

Comparison of estimated norovirus infection risk reductions for a single-fomite-contact scenario with residual and non-residual hand sanitizers

Amanda M. Wilson, MS<sup>1\*</sup>; Kelly A. Reynolds, Ph.D.<sup>1</sup>; Lee-Anne Jaykus, Ph.D.<sup>2</sup>; Blanca Escudero-Abarca, Ph.D.<sup>2</sup>; Charles P. Gerba, Ph.D.<sup>1,3</sup>

1. Department of Community, Environment and Policy, Mel and Enid Zuckerman College of Public Health, University of Arizona, Tucson, Arizona

2. Department of Food, Bioprocessing, & Nutrition Sciences, North Carolina State University, Raleigh, North Carolina

3. Department of Soil, Water, and Environmental Science, College of Agriculture and Life Sciences, University of Arizona, Tucson, Arizona

\*Please address correspondence to Amanda M. Wilson, email: [apfeifer@email.arizona.edu](mailto:apfeifer@email.arizona.edu), address: 1295 N. Martin Avenue, Drachman Hall, PO Box: 245210, Tucson AZ 85724

Key words: norovirus, hand sanitizer, risk reduction, risk target

#### Highlights:

- The residual hand sanitizer out-performed the non-residual hand sanitizer
- Residual hand sanitizer may reduce infection risk for up to 4 hr
- Longer hand sanitizer contact time translated to higher risk reductions

**Abstract**

**Background:** The purpose of this study was to relate experimentally-measured  $\log_{10}$  human norovirus reductions for a non-residual (60% ethanol) and a residual (quaternary ammonium-based) hand sanitizer to infection risk reductions.

**Methods:** Human norovirus  $\log_{10}$  reductions on hands for both sanitizers were experimentally-measured using the ASTM International Standard E1838-10 method, with modification.

Scenarios included product application to: (i) inoculated fingerpads with 30- and 60-second contact times, and (ii) hands followed by inoculation with human norovirus immediately and four hours later. Hand sanitizer efficacies were used in a mathematical model estimating norovirus infection risk from a single hand-to-fomite contact under low and high environmental contamination conditions.

**Results:** The largest  $\log_{10}$  reductions for the residual and non-residual hand sanitizers were for a 60-second contact time, reducing infection risk by approximately 99% and 85%, respectively.

Four hours after application, the residual hand sanitizer reduced infection risks by 78.5% under high contamination conditions while the non-residual hand sanitizer offered no reduction.

**Discussion:**  $\log_{10}$  virus and infection risk reductions were consistently greater for the residual hand sanitizer under all scenarios. Further data describing residual hand sanitizer efficacy with additional contamination or tactile events are needed.

**Conclusions:** Residual anti-noroviral hand sanitizers may reduce infection risks for up to four hours.

Comparison of estimated norovirus infection risk reductions for a single-fomite-contact scenario with residual and non-residual hand sanitizers

Key words: norovirus, hand sanitizer, risk reduction, risk target

Highlights:

- The residual hand sanitizer out-performed the non-residual hand sanitizer
- Residual hand sanitizer may reduce infection risk for up to 4 hr
- Longer hand sanitizer contact time translated to higher risk reductions

## **Abstract**

**Background:** The purpose of this study was to relate experimentally-measured  $\log_{10}$  human norovirus reductions for a non-residual (60% ethanol) and a residual (quaternary ammonium-based) hand sanitizer to infection risk reductions.

**Methods:** Human norovirus  $\log_{10}$  reductions on hands for both sanitizers were experimentally-measured using the ASTM International Standard E1838-10 method, with modification.

Scenarios included product application to: (i) inoculated fingerpads with 30- and 60-second contact times, and (ii) hands followed by inoculation with human norovirus immediately and four hours later. Hand sanitizer efficacies were used in a mathematical model estimating norovirus infection risk from a single hand-to-fomite contact under low and high environmental contamination conditions.

**Results:** The largest  $\log_{10}$  reductions for the residual and non-residual hand sanitizers were for a 60-second contact time, reducing infection risk by approximately 99% and 85%, respectively.

Four hours after application, the residual hand sanitizer reduced infection risks by 78.5% under high contamination conditions while the non-residual hand sanitizer offered no reduction.

**Discussion:**  $\log_{10}$  virus and infection risk reductions were consistently greater for the residual hand sanitizer under all scenarios. Further data describing residual hand sanitizer efficacy with additional contamination or tactile events are needed.

**Conclusions:** Residual anti-noroviral hand sanitizers may reduce infection risks for up to four hours.

## Background

It is widely acknowledged that fomites are an important reservoir of viral pathogens<sup>1,2</sup> and that some, especially enteric viruses, can survive on surfaces for weeks or months.<sup>1</sup> A single fomite contact contaminated at very low concentrations of virus (i.e., a single infectious unit per 100 cm<sup>2</sup>) has been predicted to have a human norovirus infection risk of  $2.7 \times 10^{-3}$ ,<sup>3</sup> and fomites have been implicated as either the source of, or having a large role in, norovirus outbreaks.<sup>4-6</sup> In addition to surface cleaning and disinfection, increasing hand hygiene compliance and efficacy are important measures for preventing norovirus outbreaks.<sup>7-9</sup>

