Aerosolized Hydrogen Peroxide Decontamination of N95 Respirators, with Fit-Testing and Virologic Confirmation of Suitability for Re-Use During the COVID-19 Pandemic

T. Hans Derr^{1,*^}, Melissa A. James^{2^}, Chad V. Kuny^{4,8^}, Devanshi Patel^{6,8}, Prem P. Kandel⁵,
Cassandra Field^{6,8}, Matthew D. Beckman⁷, Kevin L. Hockett^{5,8}, Mark A. Bates³, Troy C.
Sutton^{6,8}, Moriah Szpara^{4,8*}

^co-first-authors

¹ Environmental Health and Safety; ² Animal Resource Program, ³ Occupational Medicine Program, and ⁴ Departments of Biology, Biochemistry and Molecular Biology, ⁵ Plant Pathology and Environmental Microbiology, ⁶ Veterinary and Biomedical Sciences, ⁷ Statistics, ⁸ Center for Infectious Disease Dynamics, and the Huck Institutes of the Life Sciences, Pennsylvania State University, University Park, Pennsylvania 16802, USA

*Co-Corresponding Authors

Moriah L. Szpara, PhD
Depts. of Biology, and Biochemistry &
Molecular Biology
The Huck Institutes of the Life Sciences
Pennsylvania State University
W-208 Millennium Science Complex
(MSC)
University Park, PA 16802 USA
Phone: 814-867-0008
Email: moriah@psu.edu

T. Hans Derr, CIH
Manager, Health & Environmental
Programs
Environmental Health & Safety
Pennsylvania State University
6B Eisenhower Deck
University Park, PA 16802
Phone: 814-863-3834
Email: thd12@psu.edu

Author emails:

Mark A. Bates: mx20@psu.edu
Matthew D. Beckman: mdb268@psu.edu
T. Hans Derr: thd12@psu.edu
Cassandra Field: cif5202@psu.edu
Kevin L. Hockett: klh450@psu.edu
Melissa A. James: maj22@psu.edu

Prem Kandel: puk155@psu.edu
Chad V. Kuny: cvk108@psu.edu
Devanshi Patel: drp5323@psu.edu
Troy C. Sutton: tcs38@psu.edu
Moriah L. Szpara: moriah@psu.edu

Abstract

In response to the current demand for N95 respirators by healthcare workers responding to the COVID-19 pandemic, we evaluated decontamination of N95 respirators using a low concentration aerosolized hydrogen peroxide (aHP) system. This system dispenses a consistent atomized spray of micron-sized, low concentration, hydrogen peroxide (H₂O₂) particles over a treatment cycle. Multiple N95 respirator models were subjected to ten or more cycles of respirator decontamination, and masks were periodically assessed for qualitative and quantitative fit testing to verify respirator integrity. In parallel, we assessed the ability of aHP treatment to inactivate multiple viruses absorbed onto masks, including phi6 bacteriophage, HSV-1, CVB3, and SARS-CoV-2. Given that SARS-CoV-2 is transmitted via expired respiratory droplets and aerosols, it is critical to address respirator safety for reuse. This study provided experimental validation of a suitable aHP treatment process that decontaminates the respirators while maintaining N95 function. After ten rounds of aHP treatment, respirators passed N95 filtration efficiency testing. Virus inactivation by aHP was comparable to the sterilization of commercial spore-based biological indicators. These data demonstrate that the aHP process is effective, on the basis of zero failure rate on fit-testing of respirators, effective decontamination of multiple virus species including SARS-CoV-2, successful sterilization of bacterial spores, and filtration efficiency maintained at or greater than 95%. Collectively, these studies support the use of specific aHP decontamination protocol that permits safe reuse of N95 respirators by healthcare providers.

Importance

The ongoing COVID-19 pandemic has led to unprecedented pressure on healthcare and research facilities to provide adequate personal protective equipment. Given that the current pandemic is caused by a respiratory viral pathogen, the availability of highly protective respirator facepieces is critical to limit inhalation of this virus. While respirator facepieces were designed for single-use and disposal, the pandemic has increased overall demand for N95 respirators, and corresponding manufacturing and supply chain limitations have necessitated the safe reuse of respirators when necessary. The biosafety level 3 (BSL3) facility used in this study regularly

utilizes aerosolized hydrogen peroxide (aHP) to decontaminate equipment and spaces. We repurposed this technology for N95 respirator decontamination during the COVID-19 pandemic. Results from virus inactivation, biological indicators, respirator fit testing, and filtration efficiency testing all indicated that the process was effective at rendering N95 respirator safe for reuse.

Keywords:

N95 respirators, decontamination, aerosolized hydrogen peroxide, COVID-19, SARS-CoV2, virologic testing, virus, fit-testing, disinfection, sterilization, Pathogo™ Curis®

Abbreviations:

aHP, aerosolized hydrogen peroxide (H₂O₂); BSL, biosafety level; COVID-19, coronavirus disease 2019; CVB3, coxsackievirus B3; H₂O₂, hydrogen peroxide; HPM, hydrogen peroxide vapor monitor; HSV-1, herpes simplex virus 1; phi6, *Pseudomonas* phi6 bacteriophage; OSHA, Occupational Safety and Health Administration; QLFT, qualitative fit test; QNFT, quantitative fit-test; SARS-CoV-2, severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2; VPHP, Vapor-phase hydrogen peroxide.

Introduction

In response to the ongoing severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) pandemic, there is a shortage of personal protective equipment (PPE). In healthcare settings, the need for PPE is critical to protect frontline healthcare providers from infection, and to reduce cross-contamination between patients with coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) and other uninfected patients. In healthcare settings, N95 respirators (including surgical N95 respirators) are used to provide protection from airborne infectious particles. The N95 terminology refers to the ability to block at least 95 percent of the most penetrating particle sizes (0.1 - 0.3 micron). Proper use of N95 respirators requires qualitative fit-testing (QLFT) or quantitative fit-testing (QNFT), which are designed to ensure a tight face-to-respirator seal for each specific wearer's face.

The current shortage of N95 respirators is due to limitations on the required raw materials, limited capacity to manufacture the masks, and the ability of supply and distribution chains to handle increased global demand. For this reason, researchers have sought to demonstrate the potential for decontamination and reuse of existing N95 respirators. Standardized procedures are well-established for the sterilization and reuse of medical equipment, such as autoclaving, steam treatment, and chemical inactivation (e.g. bleach) (1). Sterilization of most medical equipment is verified using spore-based biological indicators (2). Unlike most hospital equipment (e.g. steel, metal, plastic) or fabrics (e.g. blankets) for which standardized sterilization methods exist (1), N95 respirators are generally not intended for re-use (3). Thus many of the standard sterilization approaches deform, damage, or destroy the integrity of N95 respirator fabric, nosepiece materials, or elastic straps (4, 5). Hydrogen peroxide (H₂O₂)-based methods have been successfully adapted for use in decontamination of N95 respirators, with indications that these methods are less damaging than other decontamination methods (e.g. chemical or steam), and can penetrate the densely-woven fabric of respirator facepieces (4, 6). In addition, the viricidal capability of H₂O₂ sterilization methods has been previously demonstrated (7–9). Vapor-phase H₂O₂ methods (e.g. “VHP” and other patented methods) have been used to decontaminate N95 respirators and were granted U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) “Emergency Use Authorization” (EUA) for healthcare use; however, these methods employ high concentrations of hydrogen peroxide (30-70%) and elevated temperature to achieve vaporization. Vapor-phase H₂O₂ (VPHP) methods at these concentrations pose increased health risks to decontamination personnel, and combined with elevated temperature, can result in notable respirator material decay (10). Historical aerosolized H₂O₂ (aHP) methods utilize lower peroxide concentrations (5-6%) with silver ions and other antimicrobial agents, activated aerosolization via plasma, nozzle pressure, or ultrasound, with similar limitations to VPHP methods (11–15). These methods have not received strong comparative support in U.S. markets due to lower sterilization effectiveness (13, 15–21). Therefore, we utilized a recently developed aHP method (i.e. the Pathogo™ Curis® system), which dispenses a low concentration hydrogen peroxide solution through a precision adjustable nozzle. The unit design and decontamination process characteristics allow consistent distribution of disinfectant over time and effective decontamination of space and materials with reduced health risk to personnel (22).

At present, respirator manufacturers have not approved protocols for N95 respirator decontamination (3). To address imminent pandemic needs, healthcare settings are referencing U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) guidelines on provisional N95 respirator decontamination and reuse (22). Battelle Memorial Institute of Columbus, Ohio, received FDA EUA status for an N95 decontamination protocol using a VHP method, based on a prior study addressing the potential for respirator reuse in emergency scenarios (4, 23). This study included evaluation of respirator structure, filtration, and manikin fit-testing, and used bacterial spore-based biological indicators to demonstrate effective sterilization (4); however, viral inactivation testing and respirator fit on live subjects were not performed. Given the current pandemic entails a respiratory viral pathogen, several decontamination protocols are being actively investigated at research universities and medical centers (24–31).

Given the reduced personnel health risks of using aHP, we assessed the ability of an aHP decontamination protocol to achieve viral and microbial sterilization of N95 respirators, while preserving respirator fit and integrity over multiple treatment cycles. Several respirator facepiece types, representing those in use by local healthcare and research personnel, were included, and decontamination was tested using multiple viral surrogates representing the structure, characteristics, and environmental resistance of the SARS-CoV-2 pathogen. These surrogates included *Pseudomonas* phi6 bacteriophage (phi6), herpes simplex virus 1 (HSV-1), and coxsackievirus B3 (CVB3). After establishing successful decontamination of these surrogate virus species, we further demonstrated decontamination of infectious SARS-CoV-2 virus spotted on to respirators. Throughout the process, *Geobacillus stearothermophilus* spore-based biological indicators were used to verify effectiveness of decontamination. Testing of virus inactivation utilized plaque or tissue culture infectious dose 50% (TCID50) assays to detect the partial inactivation of viruses by drying or desiccation onto respirator surfaces, and their subsequent decontamination by aHP. Fitness of respirators for reuse was assessed by qualitative and quantitative respirator fit testing of subjects using respirators subjected to multiple decontamination cycles. Real-time measurement and separate diffusion sampler analyses of hydrogen peroxide were used to monitor aHP levels associated with decontamination and subsequent decomposition of aHP through drying prior to fit testing and reuse.

