Scalable In-hospital Decontamination of N95 Filtering Facepiece Respirator with a Peracetic Acid Room Disinfection System

*Amrita R. John, MD¹; *Shine Raju, MD¹; Jennifer L. Cadnum, BS²; Kipum Lee, MDes^{3,4}, Phillip McClellan, PhD⁵, Ozan Akkus PhD^{5,6,7}, Sharon K. Miller, MSE⁸; Wayne Jennings, PhD⁹; Joy A. Buehler⁹; Daniel F. Li, BS¹⁰; Sarah N. Redmond, BS¹⁰; Melissa Braskie, MBA¹¹; Claudia K. Hoyen, MD¹²; Curtis J. Donskey, MD^{2,13}

***Equal author contribution**

Affiliations:

1. Department of Medicine, University Hospitals Cleveland Medical Center, Cleveland, Ohio
2. Research Service, Louis Stokes Cleveland VA Medical Center, Cleveland, Ohio
3. UH Ventures, Innovation Center, University Hospitals Cleveland Medical Center, Cleveland, Ohio
4. Weatherhead School of Management, Case Western Reserve University, Cleveland, Ohio
5. Department of Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering, Case Western Reserve University, Cleveland, Ohio
6. Department of Biomedical Engineering, Case Western Reserve University, Cleveland, Ohio
7. Department of Orthopedics, Case Western Reserve University, Cleveland, Ohio
8. NASA Glenn Research Center, Environmental Effects and Coatings Branch, Cleveland, Ohio
9. HX5, LLC at NASA Glenn Research Center, Cleveland, OH
10. Case Western Reserve University School of Medicine, Cleveland, Ohio
11. Department of Environmental Health and Safety, University Hospitals Cleveland Medical Center, Cleveland, Ohio

12. Department of Pediatric Infectious Diseases, University Hospitals Cleveland Medical Center,
Cleveland, Ohio

13. Geriatric Research, Education, and Clinical Center, Louis Stokes Cleveland VA Medical Center,
Cleveland, Ohio

Corresponding author:

Amrita John, MD

Staff physician, Infectious Diseases and Critical Care
Division of Pulmonary, Critical Care and Sleep Medicine,
Department of Medicine
University Hospitals Cleveland Medical Center
11100 Euclid Avenue, Cleveland, OHIO 44056

Email: Amrita.John@uhhospitals.org

Conflicts of interest:

CJD discloses research funding from Clorox, PDI and Pfizer. OA discloses stipend/ equity from
CollaMedic Inc. All other authors have no conflicts of interest to disclose.

Abbreviations:

SARS-CoV-2=Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus; FFR=Filtering facepiece respirator;
PAA=Peracetic acid; COVID-19=Coronavirus disease 2019; PPE=Personal Protective Equipment;
CDC= Center for Disease Control and Prevention; WHO=World Health Organization; FE=Filtration
efficiency; STEL=Short-term exposure limit; TWA=time weighted average; AEGL=Acute exposure

guidelines; AGP=Aerosol generating procedure; PUI=Persons under investigation; HCW=Healthcare worker; HLDS=High-level disinfection system; EUA= Emergency Use Authorization.

Keywords: Peracetic acid, N95 FFR, reuse, disinfection, SARS-CoV-2, PAA

Acknowledgement: The authors would like to extend our gratitude to UH Ventures for providing the infrastructure for this study. We would like to thank Altapure IncTM and ChemDAQ Inc[®] for their Altapure[®] AP-4 room disinfection system and SafecideTM E-cell[®] PAA and hydrogen peroxide remote monitoring system for use in this study respectively. They did not provide input on study design or interpretation of results.

Funding:

No funding sources

Contributions:

ARJ, SKR and CJD were involved in conceptualizing the study protocols and writing the manuscript; JLC, DFL and SNR performed the inoculation and microbiological reduction analysis; KL helped with the study design, organization of the work, and drawing the images; PM and OA performed the mechanical elasticity testing on the straps; SKM performed the contact angle testing; JW and JAB performed the SEM imaging and structural testing; MB and CKH helped with filtration efficiency testing.

71 Abstract

72 **Background:** Critical shortages of personal protective equipment (PPE) especially N95 respirators
73 during the SARS-CoV-2 pandemic continues to be a source of great concern among health care workers
74 (HCWs). Novel methods of N95 filtering facepiece respirator (FFR) decontamination that can be scaled-
75 up for in-hospital use can help address this concern and keep HCWs safe.

76
77 **Methods:** A multidisciplinary pragmatic study was conducted to evaluate the use of an ultrasonic room
78 high-level disinfection system (HLDS) that generates aerosolized peracetic acid (PAA) and hydrogen
79 peroxide for decontamination of large numbers of N95 respirators. A cycle duration that consistently
80 achieved disinfection of N95 respirators (defined as $\geq 6 \log_{10}$ reductions in bacteriophage MS2 and
81 *Geobacillus stearothermophilus* spores inoculated onto respirators) was identified. The treated masks
82 were then assessed for changes to their hydrophobicity, material structure, strap elasticity, and filtration
83 efficiency (FE). Assessment of PAA and hydrogen peroxide off-gassing from a treated mask was also
84 performed.