Although ethanol-based hand rubs have been shown to be effective against a number of viruses,<sup>10</sup> the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) state in the Guideline for the Prevention and Control of Norovirus Gastroenteritis Outbreaks in Healthcare Settings that information regarding alcohol-based hand sanitizer efficacy for human strains of noroviruses is an “unresolved issue” and that more research is needed.<sup>11</sup> In comparison to other hand hygiene options, such as hand washing, hand rubs have been shown to generally be more effective against bacteria than non-enveloped viruses.<sup>12,13</sup> Within the context of viruses, there is some concern over ethanol-based hand rubs replacing hand washing, as they may not be effective against all types of viruses.<sup>14,15</sup> However, compliance with hand rubs may be greater than for hand washing.<sup>16</sup>

Quaternary ammonium products have been a commonly used disinfectant since 1935.<sup>17</sup> They have variable action against non-enveloped viruses such as norovirus, and efficacy has been almost exclusively determined using cultivable surrogate viruses, which may not be an accurate indicator of human norovirus. Efficacy is formulation specific<sup>18</sup> and some quaternary ammonium products have been shown to have residual effects.<sup>19</sup> The infection risk reductions

owed to products with lower initial degrees of virus inactivation but longer effect duration in comparison to products with larger initial reduction but fleeting effects is unknown.

The purpose of this study was to utilize pilot experimental data to inform a single fomite contact exposure model scenario to evaluate the potential of residual hand sanitizers to reduce infection risks. Specifically, we compared the potential human norovirus infection risk reductions for a 60% ethanol (non-residual) and a quaternary ammonium-based (residual) hand sanitizer by informing exposure equations with experimentally-measured viral log<sub>10</sub> reductions under multiple product use scenarios. These scenarios included (i) inoculation of human fingerpads with norovirus and applying the product for a 30-second or 60-second contact time (immediate kill); and (ii) treating the hands with the product and then exposing them to norovirus immediately thereafter or four hours after hand sanitizer application (residual kill). Understanding how residual reductions may affect infection risk over time will inform infection control and public health strategies.

## **Methods**

### *Measuring hand sanitizer efficacy*

Six volunteers consented to participate in each of the *in vivo* efficacy trials. The test product was a liquid quaternary ammonium-based hand sanitizer with a claimed residual action, ULTRA GermFree 24 (Zoono, Shrewbury, NJ); this was benchmarked against a 60% ethanol solution. The liquid formulation of the ULTRA GermFree24 product includes 70% ethyl alcohol, benzalkonium chloride, silica complex, 3(trimethoxysilyl) propyl dimethyl octadecyl ammonium chloride, and water. The North Carolina State University Institutional Review Board approved all experimental protocols<sup>20</sup> which were conducted consistent with the ASTM International Standard E1838-10<sup>21</sup> fingerpad method, with modifications, particularly with respect to assessing

residual hand sanitizer efficacy. Consistencies in the methods across studies are described here. Prior to inoculation with human norovirus or application of test sanitizers, the hands of volunteers were decontaminated by soap and water wash followed by 60% ethanol spray. A 10  $\mu$ L volume of human norovirus GII.4 Sydney, obtained as a de-identified stool specimen suspended 20% in deionized water, was used as inoculum on each fingerpad. In some instances, the inoculum was eluted from the fingerpads immediately after deposition (wet control); in other cases, the inoculum was eluted after drying but without (dry control) or with (treatment) exposure to the hand sanitizer. Elution of virus from fingerpads was done using a cryovial (Sigma-Aldrich, St. Louis, MO) containing one mL of Earle's Balanced Salt Solution (Gibco, Gaithersburg, MD) supplemented with 0.1% Tween, by 20 inversions. Eluates were processed for virus detection as described below. Following completion of virus exposure and/or sanitizer treatments, fingerpads were decontaminated by soaking in 10% bleach (5,000 ppm hypochlorite) for 3-minutes, followed by soap and water wash for one minute and a final 60% ethanol spray.

#### *Phase I, immediate kill efficacy studies*

These studies are most consistent with the ASTM E1838-10 method, in which human fingerpads were inoculated with norovirus and product efficacy was evaluated after 30-second and 60-second contact times using the traditional fingerpad method. In this case, the thumbs were inoculated with human norovirus and the virus immediately eluted (wet inoculum control). Thereafter, the other eight fingertips were each inoculated with 10  $\mu$ L of the virus suspension that was allowed to dry (10-20 minutes). After drying, virus on the index fingers was eluted as described above (dry inoculum control). The middle two fingers were exposed to 1 ml of hand sanitizer contained in a cryovial for contact times of 30 or 60-seconds followed by elution of

residual virus (treatments). The pinkies were exposed to water in a cryovial followed by elution (water rinse control).

### *Phase II, residual kill efficacy studies*

In these experiments, human hands were first treated with the product and then fingerpads were inoculated with human norovirus immediately after or 4-hours post product exposure. To account for untreated fingerpads, two fingers of each hand (the thumb and the index fingers) were covered with finger cots prior to application of the sanitizer. Hand sanitizer (approx. 1 mL) was applied to clean hands and spread evenly until dried (less than one minute), followed by removal of the fingercots. Immediately or 4 hours after drying (in the latter case, the subjects worked in their normal job functions until the 4 hour time point was reached), the thumbpads were inoculated with 10  $\mu$ L of human norovirus and the virus immediately eluted (wet inoculum control). Thereafter, the three middle fingers of each hand were inoculated with virus suspension which was allowed to dry. Virus from these fingertips was then eluted as described above and served as dry inoculum control (index fingers) or treatment samples (other four middle fingers). The uninoculated pinkies served as negative controls, receiving sanitizer but no virus inoculum.