Methods

Decontamination Facility

The decontamination process was carried out in the Eva J. Pell Laboratory for Advanced Biological Research at The Pennsylvania State University, University Park campus. This facility is a purpose-built BSL3 enhanced facility, and all required approvals were obtained from the Institutional Biosafety Committee (IBC) for work involving viruses, as described below.

The primary decontamination process was performed within in an approximate 1,700 cubic feet sealed Preparation Room (Prep Room), followed by additional virus inactivation testing with SARS-CoV-2 in a separate, nearby 1,840 cubic feet Prep Room. Procedures and personal protective equipment (PPE) suitable for the viruses and materials in use were strictly observed in this biosafety level 3 (BSL-3) facility, which has consistently maintained institutional, CDC, and USDA approval for work with risk group 3 pathogens since its commissioning in 2014.

Decontamination Preparation

Respirators for decontamination were staged on a portable metal rack located centrally in the Prep Room (Supplementary Figure 1). Filtered and conditioned air is supplied to the Prep Room and the air exhausted from the room is HEPA-filtered. Bubble-tight dampers (Camfil Farr®) were operated to seal both the supply and exhaust air from associated ductwork during the decontamination cycle. The Curis® decontamination unit (Supplementary Figure 2) was programmed, equipment positioned, and the room doors sealed using polyethylene sheeting and non-porous adhesive tape (Supplementary Figure 3).

Decontamination Process

The Curis® decontamination unit programming method utilizes room size to establish the baseline parameters for charge (initial aHP dispensing) and intermittent aHP pulse periods. Once the user inputs the room's cubic volume or dimensions, the unit calculates the appropriate duration of the charge and pulse periods. Unit operation includes a user-defined dwell period (when no further aHP is introduced), at closure of the pulse period. Aeration is initiated following the dwell period (room seals are broken and ventilation resumed). The standard

aeration period is 3 hours, unless an auxiliary scavenging system is attached, or other space aeration system is utilized.

Under air-tight/sealed conditions with neutral pressurization for the 1700 ft³ room used, programming included an 11-minute, 43-second continuous charge of aHP (7% H₂O₂; Curoxide®), followed by six (6) pulse charges evenly spaced over 30 minutes to maintain H₂O₂ concentrations. To account for absorption of aHP into porous materials in the decontamination space (e.g. N95 respirators), a 30-40% increase in these default settings was initially used, as is typically recommended by the manufacturer. Additionally, to ensure adequate contact time of disinfectant to the treated surfaces, a dwell period is recommended after the continuous and pulse charge periods (decontamination phase) and prior to the aeration phase. Based on initial results, adjustments in the charge, pulse, and dwell periods were conducted to establish effectiveness of the overall decontamination process (Tables 3-4).

After completion of the decontamination phase, an aeration or dissipation phase was initiated by removing fixed room seals and opening exhaust dampers for up to 2-hour periods, with the room under slight vacuum (0.18-0.19" W.G.). Adjustments were made to room air exchange rate during aeration to efficiently dissipate detectable H₂O₂ from respirator facepieces. At cycle 5, final parameters were established to include an aeration exhaust rate greater than or equal to 35 air changes/hour, with make-up air supplied by outdoor air. Following this phase, and after room H₂O₂ concentration was measured at less than 1 ppm, the respirator-holding rack was either retained under ventilation or transferred to a separate room (referred to as the "Finishing Room") with an HVAC air supply curtain to further dry and decompose residual aHP from respirator facepieces to less than 1 ppm H₂O₂ (8, 9).

For respirators subjected to repeated rounds of decontamination as part of this study, decontamination cycles were conducted repetitively from staging through drying. In order to be considered "dry" or ready for the next cycle, the interior and exterior respirator surfaces were monitored using a calibrated, hand-held real-time H₂O₂ monitor (ATI PortaSens II), and H₂O₂ concentrations were required to measure less than 1 ppm prior to repeating a cycle, or prior to transport for subsequent respirator fit-testing or virus inactivation analysis. The U.S. Department of Labor/Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) and the American Conference of Governmental Industrial Hygienists (ACGIH) have established or adopted an eight-hour time-

weighted average (TWA) occupational permissible exposure limit (PEL) to hydrogen peroxide of 1 ppm (32, 33). Though researchers and fit-test subjects were not anticipated to experience this eight-hour exposure level, 1 ppm H₂O₂ concentration was used as a safety threshold for room entry, sealing respirators for transport, and re-use by study participants.

Since this study did not involve respirator re-use in actual hospital or clinical settings for safety reasons, the treated/dried respirators were subjected to manual stress as a proxy for the physical wear during use that may challenge subsequent fit integrity. To simulate this stress condition, each respirator was flexed bi-directionally and each band was stretched twice to a hold position similar to respirator donning, prior to re-start of the next decontamination cycle.

Spore-based Biological Indicators

Biological indicator (BI) spore discs (Steris Spordex[®]) inoculated with *Geobacillus stearothermophilus* (ATCC[®] 7953; mean spore count 2.4×10^5) were used to verify successful decontamination (34). BIs (between 6 and 12 per cycle) enclosed in Tyvek/glassine envelopes were placed throughout the room for each decontamination cycle. These were located behind or beneath equipment and surfaces, on the portable metal rack holding respirators, and either on or enclosed within the respirators themselves (Supplementary Figure 4). BIs were collected after each cycle, each spore disc transferred from glassine/Tyvek envelopes to tryptic soy broth (Spordex[®] Culture Media), incubated at 55°C, and analyzed after 7 days as an indicator of effective decontamination (Supplementary Figure 5).

Chemical Indicators of H₂O₂

Chemical indicator strips (Steris Steraaffirm[®] or Curis[®] System Hydrogen Peroxide Test Strips) (between 1 and 4 total per cycle) were placed in various locations throughout the Prep Room to indicate the presence of H₂O₂, supporting successful decontamination.

Real-Time Hydrogen Peroxide Monitoring

The portable ATI PortaSens II detector (PortaSens) was used to measure H₂O₂ levels both within and outside the Prep Room during the decontamination process. Hydrogen peroxide concentrations were measured at respirator surfaces, and necessarily reduced to less than 1 ppm prior to handling or sealing for transportation to designated tissue culture rooms. During the

charge and pulse periods of decontamination, real-time instantaneous sampling was conducted through a sealable wall port (designed for sterilizer tubing) into the Prep Room. The PortaSens was also used to monitor Prep Room concentrations at the start of the aeration phase, and to verify concentrations were reduced to less than 1 ppm for safe re-entry to the room (without respiratory protection). In addition, H₂O₂ concentrations were also monitored within the adjacent corridor along the Prep Room door seal (see Supplementary Figure 3), to assess H₂O₂ leakage.

Hydrogen Peroxide Diffusion Samplers (H₂O₂ Vapor Monitors)

Diffusion samplers, also known as hydrogen peroxide vapor monitors (HPMs) were utilized to monitor long-duration H₂O₂ leakage outside the Prep Room entry (outside containment or OC), on research personnel during decontamination activities (breathing zone samples, clipped to lapel-collar), and within sealed respirator transport containers (prior to fit-testing) to verify that H₂O₂ concentrations remained less than 1 ppm throughout transport and fit-testing. Once the decontamination process was standardized with specific room ventilation parameters, ongoing personnel monitoring was discontinued.

HPM sampler analysis was conducted by Advanced Chemical Sensors, Inc. (ACS) of Longwood, FL utilizing an ACS HP-10 hydrogen peroxide vapor monitor, via modified OSHA Method VI-6 (colorimetric analysis). Analysis was subcontracted and completed by laboratories participating in the American Industrial Hygiene Association (AIHA) Laboratory Accreditation Program. The AIHA is an ISO/IEC 17025 accrediting body (35, 36).

Respirator Selection for the Study

The N95 respirator facepiece models examined in this study represent those frequently used at Penn State or within the Penn State Health system. Six models were selected, with a range of characteristics, including those identified as surgical N95 respirators (no exhalation valve to maintain sterile field), and non-surgical N95 respirators with an exhalation valve. These characteristics are summarized in Table 1 and illustrated visually in Supplementary Figure 6. Respirator models were required to be successfully fitted by test subjects. Fit-testing participants included experienced test subjects and/or administrators. Several respirator models were qualitatively fit-tested (QLFT) using Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) fit test protocols (saccharine challenge) described in the OSHA Respiratory Protection Standard (29

CFR 1910.134) (37). This included standard exercises to challenge respirator fit, over an approximate 8 minute, 30 second period. Additionally, quantitative fit-testing (QNFT) was conducted using OSHA protocol requirements with a T.S.I, Inc. PortaCount Pro+ Model 8038 Fit Tester. This latter method employs condensation nucleus or particle counting technology (CNC or CPC) to measure aerosol concentration outside and inside the facepiece to determine a user fit-factor (38).

Sample Size and Acceptance Criteria for Fit-Test Reliability

Study design for the QLFT endpoint was intended to rigorously evaluate user respirator to facepiece seal with 3M 8511 respirators, while also providing representative feasibility data for the other respirator models (Table 1). Sample sizes associated with additional respirator models in Table 1 (i.e., those other than 3M 8511) were not derived to meet a statistical endpoint. The 3M 8511 respirators used in this study were procured and collected by Penn State from 2006 to 2009. As is common with stockpiled supplies, the manufacturer's 5-year expiration date had been exceeded prior to this study for the 3M 8511 respirators. All other respirator models (Table 1) were tested prior to their expiration date. All respirator models were unused prior to this study.

Acceptance criteria for 3M 8511 respirators required a minimum sample of 59 facepieces with no failures during QLFT in order to conclude with 95% confidence that at least 95% of 3M 8511 respirators maintain fit integrity after repeated use and decontamination. A total of seventy-seven 3M 8511 respirators were available for study purposes. A small number of these, as well as other respirator models were allocated for QNFT and virology testing subsequent to fit testing rounds. QNFT provided metric data related to fit factor, safety margin, and objective evaluation of the QLFT process to detect user fatigue (e.g., false negative for saccharine challenge). The 63 remaining 3M 8511 respirators provided sufficient sample size for evaluation against our acceptance criteria based on QLFT.

