Efficacy of anti-microbial gel vapours against aerosolised coronavirus, bacteria, and fungi

Parthasarathi Kalaiselvan, Muhammad Yasir, Mark Willcox, Ajay Kumar Vijay

School of Optometry and Vision Science, The University of New South Wales, Sydney, NSW 2052, Australia

Corresponding author:

Dr Ajay Kumar Vijay
School of Optometry and Vision Science
The University of New South Wales
Level 3, Rupert Myers Building (North Wing)
Gate 14 Barker Street
Kensington
NSW 2052
Australia
Tel: +612 93854503
Email: v.ajaykumar@unsw.edu.au

Running Title: Antimicrobial vapours for microbial aerosols

Keywords: Aerosol, Coronavirus, SARS-CoV-2, Indoor Air, Antimicrobial, Essential oils

Declaration of Interest: None

SUMMARY:

Background: The urban population spends up to 90% of their time indoors. The indoor environment harbours a diverse microbial population including viruses, bacteria, and fungi. Pathogens present in the indoor environment can be transmitted to humans through aerosols.

Aim: This study evaluated the efficacy of an antimicrobial gel containing a mix of essential oils against aerosols of bacteria, fungi, and coronavirus.

Methods: The antimicrobial gel was allowed to vapourize inside a glass chamber for 10 or 20 minutes. Microbial aerosols of *Escherichia coli*, *Aspergillus flavus* spores or murine hepatitis virus MHV 1, a surrogate of SARS CoV-2 was passed through the gel vapours and then collected on a 6-stage Andersen sampler. The number of viable microbes present in the aerosols collected in the different stages were enumerated and compared to number of viable microbes in control microbial aerosols that were not exposed to the gel vapours.

Results: Vaporizing the antimicrobial gel for 10 and 20 minutes resulted in a 48% ($p = 0.002$ Vs. control) and 53% ($p = 0.001$ Vs. control) reduction in the number of MHV-1 in the aerosols, respectively. The antimicrobial gel vaporised for 10 minutes, reduced the

number of viable *E. coli* by 51% ($p = 0.032$ Vs. control) and *Aspergillus flavus* spores by 72% ($p=0.008$ Vs. control) in the aerosols.

Conclusions: The antimicrobial gel may be able to reduce aerosol transmission of microbes.

Keywords: Aerosol, Coronavirus, SARS-CoV-2, Indoor Air, Antimicrobial, Essential oils

INTRODUCTION

1 The majority of the urban population spend up to 90% of their time indoors [1, 2]. The
2 indoor environment harbours a diverse microbial population including viruses, bacteria,
3 fungi and protozoa [3-6] that is referred to as the indoor microbiome. A major
4 component of indoor microbiome are endogenous microbes shed by human and
5 animal occupants with a minor constituent being the transient microbiota of external
6 environment transported inside [7]. Additional sources that can contribute to the indoor
7 microbiome include water from indoor plumbing such as toilets and showers, soil,
8 heating, and ventilation systems such as air-conditioning systems [4, 8-12]

9 Human exposure to the indoor microbiome has been recognised as a factor for the
10 development of respiratory diseases and allergies. Pathogens present in the indoor
11 microbiome can be transmitted to humans either through aerosols or from
12 contaminated surfaces. Key pathogens that are transmitted through aerosols include
13 the bacteria *Staphylococcus aureus* [13], *Mycobacterium tuberculosis* [14], the fungus
14 *Aspergillus fumigatus* [15], and the viruses Influenza virus, Ebola and SARS-CoV [16].

15 While there was considerable speculation regarding the aerosol transmission of the
16 SARS-CoV-2 virus [17, 18], current data confirms aerosol transmission of this virus [19,
17 20].

18 Hospitals and food industries use UV-C irradiation, plasma air ionization and fumigation
19 with disinfectants to reduce air borne pathogens in the indoor air [21, 22]. However,
20 these strategies are expensive and may not be suitable in domestic settings. Portable
21 indoor air cleaners/purifiers with HEPA filters are effective in reducing the microbial
22 concentration in aerosols including SARS-CoV-2 in classrooms, offices, and hospitals
23 [23-25]. Vapours of essential oils have good antimicrobial activity against respiratory
24 pathogens [26, 27] and offer an alternative strategy for disinfecting the indoor air [28-
25 30]. The vapours when dispersed in the air can significantly reduce the microbial levels
26 indoors [31-33]. In this study we evaluated the antimicrobial efficacy of an antimicrobial
27 gel containing a proprietary mix of essential oils for its activity against pathogenic
28 bacteria, fungi, and a coronavirus surrogate of SARS-CoV-2.

29

30 MATERIALS AND METHODS

31 Microorganisms and their preparation

32 The mouse hepatitis virus (MHV-1) ATCC/VR261 is an enveloped single-strand RNA
33 virus and an accepted surrogate of the SAR-CoV-2 virus. Viral stock was prepared by
34 growing in A9 mouse fibroblast cells (ATCC/CCL 1.4) in Dulbecco's minimum essential
35 medium (DMEM, Thermofisher, Macquarie Park, NSW, Australia) containing 10%
36 foetal bovine serum (FBS; Thermofisher), 100 µg/ml streptomycin sulphate and 100
37 I.U. penicillin G, (Thermofisher). Viral titres (1.0×10^5 to 1.0×10^6 plaque forming units
38 (PFU)/mL) were determined by plaque assay as described below.