### *Quantification of virus*

Virus eluates were pre-treated with RNase and the RNA extracted using the automated NucliSENS® easyMag® system (bioMerieux, Durham, NC). Detection of residual norovirus was done using RT-qPCR targeting the ORF1-ORF2 GII junction, as previously reported.<sup>22,23</sup> Virus quantification was calculated by comparison to standard curve, and log<sub>10</sub> reductions by comparison to dry virus controls.<sup>22</sup>

### *Models for predicting momentary norovirus exposure, dose, and infection risk*



Models were utilized to estimate the infection risk for a single hand-to-nonporous fomite contact followed directly by a single hand-to-mouth contact. Uniform distributions, informed by the minimum and maximum  $\log_{10}$  reductions measured experimentally, were used to represent  $\log_{10}$  reductions in the simulation. An infection risk for a baseline scenario in which no hand sanitizer was applied was compared with scenarios in which either a non-residual (60% ethanol) or a residual (quaternary ammonium-based) hand sanitizer was applied. Infection risks were estimated for immediate kill (treatment time of 30 and 60-seconds) and residual kill (efficacy immediately post-application and four hours thereafter). The concentration on hands was reduced by a randomly selected  $\log_{10}$  reduction from uniform distributions informed by experimental data, described above. A low virus contamination and a high virus contamination scenario were modeled for each of the hand sanitizer application scenarios to evaluate the effect of environmental contamination magnitude on estimated infection risk. In the low contamination scenario, it was assumed that surface concentrations were equal to 0.01 viral particles/cm<sup>2</sup>, as this has been assumed in other quantitative microbial risk assessment (QMRA) studies to represent the limit of detection for norovirus on a fomite surface.<sup>3</sup> In the high contamination scenario, it was assumed that surface concentrations were equal to 537 viral particles/cm<sup>2</sup>, which corresponds to the largest concentration of norovirus (expressed as genome copies/cm<sup>2</sup>) quantified on surfaces in a houseboat norovirus outbreak.<sup>6</sup> Conservatively, it was assumed that genome copies as determined by RT-qPCR had a direct 1:1 correlation with infectious particles, as this has been recommended for norovirus quantitative microbial risk assessments.<sup>24</sup> The concentration on hands was first calculated:

$$C_{hand} = \frac{TE_{sh}(A_{contact})(C_{surface})}{10^{\log_{10}reduction}} \quad (1)$$

where  $C_{hand}$  = concentration on hand (viral particles)

$TE_{sh}$  = transfer efficiency of virus from surface to hand (fraction)

$A_{contact}$  = surface area of contact (cm<sup>2</sup>)

$C_{surface}$  = viral concentration on surface (viral particles/cm<sup>2</sup>)

$\log_{10}reduction$  = log<sub>10</sub> reduction corresponding to mean log reduction measured experimentally for that particular hand sanitizer application scenario.

To represent transfer efficiency of virus from the surface to the hand, a uniform distribution informed by the minimum and maximum transfer efficiencies quantified for MS2 for nonporous fomites under low relative humidity (15% to 32%) conditions was randomly sampled.<sup>25</sup> For the baseline scenario, log<sub>10</sub> reduction was set equal to 0. For all scenarios, the dose due to the single hand-to-mouth contact was then calculated:

$$Dose = TE_{hm}(C_{hand}) \quad (2)$$

where  $Dose$  = momentary dose from hand-to-mouth contact (viral particles)

$TE_{hm}$  = transfer efficiency of virus from hand to mouth (fraction)

$C_{hand}$  = concentration on hand due to the previous hand-to-surface contact (viral particles)

This equation assumes that the same surface area of the hand used for the hand-to-surface contact is then used for the hand-to-mouth contact. This removes the potential dilution effect that could occur if the number of particles transferred to the hand during the hand-to-surface contact was divided by the total hand surface area. Therefore, this is a worst-case scenario in which all of the virus transferred to the hand during the hand-to-surface contact is available for transfer to the mouth during the hand-to-mouth contact. To represent the fraction of transfer of virus from hand to mouth, a normal distribution with a mean informed by a virus hand-to-mouth transfer efficiency (0.339) and a standard deviation of 0.25, was randomly sampled and left- and right-truncated at 0 and 1, respectively.<sup>26–28</sup>

The infection risk resulting from this single dose was estimated using the fractional Poisson dose-response curve.<sup>24,29</sup> There is no single suggested dose-response curve for human norovirus<sup>24</sup> and one curve, rather than multiple, was utilized in this study so that any difference in infection risk was a function of the intervention efficacy and not of differences between curves. Infection risk was calculated using the following equation:

$$P(\text{infection}) = P \left( 1 - e^{-\frac{\text{Dose}}{\mu_a}} \right) \quad (3)$$

where  $P(\text{infection})$  = probability of infection

$P$  = fraction of susceptible individuals

$\text{Dose}$  = momentary dose from hand-to-mouth contact (viral particles) calculated with Equation 2

$\mu_a$  = mean aggregate size

This dose-response curve assumes aggregation of viral particles. Parameters for all equations are displayed in Table 1. Estimated infection risks were then compared to a risk target of  $1 \times 10^{-6}$  (1/1,000,000), as this risk target has been used in other QMRA studies in comparisons to estimated risks for single fomite contacts.<sup>3</sup> The model was run with 10,000 iterations per scenario.