85
86 **Results:** The PAA room disinfection system was effective for the decontamination of N95 respirators in
87 a 2447 cubic feet room with deploy and dwell times of 16 and 32 minutes respectively, and a total cycle
88 time of 1 hour and 16 minutes. After 5 treatment cycles, no adverse effects were detected on filtration
89 efficiency, structural integrity, or strap elasticity. There was no detectable off-gassing of PAA and
90 hydrogen peroxide from the treated masks 20 and 60 minutes after the disinfection cycle respectively.

91
92 **Conclusion:** The PAA room disinfection system provides a rapidly scalable solution for in-hospital
93 decontamination of large numbers of N95 respirators to meet the needs of HCWs during the SARS-
94 CoV-2 pandemic.

INTRODUCTION

The Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) pandemic has revealed several inadequacies within healthcare. One of them has been the critical shortage of personal protective equipment (PPE) for healthcare workers (HCWs) on the frontlines of the pandemic response.^{1,2} Single-use disposable PPE such as N95 Filtering Facepiece Respirators (FFR) and surgical facemasks are being worn for extended periods or are reused until they become soiled or visibly damaged. Shortages of PPE have been detrimental to the morale of HCWs and places them at risk for infection, death and disability.³⁻

⁵ Given these extraordinary challenges, it has become vital to devise novel alternative methods to reuse PPE safely and effectively.

Among all PPE, the critical shortage of N95 FFRs has been most pronounced.^{6,7} At the onset of the outbreak, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) had recommended N95 FFRs to be used for all interactions with confirmed or suspected COVID-19 patients. It has subsequently modified its guidance regarding PPE required while caring for patients with SARS-CoV-2.⁸ At present, both the CDC and the World Health Organization (WHO) recommend the use of N95 FFRs for all aerosol-generating procedures (AGP) performed on confirmed COVID-19 patients and persons under investigation (PUI).^{9,10} Given the shortage of N95 respirators, the CDC has provided updated guidance for extended use and limited reuse of these respirators by HCWs.¹¹ Several strategies have been proposed for conserving the supply of PPE including repurposing other devices to be used as FFRs, creating FFRs at home and decontamination of N95s using methods such as ultraviolet-C germicidal irradiation, dry heat, moist heat, and vaporized hydrogen peroxide.¹²⁻¹⁵ Vaporized hydrogen peroxide (VHP) has provided the most promising results and was recently given provisional US Food and Drug Administration (FDA) Emergency Use Authorization (EUA) for decontamination of used N95 respirators.¹⁶ Although the

availability of VHP decontamination is an important development, the process is labor and time-intensive due to a long treatment cycle, may be limited in its access and requires the shipment of used N95 respirators to and from a central processing center.¹⁷ The FDA has since also granted EUA for other hydrogen peroxide based sterilization devices which are currently in use in several hospitals and allows for in-hospital disinfection of the used N95 FFRs, however these devices are limited by the number of N95 FFRs that can be processed at a given time.

There remains an urgent need for an effective N95 respirator disinfection process that will allow on-site reprocessing with rapid turnaround times, ease of use with existing personnel and expertise, and flexibility and scalability to process large quantities of respirators. Ideally, the process should allow for the disinfection of other PPE, such as gowns, surgical face masks, powered air-purifying respirator (PAPR) hoods, and face shields as the needs arise. It has been reported that aerosolized peracetic acid (PAA) and hydrogen peroxide was effective for disinfection of N95 respirators.^{18,19} Here, we expanded on these promising findings by evaluating the use of the same technology on a much larger scale for whole-room disinfection of a large number of respirators and evaluated the impact of the treatment on mask performance.

METHODS

A multi-institutional study was conducted by researchers at University Hospitals Cleveland Medical Center (UHCMC), Case Western Reserve University (CWRU), National Aeronautical and Space Administration (NASA) Glenn Research Center and the Cleveland Veterans Affairs Medical Center (VAMC) to evaluate the use of an ultrasonic room disinfection system that generates aerosolized PAA and hydrogen peroxide for disinfection of large numbers of N95 respirators.

141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163

Protection of Human Research Participants

The proposed PAA disinfection experiments were approved by an internal safety review at University Hospitals Cleveland Medical Center (UHCMC). The microbiologic analyses were approved by the Biosafety Committee at the VAMC. Institutional Review Board approval was not obtained as human subjects were not enrolled in the study.

Development and Optimization of the PPE Decontamination Room

The PAA room high-level disinfection system (HLDS) (AP-4™, Altapure, Mequon, WI) was placed in the center of a 16.3 x 16 x 9.5 feet room (2447 cu. ft) (**Figure 1A-E**). The device uses ultrasonic vibrations to generate a dense cloud of submicron droplets of PAA, each containing peracetic acid (0.18%), hydrogen peroxide (0.88%), water (98.58%); and the remainder being inert ingredients.²⁰ The aerosol eventually decomposes into non-toxic end products: water vapor, acetic acid (vinegar) and oxygen. The decontamination cycles consisted of 4 phases: Deploy (deployment of the PAA submicron aerosols into the room), Dwell (aerosols left to stand in the room), Scrub (clearance of the aerosol by dehumidification and by drawing it through activated charcoal filters) and Vent (fresh air is circulated through the room by opening the manual vents enabling clearance of residual vapors and drying of the masks). The ventilation in the test room was modified to allow the influx and circulation of fresh air at the end of the scrub cycle. An extra air scrubber (HJ-200™, Altapure, Mequon, WI) was deployed to keep vent times to a minimum by accelerating clearance of residual PAA. The deploy and dwell times are directly responsible for microbial reduction, whereas the scrub and the vent cycles impact clearance of residual PAA vapors to recommended safe levels. There are no specific OSHA standards for PAA.²¹ The American Conference of Governmental Hygienists (ACGIH) has set a Threshold Limit Value (TLV) of 0.4 ppm, as a 15-minute