39 *Escherichia coli* K12 (ATCC 10798) was grown overnight in tryptic soy broth (TSB; BD,
40 Sydney, NSW, Australia) to mid-log phase. Following incubation, bacterial cells were
41 collected by centrifuging and were washed once with phosphate buffer saline (PBS;
42 NaCl 8 g/L, KCl 0.2g/L, Na_2HPO_4 1.15 g/L, KH_2PO_4 0.2 g/L, pH 7.4). Following
43 washing, cells were re-suspended in PBS and the concentration adjusted
44 spectrophotometrically to an optical density of 0.1 at 660 nm which yielded $1.0 \times$
45 10^8 colony forming units (CFU/mL) upon retrospective agar plate counts, then further
46 serially diluted to a final concentration of 1.0×10^4 CFU/mL.

47 The spores of *Aspergillus flavus* ATCC 9643 were produced by growth on Sabouraud
48 dextrose agar (SDA; Thermofisher) for 10 days at 25°C. The fungal growth was
49 suspended in sterile deionized water and filtered through sterile 70 µm filters to remove
50 hyphal fragments. Spores were resuspended in sterile deionized water and their
51 concentration adjusted spectrophotometrically to an optical density of 0.2 at 660 nm
52 which yielded 1.0×10^6 CFU/mL, which were then serially diluted to a final
53 concentration of 1.0×10^4 CFU/mL.

54 **Antimicrobial Gel**

55 The antimicrobial gel (Mould Gone, SAN-AIR, West Gosford, NSW, Australia) was
56 supplied in sealed containers. The gel formulation is proprietary but includes
57 monoterpenoids, diterpenoids and sesquiterpenoids found in essential oils of plants
58 from the *Melaleuca* genus (e.g., 1,8 cineole, thymol, alpha-pinene, caryophyllene) with
59 an average dose of 0.0005% (v/v) when vapourised according to the manufacturer.

60 **Activity of the antimicrobial gel against coronavirus in solution**

61 In order to demonstrate that the gel had antiviral activity, the first experiments
62 incubated aliquots of the gel directly with viral particles in suspension. Cells of MHV-1
63 (1.0×10^5 (PFU)/mL) were incubated with 25 mg or 50 mg of the antimicrobial gel in

64 DMEM at ambient temperature for 0.5 or 2 hours. Following incubation, the DMEM was
65 removed, diluted in 20% (w/v) bovine serum albumin (BSA; Sigma-Aldrich, Castle Hill,
66 NSW, Australia) prepared in PBS and incubated for 10-15 minutes to neutralize the
67 antimicrobial agents released from the gel. Thereafter, 100 μ L aliquots were diluted
68 ten-fold (in 20% BSA) and inoculated into the wells of 12 well plates containing A9 cells
69 and incubated for 1 hour at 37 °C in the presence of 5% (v/v) CO₂. The plates were
70 gently rocked once every 15 minutes to prevent the cells from drying out. After
71 incubation, an overlay media containing a 50:50 mix of 2% (w/v) agar (Sigma-Aldrich)
72 and DMEM was added to each well and further incubated for 72 hours. Following
73 incubation, the cells were fixed with 4% (v/v) formaldehyde (Sigma-Aldrich) for 2 –
74 3 hours, the agar overlay removed, and the number of viral particles (PFUs) visualized
75 after staining with 1% (w/v) crystal violet (Sigma-Aldrich). Controls were the viral
76 inoculum incubated in DMEM or PBS without the antimicrobial gel. The percentage
77 reduction in PFU for each quantity of the gel compared to the negative control (PBS)
78 was calculated.

79 **Activity of the gel as vapours against viral aerosols**

80 As there are no standard assays for examining the effects of vapourised or aerosolised
81 disinfectants on aerosols of microbial cells, a new assay was devised. A bacterial

82 filtration efficiency (BFE) test rig (CH Technologies, Westwood, NJ, USA) was used to
 83 produce viral aerosols (Figure 1). The antimicrobial gel (10 g) was removed from its
 84 container and allowed to vaporise into the glass aerosol chamber for 10 minutes or 20
 85 minutes prior to the introduction of the virus. The viral inoculum (50 μ L; 1.0×10^6
 86 PFU/mL) was aerosolized using a continuous drive syringe pump through a nebulizer
 87 with an airflow of 28.3 L/min for one minute and allowed to interact with vapours of the
 88 antimicrobial gel as they passed through the glass tube. The size of the aerosols
 89 produced was approximately $3.0 \pm 0.3 \mu$ m and these travelled through the glass
 90 aerosol chamber into an Anderson sieve sampler and were collected by flowing past
 91 2% (w/v) agar plates. The largest (7 μ m) sized aerosols were captured on the agar
 92 plate at the top of the Anderson sieve and the smallest (0.65 μ m) on the agar plate at
 93 the bottom of the device. After one minute, the airflow was stopped to cease aerosol
 94 generation, and the vacuum pump was run for further one minute to collect any
 95 residual aerosols from the glass chamber. Following this, agar plates were flooded with
 96 1.5 ml of either 20% BSA in DMEM (neutralised samples) or DMEM alone (non-
 97 neutralised samples), and viruses were carefully removed using a sterile cell scraper.
 98 Aliquots (100 μ L) from each plate were placed in duplicate on A9 cells in 12-well cell
 99 culture plates to culture any infectious viruses. The culture conditions were as

described above. Control runs were performed at the beginning of each experiment prior to the addition of the gel in the glass aerosol chamber to collect infectious viruses so that any reduction in the number of infectious viruses could be calculated as a percentage of this control. Test and control runs were conducted in duplicate and repeated twice.