### *Sensitivity Analysis*

To evaluate the influence of  $\log_{10}$  reduction variability and other model parameters on estimated dose, a sensitivity analysis was conducted. Spearman correlation coefficients were calculated to relate randomly selected  $\log_{10}$  reductions, surface-to-hand transfer efficiencies, and hand-to-mouth transfer efficiencies to estimated infection risk. To evaluate the influence of contact surface area, the assumed contact surface area was independently decreased and increased by 25% holding surface-to-hand transfer efficiency and hand-to-mouth transfer efficiency constant at 0.217 and 0.339, respectively. The estimated doses were then compared.

## Results

### *Hand Sanitizer Efficacies*

The data from the fingerpad studies were reported as  $\log_{10}$  reductions adjusted for dry controls for a 60% ethanol (non-residual) and a quaternary ammonium-based (residual) hand sanitizer. In the case of direct application of the product to contaminated hands (immediate kill) as evaluated by the ASTM E1838-10 fingerpad method,  $1.06 \pm 0.54$  and  $1.22 \pm 0.56 \log_{10}$  reductions in genomic copy number were observed after 30 second and 60 second contact times, respectively, for the 60% ethanol (non-residual hand sanitizer) (Table 2). The quaternary ammonium-containing product produced higher anti-noroviral efficacy,  $2.13 \pm 0.50$  and  $2.09 \pm 0.35 \log_{10}$  reductions after 30 seconds and 60 seconds, respectively (Table 2). Statistically significant differences ( $p < 0.05$ ) were observed when comparing the two hand sanitizer types, but not when comparing contact times for each sanitizer ( $p > 0.05$ ).

When fingerpads were inoculated with norovirus immediately after sanitizer application, some residual effect was observed for the quaternary ammonium-containing product. Specifically, there was a  $0.80 \pm 0.46 \log_{10}$  reduction in genomic copy number for the residual hand sanitizer and a  $0.02 \pm 0.13 \log_{10}$  reduction for the 60% ethanol ( $p < 0.05$ ) (Table 2). When fingerpads were challenged with norovirus inoculum 4 hours post-sanitizer application, the 60% ethanol and quaternary ammonium-containing product reduced norovirus concentrations by  $-0.08 \pm 0.11$  (essentially no reduction) and  $0.51 \pm 0.26 \log_{10}$  genomic copies, respectively (Table 2). This demonstrates that the quaternary ammonium compound produced some anti-noroviral residual activity post-application relative to 60% ethanol.

### *Infection Risk Reductions*

Under all scenarios, the residual hand sanitizer reduced baseline (no hand sanitizer) infection risks by >78.5% on average (Table 2). With a 30-second and 60-second contact time, the non-residual hand sanitizer reduced infection risks, but under dry and 4-hour scenarios, there was no effective reduction (Table 2). The infection risks estimated for the residual hand sanitizer were also less variable than those for the non-residual hand sanitizer (Figure 1). The residual hand sanitizer reduced infection risk on average by up to 99.1%, which was estimated for the 60-second contact time scenario under low contamination conditions (Table 2). Under high contamination conditions, the baseline infection risk ( $5.19 \times 10^{-2}$ ) and all non-residual and residual hand sanitizer scenario mean infection risks still exceeded a  $1 \times 10^{-6}$  risk target (Figure 1, Table 3). Under low contamination conditions, all mean infection risks, with the exception of those for the non-residual hand sanitizer four hours after application, were below a  $1 \times 10^{-6}$  risk target. However, the distributions of predicted infection risks suggest that variability of product efficacy may influence whether a risk target is consistently met or not, along with variability in transfer efficiency for hand-to-surface and hand-to-mouth contacts (Figure 1). For example, under low contamination conditions, the average estimated infection risk associated with virus challenge immediately after application of 60% ethanol (non-residual) was below a  $1 \times 10^{-6}$  risk target, although there were instances in which some estimated infection risks were larger than this number (Figure 1). Under the same low contamination conditions, the 60% ethanol treatment with four hour post-application virus exposure produced a mean infection risk above the  $1 \times 10^{-6}$  risk target, but individual infection risks were below this number on occasion (Figure 1).

#### *Dose Estimates*

The smallest estimated doses for both the residual and non-residual hand sanitizer were for scenarios in which there was low environmental contamination and 60 seconds of contact

time with the hand sanitizer. Estimated doses and the associated average infection risk for all low contamination scenarios, regardless of hand sanitizer type, were below the  $1 \times 10^{-6}$  risk target, with the exception of the 4-hour scenario for the non-residual hand sanitizer (Table 3). The largest estimated doses were for scenarios in which there was high environmental contamination and residual hand sanitizer had been present for 4 hours. Estimated doses for all high contamination scenarios regardless of hand sanitizer type, resulted in average infection risks above a  $1 \times 10^{-6}$  risk target (Table 3)

### *Sensitivity Analysis*

For intervention scenarios, virus  $\log_{10}$  reductions were positively correlated with reductions in infection risk (Spearman correlation coefficient -0.434). For all scenarios, surface-to-hand and hand-to-mouth transfer efficiencies were positively correlated with infection risk (0.156 and 0.161, respectively). Reducing or increasing contact area by 25% while holding transfer efficiencies constant had nominal impact on estimated dose. For example, decreasing and increasing contact area by 25% resulted in a change from  $1.47 \times 10^{-3}$  to  $1.10 \times 10^{-3}$  and from  $1.47 \times 10^{-3}$  to  $1.84 \times 10^{-3}$  for estimated dose under low contamination conditions, respectively. For high contamination conditions, decreasing or increasing contact area by 25% resulted in a change from  $7.90 \times 10^1$  to  $5.93 \times 10^1$  and from  $7.90 \times 10^1$  to  $9.88 \times 10^1$  for estimated dose, respectively.