164 Short Term Exposure Limit (STEL).²¹⁻²³ The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) recommended
165 Acute Exposure Guidelines (AEGL-1) limit is 0.17 ppm (0.52 mg/m²).²⁴

166

167 Before the start of the disinfection cycle, the deploy, dwell, scrub and vent phase times were manually
168 configured using the application programming interface (API) on the accompanying digital tablet (**Figure**
169 **2**), which in turn, remotely connected to the HLDS using Bluetooth® technology. The deploy and the
170 dwell times were adjusted to provide effective disinfection of the masks with the least possible amount of
171 exposure to the PAA. The PAA concentrations in the room were measured in real-time by a PAA sensor
172 (Safecide™, ChemDAQ, Pittsburgh, PA). At the end of the vent cycle, PAA concentrations were at 0.12
173 ppm, below the AEGL-1 limit of 0.17 ppm (**Figure 3**). The 15-minute time-weighted average (TWA) of
174 PAA concentration after the decontamination cycle was 0.08 ppm (15-min STEL for PAA is 0.4 ppm).

175

176 Three test cycles were evaluated to identify a cycle time achieving consistent disinfection of bacteriophage
177 MS2 and *G. stearotheophilus* spores inoculated onto N95 respirators. The deploy time on these test
178 cycles ranged from 12 minutes (default settings for a room of 2447 cu. ft) to 19 minutes. The shortest
179 cycle tested was 44 minutes (deploy: 12 minutes, dwell: 8 minutes, scrub: 8 minutes and vent: 16 min).
180 Based on the results, the cycle times were incrementally adjusted to get an optimal cycle time. The optimal
181 cycle was identified as being the shortest cycle at which disinfection was consistently achieved (deploy:
182 16 minutes, dwell: 32 minutes, scrub: 12 minutes and vent: 16 minutes). This cycle was then repeated up
183 to 5 times with sterile masks that were then sent for analysis of structural integrity, instantaneous filtration
184 efficiency and load testing analysis.

185

186 **Efficacy of the decontamination process for treatment of contaminated N95 respirators**

The model 1860 N95 (3M, Minneapolis, USA) respirator was studied because it was the respirator used at the study hospital. Twenty new respirators were tested from 2 different lots available from the hospital inventory. Two N95 respirators were used for each decontamination test cycle. The test and control respirators were inoculated with $\sim 10^6$ colony-forming units (CFU) of *G. stearothermophilus* spores and $\sim 10^6$ plaque-forming units (PFU) of bacteriophage MS2 on the outer and inner surface of the respirator using previously described methods.^{18,25,26} The test organisms suspended in 8% simulated mucus,²⁷ and 10 μ L aliquots were pipetted onto the respirator surface and spread with a sterile loop to cover an area of 1 cm² and allowed to air dry. The test N95 respirators were suspended using metallic ‘S’ shaped hooks from metal wire shelving carts at a height of 6 feet (height of the tallest shelf) and exposed to PAA submicron droplets. The control masks were left untreated at room temperature, maintained at 68°F.

After the disinfection treatments, the inoculated sections of the N95 respirators were cut out, vortexed for 1 minute in 1 mL of phosphate-buffered saline with 0.02% Tween and serial dilutions were plated on selective media to quantify viable organisms. Broth enrichment cultures were used to assess for recovery of low levels of *G. stearothermophilus* spores. All tests were performed in triplicate. Log₁₀ CFU or PFU reductions were calculated by comparing recovery from treated versus untreated control respirators.

Evaluation of Contact Angle on the Surface of Treated N95 Respirators

The contact angle on the surface of untreated and treated N95 respirators was measured with a Kernco Instruments contact angle meter at the NASA Glenn Research Center. A micropipette was used to place a small droplet of deionized water on the surface (outer green layer) of a $\sim 1/2$ "x1" section cut from each mask with scissors. Contact angle (θ) (**Figure 4**) for each of 3 drops was measured using the Goniometer scale on the instrument for each sample. The range of angles measured was documented (**Table 1**).

210

211 **Evaluation of N95 Respirator Structural Integrity by Scanning Electron Microscopy**

212 The outer (green) fabric of the mask was examined using scanning electron microscopy (SEM) at the
 213 NASA Glenn Research Center. Samples of approximately 1"x1" cut from each mask with scissors were
 214 coated with a 10 nm layer of platinum to reduce charging in the electron beam and then mounted to a 4"
 215 pin-mount platen with conductive carbon tape for SEM viewing. A Tescan MAIA-3 Scanning Electron
 216 Microscope was used to view the fibers in each mask sample. The test parameters were: accelerating
 217 voltage, 1 kV; working distance, 15 mm; beam intensity, set at 8 resulting in an absorbed current of about
 218 180pA; and spot size, ~28 nm.