Activity gel as vapours against bacterial and fungal spore aerosols

The anti-bacterial activity of the gel vapourised for 10 minutes against *E. coli* and its sporicidal activity against *A. flavus* spores was determined using a similar method as described for MHV-1, except using 50 μ L of *E. coli* or *A. flavus* spores (1×10^4 CFU/mL). Bacteria were collected on agar plates composed of tryptic soy agar (TSA; BD, Macquarie Park, NSW, Australia) alone or containing TSA and the neutralizers Tween® 80 (5 g/L) and lecithin (7 g/L). Fungal spores were collected on SDA plates alone or containing the same neutralizers. The numbers of viable cells from each of the 6 plates in the Anderson sieve collector were enumerated following incubation at 37 °C for 24 hours for bacteria and at 25 °C for 72 hours for fungal spores. Control runs were conducted prior to the addition of the gel in the glass aerosol chamber to collect viable bacteria, and fungal spores. Test and control runs were performed in duplicate and repeated twice. The percentage of cells remaining viable after passage through the gel

118 vapours was calculated by comparing numbers in the absence (control) and presence
119 (test) of the gel vapours.

120 **Statistical analysis**

121 Statistical analyses were performed using GraphPad Prism 7.04 software (GraphPad
122 Software, La Jolla, CA, USA). The concentration and time dependent effect of the
123 antimicrobial gel in solution was determined using two-way ANOVA. The effect of
124 antimicrobial gel vapours at single time points on different aerosols sizes and overall
125 percentage (%) reduction was assessed using Welch's t-test and one-way ANOVA with
126 Tukey's test respectively. Statistical significance was set as $P \leq 0.05$.

127

128   **RESULTS**

129   **Activity of the gel in solution against coronavirus**

130   The antimicrobial gel when incubated in DMEM with the coronavirus reduced the
131   numbers of infectious MHV-1 in solution in a dose dependent manner. The greatest
132   quantity (50 mg) of the gel reduced the infectivity of the coronavirus by >99.99% (no
133   viral cells were cultured) within 30 minutes of incubation compared to control ($p <$
134   0.001; Table I). The smaller quantity (25 mg) of the gel reduced the numbers of
135   coronavirus by 98.6% after 30 minutes of incubation compared to control ($p < 0.001$).

136   **Activity of the gel as vapours against viral aerosols**

137   The antimicrobial gel vapours were active against MHV-1 aerosols. The majority of the
138   viral particles travelled in aerosols of 3.30 to 0.65 μm in the absence of the gel (Figure
139   2A) with most viral particles travelling in the 2.10 and 1.10 μm aerosols (Figure 2A).
140   After allowing the gel to vaporize in the chamber for 10 minutes, the numbers of viral
141   particles that were able to infect the mouse cells were reduced for most aerosol sizes,
142   with a significant reduction of 67% in the 1.10 μm aerosol ($p = 0.011$; Figure 2A). A
143   slightly greater reduction of 78% was produced in the 2.10 μm aerosols compared to
144   the controls when the gel was allowed to vaporize for 20 minutes ($p = 0.011$; Figure

2B). Overall, exposure of MHV-1 aerosols to the antimicrobial gel vapours (vaporized for 10 minutes) resulted a significant 48% reduction of all the aerosols sizes compared to untreated control ($p = 0.002$; Table II). Allowing the antimicrobial gel to vaporize for 20 minutes, resulted in a 53% reduction in the number of viable aerosolized viral particles of all sizes compared to control ($p = 0.001$; Table II). Following neutralization with 20% BSA, the activity of the antimicrobial gel was slightly but not significantly ($p = 0.078$; Table II) reduced, resulting in a 33% reduction in the viability of viral aerosols compared to control ($p = 0.001$; Table II).

Activity against aerosols of bacteria or fungal spores

The antimicrobial gel in vaporized form was active against aerosols of *E. coli*. In the absence of antimicrobial gel, this bacterium mostly travelled in aerosol particle sizes between 3.30 to 1.10 μm (Figure 3). Overall, the antimicrobial gel produced a reduction in bacterial viability of 29% ($p = 0.018$) when neutralised during bacterial growth and 51% ($p = 0.032$) when not neutralised during bacterial growth (Table III). Without neutralising the gel during bacterial growth, the antimicrobial gel reduced the number of live bacteria in the 3.30, 2.10 and 1.10 μm aerosols by 76%, 69% and 64%, respectively ($p = 0.001$).