## **Discussion**

### *Key Findings*

In all scenarios, the quaternary ammonium-containing hand sanitizer having residual activity out-performed the non-residual hand sanitizer in reducing norovirus concentrations on the hand and, therefore, reducing dose and infection risk (Tables 2, 3, 4, Figure 1). Utilizing

these experimental data in a QMRA modeling framework demonstrated a single application of a residual hand sanitizer with a 30- to 60-second contact time may reduce infection risk from a single fomite contact by approximately 98-99%, even under high contamination conditions representative of concentrations seen during outbreaks (Table 2). Highest infection risk reductions were observed for both hand sanitizers under a 60-second contact time (Table 2). Four hours after application, the residual hand sanitizer may have a protective effect providing 78.5% reduction in infection risk on average from single fomite contacts under high contamination conditions (Table 2). This study demonstrates the potential of residual hand sanitizers to reduce norovirus infection risks in single fomite contact scenarios, supporting future research in modeling the infection risk reduction benefits of residual hand sanitizers over the course of sequential contacts with surfaces.

### *Interpretation*

Because the fractional Poisson dose-response curve utilized in this study is non-linear, estimated risk reductions may be notably affected by the baseline infection risk. In this study, we addressed this issue by including two modeled scenarios: low and high contamination. While most of the mean infection risks for low contamination scenarios were below a  $1 \times 10^{-6}$  risk target, all of the mean infection risks for high contamination scenarios were above the  $1 \times 10^{-6}$  risk target (Table 3). This issue highlights the importance of the degree of environmental contamination to overall risk.

### *Generalizability*

Single fomite contacts have been used in other quantitative microbial risk assessment (QMRA) models to evaluate intervention efficacy.<sup>3,30</sup> Ryan et al. (2014) calculated infection risks from a single contact with a surface for a number of organisms, including norovirus. The

norovirus infection risk estimated by Ryan et al. (2014) for a single fomite contact,  $2.7 \times 10^{-3}$ , was much higher than the baseline infection risk estimated in this study,  $1.02 \times 10^{-6}$ , using the same norovirus concentration on surfaces (0.01 viral particles/cm<sup>2</sup>). However, the transfer efficiency used by Ryan et al. (2014) was 0.68, a maximum transfer efficiency for viruses among those reported in several studies used to inform a range of transfer efficiencies.<sup>3</sup> In this study, we used a uniform distribution with a maximum of 0.406, the largest transfer efficiency measured for MS2, an enteric virus surrogate, on nonporous surfaces under low relative humidity (15% to 32%) conditions.<sup>25</sup> Additionally, a different dose-response model was used to relate estimated doses to infection risk when comparing the two studies.

The effect of low versus high contamination conditions are compared in this study. Because this assumption can have an effect on estimated infection risks and whether or not a risk target has been met, varying levels of contamination should be explored to estimate reductions needed in different conditions to meet risk targets. In another QMRA study, the assumed proportion of “clean” (uncontaminated) surfaces had a large effect on estimated doses and therefore infection risks, and a range of proportions of clean surfaces was explored.<sup>31</sup> This study demonstrates the importance of addressing this effect either by including multiple scenarios describing different levels of contamination on surfaces or through a sensitivity analysis demonstrating its effect in a specific model.

### *Limitations*

Some variables in this model were provided as point estimates, such as contact area and the two concentrations explored for low and high contamination conditions, and only one dose-response curve was considered. While this was done to simplify the comparisons in infection risk reduction where differences would be due to differences in log<sub>10</sub> hand sanitizer reductions, this



model structure did not extensively explore variability and uncertainty, especially for the effects of larger ranges of norovirus surface concentrations on estimated dose and therefore infection risk. Further, while this study does elucidate potential differences in infection risk for a residual and non-residual hand sanitizer in environments with low and high levels of contamination, there is a lack of information as to how these momentary risk reductions contribute to cumulative risk mitigation over many contacts with surfaces. In reality, a single hand-to-fomite contact followed by a single hand-to-mouth contact is rarely the case, rather multiple hand-to-fomite contacts may be made before a single hand-to-mouth contact. While the frequency of micro-activities, or second-by-second behaviors, for hand-to-fomite and hand-to-mouth contacts have been described,<sup>32-34</sup> little is known about the variability in the sequences of these contacts and the effects of subsequent contacts on microbial transfer. Little is also known about whether differences in contact sequences make a notable difference in estimated infection risk. More empirical micro-activity data and their quantified relationships with infection risks are needed to inform QMRA models.

In this study, the efficacy of the hand sanitizers was measured experimentally using the fingerpad method, with modifications. This method is well standardized and widely used, however does not necessarily mimic product use exactly as performed by the consumer. Nonetheless, it was the only experimental design possible given the limited supply of human norovirus and the need to use a protocol in which thorough hand decontamination could be assured. In addition, product efficacy was measured during only the first exposure to norovirus after hand sanitizer application and for a small sample size ( $n \leq 6$ ) of participants. Future studies should explore product efficacy over multiple exposures and times, and for a larger group of people. Information such as this will likely show greater variability associated with human

behavior, perhaps impacting the degree of residual effects. It could also provide useful information to inform recommended reapplication times. In order to take this approach, further data would be required quantitatively describing the removal of hand sanitizer residue per contact with a surface, how surface type affects the removal of hand sanitizer residue, and the cumulative  $\log_{10}$  reduction over time from the moment of hand sanitizer application. With these type of data, a more complex model accounting for multiple contacts could be utilized to estimate beyond a momentary infection risk scenario.