219

220 **Effect of treatment on elasticity of the respirator straps**

221 Three samples were cut from elastic straps of two masks at each sterilization cycle (0, 3 and 5 cycles),
 222 resulting in a sample size of 6 per group. Samples were 3 cm in length and were mounted to the grips of
 223 a tensile testing machine. The gage length of specimens was set at 1 cm length. Samples were loaded
 224 under displacement control (800L, Testresources, Minnetonka, MN) at a rate of 1 mm/sec. The testing
 225 profile included two cycles of load relaxation such that in each cycle the samples were loaded to 300%
 226 strain (i.e. to net length of 30 mm following 20 mm deformation), with samples held at constant
 227 deformation for 5 minutes. There was a 5-minute period between the end of the first cycle and the
 228 beginning of the second cycle. The load attained at 300% strain was obtained from the curves for each
 229 cycle as 'Load 1' and 'Load 2' values. Load-relaxation was calculated for each cycle as the difference of
 230 the loads at the beginning and end of the load period as 'Relaxation 1' and 'Relaxation 2'. As such,
 231 relaxation represents the capacity of straps to retain a load over time. The elasticity of samples was
 232 calculated as the secant stiffness from the loading portion of cycle 1 and defined as 'Stiffness 1'. Secant

stiffness was the slope of the line connecting the origin with the point that is defined as Load 1. Owing to the limited sample size, a non-parametric Kruskal-Wallis test was used for one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) at a significance level of $P < 0.05$.

Filtration efficiency of the N95 masks following exposure to PAA vapor

Evaluation of filtration efficiency was performed at ICS Laboratories, Inc. (Brunswick, OH). N95 respirators subjected to multiple runs of the optimal cycle were subjected to testing for instantaneous filtration efficacy in accordance with NIOSH standard TEB-APR-STP-0059.²⁸ The masks were conditioned at 85% +/- 5% relative humidity and 38°C +/- 2°C for 25 hours before the filter efficiency test. Each mask was then assembled into a fixture and subjected to instantaneous aerosol loading. The sodium chloride aerosol was neutralized to a Boltzmann equilibrium state at 25 +/- 5°C and relative humidity of 30 +/- 10%. Particle size distribution was verified to be a count median diameter of 0.075 +/- 0.020 microns, with a geometric standard deviation not exceeding 1.86. The loading was performed by depositing sodium chloride aerosol at an airflow rate of 85 L/min. The flow rate, initial resistance, and initial penetration data were recorded.

Measurement of peracetic acid and hydrogen peroxide off-gassing after disinfection

Following the optimal disinfection cycle, an N95 FFR was taken out of the decontamination room and allowed to air dry in an adjacent room with a fan blowing at 500 cu. ft per minute (cfm). The N95 FFRs were tested for off-gassing after the optimal disinfection cycle and at 20-minute intervals. Testing was concluded once 2 consecutive tests showed no off-gassing for PAA and hydrogen peroxide.

The N95 FFR was placed in a sealed polyvinyl chloride cylinder (0.35 cu. ft) with airflow at 1.5L/min entering through one end and a peracetic acid or hydrogen peroxide sensor (Safecide™, ChemDAQ,

Pittsburgh, PA) connected to the other end. **(Figure 5)** A 15-minute TWA for peracetic acid or hydrogen peroxide exposure was measured.

RESULTS

Efficacy of PAA disinfection of N95 masks:

As shown in **Figure 6**, 6 log₁₀ reductions in *G. stearotheophilus* spores were achieved on inoculated 1860 N95 FFRs with all cycle durations. For bacteriophage MS2, 6 log₁₀ reductions were achieved on the inoculated 1860 N95 FFRs with the 16 minute deploy and 32 minute dwell (total cycle time 76 minutes) and the 19 minute deploy and 32 minute dwell (total cycle time 87 minutes) cycles, whereas only ~4 log₁₀ reductions were achieved with the 12 minute deploy and 8 minute dwell cycle. Based on these results, the optimal disinfection cycle time was determined to be a deploy and dwell of 16 and 32 minutes respectively.

Structural integrity of the N95 masks following exposure to aerosolized PAA:

SEM analysis indicated evidence of bubbles on the surface of the PAA-treated respirator outer fabric fibers which appeared to increase with the number of PAA cycles **(Figure 7A-E)**. Energy Dispersive Spectroscopy dot map images of the bubble feature on PAA Cycle 4 outer mask fabric indicating that the bubbles are high in oxygen, phosphorous and nitrogen, based on the bright areas of the dot map images. The overall spectrograph shows that the surface is predominantly carbon, oxygen and phosphorous. **(Figure 8A,B)**

Evaluation of the contact angle on the surface of the treated N95 masks:

279 Contact angle did not change with repeated cycles of PAA disinfection (**Table 2**), thereby concluding that
280 the hydrophobicity of the outer layer was preserved

281

282 **Effect of treatment on elasticity of the respirator straps:**

283 None of the mechanical properties were affected significantly by the number of cycles of sterilization (*P*
284 values ranged from 0.27 to 0.505). **Figure 9.A.** shows the two-cycle stress relaxation loading protocol.
285 **Figure 9.B.** shows the load versus time profile and including the load-relaxation for each cycle calculated
286 as the difference of the loads at the beginning and end of load period and shown as ‘Relaxation 1’ and
287 ‘Relaxation 2’. **Figure 9.C.** shows the load versus deformation behavior over the two cycles. As such,
288 relaxation represents the capacity of straps to retain a load over time. Elasticity of samples was calculated
289 as the secant stiffness from the loading portion of cycle 1 and defined as ‘Stiffness 1’. Secant stiffness
290 was the slope of the line connecting the origin with the point that is defined as Load 1 in Figure 8.C. Based
291 on these data, elasticity, viscoelasticity and load retention capacity of the strap material were retained for
292 up to 5 cycles (**Figure 10**).