Similarly, the antimicrobial gel vapours were also active against aerosols of *Aspergillus*

163 *flavus* spores. The spores mainly travelled in aerosols of between 7.00 µm to 2.10 µm,
 164 with significantly ($p < 0.001$) higher numbers in 2.10 µm than other aerosols sizes
 165 (Figure 4). No spores travelled in aerosols of 1.10 µm or 0.65 µm (Figure 4). Overall,
 166 the antimicrobial gel reduced the viability of spores of *Aspergillus flavus* by 72% in non-
 167 neutralised conditions and 67% when neutralised ($p \leq 0.008$; Table IV). Following
 168 exposure to the gel, the number of spores in aerosols of 2.10 µm was reduced
 169 compared to control by 60% and 73% in neutralised and non-neutralised conditions,
 170 respectively ($p=0.001$). There was no significant difference of the activity if the
 171 antimicrobial gel was neutralised or not when growing *Aspergillus flavus* spores ($p \leq$
 172 0.08).

173

174   **DISCUSSION:**

175   This study has demonstrated that the Mould Gone gel (San-Air) containing compounds
 176   found in essential oils of *Melaleuca* genus plants has good antimicrobial activity against
 177   bacteria, fungal spores, and coronavirus. Direct contact with the gel resulted in a
 178   complete kill of the virus. The gel vapours were able to reduce the numbers of the
 179   coronavirus MHV-1 and the bacterium *E. coli* by $\geq 50\%$ and the reduce the number of
 180   *A. flavus* spores that can germinate by $\geq 66\%$. The ability of vapourised gels to prevent
 181   the growth of bacteria, fungal spores and reduce the infectivity of coronavirus in
 182   aerosols has not been previously demonstrated, as far as the authors can tell.

183   This study used a ready-made bacterial filtration efficiency testing rig that is usually
 184   used to assess the ability of face masks to filter the bacterium *Staphylococcus aureus*
 185   as specified by standard ASTM F2101-1[34]. The Andersen impactor has been widely
 186   used to sample environmental bacteria and fungi [35] and has the advantage of being
 187   able to directly capture the biological aerosols on agar plates which can then be
 188   incubated to directly culture the organisms. Neutralizing chemicals can also be
 189   incorporated into the agar to inactivate antimicrobial agents present in the aerosols.
 190   While viruses can be captured on the agar plates, they had to be recovered from the
 191   agar and cultured on susceptible cells. Other researchers have used this method to

192 culture virus in aerosols [36, 37]. A major advantage of the Andersen impactor is that it
193 allows differentiation of the size of the aerosols in which microbes travel [38].

194 Human activities such as speaking, coughing and sneezing generate microbial
195 aerosols in sizes ranging from $<1\ \mu\text{m}$ to $>100\ \mu\text{m}$ [39-42]. Larger aerosols or droplets
196 remain airborne for a short time and settle close to the source [43]. Smaller aerosols
197 under $5\ \mu\text{m}$ in size can remain airborne for longer periods and are able to make their
198 way to the lungs [44]. Aerosols of this size are implicated in the airborne transmission
199 of *Mycobacterium tuberculosis* [45], *Aspergillus fumigatus* spores [46], and viruses
200 including the influenza virus [47] and SARS CoV [48].

201 The number of viral copies that are needed to cause an infection is expressed as ID_{50}
202 which denotes the mean dose that causes an infection in 50% of susceptible subjects.

203 While the ID_{50} for SARS-CoV-2 is not known, the ID_{50} for SARS CoV ranged from 16 to
204 160 PFU/person [49]. The vapours produced by the antimicrobial gel were able to
205 significantly reduce the number of viable viral particles in aerosols under $5\ \mu\text{m}$ by 48%
206 within 10 minutes and the reduction increased to 53% when the gel was allowed to
207 vaporise for 20 minutes indicating sustained and perhaps increasing antimicrobial
208 activity. Allowing the gel to vapourize for longer durations and reducing the air flow (i.e.,

209 increasing the time for the virus and vapour to interact) may result in further reductions
 210 in viral numbers and this should be tested in future experiments.

211 The gel vapours were bacteriostatic as their activity was diminished in the presence of
 212 agents that neutralized their antimicrobial compounds while the viral and fungal activity
 213 was unaffected by neutralizers. The active compounds present in the antimicrobial gel
 214 used in this study concentrate to approximately 0.0005% (v/v) on evaporation (data
 215 supplied by the manufacturer). In-vitro studies performed using essential oils have shown
 216 that the active compounds in essential oils are bactericidal for *E. coli* at higher
 217 concentrations and bacteriostatic at lower concentrations [50]. Essential oil vapours
 218 can affect spore formation in *A. fumigatus* [51] and can be either fungistatic or
 219 fungicidal depending on the active compound [52]. Very few studies have examined the
 220 antiviral efficacy of essential oil vapours against viruses. One study reported that
 221 aerosolised influenza virus or bacteriophage M13 exposed to vapourised essential oils
 222 of tea tree or eucalyptus for 24 hours. This resulted in approximately 87% reduction in
 223 influenza viral titres, but only 25-42% reduction in M13 titres [27]. Bioactive compounds
 224 are present in the essential oils at significantly greater concentration compared to the
 225 antimicrobial gel used in this study, and there are concerns about the impact of
 226 vapouring these indoor and their impact on human occupants [53]. The low

227 concentration of the active compounds present in the antimicrobial gel are unlikely to

228 impact human health.

