Modelling the thermal inactivation of viruses from the *Coronaviridae* family in suspensions or on surfaces with various relative humidities.

Authors:

Laurent Guillier,^a Sandra Martin-Latil,^b Estelle Chaix,^a Anne Thébaud,^a Nicole Pavio,^c Sophie Le Poder,^c on behalf of Covid-19 Emergency Collective Expert Appraisal Group,^d Christophe Batéjat,^e Fabrice Biot,^f Lionel Koch,^f Don Schaffner,^g Moez Sanaa,^a

Affiliations:

^aRisk Assessment Department, French Agency for Food, Environmental and Occupational Health & Safety, 14, rue Pierre et Marie Curie, Maisons-Alfort, France

^bLaboratory for food safety French Agency for Food, Environmental and Occupational Health & Safety, University of Paris-EST, Maisons-Alfort, France

^cUMR Virologie 1161, ENVA, INRAE, Anses, Maisons-Alfort, France

^dMembership of the Covid-19 Emergency Collective Expert Appraisal Group is provided in the Acknowledgments

^eUnité Environnement et Risques Infectieux, Cellule d'Intervention Biologique d'Urgence (CIBU), Institut Pasteur, Paris, France

^fBacteriology Unit, French Armed Forces Biomedical Research Institute (IRBA), Brétigny-sur-Orge, France

^gDepartment of Food Science, Rutgers University, New Brunswick, NJ, USA

Affiliations:

Running Head: Modelling the inactivation of coronaviruses on fomites

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

Abstract:

Temperature and relative humidity are major factors determining virus inactivation in the environment. This article reviews inactivation data of coronaviruses on surfaces and in liquids from published studies and develops secondary models to predict coronaviruses inactivation as a function of temperature and relative humidity. A total of 102 D-values (time to obtain a $\log_{10}$ reduction of virus infectivity), including values for SARS-CoV-2, were collected from 26 published studies. The values obtained from the different coronaviruses and studies were found to be generally consistent. Five different models were fitted to the global dataset of D-values. The most appropriate model considered temperature and relative humidity. A spreadsheet predicting the inactivation of coronaviruses and the associated uncertainty is presented and can be used to predict virus inactivation for untested temperatures, time points or new coronavirus strains.

Importance: The prediction of the persistence of SARS-CoV-2 on fomites is essential to investigate the importance of contact transmission. This study collects available information on inactivation kinetics of coronaviruses in both solid and liquid fomites and creates a mathematical model for the impact of temperature and relative humidity on virus persistence. The predictions of the model can support more robust decision-making and could be useful in various public health contexts. Having a calculator for the natural clearance of SARS-CoV-2 depending on temperature and relative humidity could be a valuable operational tool for public authorities.

Keywords: Persistence, coronavirus, modelling, fomites, SARS-CoV-2

1. Introduction

The pandemic of coronavirus respiratory infectious disease (COVID-19) initiated in Wuhan, China in December 2019 was caused by an emergent virus named Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2). SARS-CoV-2 belongs to the order *Nidovirales*, family *Coronaviridae*. These enveloped viruses have a positive, single-stranded RNA genome (directly translated) surrounded by a nucleocapsid protein. Coronaviruses are classified into four genera: alpha (α CoV), beta (β CoV), gamma (γ CoV), and delta (δ CoV). SARS-CoV-2 belongs to the *Betacoronavirus* genus and the *Sarbecovirus* sub-genus.

The route of transmission of respiratory viruses is airborne via inhalation of droplets and aerosols or through contact with contaminated intermediate objects (fomites), e.g. by self-inoculation of mucous membranes (mouth, eyes) by contaminated hands (1). The transmission route for SARS-CoV-2, SARS-CoV and Middle East respiratory syndrome (MERS-CoV) is primarily airborne (2-5) while environmental contamination through surfaces is uncertain (6-8). No study has currently quantified the importance of surface contact transmission in the spread of coronavirus diseases (9). Viral genomes have been detected in the stools of COVID-19 patients and sewage (10), but the role of liquid fomites has not yet been addressed.

Working with highly virulent coronavirus requires biosafety level 3 laboratory containment conditions and since SARS-CoV2 emerged very recently, few data on its survival related to environmental conditions are available (11, 12). The use of surrogate coronaviruses has been suggested to overcome these challenges and expand the available data on coronavirus survival likelihood (13). Surrogates can be used under the assumption that they have similar physicochemical properties that mimic the viruses they represent (14, 15).

Temperature and relative humidity have been shown to impact the kinetics of inactivation of coronaviruses. Increased temperatures have been shown to increase the rate of the inactivation (11, 16), and decreased relative humidity have been associated with a reduction of coronaviruses inactivation rate on surfaces (13, 17). Inactivation rates were lower in suspensions compared to surfaces in studies that tested both suspensions and surfaces at similar temperatures (11, 18).

Hence, the prediction of the persistence of SARS-CoV-2 on fomites is essential to investigate the importance of contact transmission. This study collects available information on inactivation kinetics of coronaviruses in both solid and liquid fomites and models the impact of temperature and relative humidity on virus persistence.

2. Materials & methods

2.1. Selection of the studies

Four inclusion criteria were used to identify studies that characterized inactivation of coronaviruses according to temperature and relative humidity. Selected studies had to focus on one virus from the *Coronaviridae* family. Inactivation must have been carried out in suspensions or on inert non-porous surfaces. Only surfaces without antimicrobial properties were considered. The quantification of infectious viruses had to be assessed by cell culture, since RT-qPCR can underestimate actual virus infectivity (19, 20). Finally, the available kinetics data points should be sufficient to allow precise statistical estimation of the rate of viral inactivation without bias. In this context, kinetic data with no significant inactivation observed during the experiment or with values below the quantification limit in the first time interval were not included.

