

PROJECT TITLE:

## STRUCTURED ABSTRACT

**Purpose:** To evaluate the effectiveness of control measures during long-term care outbreaks of norovirus (NoV) in long-term care facilities (LTCFs).

**Scope:** Long-term care facilities (LTCFs) who are affected by NoV outbreaks.

**Methods:** Epidemiological and laboratory studies were employed to complete four aims – (1) quantify the extent of NoV dispersion; (2) measure dispersion of vomitus into the environment; (3) evaluate the effectiveness of hydrogen peroxide-based disinfectants; and (4) determine norovirus persistence in the environment.

**Results:** Two epidemiological studies support control measures that limit exposure to vomitus during HuNoV outbreaks in long-term care facilities. The average extent of two-d dispersion of simulated vomitus was 44.8 m<sup>2</sup>, spanning a width of 3.6 m and a length of 7.7 m from the source. Hydrogen peroxide-based disinfectants can serve as an effective control measure.

## PURPOSE

Human norovirus (HuNoV) is the leading cause of acute gastroenteritis outbreaks in the United States. Long-term care facilities (LTCFs), home for nearly 2.5 million people, mostly older adults, are the most common setting for such outbreaks. Epidemiologic studies have identified vomiting, which occurs among more than 50% of symptomatic norovirus cases, to be a strong risk factor for norovirus transmission. Vomitus can contain over 30,000,000 million viral particles per vomitus event resulting in contamination of environmental surfaces via aerosolization and/or improper clean up. Vomitus clean-up guidelines are available but the evidence base informing procedures is limited resulting in procedural steps insufficiently detailed (e.g., radius of clean up and disinfection procedures for porous surfaces, such as carpet). This lack of detail could result in multiple interpretations of how to execute a clean-up step possibly resulting in the ineffective removal of HuNoV. In this multidisciplinary study, we conducted translational research to fill key knowledge gaps impeding development of detailed infection control procedures for vomitus. Sp

•š]u što < μ š [Ç ]v ]À] μ]v( }š]v in order to AE u]v š Z š]]vš Œ ] μ  
À}u]š]vPU ] ŒŒZ U v •š]vPš} Œ••]v(v šš]À)μ•X ••X A••} ] š}}v•  
• Z Œ Œš]•š] • v Ziš]ue šμ•]v Rμ o š]À Œ} P e r t i d e x m o d e l w i t h  
]v Œ• À Œ] v Á ]PZš]vPX

Aim 2: D •μŒ ]•% Œ•}}v }( À}u]šμ• ]vš} šZ v À]Œ e r i e s o f v š X A s c o p i n g r e  
Œ Œ]u v š o •]uμ o š}}v• Á Œ }v μ š š} m e a s u r e t h e d i s p e r s i o n o f v o m i t u s i n t o  
environment. First, a scoping literature review was conducted to describe the extent of  
knowledge related to the two research questions: (1) What are the determinants of post-  
doffing contamination? (2) Where is post-doffing contamination most likely to occur after PPE  
doffing? Two databases were searched (PubMed and sciVerse Scopus), v search term and  
inclusion criteria Á Œ d e f i n e d . D a t a e x t r a c t i o n w a s b a s e d o n t h e m a t r i x m e t h o d , w i t h  
templates constructed in in Microsoft Excel. Extraction was performed by one investigator U v  
a second investigator review š Z f i n d i n g s . }v U v Œ Œ% v š o •]uμ o š}}v •šμ Ç Á  
% Œ ( ) Œ u šš] ( Ç š Z u P v ]šμ v Œ š v š } ( v š ] Œ ] u v u š y š o } v š u  
À}u]š]vP ]v } Œ Œ Œ š }% š ] Œ o ( ) Œ o ( š v Œ P Á }u]šμ• Á v š . T h e ]•% Œ  
{ ( G μ } Œ c o n t a i n i n g s i m u l a t e d v o m i t u s w a s m e a s u r e d o n s u r f a c e s a n d i n a i r u s i n g a l i f e -  
•]i À}u]š]vP •]uμ o š}Œ X & }μ Œ Œ% Œ]u v š o À}u]š]v(P š}Œ• o  
]•% Œ•}}v - h e a d U À}u]šμ•i Á š]μ u % Œ ••μ Œ U v À}u]šμ• Á ]• }•]š  
tested using a blocked randomized design. Fluorescein was measured on 36- G } } Œ • Œ% o v  
Á]šZ ( ) μ Œ ] Œ • u % o Œ • X