Respirator Fit-Testing

Prior to decontamination, respirators were labeled with a unique identifier. After decontamination, a hash mark was placed on the lower elastic band of each respirator to identify the round(s) of decontamination completed (Supplementary Figure 7). At the conclusion of aHP decontamination, respirators were confirmed to have less than 1 ppm H₂O₂ before transfer into

sealed plastic containers for transport to the fit-testing facility. Since the study was conducted during the COVID-19 pandemic, social distancing conditions limited the use of multiple test subjects, therefore, two respirator fit-test subjects were selected (one male, one female) for fit-testing of selected respirators. All 3M 8511 respirators were subjected to QLFT on the first, fifth, and tenth rounds of decontamination. In order to continually monitor QLFT test outcomes on the same facepieces over the course of sequential cycles of decontamination, a small number of respirators per model were allocated for QNFT during each round of fit testing. Based on historical studies by the QNFT device and respirator manufacturers, N95 respirators have maximum breakthrough for particle sizes of 0.1 – 0.3 micron. Particles smaller or larger than this range have increased filtration efficiency (greater than 95%). QNFT fit testing of N95 respirators therefore focuses on measuring this maximum penetration size range, to ensure that detectable leakage is due to facepiece seal leakage. OSHA has established a minimum QNFT passing fit factor of 100 for half-face respirators (including N95s or filtering-facepiece respirators) (37). The QNFT instrument manufacturer has established a maximum quantifiable fit factor of 200, as limited by measurement reliability and particle counting factors. QNFT fit factors equal to or exceeding 200 are therefore reported as 200(+). The reported QNFT data were utilized to verify successful fit reported by QLFT.

Respirators subjected to QNFT (with metal grommet/probe installed) could not be reused for fit testing. These were repurposed for subsequent virus inactivation testing in order to conserve overall respirator use.

NIOSH Filtration Efficiency Testing

To determine whether N95 respirators used in this study experienced filtration media breakdown as a result of sequential aHP disinfection cycles, several respirators were sent for independent laboratory analysis. These included eight 3M 8511 respirators subjected to cyclic aHP treatment and intermittent fit-testing, and two additional unused, untreated 3M 8511 respirators. Respirator filtration efficiency testing was performed by ICS Laboratories, Inc. (ICS) of Brunswick, Ohio. ICS is one of two firms in the U.S. authorized by the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH) to perform respirator certification or re-certification.

An abbreviated “short-cycle” filtration efficiency verification test was conducted using the NIOSH Standard Test Procedure TEB-APR-STEP-0059 (39), which is summarized below. The

standard test protocol includes initial respirator conditioning at 85 +/- 5% relative humidity (%RH) and 38 +/- 2°C for 25 hours prior to testing. This conditioning was intended to reflect active moisture load created by the respirator user. Following sealing of the respirator exhalation valve, and placing into the test instrument, full-load testing was performed. This testing included respirator challenge using 200 milligrams sodium chloride aerosol (mean count particle size distribution verified as 0.075 +/- 0.020 microns, with geometric standard deviation not exceeding 1.86). Sodium chloride aerosol was neutralized to a “Boltzman equilibrium state” (25 +/- 5°C, 30 +/- 10% relative humidity), and introduced at an airflow rate of 85 +/- 4 liters per minute, with periodic check and adjustment to maintain this flowrate. Instrumental analysis was conducted using a T.S.I Automated Filter Tester Model 8130A. Recorded data included flow rate, resistance, penetration, maximum penetration and filtration efficiency.

The test protocol establishes the means for ensuring that the particulate filtering efficiency of N95 series filters used on non-powered respirators submitted for Approval, Extension of Approval, or examined during Certified Product Audits, meets the minimum certification standards set forth in 42 CFR, Part 84, Subpart K, §84.181.

Virus Inoculation and Titration

Viruses used here included herpes simplex virus 1 (HSV-1) strain F, coxsackievirus B3 (CVB3), *Pseudomonas* phi6 bacteriophage (phi6) and SARS-CoV-2 isolate USA-WA1/2020. The key characteristics of these viruses are summarized in Table 2. All virus-inoculated materials were handled in accordance with the biosafety level (BSL) specified for that virus (see Table 2). In all numbered aHP cycles (Table 4), the respirators used for virus inactivation testing had been subjected to preceding total number of aHP cycles – e.g. respirators used for viral testing in aHP cycle #6 had been already been subjected to 5 prior aHP cycles. In the case of the aHP cycles labeled “Post” (i.e. Post 1, 2, or 3, which took place in a second Prep Room; see Table 3), the respirators used had all been through between 10-12 prior aHP cycles. In all cases, the input inoculum for each virus was set to the maximum available in each viral stock preparation.

For virus inactivation testing, respirator facepieces were inoculated with a controlled amount of one or more surrogate virus species (refer to Table 2 for complete list). Each virus was added in duplicate (or in quadruplicate during “Post 1-3” cycles of testing) droplets of 10 µL each, on one or more surfaces of each respirator type. Droplets were allowed to air-dry or absorb fully onto

each respirator inside a Class II biosafety cabinet (BSC), before proceeding further. Selected samples of each virus-inoculated respirator were left open to air, without aHP decontamination, as a “drying-only” virus control. The remainder of each virus-inoculated facepiece was subjected to aHP decontamination as described above (i.e. “decontaminated” samples). For each round of viral testing, the duration of air-drying was matched to the duration of time needed for aHP treatment of parallel respirators (i.e. including transport, respirator staging in the Prep Room, aHP decontamination, aeration, and return to the viral testing location). After aHP treatment, respirators, each virus-inoculated area was sliced out of the “dried” or “decontaminated” respirators using dissection scissors. Each excised virus-spot encompassed all layers of the respirator, to capture any virus that had absorbed beyond the surface fabric.

Herpes simplex virus 1 and coxsackievirus B3 quantification

Respirator areas inoculated with HSV-1 or CVB3 were transferred into individual Eppendorf tubes and resuspended in a 250 μ L volume of cell media. Cell media consisted of Dulbecco’s Modified Eagle’s Medium (DMEM) supplemented with 10% fetal bovine serum (FBS) and penicillin-streptomycin (Pen/Strep; 100 U/mL; Thermo Fisher Scientific). The number of infectious units, or plaque-forming units (PFU), for these viruses was determined by limiting dilution onto confluent Vero detector cell monolayers (*Cercopithecus aethiops* monkey kidney cells, ATCC® CCL-81™). Plaque formation was assessed at 72 hours post infection (hpi), after fixation and visualization of plaques using methylene blue staining (Figure 3). Duplicates of each virus-inoculated respirator piece were frozen for titration at a subsequent date, separate from the initial viral quantification. This allowed for experimental redundancy in terms of detector cell monolayers, and reduced handling time for the large numbers of virus-respirator inoculation sites.

Bacteriophage phi6 quantification

Respirator areas inoculated with phi6 bacteriophage were resuspended in 250 μ L of King’s medium B (KB). These were then quantified on lawns of *Pseudomonas syringae pathovar phaseolicola* strain 1448A (*Pph*) using a previously described soft agar overlay protocol (40). Briefly, 100 μ L logarithmic culture of *Pph* (OD₆₀₀ ~ 0.5) and 100 μ L of the phage preparation were sequentially added to 3 ml of molten soft agar (0.7%) maintained at 55°C. The mixture was quickly poured on top of a KB agar plate and dried in the biosafety cabinet before transferring to

a 28°C incubator. Alternatively, for enumeration of “inoculum” and “dried” samples, soft agar *Pph* lawns were prepared and 10 µl dilutions of phage preparation were spotted (Figure 1). Plaque forming units (PFU) were enumerated after 24-48 hours of incubation at 28°C.

SARS-CoV-2 quantification

All experiments with SARS-CoV-2 were conducted in the Pell Laboratory under biosafety level 3 (BSL3) enhanced conditions using the USA-WA1/2020 isolate. SARS-CoV-2 was spotted onto masks in quadruplicate and treated with aHP. After aHP treatment, Respirator areas inoculated with SARS-CoV-2 were excised and resuspended in 250 µL of DMEM supplemented with sodium pyruvate, non-essential amino acids, antibiotics-antimycotics, and 2% FBS. After resuspension, viral titer was determined by tissue culture infectious dose 50 (TCID50) assay in 96-well plates, using Vero E6 cells. Briefly, 20 µL of resuspended sample was added to 4 wells containing 180 µL of resuspension media. The added samples were then serially diluted 10-fold down the plate, and the plates were incubated at 37 °C for 96-hours. At this time, cytopathic effect (CPE) was scored, and titer was calculated using the method of Reed and Muench (41).

Results

Chemical Verification and Biological Validation of Aerosolized H₂O₂ Process

This study was intended to rigorously evaluate a protocol for decontamination and re-use of N95 respirators using aerosolized hydrogen peroxide (aHP) treatment. The study focused predominantly on the 3M 8511 respirator, while also extending this approach to other respirator models (Table 1). The decontamination process was performed in the BSL3 enhanced facility, enabling the assessment of inactivation of viruses spanning multiple biosafety levels, including SARS-CoV-2 (Table 2). As described above (in Methods), the final aHP decontamination process involved a “charge period” (initial aHP injection), followed by a “pulse period” (intermittent aerosol injection for six intervals of 5-minutes each, after completion of the initial charge period), and a final 20-minute “dwell period” or quiescent maintenance of the aHP room conditions. Upon completion of the “dwell period”, an aeration phase was initiated to evacuate aHP from the room. Importantly, the aHP method used for decontamination was adapted from that used to decontaminate solid equipment, to allow for the absorbent nature of N95 respirators. The charge, pulse, and dwell period parameters were adjusted to optimize cycle times (Table 3)

as well as to account for biological indicator and virology results. Our initial tests utilized a 40-minute pulse period with no dwell time (Table 3: “Initial” parameters), which was reduced to 30 minutes in subsequent runs (“Modification 1”) to optimize overall cycle time and reduce residual H₂O₂ on respirator surfaces. Upon minor failures of biological indicators and viral inactivation (see below and Table 4), we incorporated a 20-minute dwell period to enhance inactivation without increasing H₂O₂ concentrations (Table 3: “Final” parameters).

All chemical indicators located throughout the decontamination area (Prep Room) during all aHP cycles revealed exposure to hydrogen peroxide. For cycles in which charge, pulse, and dwell periods were utilized, all biological indicators similarly indicated successful decontamination, with the exception of aHP cycles 3 and 5 (Table 4). In cycle 3 the additional dwell period was not yet implemented, and BIs indicated an unsuccessful decontamination cycle (1 positive; 5 negative). During transfer of spore coupons to media after treatment cycle 5, it was noted that external contamination of one spore coupon may have occurred, potentially resulting in the single positive indicator for this specific BI. Overall, chemical and biological indicator results supported aHP treatment and decontamination of N95 respirators with the room and cycle parameters utilized in this study.