2.2. Data collection

The kinetics were gathered from either the figures or the tables of the selected studies. The digitize R package (21) was used to retrieve data from scatter plots in figures. This package loads a graphical file of a scatterplot (in jpeg format) in the graphical window of R and calibrates and extracts the data. Data were manually reported in R vector for data provided in tables. A key was attributed to kinetics collected in each study (Table 1). The specific list of tables and figures used for each kinetics is given in appendix 1.

2.3. Modelling of inactivation

A simple primary model was used for describing each inactivation kinetics. The D -values (or decimal reduction times) were determined from the kinetics of the $\log_{10}$ number of infectious viruses (N) over time at each experimental temperature. D is the inverse of the slope of the inactivation kinetics.

$$\log_{10}(N) = \log_{10}(N_0) - t/D \quad \text{eq. (1)}$$

Several secondary models describing the impact of temperature (T) and relative humidity (RH) on D values were tested. The gamma concept of inactivation was used (22, 23). In this approach, the inactivation of a microbial population could be estimated by:

$$\log_{10}(D) = \log_{10}(D_{ref}) - \sum \log_{10}(\lambda_{xi}(x_i)) \quad \text{eq. (2)}$$

Where λ_{xi} quantifies the influence of each environmental factors (x_i corresponds to temperature and relative humidity in this study) on the microbial resistance (D_{ref}) observed in reference conditions.

Based on eq. (2), five different secondary models were established.

Model #1 is the classical Bigelow model (24). It models only the effect of temperature. The z_T , the increase of temperature which leads to a tenfold reduction of D , value was determined as the negative inverse slope of the plot of $\log_{10}(D)$ versus temperature. z_T is the increase of temperature which leads to a ten-fold reduction of the decimal reduction time. T_{ref} is the reference temperature (set to 4°C in our study) and $\log_{10}(D_{ref})$ is the $\log_{10}(D)$ at T_{ref} .

Model #1

$$\log_{10}(\lambda_T(T)) = \frac{T-T_{ref}}{z_T} \text{ and } \log_{10}(\lambda_{RH}(RH)) = 0$$

Model #2 considers the effect of temperature, however D values were fitted according to temperature using a semi-log approach, derived from Mafart *et al.* (2001).

$$\log_{10}(\lambda_T(T)) = \left(\frac{T-T_{ref}}{z_T}\right)^2 \text{ and } \log_{10}(\lambda_{RH}(RH)) = 0$$

Model #3 is similar to model #2 but the shape parameter n was estimated instead of being set to 2.

$$\log_{10}(\lambda_T(T)) = \left(\frac{T-T_{ref}}{z_T}\right)^n \text{ and } \log_{10}(\lambda_{RH}(RH)) = 0$$

The last two models (#4 and #5) include the effect of relative humidity together with the effect of temperature. In model #4, the shape parameter for temperature was set to 2.

$$\log_{10}(\lambda_T(T)) = \left(\frac{T-T_{ref}}{z_T}\right)^2 \text{ and } \log_{10}(\lambda_{RH}(RH)) = \begin{cases} \frac{RH}{z_{RH}} & RH < 99\% \\ 0 & RH \geq 99\% \end{cases}$$

In model #5, n is a model parameter to be estimated.

$$\log_{10}(\lambda_T(T)) = \left(\frac{T-T_{ref}}{Z_T}\right)^n \text{ and } \log_{10}(\lambda_{RH}(RH)) = \begin{cases} \frac{RH}{z_{RH}} & RH < 99\% \\ 0 & RH \geq 99\% \end{cases}$$

In models #4 and #5, z_{RH} is the increase of relative humidity, which leads to a ten-fold reduction of the decimal reduction time.

2.4. Model's parameters estimation

The model's parameters were fitted with `nls()` R function. Confidence intervals of fitted parameters were assessed by bootstrap using `nlsBoot()` function from `nlsMicrobio` R package (25). The five models were compared according to penalized-likelihood criteria, the Akaike information criterion (AIC) (26) and Bayesian information criterion (BIC) (27).

$$AIC = p \cdot \ln\left(\frac{RSS}{p}\right) + 2k$$

$$BIC = p \cdot \ln\left(\frac{RSS}{p}\right) + k \cdot \ln(p)$$

Where RSS is the residual sum of squares, p is the number of experimental points and k the number of parameters in the model. The lower the AIC and BIC, the better the model fits the dataset.

2.5. Data availability

The detailed information on the tables and figures where the data were collected are given in appendix 1. All the scripts and data used to prepare figures and tables of this manuscript are available in a Github repository (28).

3. Results

3.1. Literature review results

Table 1 shows the detailed characteristics of the twenty-six studies that characterized inactivation of a virus from the *Coronaviridae* family according to temperature and or relative humidity. Some kinetics were not appropriate for characterizing inactivation rate either because the duration of the experiments was too short to observe any significant decrease of virus infectivity, or because the quantification limit was reached before the first time point (Table 1). A total of 102 estimates of D-value were collected from 25 of the 26 studies (Appendix 1). These kinetic values represent 605 individual data points. For each curve, a D-value (i.e. decimal reduction time) was estimated. The 102 D-values are given in Appendix 1. Among the 102 kinetic values, 44 are from members of the *Alphacoronavirus* genus including one from Canine coronavirus (CCV), two for the feline infectious peritonitis virus (FIPV), five for the porcine epidemic diarrhea virus (PEDV), 14 for the Human coronavirus 229E (HCoV-229E) and 22 from the porcine transmissible gastroenteritis coronavirus (TGEV). The remaining 58 kinetics are related to the *Betacoronavirus* genus, including two Human coronavirus - OC43 (HCoV-OC43), two for the bovine coronavirus, 13 for the murine hepatitis virus (MHV), eight for the MERS-CoV, 22 for the SARS-CoV and 11 for the SARS-CoV-2.