## **Conclusions**

This study demonstrates the potential benefit of residual hand sanitizers in reducing norovirus infection risks from single fomite contacts in low and highly contaminated environments for up to 4 hours. Further studies are needed to quantify the  $\log_{10}$  reductions in norovirus due to residual hand sanitizers during repetitive contacts with contaminated surfaces in addition to effects over variable times to inform future QMRAs.

## **Acknowledgements**

The authors thank Jonathan D. Sexton, PhD for his advice in deciding upon methods for the equation extension portion of this study. This research was supported by an unrestricted educational grant from ZoonoUSA.

## **References**

1. Boone SA, Gerba CP. Significance of fomites in the spread of respiratory and enteric viral disease. *Appl Environ Microbiol.* 2007;73(6):1687-1696. doi:10.1128/AEM.02051-06
2. Abad FX, Pinto RM, Bosch A. Survival of enteric viruses. *Appl Environ Microbiol.* 1994;60(10):3704-3710.
3. Ryan MO, Haas CN, Gurian PL, Gerba CP, Panzl BM, Rose JB. Application of

quantitative microbial risk assessment for selection of microbial reduction targets for hard surface disinfectants. *Am J Infect Control*. 2014;42(11):1165-1172.

doi:10.1016/j.ajic.2014.07.024

4. Repp KK, Keene WE. A point-source norovirus outbreak caused by exposure to fomites. *J Infect Dis*. 2012;205(11):1639-1641. doi:10.1093/infdis/jis250
5. Matthews JE, Dickey BW, Miller RD, et al. The epidemiology of published norovirus outbreaks: a systematic review of risk factors associated with attack rate and genogroup. *Epidemiol Infect*. 2012;140(7):1161-1172. doi:10.1017/S0950268812000234
6. Canales RA, Reynolds KA, Wilson AM, et al. Modeling the role of fomites in a norovirus outbreak. *J Occup Environ Hyg*. 2019;16(1):16-26. doi:10.1080/15459624.2018.1531131
7. Assab R, Temime L. The role of hand hygiene in controlling norovirus spread in nursing homes. *BMC Infect Dis*. 2016;16(1):1-10. doi:10.1186/s12879-016-1702-0
8. Aziz A-M. Managing outbreaks of norovirus in an NHS hospital. *Br J Nurs*. 2010;19(9):589-596. doi:10.12968/bjon.2010.19.9.48065
9. Park GW, Williamson KJ, Debess E, et al. High hand contamination rates during norovirus outbreaks in long-term care facilities. *Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol*. 2018;39(2):219-221. doi:10.1017/ice.2017.274
10. Kampf G. Efficacy of ethanol against viruses in hand disinfection. *J Hosp Infect*. 2018;98(4):331-338. doi:10.1016/j.jhin.2017.08.025
11. Maccannell T, Umscheid CA, Agarwal RK, et al. *Guideline for the Prevention and Control of Norovirus Healthcare Infection Control Practices Advisory Committee (HICPAC)*.; 2011.
12. Maliekal M, Hemvani N, Ukande U. Comparison of traditional hand wash with alcoholic

- hand rub in ICU setup. *Indian J Crit Care Med.* 2005;9(3):141. doi:10.4103/0972-5229.19679
13. Girou E, Loyeau S, Legrand P, Oppein F, Brun-Buisson C. Efficacy of handrubbing with alcohol based solution versus standard handwashing with antiseptic soap: randomised clinical trial. *BMJ.* 2002;325(7360):362-362. doi:10.1136/bmj.325.7360.362
  14. Savolainen-Kopra C, Korpela T, Simonen-Tikka ML, et al. Single treatment with ethanol hand rub is ineffective against human rhinovirus - Hand washing with soap and water removes the virus efficiently. *J Med Virol.* 2012;84(3):543-547. doi:10.1002/jmv
  15. Kampf G. Efficacy of ethanol against viruses in hand disinfection. *J Hosp Infect.* 2018;98(4):331-338. doi:10.1016/j.jhin.2017.08.025
  16. Widmer AF. Replace hand washing with use of a waterless alcohol hand rub ? *Clin Infect Dis.* 2011;31(1):136-143. doi:10.1086/313888
  17. Jeffrey DJ. Chemicals used as disinfectants: active ingredients and enhancing additives. *Rev Sci Tech l'OIE.* 2016;14(1):57-74. doi:10.20506/rst.14.1.828
  18. Gerba CP. Quaternary ammonium biocides: Efficacy in application. *Appl Environ Microbiol.* 2015;81(2):464-469. doi:10.1128/AEM.02633-14
  19. Foddai ACG, Grant IR, Dean M. Efficacy of instant hand sanitizers against foodborne pathogens compared with hand washing with soap and water in food preparation settings: A systematic review. *J Food Prot.* 2016;79(6):1040-1054. doi:10.4315/0362-028X.JFP-15-492
  20. Escudero-Abarca B, Goulter R, Jaykus L-A. Evaluation of a hand sanitizer for evidence of residual activity against Norovirus. *Int Assoc Food Prot.* 2018:P1-104.
  21. ASTM International. Standard test method for determining the virus-eliminating

