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ABSTRACT

The risk of inadequate hand hygiene in food handling settings is exacerbated when water is limited or unavailable, thereby making washing with soap and water difficult. The SaniTwice method involves application of excess alcohol-based hand sanitizer (ABHS), hand “washing” for 15 s, and thorough cleaning with paper towels while hands are still wet, followed by a standard application of ABHS. This study investigated the effectiveness of the SaniTwice methodology as an alternative to hand washing for cleaning and removal of microorganisms. On hands moderately soiled with beef broth containing Escherichia coli (ATCC 11229), washing with a nonantimicrobial hand washing product achieved a 2.86 (±0.64)-log reduction in microbial contamination compared with the baseline, whereas the SaniTwice method with 62% ethanol (EtOH) gel, 62% EtOH foam, and 70% EtOH advanced formula gel achieved reductions of 2.64 ± 0.89, 3.64 ± 0.57, and 4.61 ± 0.33 log units, respectively. When hands were heavily soiled from handling raw hamburger containing E. coli, washing with nonantimicrobial hand washing product and antimicrobial hand washing product achieved reductions of 2.65 ± 0.33 and 2.69 ± 0.32 log units, respectively, whereas SaniTwice with 62% EtOH foam, 70% EtOH gel, and 70% EtOH advanced formula gel achieved reductions of 2.87 ± 0.42, 2.99 ± 0.51, and 3.92 ± 0.65 log units, respectively. These results clearly demonstrate that the in vivo antibacterial efficacy of the SaniTwice regimen with various ABHS is equivalent to or exceeds that of the standard hand washing approach as specified in the U.S. Food and Drug Administration Food Code. Implementation of the SaniTwice regimen in food handling settings with limited water availability should significantly reduce the risk of foodborne infections resulting from inadequate hand hygiene.

Foodborne diseases are a serious public health concern (3, 4, 15), but despite preventive efforts there has been little recent progress in reducing infections caused by foodborne pathogens (6). Faulty food handling practices, particularly improper hand washing, contribute significantly to the risk for foodborne disease (11–13, 19, 25–27, 29). Proper hand hygiene reduces the risk of transmission of pathogens from hands to food (7, 20, 21) and is associated with a reduction in gastrointestinal illness (2, 8, 18). The U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) Food Code for retail establishments requires hand washing as a preventive method and provides specific guidance on proper hand washing procedures (30). The five-step hand washing procedure outlined in the FDA Food Code consists of (i) rinsing under warm running water, (ii) applying the manufacturer-recommended amount of cleaning compound, (iii) rubbing the hands vigorously, (iv) rinsing thoroughly under warm running water, and (v) thoroughly drying the hands with individual paper towels, a continuous clean towel system, or a heated or pressurized hand air drying device. According to the Food Code, alcohol-based hand sanitizers (ABHS) may be used in retail and food service only after proper hand washing.

ABHS are recommended as an alternative to traditional hand washing in the health care setting (5). Alcohol-based hand sanitizers are highly effective against a range of bacterial pathogens, fungi, enveloped viruses, and certain nonenveloped viruses (2, 10). Although considered to be ineffective antimicrobial agents in the presence of visible dirt or proteinaceous material, alcohol-containing products were more effective than those containing triclosan (2, 14) or detergents (17) for removing microorganisms from hands contaminated with organic material. In health care facilities and other environments, easily accessible ABHS have resulted in greater hand hygiene compliance and reduction in infections (1, 9, 16, 31). Although ABHS are approved for use in the health care environment, the FDA does not regard these agents as adequate substitutes for soap and water in the food service setting (30).

A reliable hand hygiene method is needed for food service settings in which adequate hand washing facilities are limited or unavailable. These settings include portable bars, buffet lines, outdoor events, and catering functions at which the only available hand hygiene facility often is either “trickle hand washing” (i.e., hand washing done from a
portable container of water over a bucket or other type of basin) or simply the use of a paper towel or damp cloth to rub the hands. These methods may be inadequate for proper hand cleansing.