229 This study has demonstrated that vapours produced by a gel containing naturally

230 occurring active compounds can significantly reduce the viable numbers of aerosolized

231 microbes including coronavirus. Using the gel may reduce the transmission of

232 respiratory pathogens, improve indoor air quality and health of human occupants.

233 REFERENCES

- 234 [1] Klepeis NE, Nelson WC, Ott WR, Robinson JP, Tsang AM, Switzer P, et al. The
235 National Human Activity Pattern Survey (NHAPS): a resource for assessing exposure
236 to environmental pollutants. *J Expo Anal Environ Epidemiol* 2001;11(3):231-52.
237 <https://doi.org/10.1038/sj.jea.7500165>.
- 238 [2] Höppe P, Martinac I. Indoor climate and air quality. Review of current and future
239 topics in the field of ISB study group 10. *Int J Biometeorol* 1998;42(1):1-7.
240 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s004840050075>.
- 241 [3] Prussin AJ, 2nd, Garcia EB, Marr LC. Total Virus and Bacteria Concentrations
242 in Indoor and Outdoor Air. *Environ Sci Technol Lett* 2015;2(4):84-8.
243 <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.estlett.5b00050>.
- 244 [4] Gilbert JA, Stephens B. Microbiology of the built environment. *Nat Rev*
245 *Microbiol* 2018;16(11):661-70. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41579-018-0065-5>.
- 246 [5] Adams RI, Miletto M, Taylor JW, Bruns TD. The diversity and distribution of
247 fungi on residential surfaces. *PLoS One* 2013;8(11):e78866.
248 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0078866>.
- 249 [6] Adams RI, Miletto M, Lindow SE, Taylor JW, Bruns TD. Airborne bacterial
250 communities in residences: similarities and differences with fungi. *PLoS One*
251 2014;9(3):e91283. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0091283>.
- 252 [7] Prussin AJ, 2nd, Marr LC. Sources of airborne microorganisms in the built
253 environment. *Microbiome* 2015;3(1):78. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40168-015-0144-z>.
- 254 [8] Meadow JF, Altrichter AE, Kembel SW, Kline J, Mhuireach G, Moriyama M, et
255 al. Indoor airborne bacterial communities are influenced by ventilation, occupancy, and
256 outdoor air source. *Indoor Air* 2014;24(1):41-8. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ina.12047>.
- 257 [9] Kelley ST, Gilbert JA. Studying the microbiology of the indoor environment.
258 *Genome Biol* 2013;14(2):202. <https://doi.org/10.1186/gb-2013-14-2-202>.
- 259 [10] Leung MH, Lee PK. The roles of the outdoors and occupants in contributing to a
260 potential pan-microbiome of the built environment: a review. *Microbiome* 2016;4(1):21.
261 <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40168-016-0165-2>.
- 262 [11] Adams RI, Bhangar S, Pasut W, Arens EA, Taylor JW, Lindow SE, et al.
263 Chamber bioaerosol study: outdoor air and human occupants as sources of indoor
264 airborne microbes. *PLoS One* 2015;10(5):e0128022.
265 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0128022>.

266 [12] Kettleson EM, Adhikari A, Vesper S, Coombs K, Indugula R, Reponen T. Key
 267 determinants of the fungal and bacterial microbiomes in homes. *Environ Res*
 268 2015;138:130-5. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envres.2015.02.003>.

269 [13] Dancer SJ. Importance of the environment in meticillin-resistant *Staphylococcus*
 270 *aureus* acquisition: the case for hospital cleaning. *The Lancet Infectious Diseases*
 271 2008;8(2):101-13. [https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/S1473-3099\(07\)70241-4](https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/S1473-3099(07)70241-4).

272 [14] Clark SO, Hall Y, Kelly DL, Hatch GJ, Williams A. Survival of *Mycobacterium*
 273 *tuberculosis* during experimental aerosolization and implications for aerosol challenge
 274 models. *J Appl Microbiol* 2011;111(2):350-9. [https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2672.2011.05069.x)
 275 [2672.2011.05069.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2672.2011.05069.x).

276 [15] McCormick A, Loeffler J, Ebel F. *Aspergillus fumigatus*: contours of an
 277 opportunistic human pathogen. *Cell Microbiol* 2010;12(11):1535-43.
 278 <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1462-5822.2010.01517.x>.

279 [16] Jones RM, Brosseau LM. Aerosol transmission of infectious disease. *J Occup*
 280 *Environ Med* 2015;57(5):501-8. <https://doi.org/10.1097/JOM.0000000000000448>.

281 [17] Jayaweera M, Perera H, Gunawardana B, Manatunge J. Transmission of
 282 COVID-19 virus by droplets and aerosols: A critical review on the unresolved
 283 dichotomy. *Environmental Research* 2020;188:109819.
 284 <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envres.2020.109819>.