Table 1. Characteristics of the studies that explored inactivation of infectivity of coronavirus.

Virus	Genus	Sub-genus	Strain	Measurement	Temperatures (°C)	Conditions associated with treatment	Study reference
BCoV	<i>Betacoronavirus</i>	<i>Embecovirus</i>	Strain 88	PFU in Human rectal tumor (HRT)-18 cells	4	Salad, MEM containing 2% FBS	(29)
CCV	<i>Alphacoronavirus</i>	<i>Tegacovirus</i>	I-71	CRFK cells (PFU)	60, 80 ^a	MEM containing 2% FCS	(30)
FIPV	<i>Alphacoronavirus</i>	<i>Tegacovirus</i>	DF2-WT	Feline kidney (NLFK) cells	54	Basal Medium Eagle	(31)
FIPV	<i>Alphacoronavirus</i>	<i>Tegacovirus</i>	ATCC-990	Crandell Reese feline kidney cell line	4 ^b , 23	Dechlorinated, filtered tap water	(32)
HCoV	<i>Alphacoronavirus</i>	<i>Duvinacovirus</i>	229E	Cellular infectivity in cell strain (HDCS) WI38	33, 37	Maintenance medium 2% fetal calf serum	(33)
HCoV	<i>Alphacoronavirus</i>	<i>Duvinacovirus</i>	229E	Cellular infectivity in lung cell line L132	21 ^b	PBS, Earle's minimal essential medium, Earle's minimal essential medium to with added suspended cells	(34)
HCoV	<i>Alphacoronavirus</i>	<i>Duvinacovirus</i>	229E	Cellular infectivity in lung cell line L132	21 ^b	Aluminum, sponge, latex at 65% RH	(34)
HCoV	<i>Alphacoronavirus</i>	<i>Duvinacovirus</i>	229E	CPE on MRC-5 cells	21	Teflon, PVC, Rubber, Steel, Plastic	(35)
HCoV	<i>Alphacoronavirus</i>	<i>Duvinacovirus</i>	229E	-	23	Cell culture supernatant with or without FBS (fetal bovine serum)	(18)
HCoV	<i>Alphacoronavirus</i>	<i>Duvinacovirus</i>	229E	MRC-5 cells (TCID-50)	4 ^b , 23	Dechlorinated, filtered tap water	(32)
HCoV	<i>Alphacoronavirus</i>	<i>Duvinacovirus</i>	229E	Cellular infectivity in lung cell line L132	4 ^b , 22, 33, 37	Earle's minimal essential medium	(36)
HCoV	<i>Betacoronavirus</i>	<i>Embecovirus</i>	OC43	Cellular infectivity in cell strain (HDCS) WI38	33, 37	Maintenance medium 2% fetal calf serum	(33)
HCoV	<i>Betacoronavirus</i>	<i>Embecovirus</i>	OC43	Cellular infectivity in human rectal tumor cell line HRT-18	21 ^b	PBS, Earle's minimal essential medium, Earle's minimal essential medium to with added suspended cells	(34)

HCoV	<i>Betacoronavirus</i>	<i>Embecovirus</i>	OC43	Cellular infectivity in human rectal tumor cell line HRT-18	21 ^b	Aluminum, sponge ^a , latex ^a at 65% RH	(34)
MERS-CoV	<i>Betacoronavirus</i>	<i>Sarbecovirus</i>	FRA2	Cellular infectivity in Vero cells (TCID-50)	25 ^b , 56, 65	Cell culture supernatant	(37)
MERS-CoV	<i>Betacoronavirus</i>	<i>Sarbecovirus</i>	HCoV-EMC/2012	Cellular infectivity in Vero cells (TCID-50)	20, 30	Plastic (30%, 40% or 80% RH)	(17)
MERS-CoV	<i>Betacoronavirus</i>	<i>Sarbecovirus</i>	HCoV-EMC/2012	Cellular infectivity in Vero cells (TCID-50)	20, 30	Plastic (30%, 40% or 80% RH)	(17)
MHV	<i>Betacoronavirus</i>	<i>Embecovirus</i>	-	Cellular infectivity in DBT cells	4 ^b , 25	Reagent-grade water	(38)
MHV	<i>Betacoronavirus</i>	<i>Embecovirus</i>	-	Cellular infectivity in DBT cells	4 ^b , 25	Lake water	(38)
MHV	<i>Betacoronavirus</i>	<i>Embecovirus</i>	-	Cellular infectivity in DBT cells	4 ^b , 20, 40	Stainless steel surface with 20% humidity	(13)
MHV	<i>Betacoronavirus</i>	<i>Embecovirus</i>	-	Cellular infectivity in DBT cells	4, 20, 40	Stainless steel surface with 50% humidity	(13)
MHV	<i>Betacoronavirus</i>	<i>Embecovirus</i>	-	Cellular infectivity in DBT cells	4, 20, 40	Stainless steel surface with 80% humidity	(13)
MHV	<i>Betacoronavirus</i>	<i>Embecovirus</i>	MHV-2	Cellular infectivity in DBT cells (PFU)	40 ^b , 60, 80 ^a	MEM containing 2% FCS	(30)
MHV	<i>Betacoronavirus</i>	<i>Embecovirus</i>	MHV-N	Cellular infectivity in DBT cells (PFU)	40 ^b , 60, 80 ^a	MEM containing 2% FCS	(30)
MHV	<i>Betacoronavirus</i>	<i>Embecovirus</i>	A59	Plaque assay on L2 cells	10 ^b , 25	Pasteurized wastewater	(39)
PEDV	<i>Alphacoronavirus</i>	<i>Pedacovirus</i>	V215/78	PFU on Vero cells	50	Diluted medium for virus replication	(40)
PEDV	<i>Alphacoronavirus</i>	<i>Pedacovirus</i>	CV777	Vero cells (TCID-50)	40, 44, 48	MEM at pH 7.2	(41)
PEDV	<i>Alphacoronavirus</i>	<i>Pedacovirus</i>	CV777	Vero cells (TCID-50)	4 ^b , 44 ^b , 48	Medium at pH 7.5	(42)
SARS-CoV	<i>Betacoronavirus</i>	<i>Sarbecovirus</i>	FFM-1	Cellular infectivity in Vero cells	56	Cell culture supernatant with or without FBS (fetal bovine serum)	(18)
SARS-CoV	<i>Betacoronavirus</i>	<i>Sarbecovirus</i>	Urbani	Cellular infectivity in Vero cells	56, 65, and 75 ^a	DMEM (Dulbecco's modified Eagle's medium)	(43)
SARS-CoV	<i>Betacoronavirus</i>	<i>Sarbecovirus</i>	HKU39849	Cellular infectivity in FRH-K4 (TCID-50)	28, 33, 38	Plastic stored at 95% RH	(44)