SaniTwice (a registered trademark with James Mann, Handwashing for Life, Libertyville, IL) is a two-stage hand cleansing protocol that is performed using ABHS when water is not available. In this study, we evaluated the microbiological efficacy of the SaniTwice method on the hands of adult human participants. These studies were designed to assess (i) the antimicrobial efficacy of various ABHS used with the SaniTwice regimen as compared with that of a standard hand washing method with soap and water on soiled hands and (ii) the impact of the active ingredient and/or formulation of a hand sanitizer on antibacterial efficacy when used in a SaniTwice regimen.

### MATERIALS AND METHODS

**Test products.** All test products in this study were manufactured by GOJO Industries (Akron, OH). Two hand washing products were evaluated: a nonantimicrobial product (GOJO Luxury Foam Handwash) and an antimicrobial product (MICRELL Antibacterial Foam Handwash, 0.5% chloroxylenol active). Four ABHS also were evaluated: a 62% ethanol (EtOH) gel (PURELL Instant Hand Sanitizer Food Code Compliant), a 62% EtOH foam (PURELL Instant Hand Sanitizer Foam), a 70% EtOH gel (PURELL 70 Instant Hand Sanitizer), and a 70% EtOH Advanced Formula (AF) gel (PURELL Instant Hand Sanitizer Advanced Formula VF481).

**Overall study design.** Three studies were conducted by BioScience Laboratories (Bozeman, MT) to determine the in vivo antimicrobial efficacy of various test product configurations under conditions of moderate or heavy soil. The order of use of each product was determined randomly. A two-step testing sequence was used for all products. Each volunteer completed the baseline cycle, where hands were contaminated with moderate or heavy soil (as described below) containing *Escherichia coli* (ATCC 11229), and samples were collected for baseline bacterial counts. Following the baseline sampling, participants completed a 30-s nonmedicated soap wash followed by the product evaluation cycle, which consisted of a contamination procedure, application of the test product, and subsequent hand sampling. Between uses of different test products, participants decontaminated their hands with a 1-min 70% EtOH rinse, air drying, and a 30-s nonmedicated soap wash. A minimum of 20 min elapsed before the next testing sequence began. Baseline and postapplication samples were evaluated for the presence of *E. coli*. Testing was performed according to the FDA health care personnel hand washing product evaluation method (28) and modified as described previously (22).

The study was approved by the Gallatin Institutional Review, an independent review board unaffiliated with BioScience Laboratories, and was conducted in compliance with Good Clinical Practice and Good Laboratory Practice regulations. All participants provided written informed consent.

**Participants.** The study enrolled healthy adults with two hands. All participants were free of dermal allergies or skin disorders on the hands or forearms.

**Preparation of inoculum.** *E. coli* was used to test the efficacy of the test procedures. A 2-liter flask was filled with 1,000 ml of tryptic soy broth: 30.0 g of dehydrated tryptic soy broth medium (BD, Franklin Lakes, NJ) added to 1 liter of deionized water, heated, and sterilized for a final pH of 7.3 ± 0.2. The broth was inoculated with 1.0 ml of a 24-h culture of *E. coli* grown from a cryogenic stock culture. The flask was incubated for 24 h, and the suspension was used for challenge.

**Hand contamination procedures.** For the moderate soil study, a 24-h culture of *E. coli* was suspended in beef broth (Swanson low sodium beef broth, Campbell Soup Company, Camden, NJ) at $1 \times 10^6$ CFU/ml. Three aliquots of 1.5 ml were transferred into each participant’s cupped hands. Each aliquot was distributed over the entire front and back surfaces of the hands up to the wrists during a 20-s period and allowed to air dry for 30 s after the first and second aliquots and for 90 s after the third aliquot. After samples were collected for baseline bacterial counts and hands were decontaminated with a 30-s wash with nonmedicated soap, a second cycle of contamination was initiated. After the 90-s final drying step, participants applied the randomly assigned test product.

For the heavy soil study, 5.0-ml aliquots of the challenge suspension of *E. coli* were transferred to 4-oz (113-g) portions of sterile 90% lean ground beef and distributed evenly with gloved hands to achieve contamination levels of approximately $5.0 \times 10^7$ CFU per portion. Each participant then kneaded the inoculated raw hamburger for 2 min. Hands were air dried for 90 s and then sampled for baseline counts. After a 30-s decontamination with nonmedicated soap, the cycle was repeated, and the test product was applied.

