment
Control
Treatment


40
30
20
10
0
Mean Colony Count
control
treatment
Treatment
Treatment Group
Sodium Hypochlorite
FFUV


Bedrail
Keyboard
Manikin
Table
WOW
Percentage of Objects that the Organism was found on
0
25
50
75
55 75 50 30 0 0 5 35 0 5 5 0 0 5 0 0 0 5 0
95 60 60 30 0 5 0 30 5 0 0 5 5 0 10 5 0 0 0
75 60 45 10 15 0 0 70 0 0 0 5 10 0 0 0 5 0 0
60 45 40 0 5 0 5 25 10 5 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 5
90 70 40 10 5 5 0 50 0 5 0 5 0 0 0 0 0 0 0
S. hominis
S. epidermidis
S. haemolyticus
S. capitis
S. aureus
S. aureus (MRSA)
S. cohnii ssp urealyticus
B. cereus group
A. viridans
E. faecalis
E. faecium
P. luteola
P. putida
P. aeruginosa
A. lwoffii
E. coli
E. hormaechei
K. aerogenes
P. agglomerans
Organism
Organism
S. hominis
S. epidermidis
S. haemolyticus
S. capitis
S. aureus
S. aureus (MRSA)
S. cohnii ssp urealyticus
B. cereus group
A. viridans
E. faecalis
E. faecium
P. luteola
P. putida
P. aeruginosa
A. lwoffii
E. coli
E. hormaechei
K. aerogenes
P. agglomerans


BEAMCLEAN
8
A
B
C
D