SARS-CoV	<i>Betacoronavirus</i>	<i>Sarbecovirus</i>	HKU39849	Cellular infectivity in FRH-K4 (TCID-50)	28 ^b , 33, 38	Plastic stored at 80-89% RH	(44)
SARS-CoV	<i>Betacoronavirus</i>	<i>Sarbecovirus</i>	GVU6109	Cellular infectivity in Vero cells (TCID-50)	20	VTM medium	(45)
SARS-CoV	<i>Betacoronavirus</i>	<i>Sarbecovirus</i>	GVU6109	Cellular infectivity in Vero cells (TCID-50)	4, 20	Nasopharyngeal aspirate (NPA), throat and nasal swab (TNS) or VTM medium	(45)
SARS-CoV	<i>Betacoronavirus</i>	<i>Sarbecovirus</i>	Tor2 AY274119.3	Cellular infectivity in Vero cells (TCID-50)	22	Plastic and stainless steel stored at 40°C	(12)
SARS-CoV	<i>Betacoronavirus</i>	<i>Sarbecovirus</i>	Utah	Cellular infectivity in Vero cells (TCID-50)	58, 68	Iscove's 4% FCS medium	(46)
SARS-CoV	<i>Betacoronavirus</i>	<i>Sarbecovirus</i>	Utah	Cellular infectivity in Vero cells (TCID-50)	22	Glass surface store at 10-25% RH	(46)
SARS-CoV	<i>Betacoronavirus</i>	<i>Sarbecovirus</i>	Hanoi	Cellular infectivity in Vero cells (TCID-50)	56	Minimum essential medium	(47)
SARS-CoV2	<i>Betacoronavirus</i>	<i>Sarbecovirus</i>	-	Cellular infectivity in Vero cells (TCID-50)	4, 22, 37, 56, 70 ^a	Virus transport medium	(11)
SARS-CoV2	<i>Betacoronavirus</i>	<i>Sarbecovirus</i>	-	Cellular infectivity in Vero cells (TCID-50)	22	Plastic and stainless steel at 65% HR	(11)
SARS-CoV2	<i>Betacoronavirus</i>	<i>Sarbecovirus</i>	WA1-2020 (MN985325.1)	Cellular infectivity in Vero cells (TCID-50)	22	Plastic and stainless steel stored at 40°C	(12)
SARS-CoV2	<i>Betacoronavirus</i>	<i>Sarbecovirus</i>	-	Cellular infectivity in Vero cells (TCID-50)	56, 65 ^a	Cell culture supernatants	(48)
SARS-CoV2	<i>Betacoronavirus</i>	<i>Sarbecovirus</i>	-	Cellular infectivity in Vero cells (TCID-50)	65, 95 ^a	Nasopharyngeal samples	(48)
SARS-CoV2	<i>Betacoronavirus</i>	<i>Sarbecovirus</i>	-	Cellular infectivity in Vero cells (TCID-50)	56	Sera	(48)
TGEV	<i>Alphacoronavirus</i>	<i>Tegacovirus</i>	D52	Cellular infectivity in RPTg cells	31, 35, 39, 43, 47, 51 and 55	In HEPES solution at pH 7	(16)
TGEV	<i>Alphacoronavirus</i>	<i>Tegacovirus</i>	D52	Cellular infectivity in RPTg cells	35, 39, 43, 47, and 51	In HEPES solution at pH 8	(16)
TGEV	<i>Alphacoronavirus</i>	<i>Tegacovirus</i>	-	Cellular infectivity in ST cells	4 ^b , 20, 40	Stainless steel surface with 20% humidity	(13)
TGEV	<i>Alphacoronavirus</i>	<i>Tegacovirus</i>	-	Cellular infectivity in ST cells	4, 20, 40	Stainless steel surface with 50% humidity	(13)

TGEV	<i>Alphacoronavirus</i>	<i>Tegacovirus.</i>	-	Cellular infectivity in ST cells	4, 20, 40	Stainless steel surface with 80% humidity	(13)
TGEV	<i>Alphacoronavirus</i>	<i>Tegacovirus.</i>	-	Cellular infectivity in ST cells	4 ^b , 25	Reagent-grade water	(38)
TGEV	<i>Alphacoronavirus</i>	<i>Tegacovirus.</i>	-	Cellular infectivity in ST cells	4 ^b , 25	Lake water	(38)

^a not included: limit of quantification reached for the first sample time

^b not included: not enough decrease observed during experimentation

- data not specified

Figure 1 shows the 102 estimates of D-values, including 40 values on inert surfaces and 62 values in suspension from temperatures ranging from 4°C to 68°C. Different suspensions were noted, but most were laboratory media (Table 1).