**Test article or product application and SaniTwice procedure.** The hand washing procedure used for the nonantimicrobial and antimicrobial hand washing products was consistent with Food Code specifications. Table 1 shows the stepwise product application procedures for all test configurations.

**Bacterial recovery and microbial enumeration.** Within 1 min after contamination for baseline evaluation or after product application, powder-free sterile latex gloves were placed on each participant’s hands and secured above the wrist, and 75 ml of sterile stripping fluid (0.4 g of KH$_2$PO$_4$, 10.1 g of Na$_2$HPO$_4$, and 1.0 g of isooctylphenoxypolyethoxyethanol in 1 liter of distilled water, pH adjusted to 7.8) was transferred into each glove. Following a 60-s massage of the hands through the gloves, a 5.0-ml aliquot of the glove rinsate sample was removed and diluted in 5.0 ml of Butterfield’s phosphate buffer solution with product neutralizers. Each aliquot was serially diluted in neutralizing solution, and appropriate dilutions were plated in duplicate onto MacConkey agar plates (BD; 50.0 g of dehydrated medium added to 1 liter of deionized water, heated, and sterilized; final pH, 7.1 ± 0.2) and incubated for 24 to 48 h at 30°C. Colonies were counted and data were recorded using the computerized Q-COUNT plate-counting systems (Advanced Instruments, Inc., Norwood, MA).

**Data analysis and statistical considerations.** The estimated log transformed number of viable microorganisms recovered from each hand (the R value) was determined using the formula $R = \log(75 \times C_i \times 10^D \times 2)$, where 75 is the amount (in milliliters) of stripping solution instilled into each glove, $C_i$ is the arithmetic average colony count of the two plate counts at a particular dilution, $D$ is the dilution factor, and 2 is the neutralization dilution.

Descriptive statistics and confidence intervals were calculated using the 0.05 level of significance for type I (alpha) error. Statistical calculations of means and standard deviations were
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Application procedures were initiated within 10 s of completing the 90-s drying step.
% All SaniTwice regimens were equivalent to or better than the Food Code hand washing protocol. Reductions from baseline ranged from 2.64 ± 0.89 log CFU/ml for SaniTwice with the 62% EtOH gel to 4.61 ± 0.33 log CFU/ml for SaniTwice with the 70% EtOH AF gel.

SaniTwice using the 62% EtOH gel was equivalent to the nonantimicrobial Food Code hand washing protocol. However, SaniTwice using the 62% EtOH foam (3.64 ± 0.57-log reduction) was more effective than SaniTwice with the 62% EtOH gel and the Food Code hand washing protocol (P < 0.05).

The 70% EtOH AF gel was the most effective sanitizing product. When used independently, it was significantly more effective (4.44 ± 0.47-log reduction) than SaniTwice with 62% EtOH foam or 62% EtOH gel or the nonantimicrobial hand washing product (P < 0.05 for all comparisons). Although the log reduction data suggest that SaniTwice with 70% EtOH AF gel (4.61 ± 0.33-log reduction) was equivalent to the 70% EtOH AF gel used independently, this lack of differentiation was most likely due to the limitations of the assay. The 4.61-log reduction was at the limit of detection for all participants using 70% EtOH AF gel with SaniTwice but for only half the participants using 70% EtOH AF gel alone. Therefore, the log reductions produced by the 70% EtOH AF gel after either a single sanitization or the SaniTwice regimen are likely underestimated, and the log reductions in both cases would likely be higher if the limits of detection were lower.

Reduction in microbial contamination of heavily soiled hands. Figure 2 shows microbial count reductions produced by test product configurations on hands that had been contaminated by handling ground beef containing E. coli. All SaniTwice regimens tested were equivalent to or better than the Food Code hand washing protocol, indicating that under conditions of heavy soil, the SaniTwice procedure is as effective as hand washing. The performance of the antimicrobial hand washing product was equivalent to that of the nonantimicrobial hand washing product in this heavy soil challenge, with log reductions of 2.69 ± 0.32 and 2.65 ± 0.33, respectively. SaniTwice with the 70% EtOH AF gel outperformed all other sanitizer configurations tested and was superior to hand washing for reduction of organisms on heavily soiled hands (P < 0.05 for comparisons of SaniTwice with 70% EtOH AF gel versus each of the other procedures).