Real-Time Hydrogen Peroxide Monitoring

Real-time H₂O₂ measurement concentrations during the decontamination process were obtained with a portable, real-time ATI PortaSens II monitor (summarized in Table 5). Instantaneous H₂O₂ concentrations in the treatment area (inside containment or IC) were measured at ≥ 120 ppm during the charge and pulse periods. Hydrogen peroxide concentrations in the corridor outside the sealed entryway (outside containment or OC) were low or undetected (0 ppm) throughout the decontamination cycle; however, occasional concentrations were detected up to 3 ppm. These detectable levels were consistently associated with broken seals in the tape around the door, and when corrected, immediately reduced aHP levels to 0 ppm.

At the timed start of the aeration phase, tape seals at the door entry were removed, and the door was opened and left slightly ajar. Hydrogen peroxide concentrations at the door were subsequently monitored at breathing zone height (BZH) or 5 feet above floor level, until concentrations measured ≤ 2 ppm. At this time research personnel entered the Prep Room to measure H₂O₂ concentrations at respirator surfaces. Hydrogen peroxide concentrations were

observed to decline rapidly during aeration within 20-30 minutes of door opening. Initial respirator surface concentrations (at fabric) typically exceeded 2 ppm. Subsequent respirator drying to achieve < 1 ppm required further staging under aeration (exhaust ventilation) exceeding two hours, or overnight. Once H₂O₂ respirator surface concentrations were measured < 1 ppm, they were either subjected to further rounds of aHP, or collected and containerized for further fit-testing or virus inactivation analysis.

Hydrogen Peroxide Diffusion Sampler (Monitor) Analysis

Diffusion samplers, also known as hydrogen peroxide vapor monitors (HPMs) were utilized to assess researcher exposure levels to H₂O₂, with reference to the OSHA permissible exposure limit (PEL) and ACGIH Threshold Limit Value (TLV[®]) of 1 ppm, as an eight-hour time-weighted average (TWA). HPMs were also collected to monitor H₂O₂ build-up within respirator containers prior to fit-testing (for test subject safety), and to verify that H₂O₂ concentrations remained low in areas occupied by researchers (outside containment) during the decontamination process (summarized in Table 6). All personal breathing zone HPM sampler results were reported below sample detection limits (< 0.08 ppm, <0.1 ppm) for researchers conducting all aHP processing activities (up to 3 hours). All results for HPMs placed within sealed respirator transport containers were reported below sample detection limits (< 0.03 ppm), indicating no residual H₂O₂ present through transport and respirator fit-testing. All results for HPMs collected as OC samples were reported below sample detection limits (< 0.08 ppm, cycle 1b) and < 0.2 ppm (cycle 11).

Qualitative and Quantitative Fit-Testing After aHP Decontamination

Fit-testing using both QLFT and QNFT on all 3M model 8511 respirators was assessed after the first, fifth, and tenth decontamination cycles for both the male and female subject (summarized in Figure 1). All respirators passed these fit tests. No other failures occurred, therefore with 95% confidence, at least 95% of 3M model 8511 respirators maintain successful N95 fit seal after ten aHP decontamination cycles based on these data. QNFT results associated with 3M model 8511 respirators passed the minimum passing fit factor of 100, and the maximum quantifiable fit factor of 200(+) in 8 of 9 tests. The numerical range of passing fit factors (100 – 200), and available sample quantity, limit statistical analysis. The consistently successful QNFT results

verified QLFT findings, and support retention of successful respirator fitting following repeated cycles of aHP decontamination and physical respirator stress.

QLFT and QNFT were also conducted on a smaller number of additional respirator models (as indicated in Table 1 and Figure 1). For these respirator models, a maximum of 11 facepieces were included, with all subjected to QLFT and a subset used for QNFT at various intervals. Respirator models 3M 1860, 3M 1870+, 3M 9211+, Kimberly Clark PFR95, and Sperian N1125 passed all QLFT and QNFT tests. One respirator facepiece (3M model 1870+) experienced a broken rubber strap when subjected to physical stress (e.g., stretching) after eight cycles of aHP. This respirator was treated as a censored observation since it had successfully passed QLFT after the first and fifth decontamination cycles but could not be fit-tested to assess fit seal and filtration performance after the tenth cycle. Since fit test results varied widely by subject during early testing of Alpha ProTech respirators, this model was discontinued from further study. Given that no respirator models included in this study were designed for reuse, any apparent shortcoming should not be interpreted as a failure of respirator performance when respirators are used as designed and intended by the manufacturer.

Respirator Filtration Efficiency Testing

N95 respirator filtration efficiency testing was conducted on stockpiled 3M 8511 aHP-treated respirators using the NIOSH test protocol under full-load test conditions (Table 7). No visible degradation was found on inspection (e.g. metal nose guard discoloration, unusual thinning or wear). Filtration efficiencies were found to exceed 95% for all eight respirators subjected to ten cycles of aHP decontamination. Therefore, for at least ten aHP cycles, there were no adverse impacts or loss of N95 respirator efficiencies. Two additional unused, untreated 3M 8511 respirators were additionally tested and found with slightly reduced filtration efficiencies (94.4%, 94.6%). These findings are consistent with the respirator manufacturer's 5-year shelf life limitation; however, the overall respirator performance is maintained.

Application of Multiple Viral Species to N95 Respirator Facepieces

Viral inactivation on respirator facepieces was anticipated to occur both by the process of drying or desiccation, and by the process of aHP decontamination. Multiple virus species were included to test the decontamination potential of aHP against viruses in general, as well as against SARS-

CoV-2. These included: *Pseudomonas* phi6 bacteriophage (phi6), herpes simplex virus 1 (HSV-1) strain F, coxsackievirus B3 (CVB3), and SARS-CoV-2 isolate USA-WA1/2020 (see Table 2 for details). In order to preserve overall respirator consumption during the pandemic, respirators used for virus inactivation testing were ones previously subjected to aHP treatment and fit-testing (see Methods for details). Initial application of virus to each of the four (4) 3M respirator facepiece types revealed clear differences in relative absorption vs. fluid repulsion. 3M respirator models 1870+ and 9211+ share a common outer fabric which is listed by the manufacturer as having the highest fluid resistance of any N95 respirator (42). In our testing, these two respirator models displayed no apparent absorption of virus inoculum in our tests, and instead dried with a “coffee ring effect” on the respirator surface. In contrast, all other respirator types (Table 1) experienced a combination of liquid spreading, absorption, and evaporative drying of the virus inoculum droplet. Viruses were inoculated onto different areas of each respirator facepiece model, including the outer and inner fabric surfaces, the elastic strap, and where present, the inner and outer surface of the plastic exhalation valves (see Supplementary Figure 6).

Inactivation of Multiple Viral Species by Air-Drying on Respirators

To mimic the potential inactivation of viruses that could occur during a multi-hour session of respirator use, we tested the amount of virus remaining after air-drying of virus applied to N95 respirators. For each round of viral testing, the duration of air-drying was matched to the duration of time needed for aHP treatment of parallel virus-inoculated respirator areas (see Table 4 for summary; detailed further below). These “drying-only” samples confirmed a partial loss of viral infectiousness, ranging from 10-100-fold for phi6 and HSV-1, and 100-fold or greater for CVB3 and SARS-CoV-2 (Figures 2-5; see also Supplementary Figure 8 and Supplementary Table 1). For phi6 bacteriophage, this included 29 “drying-only” inoculation sites spanning three independent rounds of testing (Figure 2). For HSV-1 and CVB3, this included 55 “drying-only” inoculation sites for each virus species, spanning four independent rounds of testing (Figure 3 and Figure 4, respectively). Viral inactivation by drying was not markedly different on inner vs. outer surfaces of the respirator models (Figures 2-5; see also Supplementary Table 1), or in limited testing of alternative inoculation sites, such as elastic straps or plastic exhalation valves (Figure 3A-B and Figure 4A-B).

Decontamination of Virus-Inoculated Respirators by Aerosolized H₂O₂ Treatment

While natural inactivation of viruses by air drying is an ancillary benefit of extended respirator use, our main goal was to assess the effectiveness of active decontamination by aHP treatment. For this purpose, parallel virus inoculation sites to those used in the air-drying experiments above were subjected to aHP treatment, using both “Modification 1” and “Final” parameters (see Table 3 for details). Viral testing of decontamination was conducted during six independent aHP cycles (summarized in Table 4), using the maximum inoculum titer available for each viral stock preparation. For phi6 bacteriophage, this included 37 “aHP-treated” sites spanning three independent rounds of testing (Figure 2). For HSV-1 and CVB3, this included 65 and 63 “aHP-treated” sites respectively, spanning four independent rounds of testing (Figure 3 and Figure 4). Across a total of 213 respirator sites inoculated with one of four virus species tested (Table 2; see also Supplementary Table 1), only 5 sites had any remaining infectious virus. Even these rare instances of virus positivity still entailed a 4-6 log₁₀ reduction in viral load from the initial inoculum (10⁶ reduction for phi6, Figure 2B; 10⁵ reduction for HSV-1, Figure 3A; 10⁴ reduction for CVB3; Figure 4A-B). Three of these rare positive virus plaques were detected in an aHP cycle using the “Modification 1” parameters (Figure 2A and 3A; Table 4; see also Supplementary Figure 8), and these were a key motivation to add a dwell time in the “Final” aHP cycle parameters (Table 3). There was no observable difference in the effectiveness of aHP decontamination for inner vs. outer surfaces of respirators (Figures 2-5; see also Supplementary Table 1), or in limited testing of alternative inoculation sites such as elastic straps (Figure 3A-B and Figure 4A-B). The success of virus inactivation by aHP treatment mirrored the results of biological indicators (BIs) consisting of bacterial spore coupons (Table 4).