Figure 1. Decimal reduction times of ten coronaviruses according to temperature in suspension or on inert surfaces.

3.2. Modelling the inactivation

The 102 D-values were fitted with five different models. Table 2 shows the performance of these models to describe D-values according to temperature and relative humidity. For the tested range of temperatures (between 4 and 68°C), model #1 (the classical Bigelow model) based on a log-linear relation between D-values and temperature does not perform as well as model #2 that considers a linear second-degree equation. Model #3 offers a further refinement over model #2 by also fitting the degree of the equation (n parameter). The fitted value of n was equal to 1.9 with a confidence interval that includes 2 (*i.e.* model #2). Accordingly, the values taken by

the parsimony criterions for model selection AIC and BIC for model #2 and #3, indicate that n can be set to 2.

Table 2. Characteristics of the different models fitted to the 102 decimal reduction time data of coronaviruses according to temperature (T_{ref} set at 4°C) and relative humidity.

Model	Fitted parameters	Best fit values [95%CI bootstrap intervals]	BIC	AIC
Model #1	log10Dref z_T	3.1 [2.8 - 3.3] 13.8 [12.7 - 15.1]	-124.7	-130.0
Model #2	log10Dref z_T	2.2 [2.1 - 2.3] 29.4 [28.4 - 30.5]	-160.6	-165.9
Model #3	log10Dref z_T n	2.3 [2.1 - 2.6] 27.7 [23.2 - 31.6] 1.9 [1.5 - 2.2]	-156.7	-164.6
Model #4	log10Dref z_T z_{RH}	2.3 [2.2 - 2.5] 29.1 [28.1 - 30.1] 341.4.7 [190.1 - 5631.4]	-160.2	-168.0
Model #5	log10Dref z_T z_{RH} n	2.4 [2.2 - 2.6] 27.5 [23.6 - 31.2] 330.7 [182.8 - 7020,1] 1.9 [1.6 - 2.2]	-156.2	-166.6

Figure 2 illustrates the performance of models #1 (Fig. 2A), #2 (Fig. 2B) and #3 (Fig. 3C) for which only temperature effect is considered for predicting D-values.

Figure 2. Observed (points) and fitted (grey lines) log decimal reduction time values according to temperature for model #1 (A), model #2 (B) and #3 (C). One thousand (1000) bootstrap values of uncertainty characterisation are shown. Estimates of model parameters are given in Table 2.

Table 2 demonstrates that the inclusion of relative humidity should be considered. Models #4 and #5 that describe the D-values according to temperature and relative humidity were more appropriate models than models #1, #2 and #3 with a decrease of AIC of more than 2 points in comparison with other models (49). The estimated value for the shape parameter in Model #5 is not different from the value two. According to BIC criterion, models #4 and model #2 were the most appropriate. Appendix 2 shows a further comparison of these two models. According to the two parsimony criteria, the best model overall was Model #4. Figure 3A shows the prediction of inactivation rate according to T and RH for this model.

A

B

Figure 3. (A) Observed inactivation rate values (grey points) according to temperature and relative humidity and Model #4 predictions (dashed black points). (B) Scatter points of observed versus predicted D-values. The dashed line represents a perfect match between observations and predictions.

3.3. Potential use of the model

An Excel spreadsheet implementing model #4 has been prepared and is available in Appendix 3. The spreadsheet can be used to estimate the number of decimal reductions of infectivity of coronaviruses according to user defined time, temperature and relative humidity. For example, the predicted inactivation for a temperature of 70°C for 1 minute in liquid is -11.8 log₁₀ with a 95% CI [-6.4; -22.1]. The spreadsheet also allows an estimate of the time necessary to reach a target number of decimal reductions of infectivity with a certain confidence level. For example, the time to reach a 5 log₁₀ inactivation at 20°C and 20% of relative humidity is 438 h with a 95% CI of [339; 569].

4. Discussion

Our study identified 102 kinetic values for inactivation of coronaviruses on surfaces and in suspensions. The included studies cover those identified in three recently published articles that conducted a systematic review on coronaviruses inactivation (50-52). These data were used to suggest a novel inactivation model specific to the *Coronaviridae* family. The modelling approach identified temperature and relative humidity as major factors needed to predict infectious coronavirus persistence on fomites.

The log₁₀ of D values was not linearly related to temperature in the range of temperatures studied (4 – 68°C). Bertrand et al. (15) made a similar observation in a meta-analysis for virus and phage inactivation in foods and water and proposed two different models on either side of the threshold temperature of 50°C. Laude (16) suggested a similar approach for TGEV with a threshold temperature at 45°C (16).

The modelling approach we used in our study allows fitting the inactivation values with a single relation. In another meta-analysis on inactivation of viruses, Boehm et al. (20) did not observe such different trends but also studied a smaller temperature range (4 – 29°C). In the highest range of temperature (above 60°C), coronaviruses are found to be far less heat resistant than non-enveloped viruses (53).

The present modelling approach considers the non-monotonous impact of relative humidity on inactivation. Coronaviruses persisted better at low RHs and at 100% RH, than for intermediate RHs. Lin and Marr (54) recently observed the same relation for two bacteriophages, where the observed RH where survival was worst is close to 80% while in the present study, the less favourable condition for coronaviruses was set to 99%. Another study has confirmed that low RH makes viruses more resistant to thermal inactivation (55).