TABLE 1. Test product application proceduresa

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Food Code-compliant procedure for hand washing products</th>
<th>Sani Twiceb procedure for ABHS</th>
<th>Procedure for 70% EtOH AF gel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Wet hands with water at 40°C</td>
<td>Dispense ~3 ml of product into cupped hands</td>
<td>Dispense ~1.5 ml of product into cupped hands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Apply ~1.5 ml of product</td>
<td>Rub vigorously over hands for 15 s to simulate washing</td>
<td>Rub hands together until dry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Lather for 15 s</td>
<td>Clean thoroughly with two paper towels</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Rinse with water for 10 s</td>
<td>Dispense additional ~1.5 ml of product</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Pat dry with two paper towels</td>
<td>Rub hands together until dry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* All application procedures were initiated within 10 s of completing the 90-s drying step.
b SaniTwice is a registered trademark with James Mann (Handwashing for Life, Libertyville, IL).

generated for the log recovery data from baseline samples, postproduct application samples, and the log differences between baseline and postapplication samples. Product comparisons were made using a one-way analysis of variance with post hoc analysis (Bonferroni’s multiple comparison test) using the 0.05 level of significance for alpha error.

RESULTS

Reduction in microbial contamination of moderately soiled hands. Two studies were conducted to evaluate microbial count reductions on hands that had been contaminated by handling beef broth containing E. coli. Reductions from baseline produced by the five test product configurations in these two studies are shown in Figure 1.

FIGURE 1. Log reduction from baseline for microbial contamination of hands moderately soiled with contaminated beef broth after application of test products. Error bars represent standard deviation. Data are from two separate studies. In study 1 (n = 11), nonantimicrobial hand washing product and Sani Twice with 62% EtOH gel were compared. In study 2 (n = 12), the conditions evaluated were nonantimicrobial hand washing product, Sani Twice with 62% EtOH foam, 70% EtOH AF gel without Sani Twice, and Sani Twice with 70% EtOH AF gel. Results for nonantimicrobial hand washing product represent pooled data from both studies. * P < 0.05 for Sani Twice with 62% EtOH foam versus nonantimicrobial hand washing product or Sani Twice with 62% EtOH gel. ** P < 0.05 for 70% EtOH AF gel or for Sani Twice with 70% AF gel versus nonantimicrobial hand washing product, Sani Twice with 62% EtOH gel, or Sani Twice with 62% EtOH foam.

FIGURE 2. Microbial count reductions on hands heavily soiled with contaminated beef broth after application of test products.
The ABHS products used in this study exhibited a range of antimicrobial efficacy, suggesting that product formulation and the concentration of active ingredient may play a role in the observed efficacy. The impact of formulation was indicated by the significantly higher efficacy of the 62% EtOH foam compared with the 62% EtOH gel when challenged with moderate soil. This difference may be due to the additional foaming surfactants in the foam formulation, which may aid in lifting and removing bacteria and soil from the hands during the SaniTwice procedure. In addition, SaniTwice with the 70% EtOH AF gel was superior to SaniTwice with the 70% EtOH gel and 62% EtOH foam under heavy soil conditions. The 70% EtOH AF gel, whether tested as a single application or with the SaniTwice method, was superior to hand washing and to the 62% EtOH gel or foam under moderate soil conditions. The 4.44-log reduction with a single use of the 70% EtOH AF gel demonstrates its high antimicrobial efficacy, which is further enhanced when used with the SaniTwice method. The 70% EtOH AF gel contains a patent-pending blend of ingredients that enhance the activity of the alcohol and likely contribute to the high efficacy observed in this study. The SaniTwice procedure gives the benefit of skin cleansing and soil removal, which is not obtained with single use of a product. The efficacy of ABHS used with SaniTwice against nonenveloped enteric viruses, which are more difficult to eradicate, remains to be determined.