285 [18] Asadi S, Bouvier N, Wexler AS, Ristenpart WD. The coronavirus pandemic and
 286 aerosols: Does COVID-19 transmit via expiratory particles? *Aerosol Sci Technol*
 287 2020;0(0):1-4. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02786826.2020.1749229>.

288 [19] Meyerowitz EA, Richterman A, Gandhi RT, Sax PE. Transmission of SARS-
 289 CoV-2: A Review of Viral, Host, and Environmental Factors. *Ann Intern Med*
 290 2021;174(1):69-79. <https://doi.org/10.7326/m20-5008>.

291 [20] MacIntyre CR, Ananda-Rajah MR. Scientific evidence supports aerosol
 292 transmission of SARS-COV-2. *Antimicrob Resist Infect Control* 2020;9(1):202.
 293 <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13756-020-00868-6>.

294 [21] Ijaz MK, Zargar B, Wright KE, Rubino JR, Sattar SA. Generic aspects of the
 295 airborne spread of human pathogens indoors and emerging air decontamination
 296 technologies. *Am J Infect Control* 2016;44(9 Suppl):S109-20.
 297 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ajic.2016.06.008>.

298 [22] Oliveira M, Tiwari BK, Duffy G. Emerging Technologies for Aerial
 299 Decontamination of Food Storage Environments to Eliminate Microbial Cross-
 300 Contamination. *Foods* 2020;9(12). <https://doi.org/10.3390/foods9121779>.

301 [23] Bischoff W, Russell G, Willard E, Stehle J, Jr. Impact of a novel mobile high-
302 efficiency particulate air-ultraviolet air recirculation system on the bacterial air burden
303 during routine care. *Am J Infect Control* 2019;47(8):1025-7.
304 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ajic.2018.12.019>.

305 [24] Curtius J, Granzin M, Schrod J. Testing mobile air purifiers in a school
306 classroom: Reducing the airborne transmission risk for SARS-CoV-2. *Aerosol Science*
307 and Technology 2021;55(5):586-99. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02786826.2021.1877257>.

308 [25] Guo J, Xiong Y, Kang T, Xiang Z, Qin C. Bacterial community analysis of floor
309 dust and HEPA filters in air purifiers used in office rooms in ILAS, Beijing. *Sci Rep*
310 2020;10(1):6417. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-020-63543-1>.

311 [26] Inouye S, Takizawa T, Yamaguchi H. Antibacterial activity of essential oils and
312 their major constituents against respiratory tract pathogens by gaseous contact. *J*
313 *Antimicrob Chemother* 2001;47(5):565-73. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jac/47.5.565>.

314 [27] Usachev EV, Pyankov OV, Usacheva OV, Agranovski IE. Antiviral activity of tea
315 tree and eucalyptus oil aerosol and vapour. *Journal of Aerosol Science* 2013;59:22-30.
316 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jaerosci.2013.01.004>.

317 [28] Karpinski TM. Essential Oils of Lamiaceae Family Plants as Antifungals.
318 *Biomolecules* 2020;10(1). <https://doi.org/10.3390/biom10010103>.

319 [29] Maczka W, Duda-Madej A, Gorny A, Grabarczyk M, Winska K. Can Eucalyptol
320 Replace Antibiotics? *Molecules* 2021;26(16).
321 <https://doi.org/10.3390/molecules26164933>.

322 [30] Sharifi-Rad J, Salehi B, Varoni EM, Sharopov F, Yousaf Z, Ayatollahi SA, et al.
323 Plants of the Melaleuca Genus as Antimicrobial Agents: From Farm to Pharmacy.
324 *Phytother Res* 2017;31(10):1475-94. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ptr.5880>.

325 [31] Sato K, Krist S, Buchbauer G. Antimicrobial effect of vapours of geraniol, (R)-(-
326)-linalool, terpineol, γ -terpinene and 1,8-cineole on airborne microbes using an
327 airwasher. *Flavour and Fragrance Journal* 2007;22(5):435-7.
328 <https://doi.org/10.1002/ffj.1818>.

329 [32] Lanzerstorfer A, Hackl M, Schlomer M, Rest B, Deutsch-Grasl E, Lanzerstorfer
330 C. The influence of air-dispersed essential oils from lemon (*Citrus limon*) and silver fir
331 (*Abies alba*) on airborne bacteria and fungi in hospital rooms. *J Environ Sci Health A*
332 *Tox Hazard Subst Environ Eng* 2019;54(3):256-60.
333 <https://doi.org/10.1080/10934529.2018.1546498>.