As noted in the methods, all the kinetic values analyzed were established based on the quantification of coronavirus infectivity with cell cultures. The model prediction did not include other inactivation results from methods combining dyes with RT-qPCR. This method (although more appropriate than classical RT-qPCR) can underestimate virus infectivity (19, 20).

Our findings suggest that persistence potential of different coronaviruses is similar. It confirms previous finding that advocates for the use of surrogates' coronavirus such as TGEV (38). This could considerably simplify the acquisition of relevant data for persistence potential for other environmental factors. The data analyzed here only include *Alpha*- and *Betacoronavirus*, as no data for the two other major sub-genus, *Delta*- and *Gammacoronavirus*, were identified. Inclusion of such data would help to challenge the present model robustness.

The models developed in our study are specific to viruses from the *Coronaviridae* family. Several studies on the inactivation of other viruses have suggested that the impact of temperature can be modelled, as a whole, with a unique parameter (15, 20, 56). Variability of behavior by virus type has been observed and model parameters to account these differences have been proposed (20, 56), e.g. non-enveloped viruses are known to show greater persistence in the environment (56). Like a recently proposed model for SARS-CoV-2 (57), our model takes into consideration of relative humidity in the prediction of inactivation. This integration is of high interest in the perspective of assessment of seasonality on virus persistence (58).

It's also worth noting our model is specific to fomites. Survival kinetics in fecal materials were identified (45) but not considered for inclusion. The level of matrix contamination with fecal materials has been shown to significantly increase the inactivation rate of viruses (56), so by excluding these data, model predictions are biased to be fail-safe. Inactivation data on porous surfaces were also not considered since it may be difficult to determine if any measured inactivation is associated with real loss of infectivity or difficulty in recovering viruses absorbed inside the porous material. That said, there is no reason to consider that model predictions for coronaviruses are not pertinent to survival on porous material (e.g. face masks).

Inactivation on anti-microbial surfaces, such as copper and silver, was also not considered. For the same reason, model predictions are fail safe as surfaces including copper or other antimicrobial compounds increase the inactivation rate of coronaviruses (12, 35).

The predictions of the present model could support more robust decision-making and could be useful in various contexts such as blood safety assessment (59) or validation of thermal inactivating treatments for room air, surfaces or suspensions.

Indeed, an important issue is the possibility of reusing privates or public offices, rooms of hotels, or vehicles that are difficult to decontaminate. Moreover, many devices like electronics or more sensitive materials, are not suitable for chemical decontamination processes which could make them inoperative. Another aspect of decontamination is the economical challenge as large scale decontamination of buildings can cost billions of dollars (60). Furthermore, the use of detergents and/or disinfectants may have environmental consequences. Thus the large scale decontamination of surfaces for SARS-CoV-2, that are not necessarily in contact with people may not be required. For these reasons the waiting time needed before handling suspected contaminated materials in absence of decontamination is more than ever an important question. Having a calculator for the natural clearance of SARS-CoV-2 depending on temperature could be a valuable operational tool for public authorities (57).

The present model also opens the way for risk assessment for SARS-CoV-2 transmission through contact (61). Further model developments including data on matrix pH, salinity and exposure to visible and UV light would also be important to consider (56).

5. Acknowledgements

The Covid-19 Emergency Collective Expert Appraisal Group members included the co-authors LG, S.M-L, E.C, N.P, S.L.P, M.S. and (in alphabetical order): Paul Brown, Charlotte Dunoyer, Florence Etoe, Elissa Khamisse, Meriadeg Legouil, François Meurens, Gilles Meyer, Elodie Monchatre-Leroy, Gaëlle Simon and Astrid Vabret.

6. References

1. Kutter JS, Spronken MI, Fraaij PL, Fouchier RA, Herfst S. 2018. Transmission routes of respiratory viruses among humans. *Current Opinion in Virology* 28:142-151.
2. Lu J, Gu J, Li K, Xu C, Su W, Lai Z, Zhou D, Yu C, Xu B, Yang Z. 2020. COVID-19 Outbreak associated with air conditioning in restaurant, Guangzhou, China, 2020. *Emerging Infectious Diseases* 26.
3. Lee N, Hui D, Wu A, Chan P, Cameron P, Joynt GM, Ahuja A, Yung MY, Leung C, To K. 2003. A major outbreak of severe acute respiratory syndrome in Hong Kong. *New England Journal of Medicine* 348:1986-1994.
4. Kim S-H, Chang SY, Sung M, Park JH, Bin Kim H, Lee H, Choi J-P, Choi WS, Min J-Y. 2016. Extensive viable Middle East respiratory syndrome (MERS) coronavirus contamination in air and surrounding environment in MERS isolation wards. *Reviews of Infectious Diseases* 63:363-369.
5. Liu J, Liao X, Qian S, Yuan J, Wang F, Liu Y, Wang Z, Wang F, Liu L, Zhang Z. 2020. Community transmission of Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2, Shenzhen, China, 2020. *Emerging Infectious Diseases* 26.
6. Chen Y-C, Huang L-M, Chan C-C, Su C-P, Chang S-C, Chang Y-Y, Chen M-L, Hung C-C, Chen W-J, Lin F-Y. 2004. SARS in hospital emergency room. *Emerging Infectious Diseases* 10:782.
7. Danis K, Epaulard O, Bénet T, Gaymard A, Campoy S, Bothelo-Nevers E, Bouscambert-Duchamp M, Spaccaferri G, Ader F, Mailles A, Boudalaa Z, Tolsma V, Berra J, Vaux S, Forestier E, Landelle C, Fougere E, Thabuis A, Berthelot P, Veil R, Levy-Bruhl D, Chidiac C, Lina B, Coignard B, Saura C, Team I. 2020. Cluster of coronavirus disease 2019 (Covid-19) in the French Alps, 2020. *Clinical Infectious Diseases* doi:10.1093/cid/ciaa424.
8. Otter JA, Donskey C, Yezli S, Douthwaite S, Goldenberg SD, Weber DJ. 2016. Transmission of SARS and MERS coronaviruses and influenza virus in healthcare settings: the possible role of dry surface contamination. *Journal of Hospital Infection* 92:235-250.
9. Wolff MH, Sattar SA, Adegburin O, Tetro J. 2005. Environmental survival and microbicide inactivation of coronaviruses, p 201-212, *Coronaviruses with special emphasis on first insights concerning SARS*. Springer.
10. Medema G, Heijnen L, Elsinga G, Italiaander R, Brouwer A. 2020. Presence of SARS-Coronavirus-2 in sewage. medRxiv doi:<https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.03.29.20045880>.
11. Chin A, Chu J, Perera M, Hui K, Yen H-L, Chan M, Peiris M, Poon L. 2020. Stability of SARS-CoV-2 in different environmental conditions. . *The Lancet Microbe* [https://doi.org/10.1016/S2666-5247\(20\)30003-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2666-5247(20)30003-3).
12. van Doremalen N, Bushmaker T, Morris DH, Holbrook MG, Gamble A, Williamson BN, Tamin A, Harcourt JL, Thornburg NJ, Gerber SI. 2020. Aerosol and surface stability of SARS-CoV-2 as compared with SARS-CoV-1. *New England Journal of Medicine*.
13. Casanova LM, Jeon S, Rutala WA, Weber DJ, Sobsey MD. 2010. Effects of air temperature and relative humidity on coronavirus survival on surfaces. *Appl Environ Microbiol* 76:2712-2717.