Inactivation of SARS-CoV-2 by aHP Treatment

Experimental testing of SARS-CoV-2 by aHP necessitated that all work be completed at BSL3. These studies were conducted with the 3M 8511, 1860, and 1870+ N95 respirators, spanning two independent rounds of testing (Figure 5). As with the surrogate virus species, SARS-CoV-2 was first inoculated onto respirator facepieces. The “drying only” controls were left open to air, while the decontaminated samples were subjected to aHP-treatment. The respirators used for SARS-CoV-2 testing had been subjected to 10 prior rounds of aHP before virus inoculation. For SARS-CoV-2, viral testing included 48 “drying-only” inoculation sites and 48 “aHP-treated” sites, spanning two independent rounds of testing (Figure 4). We observed a partial loss of viral

infectiousness for SARS-CoV-2 due to drying (e.g. $10^{6.125}$ TCID₅₀/mL input vs $\sim 10^2$ TCID₅₀/mL after drying; Figure 5). Importantly, no infectious SARS-CoV-2 remained on any respirator model after aHP decontamination (Figure 5).

Discussion

Based on a series of ten respirator decontamination cycles and multiple rounds of viral inactivation testing, 3M 8511 and other similar N95 respirator models tested were found to be suitable for aHP decontamination and reuse. We found that respirators could successfully pass qualitative respirator fit testing through multiple cycles of the aHP decontamination process, and ultimately passed filtration efficiency tests indicating no loss in filtration efficiency. Most studies thus far have focused either on verifying fit-testing after respirator decontamination (6, 27, 30), or the ability of decontamination approaches to inactivate one or more virus species on respirators (25, 29, 31), but not both. A minority of N95 respirator decontamination studies have included both fit-testing and measures of viral inactivation (26, 28), although none have employed the aerosolized H₂O₂ method utilized here. Our study is unique in including multiple measures of respirator integrity via fit-testing, as well as filtration efficiency, and robust verification of viral inactivation using multiple surrogates and SARS-CoV-2 itself. The breadth of this approach will extend the usefulness of this study beyond the current pandemic.

Respirator Resilience for Re-Use

Aerosolized H₂O₂ decontamination of the N95 respirators used in this study did not indicate any adverse impact on final respirator filtration efficiency. Hydrogen peroxide concentrations were controlled within the study, supporting effective microbial and viral decontamination, with proper containment of aHP and with no detectable researcher exposure. These findings support and reflect those of parallel studies using other forms of hydrogen peroxide vapor, and/or other decontamination methods for N95 respirators (24, 26–28, 30). In order to assess the H₂O₂ concentration profile during aHP decontamination (inside containment), and for comparison with levels for different H₂O₂ decontamination methods, further studies would require use of real-time instruments with a higher detection range and data logging features.

We are not aware of any studies reaching the ten cycles of aHP decontamination, with successful fit-testing and verification of viral inactivation. As noted by the CDC, laboratory study

conditions such as those used in this study do not fully reflect clinical use conditions, which can impact respirator fit and performance (43). While each facepiece was physically stressed between each decontamination cycle as a proxy for use, then re-used by the same subjects during fit-testing, sustained clinical use includes other pertinent stressors which may influence fit and performance (e.g. build-up of facial oils, cosmetics, exhaled moisture, perspiration, intermittent user adjustments) (27, 28, 43). Future studies are needed to explore these impacts during re-use, in combination with the metrics used in this study.

During this study, one 3M 1870+ respirator suffered a broken rubber strap during re-use. The breakage occurred after eight cycles of aHP, during inter-cycle strap stretching to simulate re-use. The breakage occurred at a point on the strap that corresponded with a penned hash mark (used to denote decontamination cycle; see Supplementary Figure 7). There were no other instances of failure for this or any other respirator models. This observation has relevance to real-world decontamination scenarios, in which elastic or rubber straps may be damaged with cycle marking. Care should be exercised when marking respirators during re-use protocols, and a visual inspection for incidental damage is prudent.

Viral and Biological Indicator Inactivation

To model real-world scenarios in which healthcare staff may have aerosolized virus absorbed on to their respirator, we inoculated viruses onto different respirator surfaces to thoroughly test for the ability of aHP to inactivate viruses. We further tested several different components and regions of the respirator to discern whether any differences in respirator construction (e.g. outer vs. inner surface fabric) would influence viral inactivation. This work was inspired by early efforts to verify viral inactivation in the context of N95 respirator surfaces, such as that of Kenney et al. (25) We found no evidence of viral survival during the aHP decontamination process. Relative to other similar studies using different decontamination methods to test viral inactivation on N95 respirators, these data shown an equal or better inactivation of viruses in the present study (25, 26, 28, 29, 31). During establishment of aHP cycle process parameters, we observed a biological indicator test failure (positive result), and corresponding virology test failure associated with cycle 3, in which no dwell period was used. Commercial bioindicator tests have been relied upon for sterilization processes over several years (2, 34). These data suggest that the use of commercial spore-based biological indicators during decontamination of

N95 respirators provides a useful predictor of success or failure for viral inactivation as well. In this study, we tested up to ten cycles of aHP decontamination, which meets or exceeds current FDA recommendations for N95 respirator re-use following vapor-phase H₂O₂ decontamination. (25–30).

Like SARS-CoV-1, SARS-CoV-2 has a high level of environmental stability (44–48). In terms of virion characteristics, SARS-CoV-2 has a lipid-enveloped virion of ~120 nm, with no icosahedral capsid core. The lipid envelope encloses a single-stranded, linear, positive-sense RNA genome (summarized in Table 2). We used multiple virus species to test the viral inactivation capabilities of aHP decontamination. These viruses represented multiple characteristics of human viral pathogens, with a range of virion and genome types and sizes, and previously documented environmental stability (49–51). Virions of herpes simplex virus 1 (HSV-1) and *Pseudomonas* phi6 bacteriophage have a lipid envelope, with an underlying icosahedral capsid core. In contrast, coxsackievirus B3 (CVB3) is a non-enveloped or naked icosahedral capsid virus. Prior work has shown that naked-capsid viruses have a higher stability than enveloped viruses, thus providing a useful test of aHP sterilization abilities (49–51). While most viruses utilized in this study are mammalian viruses requiring analysis in mammalian cell lines at biosafety level 2 (BSL2), phi6 can be assayed more flexibly, using rapid bacterial cultures (24-hour turnaround) at biosafety level 1. Phi6 is a natural pathogen phage of *Pseudomonas syringae* pathovar *phaseolicola*, which is itself a bacterial pathogen of green beans. We found that all viral species examined in this study were effectively sterilized by aHP, comparable to the decontamination observed with commercial spore-based biological indicators of sterilization. Together, this combination of respirator fit testing and virus inactivation testing indicate that aHP is a suitable decontamination process to enable reuse of N95 respirators during the COVID-19 pandemic.

Virus inactivation data associated with respirator analyses are impacted by the effects of viral drying on hydrophobic respirator surfaces (31). Overall effectiveness of viral inactivation can be consistently demonstrated through aHP process; however, there is no way to fully separate the effects of air drying from the impacts of aHP. Clinical exposure to SARS-CoV-2 or other viral pathogens would likewise entail conditions that allow viral drying prior to decontamination and/or respirator re-use (e.g. virus may dry onto a respirator in the course of a work-shift, or air-dry during respirator bagging for decontamination or direct re-use). If anything, our “drying-

only” time frame was shorter than would likely occur in a clinical setting. This suggests that emergency-protocols that involve respirator re-use after multiple days of drying, even without aHP or other similar decontamination methods, are likely providing substantial levels of viral inactivation (22, 43).

Acknowledgements

We appreciate the contributions of colleagues and scientists who provided intellectual input and/or materials for this work. These include Joyce Jose, Susan Hafenstein, Anthony Schmitt, Gregory Broussard, Michael Brignati, and Tim Simpson. We thank Dr. Paul Turner and his lab for providing phi6 bacteriophage. We appreciate the contributions and support of Jim Crandall and the Penn State Environmental Health and Safety staff, as well Theresa Engle and other Occupational Medicine staff, who provided support in study implementation, and fit-testing. We also thank Irene Miller as part of the Pell Lab decontamination staff, researchers, clinical staff, as well as Neerav Goyal, Justin Soulier, and the healthcare providers of the Penn State Health Milton S. Hershey Medical Center and College of Medicine.

This work was supported by the Pennsylvania State University. SARS-CoV-2 research in Dr. Troy Sutton’s laboratory was initiated by a seed grant from The Huck Institutes of Life Sciences at Pennsylvania State University, and Dr. Sutton’s research is further supported by the USDA National Institute of Food and Agriculture, Hatch project 4605.

Tables

Table 1: N-95 respirator facepiece models included in this study

Brand & model	# in study	Style	Type	Exhalation valve	Notes
3M 8511	77	molded	Non-surgical	yes	
3M 1860	10	molded	Surgical	no	
3M 1870+	11	folded	Surgical	no	Highest fluid resistance*
3M 9211+	12	folded	Non-surgical	yes	Same fabric as 1870+
Honeywell Sperian N11125	5	molded	Non-surgical	yes	
Alpha ProTech	65	folded	Surgical	No	

* Highest level of fluid resistance according to ASTM F1862 at 160 mm Hg (42).

Table 2. Characteristics of virus species used to test inactivation by aerosolized H2O2, as compared to SARS-CoV-2

Virus species (abbreviation)	Diameter	Capsid / virion shape	Genome type, ~size*	Taxonomic family	Biosafety Level (BSL)
Severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2)	120 nm	Enveloped, no icosahedral capsid	linear (+) ssRNA genome, ~30 kbp	<i>Coronaviridae</i>	BSL3
Herpes simplex virus 1 (HSV-1)	200 nm	Enveloped, icosahedral	linear dsDNA genome, ~152 kbp	<i>Herpesviridae</i>	BSL2
Coxsackie virus B3 (CVB3)	30 nm	Non-enveloped (naked), icosahedral	linear (+) ssRNA genome, ~7.4 kbp	<i>Picornaviridae</i>	BSL2
<i>Pseudomonas</i> phi6 bacteriophage (phi6)	85 nm	Enveloped, icosahedral	segmented, dsRNA genome, ~13.3 kbp	<i>Cystoviridae</i>	BSL1

*ds, double-stranded; ss, single-stranded; ssRNA genomes are either (+) positive sense or (-) negative sense.