293

294 **Filtration efficacy of the N95 masks following exposure to PAA vapor:**

295 **Table 3** shows the results of instantaneous filtration efficiency on the masks subjected to 5 cycles of PAA
296 treatment. There was no decline in filtration efficiency in the N95 respirators for up to 5 cycles of PAA
297 disinfection.

298

299 **Results of PAA and Hydrogen Peroxide off-gassing after disinfection**

At 20 minutes after the optimal disinfection cycle, the PAA off-gassing was measured at 0.00 ppm. At 60 minutes after the optimal disinfection cycle, the hydrogen peroxide off-gassing was measured at 0.00 ppm. **Table 4** outlines the full results of the testing.

DISCUSSION

The goal of this investigation was to address the urgent need for an effective N95 respirator decontamination process allowing onsite reprocessing with rapid turnaround times, ease of use, and scalability to process large numbers of respirators. We found that the PAA room disinfection system was easy to set up, operate and was effective for disinfection of N95 respirators with a total cycle time of 1 hour and 16 minutes. Using multiple methods, we did not detect any adverse effects on filtration efficiency, structural integrity, or strap elasticity after 5 treatment cycles. There was no detectable off-gassing of PAA and hydrogen peroxide from the treated masks after they were allowed to air dry for 60 additional minutes after the disinfection cycle.. These results suggest that the PAA room disinfection system provides a scalable solution for in-hospital decontamination of N95 respirators to meet the needs of HCWs during the SARS-CoV-2 pandemic.

Microbiological agents chosen to test for disinfection were based on guidance provided by the FDA EUA document.²⁹ During the Ebola outbreak, the CDC recommended the use of disinfectants that were registered to be effective against non-enveloped viruses - as compared to enveloped viruses such as SARS-CoV-2- since they were more resistant to disinfection.^{30,31} Bacteriophage MS2 is a non-enveloped virus that has been used as a surrogate in studies looking at airborne RNA viral pathogens, as well as disinfectant

322 studies performed by the U.S. EPA.³²⁻³⁴ *G. stearothersophilus* spores have been used in the study of PAA
323 decontamination of surfaces.³⁵

324

325 Our findings are consistent with previous studies that demonstrated the efficacy of the PAA disinfection
326 system. Both the room HLDS and a high-level disinfection cabinet were effective in reducing pathogens,
327 including *C. difficile* spores, on steel disk carriers by greater than 6 log₁₀ CFU.^{25,36} However, an extended
328 cycle with the disinfection cabinet was required to achieve a 6 log₁₀ reduction in bacteriophage MS2
329 inoculated on N95 respirators.¹⁸ In the current study, an extended cycle (identified as the optimal
330 disinfection cycle in our experiments) was also required to achieve a 6 log₁₀ reduction in bacteriophage
331 MS2 or *G. stearothersophilus* spores on N95 respirators. Similarly, Battelle has reported a prolonged
332 VHP cycle time with a total time of 480 minutes for N95 decontamination.¹⁷

333

334 Our results demonstrate that the N95 respirators retain their structural integrity, outer surface
335 hydrophobicity and strap elasticity for at least 5 repeated cycles of PAA treatment. However, on a
336 microscopic level, there was evidence of visible bubbling on the non-woven polypropylene fibers of the
337 outer layer, which increased proportionally with the duration of exposure to PAA. The significance of
338 these bubbles is unclear at this time. It could be indicative of a trend towards loss of structural integrity
339 with continued exposure to PAA. These changes, however, did not affect the filtration efficiency of the
340 treated masks. Off-gassing of PAA from the treated mask was undetectable after just 20 minutes of air
341 drying. This may be explained by the low concentrations of PAA in the aerosols, much shorter exposure
342 times to PAA when compared to VHP and the inherently unstable nature of the compound leading to its
343 rapid decomposition.^{17,37} The hydrogen peroxide off-gassing was found to be undetectable after 60
344 minutes of air drying.

345

346 The PAA room disinfection system offers several advantages over other technologies being evaluated for
 347 PPE decontamination. The technology is substantially more effective than ultraviolet-C (UVC) light for
 348 N95 decontamination.^{18,38} The aerosols allow for complete coverage of all surfaces on the masks, thus
 349 eliminating the concerns of ‘shadow areas’ with UVC germicidal irradiation.³⁹ Compared to VHP, the
 350 cycle times with PAA are considerably shorter, allowing rapid turnaround times.^{17,40} This can be vital for
 351 healthcare systems to achieve decontamination of large numbers of N95 FFRs during the COVID-19
 352 pandemic. The platform is scalable and can be replicated in real-world hospital settings. We conservatively
 353 estimate that about 2000 N95 respirators can be effectively disinfected in a room with the dimensions of
 354 the test room (2447 cu. ft), with capacity increasing proportionally to the room dimensions. An estimated
 355 15000-20000 N95 FFRs can be decontaminated per day with this method. The disinfection room can be
 356 set up relatively easily with simple modifications to the ventilation setups in most hospital rooms. The
 357 software is easy to use and the AP-4™ can be operated by hospital personnel with minimal training. The
 358 PAA room HLDS is currently used for terminal disinfection of patient rooms in some centers across the
 359 United States and abroad. It can be readily repurposed for N95 decontamination without much added
 360 costs. While the use of VHP is not recommended with cellulose-containing materials, PAA could
 361 potentially be used with masks containing cellulose.