14. Bozkurt H, D'Souza DH, Davidson PM. 2015. Thermal inactivation kinetics of human norovirus surrogates and hepatitis A virus in turkey deli meat. *Appl Environ Microbiol* 81:4850-4859.
15. Bertrand I, Schijven J, Sánchez G, Wyn-Jones P, Ottoson J, Morin T, Muscillo M, Verani M, Nasser A, de Roda Husman A. 2012. The impact of temperature on the inactivation of enteric viruses in food and water: a review. *Journal of Applied Microbiology* 112:1059-1074.
16. Laude H. 1981. Thermal inactivation studies of a coronavirus, transmissible gastroenteritis virus. *Journal of General Virology* 56:235-240.
17. Van Doremalen N, Bushmaker T, Munster V. 2013. Stability of Middle East respiratory syndrome coronavirus (MERS-CoV) under different environmental conditions. *Eurosurveillance* 18:20590.
18. Rabenau H, Cinatl J, Morgenstern B, Bauer G, Preiser W, Doerr H. 2005. Stability and inactivation of SARS coronavirus. *Medical Microbiology and Immunology* 194:1-6.
19. Coudray-Meunier C, Fraisse A, Martin-Latil S, Guillier L, Perelle S. 2013. Discrimination of infectious hepatitis A virus and rotavirus by combining dyes and surfactants with RT-qPCR. *BMC microbiology* 13:216.
20. Boehm AB, Silverman AI, Schriewer A, Goodwin K. 2019. Systematic review and meta-analysis of decay rates of waterborne mammalian viruses and coliphages in surface waters. *Water research* 164:114898.
21. Poisot T. 2011. The digitize package: extracting numerical data from scatterplots. *The R Journal* 3:25-26.
22. Coroller L, Kan-King-Yu D, Leguerinel I, Mafart P, Membré J-M. 2012. Modelling of growth, growth/no-growth interface and nonthermal inactivation areas of *Listeria* in foods. *International Journal of Food Microbiology* 152:139-152.
23. Mafart P. 2000. Taking injuries of surviving bacteria into account for optimising heat treatments. *International Journal of Food Microbiology* 55:175-179.
24. Bigelow W. 1921. The logarithmic nature of thermal death time curves. *The Journal of Infectious Diseases*:528-536.
25. Baty F, Delignette-Muller M. 2017. nlsMicrobio: data sets and nonlinear regression models dedicated to predictive microbiology. R package version 0.0-1.
26. Akaike H. 1974. A new look at the statistical model identification. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control* 19:716-723.
27. Schwarz G. 1978. Estimating the dimension of a model. *The Annals of Statistics* 6:461-464.
28. Guillier L. 2020. Data and models related to coronaviruses inactivation. <https://github.com/lguillier/Persistence-Coronavirus>.
29. Mullis L, Saif LJ, Zhang Y, Zhang X, Azevedo MS. 2012. Stability of bovine coronavirus on lettuce surfaces under household refrigeration conditions. *Food Microbiology* 30:180-186.
30. Saknimit M, Inatsuki I, Sugiyama Y, Yagami K. 1988. Virucidal efficacy of physico-chemical treatments against coronaviruses and parvoviruses of laboratory animals. *Jikken dobutsu Experimental animals* 37:341.
31. Christianson K, Ingersoll J, Landon R, Pfeiffer N, Gerber J. 1989. Characterization of a temperature sensitive feline infectious peritonitis coronavirus. *Archives of Virology* 109:185-196.
32. Gundy PM, Gerba CP, Pepper IL. 2009. Survival of coronaviruses in water and wastewater. *Food and Environmental Virology* 1:10.