Table 3: Optimization of aHP treatment parameters

aHP Cycle #	Room Volume (ft ³)	Charge Period	Pulse Period	Dwell Period	aHP Parameter Set
1a	1700	16:20	40:00	0:00	Initial
1b	1700	16:20	40:00	0:00	Initial
2	1700	11:43	30:00	0:00	Modification 1
3	1700	11:43	30:00	0:00	Modification 1
4	1700	11:43	30:00	0:00	Modification 1
5	1700	11:43	30:00	20:00	Final
6	1700	11:43	30:00	20:00	Final
7	1700	11:43	30:00	20:00	Final
8	1700	11:43	30:00	20:00	Final
9	1700	11:43	30:00	20:00	Final
10	1700	11:43	30:00	20:00	Final
11	1700	11:43	30:00	20:00	Final
12	1700	11:43	30:00	20:00	Final
Post 1	1840	12:41	30:00	20:00	Final*
Post 2	1840	12:41	30:00	20:00	Final*
Post 3	1840	12:41	30:00	20:00	Final*

* These cycles were carried out in a larger preparation room, which necessitated adjustment to the charge time to account for the larger room size

Table 4: Spore-based Biological indicator (BI) and Virus Inactivation Results

aHP Cycle #	aHP-treated Spore-based BIs	Control Spore-based BIs	Spore-based BI Results	aHP parameter set	Viruses Tested	Virus Inactivation Results
1a	12	1	PASS	Initial		
1b	12	1	PASS	Initial		
2	--	--	--	Modification 1		
3	6	1	FAIL (1+/5-)	Modification 1	phi6, HSV1, CVB3	3 of 64 sites positive
4	6	1	PASS	Modification 1		
5	6	1	FAIL*(1+/5-)*	Final		
6	6	1	PASS	Final	HSV1, CVB3	1 of 26 sites positive
7	6	1	PASS	Final		
8	6	1	PASS	Final		
9	6	1	PASS	Final		
10	6	1	PASS	Final		
11	6	1	PASS	Final	phi6, HSV1, CVB3	1 of 9 sites positive
12	6	1	PASS	Final		
Post 1	--	--	--	Final	phi6, HSV1, CVB3	0 of 66 sites positive
Post 2	12	1	PASS	Final	SARS-CoV-2	0 of 24 sites positive
Post 3	12	1	PASS	Final	SARS-CoV-2	0 of 24 sites positive

*In cycle 5, it was noted upon transfer of one spore coupon to media, post-treatment contamination may have occurred.

Table 5: Portable real-time H₂O₂ measurements, using ATI PortaSens II

aHP Cycle ID	Measurement Location*	Measurement Condition	H ₂ O ₂ Concentration or range (ppm)**	Time period to decayed concentration (minutes)	aHP Parameter set
1a	IC, wall port	Charge	> 120	--	Initial
1a	IC, wall port	Aeration, to entry	2.5 – 57	52	Initial
1b	IC, wall port	Charge	> 120	--	Initial
2	No data	No data	No data	No data	Modification 1
3	IC, door open	Aeration, to entry	1.5 – 11.6	20	Modification 1
3	IC, door open	Aeration, to respirator measurement	1.5 – 0.8	40	Modification 1
4	IC, door open	Aeration, to entry	2 – 10.6	20	Modification 1
4	respirator surface	After overnight drying	0 – 3	overnight	Modification 1
5	IC, wall port	Charge	> 120	--	Final
6	IC, wall port	Pulse	120	--	Final
6	respirator surface	After overnight drying	0	overnight	Final
7	IC, wall port	Charge	> 120	--	Final
7	OC, seal check(s)	Charge, Pulse, Dwell	0	--	Final
7	IC, door open	Aeration, to entry	2 – 7	27	Final
7	respirator surface	After overnight drying	0	overnight	Final
8	IC, wall port	Pulse	88	--	Final
9	IC, wall port	Charge	> 120	--	Final
9	IC, door open	Aeration, to entry	1.6 – 24	20	Final
9	respirator surface	Aeration, to respirator measurement	< 1	85	Final
10	OC, seal check	Pulse, door seal repair	0 – 1.6	--	Final
10	IC, door open	Aeration, to entry	1.3 – 15	32	Final
10	respirator surface	After overnight drying	< 1	overnight	Final
11	IC, door open	Aeration, to entry	1 – 13.6	35	Final
11	respirator surface	After overnight drying	< 1	overnight	Final
Post	respirator surface	Aeration to 1ppm, respirator data log	1 – 8.1	150	Final

* Measurement Location: IC – inside containment, (wall port) – through sealable wall port, (door open) – door ajar after door seal removed, OC – outside containment, (seal check) – Prep Room door tape seal, (respirator surface) – at respirator surface following room entry.

** Low measurement value represents lowest concentration following concentration decay; high value represents starting concentration (prior to decay).

Table 6: Hydrogen peroxide diffusion sampler (HPM) data

aHP Cycle ID	Sample Type	Location Notes*	H₂O₂ (ppm)**	Sampling Period (minutes)***
1a	Researcher A – personal breathing zone	Sampler at worker lapel; transit in all service areas	< 0.1	143
1b	Researcher B – personal breathing zone	Sampler at worker lapel; transit in all service areas	< 0.08	185
1b	area sample	Door Seal (OC), breathing zone height	< 0.08	183
1b	respirator container	3M 1860 (within brown paper bag)	< 0.03	461
1b	respirator container	3M 9211+ (bag)	< 0.03	518
1b	respirator container	Alpha Protech PFL (within brown paper bag)	< 0.03	497
1b	respirator container	Alpha Protech PFL (within brown paper bag)	< 0.03	510
11	area sample	Door Seal (OC), breathing zone height	< 0.2	110

*C (charge period), P (pulse period), D (dwell period), A (aeration phase)

** “< Value” indicates sample analysis was below limit of quantitation (LOQ) based on sampler diffusion rate and air volume collected. Time-weighted average (TWA) not calculated for results reported <LOQ. The OSHA PEL and ACGIH TLV[®] exposure standard for hydrogen peroxide is 1ppm eight-hour TWA.

***Sampling period varied by sampling objectives.

Table 7: Respirator filtration efficiency testing results following 10 cycles of aerosolized hydrogen peroxide decontamination

Full-loading efficiencies – 3M Model 8511 (N95 respirator)*						
Sample ID**	Initial Test Flow Rate (LPM)	Initial Test Resistance (mmH ₂ O)	Initial Test Penetration (%)	Maximum Penetration (%)	Filter Efficiency*** (%)	Result
MS – 1	84	6.5	0.67	2.29	97.71	Pass
MS – 2	85	6.7	0.82	2.38	97.62	Pass
MS – 3	84	6.9	1.46	4.16	95.84	Pass
MS – 4	85	6.8	1.75	4.14	95.86	Pass
FS – 1	85	7.1	2.02	4.58	95.42	Pass
FS – 2	84	6.6	1.47	3.5	96.50	Pass
FS – 3	85	6.6	0.20	2.37	97.63	Pass
FS – 4	86	7.0	1.47	4.12	95.88	Pass
Test specification	81-89			≤ 5.0	≥ 95.0	

* Respirator testing analysis performed by ICS Laboratories of Brunswick, OH

** MS, FS – [x] Male subject or female subject sample respirator id

***Filter efficiency percent is based on maximum penetration value.

Figures

Figure 1: Sequential fit testing (QLFT & QNFT) of N95 respirators subjected to repeated aHP decontamination cycles.

Figure 1: Sequential fit testing (QLFT & QNFT) of N95 respirators subjected to repeated aHP decontamination cycles. Results demonstrate that all 3M model 8511 respirators successfully pass QLFT and QNFT after 1, 5, and 10 cycles. In particular, 8 of 9 QNFT results for the 3M model 8511 respirator surpassed a fit factor of 200, the maximum reportable by the test method – providing qualitative, yet objective, evidence of the safety margin related to fit

688 integrity after 10 aHP decontamination cycles. All respirator models except Alpha Protech
689 (which had inconsistent fit-test results; see Methods for details) passed all QLFT and QNFT to
690 which they were subjected. Models Alpha ProTech (aHP cycle 1) and Kimberly Clark (aHP
691 cycle 2) were only included for a single cycle and are thus not shown here.

692

Figure 2: Infectious titer of phi6 bacteriophage inoculated on N95 respirator facepieces was eliminated after aerosolized H₂O₂ decontamination.

Figure 2: Infectious titer of phi6 bacteriophage inoculated on N95 respirator facepieces was eliminated after aerosolized H₂O₂ (aHP) decontamination. (A-C) Data are plotted separately for each aHP cycle in which viral testing was done (see Table 4). Multiple models of N95 respirator (see Table 1) were inoculated and either treated as “drying only” controls (red), or subjected to aHP treatment (blue). The respirator surface and model are indicated by the symbol

shape and fill. The median of all points within a given aHP cycle and treatment is indicated by a solid horizontal line. The dashed horizontal line indicates the limit of detection (LOD) at 1 viral plaque-forming unit (PFU), in the resuspended but undiluted volume from the site of viral inoculation. (D) Image depicts Petri dish plating of bacterial lawns exposed to phi6 from drying-only (left side) or aHP-treated (right side) respirator inoculation sites. These were applied to the bacterial lawn either as an undiluted resuspension (top row) or 1:10⁶ dilution applied to focal points (bottom row). For phi6, the only positive plaque occurring after aHP treatment occurred on in a round of testing without replicate samples (aHP cycle 11), and thus could not be validated. For the purposes of illustrating the decontaminated sites where zero plaques were detected, these numbers were replaced with fractional values (0.5), to allow their visualization on this log-scale plot. See Supplementary Table 1 for all data values.

Figure 3: Infectious titer of HSV-1 inoculated on N95 respirator facepieces was reduced by drying and eliminated after aerosolized H₂O₂ decontamination.

Figure 3: Infectious titer of HSV-1 inoculated on N95 respirator facepieces was reduced by drying and eliminated after aerosolized H₂O₂ (aHP) decontamination. (A-D) Data are plotted separately for each aHP cycle in which viral testing was done (see Table 4). For HSV-1, the sole positive plaque after aHP treatment occurred in aHP cycle #3, when the “Modification 1” parameters were in use (Tables 3-4). This failure, in concert with a spore-based biological

indicator and 2 CVB3 plaques (Figure 4) motivated the addition of a “dwell time” in the final aHP parameter. As in Figure 2, multiple models of N95 respirator (see Table 1) were inoculated and either treated as “drying only” controls (red), or subjected to aHP treatment (blue). The respirator surface and model are indicated by the symbol shape and fill. The median of all points within a given aHP cycle and treatment is indicated by a solid horizontal line. The dashed horizontal line indicates the limit of detection (LOD) at 1 viral plaque-forming unit (PFU), in the resuspended but undiluted volume from the site of viral inoculation. For the purposes of illustrating the decontaminated sites where zero plaques were detected, these numbers were replaced with fractional values (0.5), to allow their visualization on this log-scale plot. Note that the same HSV-1 starting inoculum values (titered in triplicate) are included on each plot, for comparison to drying and aHP-treated values. See Supplementary Table 1 for all data values.