Aim 3: š Œ u]v šZ 8 Ç } ( Œ } -•% š Œ μ u ]•]v( Z š ] } v Ç •š Œ š P ]  
of chemical- and non-chemical- • ]•]v( š}}v •š Œ š P ] e d a c t e d u s i n g e  
two norovirus surrogates and X ] 8 ] o e . E ] v ]•]v( š v š • ] v š ] . ( Œ } u > ]•š '   
Regist Œ v š]u] Œ } ] o W Œ } μ š • + š]À P ]v•š E n } Œ } Á ] Œ μ • Á Œ  
calicivirus (FCV), tulane virus (TuV), and o }•š Œ ] ] } ] • ] 8 ] o e n d o s p o r e s i n s u s p e n s i o n o n  
stainless- •š o • μ Œ v ( Œ% š X ]š}}v o o Ç U •š 2 w e r e e x p l o r e d a s v % Z } š } c  
o š Œ v š]À • š } Z u ] o ]•]v( š v š • ( ) Œ • μ Œ ( 8 ]•]v μ • [š]}v X / v  
Á • . v Œ - o } P Œ μ š}}v } ( & s v Œ o ] B e n e f i t s o f s u r f a c e h a r d U  
nonporous surfaces. As EPA does not recognize TuV as a target agent, 'e 8 ] } μ • [ Á • . v  
as a 3- o } P Œ } μ } š ] P v Œ o Á ] Œ First, suspension tests were conducted to  
screen disinfectants against FCV, TuV, and X ] 8 ] e n d o s p o r e s . N e x t , a c a r r i e r t e s t o n  
stainless steel was conducted š } } v . Œ u 8 Ç } v v } v % } Œ } μ • Z v Œ o t o Q Œ ( • X  
nylon carpets constructed with water-permeable or water % Œ } } . v P ] ] v P • ( ) Œ š Z Œ %  
were tested ( ) Œ ] + Œ v v 8 A l l Œ r e s u l t s f r o m t h e s u s p e n s i o n a n d s t a i n l e s s s t e e l c a r r i e r  
testto.776 0 Td -0.084ad89011(te)0Tc <01C80301182.83<3015Aai96n8w (.)Tjd susp(st)Tj0.024 Tc -0.0369ia(nyl



1 v ( š ]

2.5 log-CE ř]]v }( & s v dμs }v šZ vÇo}v CE% š Á]šZ Á š CE%CE }  
CE •%o]Àr orÇ Z]PZ CE 8 Ç šZ v }v šZ permeCE%backing}(š.Z-aÁ š CE  
1.1- CE ř]]v U CE]À%o Ç•X

]u ðX š CEu]v v}CE}À]CE μ•v%o]CE}•v]u šv š X Results: During previous  
experiments, š CDC had shown that two hydrogen peroxiderebased products (Virasept and  
KÆ]À]CE d • CE μšÀ]ššZ }(|v|šZ & s ~EñsX+H}P š CE) P•u]vμš • }(  
}vš šřu }v •š ]vo •CE CEš] CE•X /v šZ]• }š μCEU ššZ š šZ u] }v  
}oμuv• P o šp}šCEu šZ `yQBV\$}Àv†D CE% š Á]šZ Á a}P 9!!c#, ñ @ àPœ'A/

**Table 1.** Concentration Reduction of Feline calicivirus (FCV) and Tulane virus (TuV) on stainless steel surfaces by various disinfectants.