33. Bucknall RA, King LM, Kapikian AZ, Chanock RM. 1972. Studies with human coronaviruses II. Some properties of strains 229E and OC43. *Proceedings of the Society for Experimental Biology and Medicine* 139:722-727.
34. Sizun J, Yu M, Talbot P. 2000. Survival of human coronaviruses 229E and OC43 in suspension and after drying on surfaces: a possible source of hospital-acquired infections. *Journal of Hospital Infection* 46:55-60.
35. Warnes SL, Little ZR, Keevil CW. 2015. Human coronavirus 229E remains infectious on common touch surface materials. *MBio* 6:e01697-15.
36. Lamarre A, Talbot PJ. 1989. Effect of pH and temperature on the infectivity of human coronavirus 229E. *Canadian Journal of Microbiology* 35:972-974.
37. Leclercq I, Batejat C, Burguière AM, Manuguerra JC. 2014. Heat inactivation of the Middle East Respiratory Syndrome coronavirus. *Influenza and Other Respiratory Viruses* 8:585-586.
38. Casanova L, Rutala WA, Weber DJ, Sobsey MD. 2009. Survival of surrogate coronaviruses in water. *Water research* 43:1893-1898.
39. Ye Y, Ellenberg RM, Graham KE, Wigginton KR. 2016. Survivability, partitioning, and recovery of enveloped viruses in untreated municipal wastewater. *Environmental Science & Technology* 50:5077-5085.
40. Hofmann M, Wyler R. 1989. Quantitation, biological and physicochemical properties of cell culture-adapted porcine epidemic diarrhea coronavirus (PEDV). *Veterinary Microbiology* 20:131-142.
41. Quist-Rybachuk G, Nauwynck H, Kalmar I. 2015. Sensitivity of porcine epidemic diarrhea virus (PEDV) to pH and heat treatment in the presence or absence of porcine plasma. *Veterinary microbiology* 181:283-288.
42. Hulst MM, Heres L, Hakze-van der Honing R, Pelser M, Fox M, van der Poel WH. 2019. Study on inactivation of porcine epidemic diarrhoea virus, porcine sapelovirus 1 and adenovirus in the production and storage of laboratory spray-dried porcine plasma. *Journal of Applied Microbiology* 126:1931-1943.
43. Darnell ME, Subbarao K, Feinstone SM, Taylor DR. 2004. Inactivation of the coronavirus that induces severe acute respiratory syndrome, SARS-CoV. *Journal of virological methods* 121:85-91.
44. Chan K, Peiris J, Lam S, Poon L, Yuen K, Seto W. 2011. The effects of temperature and relative humidity on the viability of the SARS coronavirus. *Advances in Virology* 2011.
45. Lai MY, Cheng PK, Lim WW. 2005. Survival of severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus. *Clinical Infectious Diseases* 41:e67-e71.
46. Pagat A-M, Seux-Goepfert R, Lutsch C, Lecouturier V, Saluzzo J-F, Kusters IC. 2007. Evaluation of SARS-Coronavirus decontamination procedures. *Applied Biosafety* 12:100-108.
47. Kariwa H, Fujii N, Takashima I. 2006. Inactivation of SARS coronavirus by means of povidone-iodine, physical conditions and chemical reagents. *Dermatology* 212:119-123.
48. Batejat C, Grassin Q, Manuguerra J-C, Leclercq I. 2020. Heat inactivation of the Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2. bioRxiv: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.01.067769>.
49. Burnham KP, Anderson DR. 1998. Practical use of the information-theoretic approach, p 75-117, *Model selection and inference*. Springer.
50. Kampf G, Voss A, Scheithauer S. 2020. Inactivation of coronaviruses by heat. *Journal of Hospital Infection*.

51. La Rosa G, Bonadonna L, Lucentini L, Kenmoe S, Suffredini E. 2020. Coronavirus in water environments: Occurrence, persistence and concentration methods-A scoping review. *Water Research*:115899.
52. Kampf G, Todt D, Pfaender S, Steinmann E. 2020. Persistence of coronaviruses on inanimate surfaces and its inactivation with biocidal agents. *Journal of Hospital Infection*.
53. Firquet S, Beaujard S, Lobert P-E, Sané F, Caloone D, Izard D, Hober D. 2014. Viruses contained in droplets applied on warmed surface are rapidly inactivated. *Microbes and Environments* 29:408-412.
54. Lin K, Marr LC. 2019. Humidity-Dependent Decay of Viruses, but Not Bacteria, in Aerosols and Droplets Follows Disinfection Kinetics. *Environmental Science & Technology* 54:1024-1032.
55. Sauerbrei A, Wutzler P. 2009. Testing thermal resistance of viruses. *Archives of virology* 154:115-119.
56. Brainard J, Pond K, Hunter PR. 2017. Censored regression modeling to predict virus inactivation in wastewaters. *Environmental science & technology* 51:1795-1801.
57. United States Department of Homeland Security. 2020. SARS-CoV-2 Indoor Environmental Stability Predictive Model. Available at: https://www.dhs.gov/sites/default/files/publications/sars-cov-2_environment_predictive_model_factsheet_2.pdf
58. Prussin AJ, Schwake DO, Lin K, Gallagher DL, Buttling L, Marr LC. 2018. Survival of the enveloped virus Phi6 in droplets as a function of relative humidity, absolute humidity, and temperature. *Appl Environ Microbiol* 84:e00551-18.
59. Chang L, Yan Y, Wang L. 2020. Coronavirus Disease 2019: Coronaviruses and Blood Safety. *Transfusion Medicine Reviews* doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tmr.2020.02.003>.
60. Schmitt K, Zacchia NA. 2012. Total decontamination cost of the anthrax letter attacks. *Biosecurity and bioterrorism: biodefense strategy, practice, and science* 10:98-107.
61. Haas C. 2020. Coronavirus and Risk Analysis. *Risk Analysis* 40:660-661.