Figure 4: Infectious titer of CVB3 inoculated on N95 respirator facepieces was reduced by drying and eliminated after aerosolized H₂O₂ decontamination.

Figure 4: Infectious titer of CVB3 inoculated on N95 respirator facepieces was reduced by drying and eliminated after aerosolized H₂O₂ (aHP) decontamination. (A-D) Data are plotted separately for each aHP cycle in which viral testing was done (see Table 4). For CVB3, two positive plaques after aHP treatment occurred in aHP cycle #3, when the “Modification 1”

parameters were in use (Tables 3-4). This failure, in concert with a spore-based biological indicator and 1 HSV-1 plaques (Figure 4) motivated the addition of a “dwell time” in the final aHP parameter. The only other positive CVB3 plaque after aHP treatment occurred in aHP cycle 6 (B), and no plaques were detected in the replicate or in parallel samples. As in Figure 2, multiple models of N95 respirator (see Table 1) were inoculated and either treated as “drying only” controls (red), or subjected to aHP treatment (blue). The respirator surface and model are indicated by the symbol shape and fill. The median of all points within a given aHP cycle and treatment is indicated by a solid horizontal line. The dashed horizontal line indicates the limit of detection (LOD) at 1 viral plaque-forming unit (PFU), in the resuspended but undiluted volume from the site of viral inoculation. For the purposes of illustrating the decontaminated sites where zero plaques were detected, these numbers were replaced with fractional values (0.5), to allow their visualization on this log-scale plot. Note that the same CVB3 starting inoculum values (titered in triplicate) are included on each plot, for comparison to drying and aHP-treated values. See Supplementary Table 1 for all data values.

Figure 5: Infectious titer of SARS-CoV-2 inoculated on N95 respirator facepieces was reduced by drying and eliminated after aerosolized H₂O₂ decontamination.

SARS-CoV-2 titer after drying or aHP treatment

Figure 4: Infectious titer of SARS-CoV-2 inoculated on N95 respirator facepieces was reduced by drying and eliminated after aerosolized H₂O₂ (aHP) decontamination. (A-B)

Data are plotted separately for each aHP cycle in which viral testing was done (see Table 4). For

765 SARS-CoV-2, no infectious virus was detected by TCID50 assay after aHP treatment. As in
766 Figure 2, multiple models of N95 respirator (see Table 1) were inoculated and either treated as
767 “drying only” controls (red), or subjected to aHP treatment (blue). The respirator surface and
768 model are indicated by the symbol shape and fill. The median of all points within a given aHP
769 cycle and treatment is indicated by a solid horizontal line. Viral titer was determined by tissue
770 culture infectious dose 50 (TCID50) assay in 96-well plates, with a limit of detection (LOD) of
771 1.2 (see Methods for details). For the purposes of illustrating the decontaminated samples where
772 no virus was detected, these numbers were plotted as a value of 1. See Supplementary Table 1
773 for all data values.

774

References

1. Rutala WA, Weber DJ, Healthcare Infection Control Practices Advisory Committee (HICPAC). 2008. Guideline for Disinfection and Sterilization in Healthcare Facilities, 2008. Cent Dis Control CDC 163.
2. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, National Center for Emerging and Zoonotic Infectious Diseases (NCEZID), Division of Healthcare Quality Promotion (DHQP). 2008. Guideline for Disinfection and Sterilization in Healthcare Facilities. Sterilizing Pract Disinfect Steriliz Guidel Guidel Libr Infect Control CDC.
3. 3M Personal Safety Division. 2020. Disinfection of Filtering Facepiece Respirators. 3M Tech Bull 4.
4. Battelle Memorial Institute. 2016. Final Report for the Bioquell Hydrogen Peroxide Vapor (HPV) Decontamination for Reuse of N95 Respirators. Prep Contract – Study Number 3245 US Food Drug Adm 46.
5. Liao L, Xiao W, Zhao M, Yu X, Wang H, Wang Q, Chu S, Cui Y. 2020. Can N95 Respirators Be Reused after Disinfection? How Many Times? ACS Nano 14:6348–6356.
6. Schwartz A, Stiegel M, Greeson N, Vogel A, Thomann W, Brown M, Sempowski GD, Alderman TS, Condreay JP, Burch J, Wolfe C, Smith B, Lewis S. 2020. Decontamination and Reuse of N95 Respirators with Hydrogen Peroxide Vapor to Address Worldwide Personal Protective Equipment Shortages During the SARS-CoV-2 (COVID-19) Pandemic. Appl Biosaf 25:67–70.
7. Goyal SM, Chander Y, Yezli S, Otter JA. 2014. Evaluating the virucidal efficacy of hydrogen peroxide vapour. J Hosp Infect 86:255–259.
8. Tuladhar E, Terpstra P, Koopmans M, Duizer E. 2012. Virucidal efficacy of hydrogen peroxide vapour disinfection. J Hosp Infect 80:110–115.

- 799 9. Holmdahl T, Odenholt I, Riesbeck K, Medstrand P, Widell A. 2019. Hydrogen peroxide
800 vapour treatment inactivates norovirus but has limited effect on post-treatment viral RNA
801 levels. *Infect Dis* 51:197–205.
- 802 10. Hultman C, Hill A, McDonnell G. 2006. The physical chemistry of decontamination with
803 gaseous hydrogen peroxide. *Pharm Eng* 27:22–32.
- 804 11. Otter JA, Yezli S. 2011. A call for clarity when discussing hydrogen peroxide vapour and
805 aerosol systems. *J Hosp Infect* 77:83–84.
- 806 12. Boyce JM. 2009. New Approaches to Decontamination of Rooms After Patients Are
807 Discharged. *Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol* 30:515–517.
- 808 13. Fu TY, Gent P, Kumar V. 2012. Efficacy, efficiency and safety aspects of hydrogen peroxide
809 vapour and aerosolized hydrogen peroxide room disinfection systems. *J Hosp Infect*
810 80:199–205.
- 811 14. Holmdahl T, Lanbeck P, Wullt M, Walder MH. 2011. A Head-to-Head Comparison of
812 Hydrogen Peroxide Vapor and Aerosol Room Decontamination Systems. *Infect Control*
813 *Hosp Epidemiol* 32:831–836.
- 814 15. Freyssenet C, Karlen S. 2019. Plasma-Activated Aerosolized Hydrogen Peroxide (aHP) in
815 Surface Inactivation Procedures. *Appl Biosaf* 24:10–19.
- 816 16. Best EL, Parnell P, Thirkell G, Verity P, Copland M, Else P, Denton M, Hobson RP, Wilcox
817 MH. 2014. Effectiveness of deep cleaning followed by hydrogen peroxide decontamination
818 during high *Clostridium difficile* infection incidence. *J Hosp Infect* 87:25–33.
- 819 17. Barbut F, Menuet D, Verachten M, Girou E. 2009. Comparison of the Efficacy of a
820 Hydrogen Peroxide Dry-Mist Disinfection System and Sodium Hypochlorite Solution for
821 Eradication of *Clostridium difficile* Spores. *Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol* 30:507–514.
- 822 18. Shapey S, Machin K, Levi K, Boswell TC. 2008. Activity of a dry mist hydrogen peroxide
823 system against environmental *Clostridium difficile* contamination in elderly care wards. *J*
824 *Hosp Infect* 70:136–141.

- 825 19. Bartels MD, Kristoffersen K, Slotsbjerg T, Rohde SM, Lundgren B, Westh H. 2008.
826 Environmental meticillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* (MRSA) disinfection using dry-
827 mist-generated hydrogen peroxide. *J Hosp Infect* 70:35–41.
- 828 20. Andersen BM, Syversen G, Thoresen H, Rasch M, Hochlin K, Seljordslia B, Snevold I, Berg
829 E. 2010. Failure of dry mist of hydrogen peroxide 5% to kill *Mycobacterium tuberculosis*. *J*
830 *Hosp Infect* 76:80–83.
- 831 21. Beswick AJ, Farrant J, Makison C, Gawn J, Frost G, Crook B, Pride J. 2011. Comparison of
832 Multiple Systems for Laboratory Whole Room Fumigation. *Appl Biosaf* 16:139–157.
- 833 22. The National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH). 2020. Recommended
834 Guidance for Extended Use and Limited Reuse of N95 Filtering Facepiece Respirators in
835 Healthcare Settings. NIOSH Workplace Saf Health Top.
- 836 23. Hinton, Chief Scientist, Food and Drug Administration D. 2020. FDA Letter - Emergency
837 Use Authorization (EUA) for the Battelle Critical Care Decontamination System (CCDS).
- 838 24. Schwartz A, Stiegel M, Greeson N, Vogel A, Thomann W, Brown M, Sempowski GD,
839 Alderman TS, Condreay JP, Burch J, Wolfe C, Smith B, Lewis S. 2020. Decontamination
840 and Reuse of N95 Respirators with Hydrogen Peroxide Vapor to Address Worldwide
841 Personal Protective Equipment Shortages During the SARS-CoV-2 (COVID-19) Pandemic.
842 *Appl Biosaf* 153567602091993.
- 843 25. Kenney P, Chan BK, Kortright K, Cintron M, Havill N, Russi M, Epright J, Lee L, Balcezak
844 T, Martinello R. 2020. Hydrogen Peroxide Vapor sterilization of N95 respirators for reuse.
845 medRxiv preprint.
- 846 26. Kumar A, Kasloff SB, Leung A, Cutts T, Strong JE, Hills K, Gu FX, Chen P, Vazquez-
847 Grande G, Rush B, Lothar S, Malo K, Zarychanski R, Krishnan J. 2020. Decontamination
848 of N95 masks for re-use employing 7 widely available sterilization methods. *PLOS ONE*
849 15:e0243965.
- 850 27. Levine C, Grady C, Block T, Hurley H, Russo R, Peixoto B, Frees A, Ruiz A, Alland D.
851 2021. Use, re-use or discard? Quantitatively defined variance in the functional integrity of