- effectiveness of hygienic handwash and handrub agents using the fingerpads of adults. 2010.
22. Manuel CS, Moore MD, Jaykus LA. Destruction of the capsid and genome of GII.4 human norovirus occurs during exposure to metal alloys containing copper. *Appl Environ Microbiol.* 2015;81(15):4940-4946. doi:10.1128/aem.00388-15
  23. Jothikumar N, Lowther JA, Henshilwood K, Lees DN, Hill VR, Vinjé J. Rapid and sensitive detection of noroviruses by using TaqMan-based one-step reverse transcription-PCR assays and application to naturally contaminated shellfish samples. *Appl Environ Microbiol.* 2005;71(4):1870-1875. doi:10.1128/AEM.71.4.1870
  24. Van Abel N, Schoen ME, Kissel JC, Meschke JS. Comparison of risk predicted by multiple norovirus dose–response models and implications for quantitative microbial risk assessment. *Risk Anal.* 2016;37(2):245-264. doi:10.1111/risa.12616
  25. Lopez GU, Gerba CP, Tamimi AH, Kitajima M, Maxwell SL, Rose JB. Transfer efficiency of bacteria and viruses from porous and nonporous fomites to fingers under different relative humidity. *Appl Environ Microbiol.* 2013;79(18):5728-5734. doi:10.1128/AEM.01030-13
  26. Julian TR, Canales RA, Leckie JO, Boehm AB. A model of exposure to rotavirus from nondietary ingestion iterated by simulated intermittent contacts. *Risk Anal.* 2009;29(5):617-632.
  27. Julian TR, Canales RA, Leckie JO, Boehm AB. Erratum to “A model of exposure to rotavirus from nondietary ingestion iterated by simulated intermittent contacts.” By T.R. Julian, R.A. Canales, J.O. Leckie, and A.B. Boehm, in *Risk Analysis*, 29(5):617–622. *Risk Anal.* 2017;37(8):1628-1628. doi:10.1111/risa.12885

28. Rusin P, Maxwell S, Gerba C. Comparative surface-to-hand and fingertip-to-mouth transfer efficiency of gram-positive bacteria, gram-negative bacteria, and phage. *J Appl Microbiol.* 2002;93(4):585-592.
29. Messner MJ, Berger P, Nappier SP. Fractional poisson - A simple dose-response model for human norovirus. *Risk Anal.* 2014;34(10):1820-1829. doi:10.1111/risa.12207
30. Wilson AM, Reynolds KA, Sexton JD, Canales RA. Modeling surface disinfection needs to meet microbial risk reduction targets. *Appl Environ Microbiol.* 2018;84(18):1-9.
31. Canales RA, Wilson AM, Sinclair RG, et al. Microbial study of household hygiene conditions and associated *Listeria monocytogenes* infection risks for Peruvian women. *Trop Med Int Heal.* 2019. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1111/tmi.13246>
32. AuYeung W, Canales RA, Beamer P, Ferguson AC, Leckie JO. Young children's hand contact activities: An observational study via videotaping in primarily outdoor residential settings. *J Expo Sci Environ Epidemiol.* 2006;16(5):434-446. doi:10.1038/sj.jes.7500480
33. Beamer PI, Luik CE, Canales RA, Leckie JO. Quantified outdoor micro-activity data for children aged 7 – 12-years old. *J Expo Sci Environ Epidemiol.* 2012;22(1):82-92. doi:10.1038/jes.2011.34
34. Nicas M, Best D. A study quantifying the hand-to-face contact rate and its potential application to predicting respiratory tract infection. *J Occup Environ Hyg.* 2008;5(6):347-352. doi:10.1080/15459620802003896

**Table 1.** Model parameters

Parameter		Variable	Unit	Point Value/Distribution	Source
Transfer efficiency	Surface-to-hand	$TE_{sh}$	Fraction	Uniform (min=0.01, max=0.406)	25
	Hand-to-mouth	$TE_{hm}$	Fraction	Normal* (mean=0.339, SD=0.25)	26-28
Surface concentration	Low contamination scenario	$C_{surface}$	Viral particles/cm <sup>2</sup>	0.01	3
	High contamination scenario		Viral particles/cm <sup>2</sup>	537.25	6
Contact surface area		$A_{contact}$	cm <sup>2</sup>	2	34
Log <sub>10</sub> reduction		$log_{10}reduction$	-	30-second, Non-residual Uniform: (min=0.15, max=1.89)	This study
				30-second, Residual Uniform: (min=1.32, max=2.94)	
				60-second, Non-residual Uniform: (min=0.19, max=2.07)	
				60-second, Residual Uniform: (min=1.56, max=2.72)	
				Dry, Non-residual Uniform: (min=0.12, 0.28)	
				Dry, Residual Uniform: (min=0.20, max=1.76)	
				4-hour, Non-residual Uniform: (min=-0.23, max=0.07)	
				4-hour Residual Uniform: (min=0.33, max=1.17)	
Dose-response curve		$P$	fraction	0.722	

	$\mu_a$	Mean aggregate size	1106	24,29
--	---------	---------------------	------	-------