362

363 The PAA room disinfection system has some disadvantages. The PAA aerosols are hazardous requiring
 364 that the ventilation system is closed and the room sealed during operation. While the AP-4 HLDS is
 365 designed to disinfect rooms of varying sizes, a single device does not effectively disinfect spaces larger
 366 than 4000 cu ft. However, the software allows for synchronous use of multiple AP-4™ devices if larger
 367 decontamination room setups are to be considered.

368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395

Our study has some limitations. Only one model of N95 FFR was evaluated. There are variations in the construction and materials of different N95 respirators and thus further studies are needed with other N95 models. Our sample size was small, in keeping with the need to preserve N95 FFRs for HCWs. We only evaluated N95 structural integrity and filtration efficiency for up to 5 treatment cycles. Studies are needed to assess the impact of increased number of treatments. Despite these limitations, our study has the advantage of including assessments by a multidisciplinary group which helped evaluate the different factors that would affect the reusability of an N95 FFR.

CONCLUSION

We found that a PAA room HLDS was effective for the decontamination of N95 respirators with a short cycle time. No adverse effects on filtration efficiency, structural integrity, or strap elasticity were detected after 5 treatment cycles. The PAA room HLDS system provides a rapidly scalable solution for hospitals requiring in-hospital disinfection of N95 respirators.

References

1. Wang X, Zhang X, He J. Challenges to the system of reserve medical supplies for public health emergencies: reflections on the outbreak of the severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) epidemic in China. *Bioscience trends*. 2020;14(1):3-8.
2. O'Reilly KB. This is war: We must tackle shortages hampering COVID-19 effort. 2020; <https://www.ama-assn.org/delivering-care/public-health/war-we-must-tackle-shortages-hampering-covid-19-effort>.
3. BBC. Coronavirus: PPE shortage creating 'immense distress' for nurses. 2020, April 18; <https://www.bbc.com/news/uk-wales-52339103>.
4. Soumya Karlamangla AC, Emily Baumgaertner. Despite promises of more masks, doctors and nurses have to reuse N95s. 2020, April 14; <https://www.latimes.com/california/story/2020-04-14/coronavirus-ppe-shortage-persists-hospitals>.
5. Sherry L. Burrer CMAdP, CDC; Michelle M. Hughes, CDC; David T. Kuhar, CDC; Sara E. Luckhaupt, CDC; Clinton J. McDaniel, CDC; Rachael M. Porter, CDC; Benjamin Silk, CDC; Matthew J. Stuckey, CDC; Maroya Walters, CDC. Characteristics of Health Care Personnel with COVID-19 — United States, February 12–April 9, 2020. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep*. 2020(69):477–481.
6. Nierenberg A. Where Are All the Masks? 2020, April 3; <https://www.nytimes.com/article/face-masks-coronavirus.html>.
7. OSHA. Enforcement Guidance for Respiratory Protection and the N95 Shortage Due to the Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) Pandemic. 2020, April 3; <https://www.osha.gov/memos/2020-04-03/enforcement-guidance-respiratory-protection-and-n95-shortage-due-coronavirus>.
8. CDC. Healthcare Infection Prevention and Control FAQs for COVID-19. 2020, April 12; <https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/hcp/infection-control-faq.html>.
9. CDC. Interim Infection Prevention and Control Recommendations for Patients with Suspected or Confirmed Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) in Healthcare Settings. 2020, April 13; <https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/hcp/infection-control-recommendations.html>.
10. WHO. Infection prevention and control during health care when novel coronavirus (nCoV) infection is suspected. 2020, March 19; WHO reference number: WHO/2019-nCoV/IPC/2020.2013. Available at: [https://www.who.int/publications-detail/infection-prevention-and-control-during-health-care-when-novel-coronavirus-\(ncov\)-infection-is-suspected-20200125](https://www.who.int/publications-detail/infection-prevention-and-control-during-health-care-when-novel-coronavirus-(ncov)-infection-is-suspected-20200125).
11. NIOSH. Recommended Guidance for Extended Use and Limited Reuse of N95 Filtering Facepiece Respirators in Healthcare Settings. 2020; <https://www.cdc.gov/niosh/topics/hcwcontrols/recommendedguidanceextuse.html>.
12. Bauchner H, Fontanarosa PB, Livingston EH. Conserving Supply of Personal Protective Equipment—A Call for Ideas. *Jama*. 2020.
13. Price AD, Cui Y, Liao L, et al. Is the fit of N95 facial masks effected by disinfection? A study of heat and UV disinfection methods using the OSHA protocol fit test. *medRxiv*. 2020:2020.2004.2014.20062810.
14. Oral E, Wannomae KK, Connolly RL, et al. Vapor H2O2 sterilization as a decontamination method for the reuse of N95 respirators in the COVID-19 emergency. *medRxiv*. 2020:2020.2004.2011.20062026.
15. Anderegg L, Meisenhelder C, Ngooi CO, et al. A Scalable Method of Applying Heat and Humidity for Decontamination of N95 Respirators During the COVID-19 Crisis. *medRxiv*. 2020:2020.2004.2009.20059758.
16. USFDA. Investigating Decontamination and Reuse of Respirators in Public Health Emergencies. 2020, April 10; <https://www.fda.gov/emergency-preparedness-and-response/mcm-regulatory-science/investigating-decontamination-and-reuse-respirators-public-health-emergencies>.
17. Battelle. Final Report for the Bioquell Hydrogen Peroxide Vapor (HPV) Decontamination for Reuse of N95 Respirators. 2016, July 22; <https://www.fda.gov/media/136386/download>.