Disinfectant	Active ingredient	Concentration Reduction					
		TuV		FCV		X	
		Suspension	Steel	Suspension	Steel	Suspension	Steel
A	0.5 % Hydrogen peroxide	3.8±0.6 <sup>AB</sup>	0.8	5.1±0.6 <sup>A</sup>	>5.1 <sup>A</sup>	>6.0 <sup>A</sup>	3.4±0.4 <sup>B</sup>
B	0.88 % Hydrogen peroxide	3.4±0.7 <sup>AB</sup>	1.1	4.1±1.4 <sup>AB</sup>	>5.1 <sup>A</sup>	0.1±0.1 <sup>B</sup>	0.2±0.1 <sup>D</sup>
C	1.4 % Hydrogen peroxide	3.8±0.8 <sup>A</sup>	2.4	5.0±0.4 <sup>A</sup>	>5.1 <sup>A</sup>	1.4±0.1 <sup>C</sup>	1.0±0.3 <sup>CD</sup>
D	3.13 % Hydrogen peroxide/0.05 % Peracetic acid	3.9±0.5 <sup>A</sup>	>3.1	>5.4 <sup>A</sup>	>5.1 <sup>A</sup>	>6.0 <sup>A</sup>	>6.0 <sup>A</sup>
E	5 % Hydrogen peroxide/0.01 % Silver	2.5±0.0 <sup>B</sup>	0.8	2.7±0.2 <sup>B</sup>	2.2±0.7 <sup>C</sup>	1.3±0.2 <sup>C</sup>	1.3±0.1 <sup>C</sup>
F	Citric acid/Silver	0.2±0.2 <sup>C</sup>	1.0	2.2±0.2 <sup>B</sup>	>5.1 <sup>A</sup>	0.0±0.1 <sup>B</sup>	0.1±0.2 <sup>D</sup>
G	Chlorine dioxide/QACs/	1.8±0.8 <sup>B</sup>	0.9	0.3±0.1 <sup>C</sup>	0.2±0.2 <sup>B</sup>	0.4±0.3 <sup>B</sup>	0.4±0.3 <sup>D</sup>
H	QACs/Ethanol/Isopropanol	3.8±0.6 <sup>AB</sup>	1.0	1.9±1.3 <sup>B</sup>	>5.1 <sup>A</sup>	0.4±0.4 <sup>B</sup>	0.3±0.2 <sup>D</sup>
I	Ethyl and isopropyl alcohols	4.3±0.2 <sup>A</sup>	1.9	5.2±0.8 <sup>A</sup>	>5.1 <sup>A</sup>	0.0±0.1 <sup>B</sup>	0.1±0.1 <sup>D</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Contact time for the reduction of endospores was 10 min in suspension and on stainless steel. The concentration reduction was determined by the number of viable virus particles remaining after treatment. The data are presented as mean ± standard deviation. Letters above the values indicate statistical significance (p < 0.05) by Tukey's test.





**Table 4.** Reduction of Feline calicivirus (FCV), Tulane virus (TuV), and X-1809 virus on Amicon column units

Microorganism	Surface	Lighting	Reduction (logs) <sup>a</sup>	
			60 min	120 min
FCV	Stainless steel	Controlled light	>5.3	n.a.
	Stainless steel	Indoor lighting	2.4±0.3	4.3±0.2
	Color Accent® (water-permeable)	Controlled light	1.3±0.3	n.a.
	Highlight® (waterproof)	Controlled light	2.9±0.5	n.a.
TuV	Stainless steel	Controlled light	3.3±0.3	n.a.
	Stainless steel	Indoor Lighting	0.8±0.1	1.4±0.1
	Color Accent® (water-permeable)	Controlled light	1.1±0.5	n.a.
	Highlight® (waterproof)	Controlled light	2.5±0.7	n.a.
X-1809	Stainless steel	Controlled light	0.0±0.1	0.5±0.2
	Color Accent® (water-permeable)	Controlled light	n.a.	0.3±0.2
	Highlight® (waterproof)	Controlled light	n.a.	0.3±0.2

<sup>a</sup> The reduction of virus titer was determined by plaque assay. "n.a." indicates data not available.

**Table 5.** Viral recovery of Feline calicivirus (FCV) and Tulane virus (TuV) on Amicon column units

Table 6

## List of Publications and Products Use

Paul P, Marsh Z, Hall AJ, Lopman BA. Quantifying the roles of vomiting, diarrhea, and residents vs. staff in norovirus transmission in U.S. nursing home outbreaks. *PLoS Comput Biol.* 2020 Mar 25;16(3):e1007271.

Chen Y, Lopman BA, Hall AJ, Kambhampati AK, Roberts L, Mason J, Vilen K, Salehi E, Fraser A, Adams C. Factors driving norovirus transmission in long-term care facilities: A case-level analysis of 10 outbreaks. *PLoS One.* 2015;10(12):e0150586. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0150586