\*Left-truncated at 0 and right-truncated at 1

**Table 2.** Experimentally quantified mean log<sub>10</sub> reductions adjusted for dry controls for 60% ethanol (non-residual) and a quaternary ammonium based (residual) hand sanitizer and estimated mean percent infection risk reductions compared to baseline (no hand sanitizer) for low and high virus contamination scenarios

Hand Sanitizer Type	Log <sub>10</sub> Reductions									
	30-Second		60-Second		Dry*		4-Hour			
	Mean ± SD	Min, Max	Mean ± SD	Min, Max	Mean ± SD	Min, Max	Mean ± SD	Min, Max	Mean ± SD	Min, Max
Non-residual	1.06 ± 0.54 (n=10)	0.15, 1.89	1.22 ± 0.56 (n=10)	0.19, 2.07	0.02 ± 0.13 (n=5)	-0.12, 0.28	-0.08 ± 0.11 (n=5)	-0.23, 0.07		
Residual	2.13 ± 0.50 (n=6)	1.32, 2.94	2.09 ± 0.35 (n=6)	1.56, 2.72	0.80 ± 0.46 (n=5)	0.20, 1.76	0.51 ± 0.26 (n=5)	0.33, 1.17		
Infection Risk Reductions (%)										
Hand Sanitizer Type	30-Second		60-Second		Dry*		4-Hour			
	Low	High	Low	High	Low	High	Low	High	Low	High
Non-residual	82.7 ± 18.0	82.2 ± 18.3	85.0 ± 16.5	85.0 ± 16.5	13.8 ± 22.8	13.8 ± 22.0	-22.6 ± 24.1	-21.9 ± 23.1		
Residual	98.7 ± 1.2	98.7 ± 1.3	99.1 ± 0.7	99.0 ± 0.7	82.8 ± 16.1	82.1 ± 16.8	79.3 ± 11.2	78.5 ± 11.6		

\*virus was applied after the hand sanitizers had dried





**Intervention**  **Non-residual**  **Residual**

**Figure 1.** Comparison of estimated infection risk distributions for a 60% ethanol (non-residual) and a quaternary ammonium based (residual) hand sanitizer under four conditions: 30-second and 60-second product contact time, 4-hr post-drying, and immediately after drying with low and high environmental contamination conditions where the red dotted line indicates a 1/1,000,000 infection risk target

**Table 3.** Comparisons of mean estimated virus concentration on hands, dose, and infection risk\*

Concentration on Hands											
	Baseline	30-Second Scenario		60-Second Scenario		Dry Scenario		4-Hour Scenario			
		Non-residual	Residual	Non-residual	Residual	Non-residual	Residual	Non-residual	Residual		
Low contamination	$4.15 \times 10^{-3}$	$7.16 \times 10^{-4}$	$5.32 \times 10^{-5}$	$6.22 \times 10^{-4}$	$3.97 \times 10^{-5}$	$3.59 \times 10^{-3}$	$7.13 \times 10^{-4}$	$5.09 \times 10^{-3}$	$8.64 \times 10^{-4}$		
High contamination	$2.23 \times 10^2$	$3.88 \times 10^1$	$2.81 \times 10^0$	$3.23 \times 10^1$	$2.14 \times 10^0$	$1.91 \times 10^2$	$3.90 \times 10^1$	$2.74 \times 10^2$	$4.67 \times 10^1$		
Dose											
	Baseline	30-Second Scenario		60-Second Scenario		Dry Scenario		4-Hour Scenario			
		Non-residual	Residual	Non-residual	Residual	Non-residual	Residual	Non-residual	Residual		
Low contamination	$1.56 \times 10^{-3}$	$2.72 \times 10^{-4}$	$2.01 \times 10^{-5}$	$2.34 \times 10^{-4}$	$1.49 \times 10^{-5}$	$1.35 \times 10^{-3}$	$2.68 \times 10^{-4}$	$1.92 \times 10^{-3}$	$3.27 \times 10^{-4}$		
High contamination	$8.47 \times 10^1$	$1.47 \times 10^1$	$1.08 \times 10^0$	$1.22 \times 10^1$	$8.12 \times 10^{-1}$	$7.29 \times 10^1$	$1.48 \times 10^1$	$1.04 \times 10^2$	$1.79 \times 10^1$		
Norovirus Infection Risk											
	Baseline	30-Second Scenario		60-Second Scenario		Dry Scenario		4-Hour Scenario			
		Non-residual	Residual	Non-residual	Residual	Non-residual	Residual	Non-residual	Residual		
Low contamination	$1.02 \times 10^{-6}$	$1.77 \times 10^{-7}$	$1.31 \times 10^{-8}$	$1.53 \times 10^{-7}$	$9.72 \times 10^{-9}$	$8.79 \times 10^{-7}$	$1.75 \times 10^{-7}$	$1.25 \times 10^{-6}$	$2.13 \times 10^{-7}$		
High contamination	<b><math>5.19 \times 10^{-2}</math></b>	<b><math>9.37 \times 10^{-3}</math></b>	<b><math>7.03 \times 10^{-4}</math></b>	<b><math>7.80 \times 10^{-3}</math></b>	<b><math>5.30 \times 10^{-4}</math></b>	<b><math>4.53 \times 10^{-2}</math></b>	<b><math>9.45 \times 10^{-3}</math></b>	<b><math>6.28 \times 10^{-2}</math></b>	<b><math>1.14 \times 10^{-2}</math></b>		

\* Bolded values indicate a  $1 \times 10^{-6}$  (1/1,000,000) risk target is not met. There were 10,000 iterations for each scenario.