- 443 18. Cadnum JL LD, Redmond SN, John AR, Pearlmutter B, Donskey C. Effectiveness of Ultraviolet-C Light and
444 a High-Level Disinfection Cabinet for Decontamination of N95 Respirators. . *Pathogens and Immunity*.
445 2020;5(1):52-67.
- 446 19. Kumar A, Kasloff SB, Leung A, et al. N95 Mask Decontamination using Standard Hospital Sterilization
447 Technologies. *medRxiv*. 2020:2020.2004.2005.20049346.
- 448 20. Altapure. <https://altapure.com/technology/altacare/>.
- 449 21. OSHA. <https://www.osha.gov/dts/sltc/methods/partial/pv2321/pv2321.pdf>.
- 450 22. USDA. [https://www.fsis.usda.gov/wps/wcm/connect/df3f6030-a4c4-4064-b156-](https://www.fsis.usda.gov/wps/wcm/connect/df3f6030-a4c4-4064-b156-e813bb49e577/Peroxyacetic-Acid.pdf?MOD=AJPERES)
451 [e813bb49e577/Peroxyacetic-Acid.pdf?MOD=AJPERES](https://www.fsis.usda.gov/wps/wcm/connect/df3f6030-a4c4-4064-b156-e813bb49e577/Peroxyacetic-Acid.pdf?MOD=AJPERES).
- 452 23. ACGIH. *2019 Guide to Occupational Exposure Values*. 2019.
- 453 24. Agency USEP. [https://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2014-](https://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2014-09/documents/peracetic_acid_final_volume8_2010_0.pdf)
454 [09/documents/peracetic_acid_final_volume8_2010_0.pdf](https://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2014-09/documents/peracetic_acid_final_volume8_2010_0.pdf).
- 455 25. Mana TS, Sitzlar B, Cadnum JL, Jencson AL, Koganti S, Donskey CJ. Evaluation of an automated room
456 decontamination device using aerosolized peracetic acid. *American journal of infection control*.
457 2017;45(3):327-329.
- 458 26. Tomas ME, Kundrapu S, Thota P, et al. Contamination of Health Care Personnel During Removal of
459 Personal Protective Equipment. *JAMA Intern Med*. 2015;175(12):1904-1910.
- 460 27. Masiuk T, Kadakia P, Wang Z. Development of a physiologically relevant dripping analytical method using
461 simulated nasal mucus for nasal spray formulation analysis. *Journal of pharmaceutical analysis*.
462 2016;6(5):283-291.
- 463 28. NIOSH. Determination of Particulate Filter Efficiency Level for N95 Series Filters against Solid Particulates
464 for Non- Powered, Air-Purifying Respirators Standard Testing Procedure. Revision 3.2, 13 December
465 2019.
- 466 29. (FDA) UFaDA. Enforcement Policy for Face Masks and Respirators During the Coronavirus Disease
467 (COVID-19) Public Health Emergency (Revised). 2020, April.
- 468 30. McDonnell GE. *Antisepsis, disinfection, and sterilization: types, action, and resistance*. John Wiley &
469 Sons; 2017.
- 470 31. CDC. Interim Guidance for Environmental Infection Control in Hospitals for Ebola Virus. 2014, August 1;
471 <https://www.cdc.gov/vhf/ebola/clinicians/cleaning/hospitals.html>.
- 472 32. Joseph Wood WR, Michelle Sunderman. Evaluating Low Concentration Hydrogen Peroxide Vapor for
473 Inactivation of Ebola Virus Surrogates Phi6 and MS2 Bacteriophage. US EPA Decontamination
474 Conference; 2019, November 19-21; Norfolk, VA.
- 475 33. Wood JP, Richter W, Sunderman M, Calfee MW, Serre S, Mickelsen L. Evaluating the Environmental
476 Persistence and Inactivation of MS2 Bacteriophage and the Presumed Ebola Virus Surrogate Phi6 Using
477 Low Concentration Hydrogen Peroxide Vapor. *Environmental Science & Technology*. 2020;54(6):3581-
478 3590.
- 479 34. Gendron L, Verreault D, Veillette M, Moineau S, Duchaine C. Evaluation of Filters for the Sampling and
480 Quantification of RNA Phage Aerosols. *Aerosol Science and Technology*. 2010;44(10):893-901.
- 481 35. Wood JP, Calfee MW, Clayton M, Griffin-Gatchalian N, Touati A, Egler K. Evaluation of peracetic acid fog
482 for the inactivation of Bacillus anthracis spore surrogates in a large decontamination chamber. *Journal of*
483 *hazardous materials*. 2013;250-251:61-67.
- 484 36. Kumar JA, Cadnum JL, Jencson AL, Donskey CJ. Efficacy of a multi-purpose high level disinfection cabinet
485 against Candida auris and other health care-associated pathogen. *American journal of infection control*.
486 2019.
- 487 37. National Center for Biotechnology Information. PubChem Database. Peracetic acid, CID=6585.
488 <https://pubchem.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/compound/Peracetic-acid> (accessed on Apr. 21, 2020).
- 489 38. Fischer R, Morris DH, van Doremalen N, et al. Assessment of N95 respirator decontamination and re-use
490 for SARS-CoV-2. *medRxiv*. 2020:2020.2004.2011.20062018.