In support of previous findings (23), the findings in this study indicate that the decontamination efficacy was similar for the antimicrobial and nonantimicrobial hand washing products under heavy soil conditions, suggesting that the cleansing properties of the surfactants in these soaps and the mechanical action of hand washing may be the primary contributors to efficacy rather than the antimicrobial activity of any constituent of the formulations. It is expected that with heavy hand soiling, the surfactant effect drives efficacy, and typical antibacterial constituents will have little additional effect.

In this study, SaniTwice was an effective hand hygiene regimen at least equivalent to hand washing with soap and water for reducing microbial contamination, even under worst case conditions of high bacterial load and heavy food soils. The current FDA Food Code allows use of ABHS only on hands that have been cleaned according to the recommended hand washing protocol (30). However, other than substitution of an ABHS for soap and water, the SaniTwice protocol mirrors the FDA-specified hand washing sequence. SaniTwice is at least as effective as hand washing when used with standard-efficacy ABHS; when used with a high-efficacy ABHS, the SaniTwice protocol is superior to washing with soap and water. The Food Code provides few specific recommendations for achieving good hand hygiene when water (or other hand washing supplies and equipment) is unavailable or limited. The Food Code (Section 2-301.16) severely restricts hand sanitizers by allowing use only after proper hand washing or in situations in which no direct contact with food occurs (30).

A potential solution to this gap in food safety practices is SaniTwice. The SaniTwice studies described here provide convincing scientific rationale for including the SaniTwice approach in the Food Code as an alternative method of hand hygiene when standard hand washing is impractical. The simplicity and ease of use of the SaniTwice method, which requires only a supply of ABHS and paper towels, should allow this protocol to be applied to various food service settings and other areas in which hand hygiene is needed but safe water is unavailable or in short supply.

The findings in the present study support and extend those from previous studies; ABHS used alone or in combination with hand washing can be effective for decontaminating hands in the presence of organic soils (17, 23, 24). A well-formulated ABHS in conjunction with
the SaniTwice regimen can have high efficacy, even in the presence of high organic load. Therefore, a reevaluation of the longstanding paradigm defining the use of ABHS in the presence of organic soils in both food handling and health care environments is warranted.
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ABSTRACT

Pathogenic strains of *Escherichia coli* and human norovirus are the main etiologic agents of foodborne illness resulting from inadequate hand hygiene practices by food service workers. This study was conducted to evaluate the antibacterial and antiviral efficacy of various hand hygiene product regimens under different soil conditions representative of those in food service settings and assess the impact of product formulation on this efficacy. On hands contaminated with chicken broth containing *E. coli*, representing a moderate soil load, a regimen combining an antimicrobial hand washing product with a 70% ethanol advanced formula (EtOH AF) gel achieved a 5.22-log reduction, whereas a nonantimicrobial hand washing product alone achieved a 3.10-log reduction. When hands were heavily soiled from handling ground beef containing *E. coli*, a wash-sanitize regimen with a 0.5% chloroxylenol antimicrobial hand washing product and the 70% EtOH AF gel achieved a 4.60-log reduction, whereas a wash-sanitize regimen with a 62% EtOH foam achieved a 4.11-log reduction. Sanitizing with the 70% EtOH AF gel alone was more effective than hand washing with a nonantimicrobial product for reducing murine norovirus (MNV), a surrogate for human norovirus, with 2.60- and 1.79-log reductions, respectively. When combined with hand washing, the 70% EtOH AF gel produced a 3.19-log reduction against MNV. A regimen using the SaniTwice protocol with the 70% EtOH AF gel produced a 4.04-log reduction against MNV. These data suggest that although the process of hand washing helped to remove pathogens from the hands, use of a wash-sanitize regimen was even more effective for reducing organisms. Use of a high-efficacy sanitizer as part of a wash-sanitize regimen further increased the efficacy of the regimen. The use of a well-formulated alcohol-based hand rub as part of a wash-sanitize regimen should be considered as a means to reduce risk of infection transmission in food service facilities.

Foodborne diseases are a serious and growing public health concern both in the United States (8, 19) and worldwide (46). The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention attributed 9.4 million illnesses, nearly 56,000 hospitalizations, and more than 1,300 deaths to foodborne pathogens annually in the United States (33). Many researchers believe that foodborne diseases are underreported (27, 39, 43).