334 [33] Gelmini F, Belotti L, Vecchi S, Testa C, Beretta G. Air dispersed essential oils
335 combined with standard sanitization procedures for environmental microbiota control in

336 nosocomial hospitalization rooms. Complement Ther Med 2016;25:113-9.
337 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ctim.2016.02.004>.
338 [34] www.astm.org. Standard Test Method for Evaluating the Bacterial Filtration
339 Efficiency (BFE) of Medical Face Mask Materials, Using a Biological Aerosol of
340 *Staphylococcus aureus*. West Conshohocken, PA: ASTM International; 2019:5.
341 [35] Xu Z, Yao M. Monitoring of bioaerosol inhalation risks in different environments
342 using a six-stage Andersen sampler and the PCR-DGGE method. Environ Monit
343 Assess 2013;185(5):3993-4003. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10661-012-2844-1>.
344 [36] Kutter JS, de Meulder D, Bestebroer TM, Mulders A, Fouchier RAM, Herfst S.
345 Comparison of three air samplers for the collection of four nebulized respiratory viruses
346 - Collection of respiratory viruses from air. Indoor Air 2021.
347 <https://doi.org/10.1111/ina.12875>.
348 [37] Zhao Y, Aarnink AJ, Wang W, Fabri T, Groot Koerkamp PW, de Jong MC.
349 Airborne virus sampling: Efficiencies of samplers and their detection limits for infectious
350 bursal disease virus (IBDV). Ann Agric Environ Med 2014;21(3):464-71.
351 <https://doi.org/10.5604/12321966.1120585>.
352 [38] Andersen AA. New sampler for the collection, sizing, and enumeration of viable
353 airborne particles. J Bacteriol 1958;76(5):471-84. [https://doi.org/10.1128/jb.76.5.471-](https://doi.org/10.1128/jb.76.5.471-484.1958)
354 [484.1958](https://doi.org/10.1128/jb.76.5.471-484.1958).
355 [39] Morawska L, Johnson GR, Ristovski ZD, Hargreaves M, Mengersen K, Corbett
356 S, et al. Size distribution and sites of origin of droplets expelled from the human
357 respiratory tract during expiratory activities. Journal of Aerosol Science 2009;40(3):256-
358 69. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jaerosci.2008.11.002>.
359 [40] Chao CYH, Wan MP, Morawska L, Johnson GR, Ristovski ZD, Hargreaves M,
360 et al. Characterization of expiration air jets and droplet size distributions immediately at
361 the mouth opening. J Aerosol Sci 2009;40(2):122-33.
362 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jaerosci.2008.10.003>.
363 [41] Johnson GR, Morawska L, Ristovski ZD, Hargreaves M, Mengersen K, Chao
364 CYH, et al. Modality of human expired aerosol size distributions. Journal of Aerosol
365 Science 2011;42(12):839-51. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jaerosci.2011.07.009>.
366 [42] Papineni RS, Rosenthal FS. The size distribution of droplets in the exhaled
367 breath of healthy human subjects. J Aerosol Med 1997;10(2):105-16.
368 <https://doi.org/10.1089/jam.1997.10.105>.
369 [43] Xie X, Li Y, Chwang AT, Ho PL, Seto WH. How far droplets can move in indoor
370 environments--revisiting the Wells evaporation-falling curve. Indoor Air 2007;17(3):211-
371 25. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1600-0668.2007.00469.x>.

- 372 [44] Owen MK, Ensor DS, Sparks LE. Airborne particle sizes and sources found in
373 indoor air. *Atmospheric Environment Part A General Topics* 1992;26(12):2149-62.
374 [https://doi.org/10.1016/0960-1686\(92\)90403-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/0960-1686(92)90403-8).
- 375 [45] Cole EC, Cook CE. Characterization of infectious aerosols in health care
376 facilities: an aid to effective engineering controls and preventive strategies. *Am J Infect*
377 *Control* 1998;26(4):453-64. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s0196-6553\(98\)70046-x](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0196-6553(98)70046-x).
- 378 [46] Morris G, Kokki MH, Anderson K, Richardson MD. Sampling of *Aspergillus*
379 spores in air. *J Hosp Infect* 2000;44(2):81-92. <https://doi.org/10.1053/jhin.1999.0688>.
- 380 [47] Alford RH, Kasel JA, Gerone PJ, Knight V. Human influenza resulting from
381 aerosol inhalation. *Proc Soc Exp Biol Med* 1966;122(3):800-4.
382 <https://doi.org/10.3181/00379727-122-31255>.
- 383 [48] Tang JW, Wilson P, Shetty N, Noakes CJ. Aerosol-Transmitted Infections-a
384 New Consideration for Public Health and Infection Control Teams. *Curr Treat Options*
385 *Infect Dis* 2015;7(3):176-201. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40506-015-0057-1>.
- 386 [49] Watanabe T, Bartrand TA, Weir MH, Omura T, Haas CN. Development of a
387 dose-response model for SARS coronavirus. *Risk Anal* 2010;30(7):1129-38.
388 <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1539-6924.2010.01427.x>.
- 389 [50] Puvaca N, Milenkovic J, Galonja Coghill T, Bursic V, Petrovic A, Tanaskovic S,
390 et al. Antimicrobial Activity of Selected Essential Oils against Selected Pathogenic
391 Bacteria: In Vitro Study. *Antibiotics (Basel)* 2021;10(5).
392 <https://doi.org/10.3390/antibiotics10050546>.
- 393 [51] Inouye S, Watanabe M, Nishiyama Y, Takeo K, Akao M, Yamaguchi H.
394 Antisporulating and respiration-inhibitory effects of essential oils on filamentous fungi.
395 *Mycoses* 1998;41(9-10):403-10. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1439-0507.1998.tb00361.x>.
- 396 [52] Inouye S, Tsuruoka T, Watanabe M, Takeo K, Akao M, Nishiyama Y, et al.
397 Inhibitory effect of essential oils on apical growth of *Aspergillus fumigatus* by vapour
398 contact. *Mycoses* 2000;43(1-2):17-23. <https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1439-0507.2000.00538.x>.
- 400 [53] Angulo Milhem S, Verrielle M, Nicolas M, Thevenet F. Does the ubiquitous use
401 of essential oil-based products promote indoor air quality? A critical literature review.
402 *Environ Sci Pollut Res Int* 2020;27(13):14365-411. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11356-020-08150-3>.