- 491 39. Baluja A, Arines J, Vilanova R, Bao-Varela C, Flores-Arias MT. UV light dosage distribution over irregular
492 respirator surfaces. Methods and implications for safety. *medRxiv*. 2020:2020.2004.2007.20057224.
- 493 40. Grossman J, Pierce A, Mody J, et al. Institution of a Novel Process for N95 Respirator Disinfection with
494 Vaporized Hydrogen Peroxide in the Setting of the COVID-19 Pandemic at a Large Academic Medical
495 Center. *Journal of the American College of Surgeons*. 2020.
- 496
- 497
- 498

Figures and Legends

Figure 1 (A-E)

Legend: Figure 1 shows A) Placement of the aerosolization device (F) and extra scrubber (Sr) in the middle of the test room B) N95 masks suspended on 'S' shaped hooks C) Test room layout with ventilation on the ceiling providing fresh air (supply) into the room during the vent cycle D) the ventilation set up with supply (S) and exhaust (E); note two 600 cfm blower fans (X) in a push-pull configuration with manually operated gasketed dampers (G). E) Schematic diagram of the room dimensions and ventilation system.

Figure 2 (A,B)

Legend: Figure 2 shows the API which controls the fumigator via Bluetooth technology. A) Home screen with water and concentrate levels B) Interface which lets the operator set cycle times

Figure 3:

Legend: Figure 3 shows the PAA concentrations in the test room at the beginning of the vent phase when the blower fans are turned on (active ventilation). PAA concentrations in the room drop to 0.12 ppm after 16 minutes. (The AEGL-1 limit for PAA over a 10 min or 8 hour period is 0.17 ppm)

Figure 4:

Legend: Figure 4 demonstrates measurement of the contact angle during hydrophobicity testing.

Figure 5:

Legend: Figure 5 shows the off-gassing set up. The treated mask was placed in a sealed cylinder and with a constant airflow of 1.5 Lpm from one end. The other end was connected to a PAA/H₂O₂ sensor and 15-minute TWA levels were documented.

Figure 6:

Legend: Figure 6: Efficacy of PAA HLDS for decontamination or disinfection of *G. stearothermophilus* spores and MS2. The respirator was exposed to 3 different cycles as in the figure and log₁₀ reductions CFU/PFU studied. Error bars indicate standard error

Figure 7 (A-F)

Legend: Figure 7 shows SEM images of the outer layer of the N95 mask under 100x (images in the left column) and 1000x magnification (images in the right column. A (control), B though E indicate multiple cycles of PAA treatment from 1-4. Note increase bubbling on the fibers after PAA exposure. Magnified image of bubbling on fibers (7F)

Figure: 8 (A,B)

Legend: EDS showed that the bubbles are high in oxygen, phosphorous and nitrogen indicated by the bright areas of the dot map images (8A). Overall spectrograph shows that the surface is predominantly carbon, oxygen and phosphorous (8B)

Figure 9: (A-C)

Legend: Figure 9: Two-cycle stress relaxation loading protocol. A) Deformation vs. time profile. B) Load vs. time profile and calculated variables. C) Load vs. deformation behavior over the two cycles.

Figure 10:

Legend: Interval plots for mechanical test variables as a function of disinfection cycles. The horizontal line is the median, the box indicates the interquartile range and the whiskers extend to the minimum and maximum values.

Table 1

No of cycles	Contact angle (Degrees)
Control Mask (0 runs)	97-99
1x	97-99
2x	97-99
3x	97-99
4x	97-99

Legend: Table 1 shows the contact angle with repeated cycles of PAA disinfection. The cycle length was a dwell of 12 minutes and a deploy of 8 minutes. 'N'x indicates number of times the N95 FFR was treated with this cycle.

Table 2

Number of cycles repeated	Flow rate (LPM)	Initial Resistance (mm of H ₂ O)	Instantaneous Penetration (%)	Instantaneous Efficiency (%)	Result
3x	86	12.9	0.59	99.41	Pass
3x	86	13.5	0.31	99.69	Pass
5x	86	14	0.51	99.49	Pass
5x	86	13.3	0.84	99.16	Pass
Specification	81-89			≥ 95	

Legend: Table 2 outlines the results of the instantaneous loading tests for filtration efficiency. The cycle length was a dwell of 16 minutes and a deploy of 32 minutes (optimal cycle). 'N'x indicates number of times the N95 FFR was treated with this cycle.

Table 3

Number of cycles repeated	Flow rate (LPM)	Initial Resistance (mm of H ₂ O)	Initial Penetration (%)	Maximum Penetration (%)	Filter Efficiency (%)	Result
5x	85	14.9	0.56	1.35	98.65	Pass
5x	86	13.8	0.6	1.37	98.63	Pass
Specification	81-89			≤ 5.0	≥ 95	

Legend: Table 3 outlines the results of the full loading tests for filtration efficiency. The cycle length was a dwell of 16 minutes and a deploy of 32 minutes. 'N'x indicates the number of times the N95 FFR was treated with this cycle.

Table 4

Time after cycle	Instantaneous	15 min STEL
0	2.4 ppm	1.76
20 min	1.4 ppm	1.15
40 min	0.2 ppm	0.18 ppm
60 min	0.0 ppm	0.0 ppm
80 min	0.0 ppm	0.0 ppm

Legend: Table 4 outlines the results of the hydrogen peroxide off-gassing from the N95 FFR which had undergone an ideal decontamination cycle.