- 852 N95 respirators following vaporized hydrogen peroxide decontamination during the
853 COVID-19 pandemic. *J Hosp Infect* 107:50–56.
- 854 28. Fischer RJ, Morris DH, van Doremalen N, Sarchette S, Matson MJ, Bushmaker T, Yinda
855 CK, Seifert SN, Gamble A, Williamson BN, Judson SD, de Wit E, Lloyd-Smith JO,
856 Munster VJ. 2020. Effectiveness of N95 Respirator Decontamination and Reuse against
857 SARS-CoV-2 Virus. *Emerg Infect Dis* 26:2253–2255.
- 858 29. Oral E, Wannomae KK, Connolly RL, Gardecki JA, Leung HM, Muratoglu OK, Durkin J,
859 Jones R, Collins C, Gjore J, Budzilowicz A, Jaber T. 2020. Vaporized H₂O₂
860 decontamination against surrogate viruses for the reuse of N95 respirators in the COVID-19
861 emergency. preprint, Occupational and Environmental Health.
- 862 30. Grillet AM, Nemer MB, Storch S, Sanchez AL, Piekos ES, Leonard J, Hurwitz I, Perkins DJ.
863 2020. COVID-19 global pandemic planning: Performance and electret charge of N95
864 respirators after recommended decontamination methods. *Exp Biol Med*
865 153537022097638.
- 866 31. Rockey N, Arts PJ, Li L, Harrison KR, Langenfeld K, Fitzsimmons WJ, Luring AS, Love
867 NG, Kaye KS, Raskin L, Roberts WW, Hegarty B, Wigginton KR. 2020. Humidity and
868 Deposition Solution Play a Critical Role in Virus Inactivation by Heat Treatment of N95
869 Respirators. *mSphere* 5.
- 870 32. Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA), United States Department of
871 Labor. Limits for Air Contaminants. 19101000 TABLE Z-1 - TABLE Z-1.
- 872 33. American Conference of Governmental Industrial Hygienists (ACGIH). 2019. Hydrogen
873 Peroxide: Threshold Limit Values (TLV) Chemical Substances, 7th ed. Cincinnati, OH.
- 874 34. Steris Healthcare. Biological Indicators for Sterilization | STERIS.
- 875 35. Advanced Chemical Sensors. AIHA-LAP ID No. 102047. Longwood, Florida.
- 876 36. SGS Galson Laboratories. AIHA-LAP ID No. 100324. E. Syracuse, New York 13057.

37. Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA), United States Department of Labor. Fit Testing Procedures (Mandatory). Respir Prot Stand 29 CFR 1910.134 F – Fit Test Append Subpart B3 – Qual Fit-Test QLFT Protoc Saccharine Solut Aerosol Protoc Subpart C3 – Quant Fit-Test QNFT Protoc Ambient Aerosol Condens Nucl Count CNC Quant Fit Test Protoc. <https://www.osha.gov/laws-regs/regulations/standardnumber/1910/1910.134AppA>.
38. Operation and Service Manual. 2015. Portacount Pro 8030 and Portacount Pro+ 8038 Respirator Fit Testers Rev. P. T.S.I., Inc., Shoreview, MN.
39. National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health. 2019. Determination of Particulate Filter Efficiency Level for N95 Series Filters Against Solid Particulates for Non-Powered, Air-Purifying Respirators Standard Testing Procedure (STP), p. 9. *In* TEB-APR-STEP-0059 Revision 3.2. <https://www.cdc.gov/niosh/npptl/stps/apresp.html>.
40. Hockett KL, Baltrus DA. 2017. Use of the Soft-agar Overlay Technique to Screen for Bacterially Produced Inhibitory Compounds. *J Vis Exp* <https://doi.org/10.3791/55064>.
41. Reed LJ, Muench H. 1938. A simple method of estimating fifty per cent endpoints. *Am J Epidemiol* 27:493–497.
42. 3M Personal Safety Division. 3M™ Aura™ Health Care Particulate Respirator and Surgical Mask 1870+, N95.
43. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC). 2020. Implementing Filtering Facepiece Respirator (FFR) Reuse, Including Reuse after Decontamination, When There Are Known Shortages of N95 Respirators. *Coronavirus Dis 2019 COVID-19*.
44. van Doremalen N, Bushmaker T, Morris DH, Holbrook MG, Gamble A, Williamson BN, Tamin A, Harcourt JL, Thornburg NJ, Gerber SI, Lloyd-Smith JO, de Wit E, Munster VJ. 2020. Aerosol and Surface Stability of SARS-CoV-2 as Compared with SARS-CoV-1. *N Engl J Med* <https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMc2004973>.

45. Sizun J, Yu MWN, Talbot PJ. 2000. Survival of human coronaviruses 229E and OC43 in suspension and after drying on surfaces: a possible source of hospital-acquired infections. *J Hosp Infect* 46:55–60.
46. Duan S-M, Zhao X-S, Wen R-F, Huang J-J, Pi G-H, Zhang S-X, Han J, Bi S-L, Ruan L, Dong X-P, SARS Research Team. 2003. Stability of SARS coronavirus in human specimens and environment and its sensitivity to heating and UV irradiation. *Biomed Environ Sci* 16:246–255.
47. Rabenau HF, Cinatl J, Morgenstern B, Bauer G, Preiser W, Doerr HW. 2005. Stability and inactivation of SARS coronavirus. *Med Microbiol Immunol (Berl)* 194:1–6.
48. Geller C, Varbanov M, Duval R. 2012. Human Coronaviruses: Insights into Environmental Resistance and Its Influence on the Development of New Antiseptic Strategies. *Viruses* 4:3044–3068.
49. Firquet S, Beaujard S, Lobert P-E, Sané F, Caloone D, Izard D, Hober D. 2015. Survival of Enveloped and Non-Enveloped Viruses on Inanimate Surfaces. *Microbes Environ* 30:140–144.
50. Kampf G, Todt D, Pfaender S, Steinmann E. 2020. Persistence of coronaviruses on inanimate surfaces and their inactivation with biocidal agents. *J Hosp Infect* 104:246–251.
51. Vasickova P, Pavlik I, Verani M, Carducci A. 2010. Issues Concerning Survival of Viruses on Surfaces. *Food Environ Virol* 2:24–34.

924 **Supplementary Figures**

925

926

927 **Supplementary Figure 1: Respirators positioned on rack**

928 Respirator staging (partial loading) on metal rack with binder clips and rack centrally positioned
929 in the Prep Room.

930

931

932

933 **Supplementary Figure 2: Curis® unit.**

934 Curis® decontamination unit with adjustable aHP dispersal nozzle and programmable inputs.

935

936

937

938 **Supplementary Figure 3: Prep Room door seal**

939 Door sealed with polyethylene sheeting and non-porous adhesive tape to prevent migration of
940 H₂O₂ outside of the Prep Room.

941

942

943

944 **Supplementary Figure 4: BIs positioned within nested N95 respirators**

945 In order to test the ability of aHP under these cycle parameters to penetrate respirator material,
 946 biological indicators (BI's) (*Geobacillus stearothermophilis*) were nested between two molded
 947 respirators (3M 1860) and taped together, or BIs were enclosed within a flat-fold type respirator
 948 (3M Aura 9211+; not pictured). All BIs positioned in this manner were rendered inactivated after
 949 aHP treatment.

950

951

952

953 **Supplementary Figure 5: Cultures of spore-based biological indicators**

954 Biological indicator spore discs are transferred from Tyvek/glassine envelopes to culture media
 955 and incubated for at 55°C for at least 7 days post decontamination cycle. Media color change to
 956 yellow indicates bacterial growth, as seen in the positive control tube on the far right.

957

958

959

960 **Supplementary Figure 6: Respirator facepiece models & characteristics**

961 **(A)** 3M models 1860 and 8511 (left) have a molded facepiece, with 8511 including an exhalation
 962 valve. **(B)** Virus-inoculation via droplets spotted onto the respirator fabric are shown for two
 963 examples. **(C)** 3M models 1870+ and 9211+ share a common folded fabric model, with a high
 964 fluid resistance of the fabric. 3M 9211+ includes an exhalation valve. Several of the facepieces
 965 (1860, 1870+, 9211+) display the metal grommet from insertion of the probe used for
 966 quantitative fit testing (QNFT). The inner face of each respirator is shown, which for the models
 967 shown in (C) required a prop to hold them open.

968

969

970 **Supplementary Figure 7: Respirator aHP cycle markings**

971 Indelible ink pen hash marks (noted at lower respirator straps) placed to notate completed aHP
972 cycle, at time of cycle completion, or collection/transport for subsequent fit-testing or virus
973 inactivation testing.

974

977 **Supplementary Figure 8: Viral titration demonstrates inactivation and loss of**
978 **infectious units due to drying and aerosolized H₂O₂ (aHP) decontamination**

979 Shown here are representative examples of serial dilutions (titration) of HSV-1 or CVB3 that
980 were spotted onto 3M 9211+ respirators, and then resuspended and plated onto monolayers of
981 Vero detector cells. Viral plaques, which are visible as clear foci of infection (plaque-forming
982 units, or PFU) on the background of methylene blue-stained cells, were visualized at 72 hours
983 post infection. The plate shown in **(A)** illustrates serial dilution of a high concentration of HSV-1
984 after drying (10⁵ PFU; see plot in Figure 3A), and a lower concentration of CVB3 after drying
985 (10² PFU; see plot in Figure 4A). The plate shown in **(B)** is from an aHP cycle run with
986 "Modification 1" parameters, when no dwell time was used (aHP cycle 3; see Tables 3-4) and
987 commercial spore-based biological indicators indicated a failure of decontamination. Even on
988 this partial aHP decontamination, only three wells (of which two are shown above) had any viral
989 plaques (indicated by arrowheads; these equate to 25 PFU of HSV-1, and 5 PFU of CVB3; see
990 plots in Figure 3A and 4A).

Supplementary Table (separate Excel file)

Supplementary Table 1 (Excel): aHP Viral Testing Values

Data underlying Figures 2-4, and Table 4. These include the number of plaque-forming units (PFU) for phi6, HSV-1, and CVB3, as well as TCID50(log10)/mL values for SARS-CoV-2. As noted in Figures 2-4, for samples where no virus was detected, these numbers were replaced with non-zero values to allow their visualization on the log-scale plots in Figures 2-4. HSV-1, CVB3, and phi6 "no virus detected" values were set to 0.5 (less than 1 plaque detected), and SARS-CoV-2 values were set to 1 (less than the limit of detection of 1.2 TCID50(log10)/mL).