404

405 **Table I:** Effect of different concentrations of antimicrobial gel against coronavirus MHV-
406 1 in solution at different time points.

Sample	Amount of gel (mg)	Incubation time (minutes)	Number of plaques (PFU/mL)	Log ₁₀ reduction	% Reduction	P-value
Control	-	-	26750 ± 1658	-	-	
Antimicrobial gel	25	30	375 ± 35	1.9	98.60	<0.001
	25	120	225 ± 177	2.1	99.16	< 0.001
	50	30	0 ± 0	4.4	99.99	< 0.001
	50	120	0 ± 0	4.4	99.99	<0.001

407

408

Table II: The ability of antimicrobial gel vapourised for 10 and 20 minutes to reduce the numbers of aerosolised coronavirus MHV-1.

Sample	Amount of gel (g)	Evaporation time (minutes)	Number of plaques (PFU/mL)	Log ₁₀ reduction	% Reduction	p-value
Control	-	-	1152 ± 354	-	-	
Antimicrobial gel (No neutraliser)	10	10	596 ± 149	0.3	48.26	0.002
Control	-	-	1396 ± 240	-	-	
Antimicrobial gel (No neutraliser)	10	20	650 ± 101	0.3	53.44	0.001
Antimicrobial gel (With neutraliser)	10	20	930± 142	0.2	33.48	0.001

Table III: The ability of antimicrobial gel vapourised for 10 minutes to reduce the numbers of aerosolised *E. coli* K12.

Sample	Amount of gel (g)	Evaporation time (minutes)	Number of bacteria (CFU/mL)	Log ₁₀ reduction	% Reduction	p-Value
Control (no neutraliser)	-	-	86 ± 14	-	-	-
Antimicrobial gel (No neutraliser)	10	10	42 ± 20	0.3	51.16	0.001
Control (With neutraliser)	-	-	139 ± 46	-	-	-
Antimicrobial gel (With neutraliser)	10	10	99 ± 47	0.1	28.77	0.018

417 **Table IV:** The ability of the antimicrobial gel vapourised for 10 minutes to reduce the
418 numbers of aerosolised *A. flavus* spores.

Sample	Amount of gel (g)	Evaporation time (minutes)	Number of fungal spores (CFU/mL)	Log ₁₀ Reduction	% Reduction	p- Value
Control (No neutralizer)	-	-	231 ± 42			
Antimicrobial gel (No neutralizer)	10	10	65 ± 7	0.6	71.86	0.008
Control (With neutralizer)	-	-	170 ± 77	-	-	
Antimicrobial gel (With neutralizer)	10	10	57 ± 23	0.5	66.47	0.001

419

420

421 **FIGURE LEGENDS:**

422 **Figure 1:** The Bacterial Filtration Efficiency Rig containing an Anderson sieve sampler.

423 Aerosols of $3.0 \pm 0.3 \mu\text{m}$ on average of viruses, bacteria or fungal spores were produced in
424 the glass chamber.

425 **Figure 2:** Number of murine hepatitis virus (MHV-1) recovered from different aerosol
426 sizes with or without neutralization of the gel vaporized for 10 minutes (A) or 20
427 minutes (B). The antimicrobial gel significantly reduced the ability of viral aerosols to
428 infected A9 cells in aerosols sizes of 2.10 and 1.10 μm compared to untreated control
429 ($p \leq 0.001$). Data points represent the mean ($\pm$ 95% confidence interval) of three
430 independent experiments.

431 **Figure 3:** Numbers of *E. coli* K12 recovered from different aerosol sizes with or without
432 neutralisation of the gel vapourised for 10 minutes. The gel significantly reduced the
433 viability of bacteria in aerosols sizes 3.30 and 2.10 μm when neutralised or non-
434 neutralised during bacterial growth compared to untreated control ($p < 0.05$). Data
435 points represent the mean ($\pm$ 95% confidence interval) of three independent
436 experiments.

437 **Figure 4.** Number of *A. flavus* spores recovered from different aerosol sizes with or
 438 without neutralisation of the gel vapourised for 10 minutes. The antimicrobial gel
 439 significantly reduced the viability of spores of *A. flavus* in aerosols sizes 3.30 and 2.10
 440 μm in both neutralised and non-neutralised condition compared to untreated control (p
 441 < 0.05). Data points represent the mean ($\pm$ 95% confidence interval) of three
 442 independent experiments.

443   **Funding Information:** This research was supported by San-Air, NSW, Australia.

Aerosols enter here

The
Anderson
sieve
collector