The ever-changing nature of pathogens, including the emergence of new ones, is contributing to an increase in foodborne diseases (5). Enterotoxigenic *Escherichia coli* has been implicated in one of the largest foodborne outbreaks reported in the United States to date (3). According to the Foodborne Disease Outbreak Surveillance System (1998 to 2002), 31% of foodborne disease outbreaks and 41% of cases of infection with known etiology can be attributed to human norovirus (HNV) (27), and HNV is now recognized as the most significant cause of infectious gastrointestinal illnesses, with a growing number of virulent strains circulating (4, 9, 16, 44).

Poor personal hygiene of food service workers, in particular improper hand washing, contributes significantly to the risk of foodborne diseases (15, 17, 26, 38, 41). The majority of HNV infection outbreaks are attributed to contamination of food via unwashed or improperly washed hands of food handlers (5, 9, 23). HNVs have a low infective dose (37, 44), persist in the environment, and are resistant to chlorination and freezing (23, 35, 44). These factors contribute to an increased risk of HNV illness transmission. Heavily soiled items are frequently encountered in food service settings when preparing food, and antimicrobial agents are considered to be less effective in the presence of such items (6). The U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) Food Code requires that food service workers wash their hands with a cleaning compound and water before using alcohol-based hand rubs (ABHRs) (42). Although an improvement in compliance among food handlers with personal hygiene risk factors was observed between 1998 and 2008 in retail food facilities, hand washing practices were the most out-of-compliance risk factor for every type of facility evaluated (40). In 2008, hand washing practices were not being followed in 76% of restaurants and approximately 50% of delicatessens (40). In another study, compliance with Food Code recommendations for frequency of washing during production, service, and cleaning phases in restaurants was only 5% (36).

* Author for correspondence. Tel: 330-255-6745; Fax: 330-255-6083; E-mail: edmondss@gojo.com.
Various hand hygiene regimens reduce the risk of transmission of pathogens from the hands of food service workers to the food they handle and prepare (10, 29, 30). Proper hand hygiene has been associated with reductions of gastrointestinal illness ranging from 42 to 57% (5, 11, 25). However, some interventions are more effective for removing pathogens than are others. Hand washing with soap and water was more effective for reducing contamination on the hands than was rinsing with water or not washing at all (7, 10). Antimicrobial agents are more effective for removing bacteria on hands than is nonantimicrobial soap (13, 30). Even ABHRs used alone decontaminate hands at least as effectively as does washing with soap and water (12, 34). However, the combination of hand washing followed by the use of ABHRs produces even greater reduction of bacteria on hands (18, 29, 30, 32). When water is unavailable, a two-stage hand cleansing protocol using an ABHR known as the SaniTwice method (a registered trademark, James Mann, Handwashing for Life, Libertyville, IL) was at least as effective for removing bacteria from the hands as was only washing with soap and water (12).

A critical need remains for hand hygiene products with increased efficacy against hard-to-kill pathogens. Typical ABHR activity against nonenveloped enteric viruses varies depending on the type and concentration of alcohol (5, 6, 14, 21). Different strains of HVs may be more resistant to antimicrobial agents than others (24). Several studies have been conducted on newly formulated ABHRs with significantly improved inactivation of nonenveloped viruses (24, 28). A 70% ethanol advanced formula (EtOH AF) gel reduced HV by 3.74 log units in 15 s, a significantly greater HV reduction than produced by six other commercially available hand hygiene products (24). This gel was the most effective product tested against two strains of HV.

Quantitative data are scarce on the relative health impact of different hygiene interventions (5), in particular hand hygiene product performance against organisms commonly found in food service facilities, i.e., in food soils. This series of studies was designed to determine the antimicrobial effectiveness of various hand hygiene product regimens under moderate and heavy food soil conditions and against the murine norovirus (MNV), a surrogate for HVN. The impact of specific product formulation on antimicrobial efficacy also was evaluated.

**MATERIALS AND METHODS**

**Test products.** The test products, which were manufactured by GOJO Industries (Akron, OH), are described in Table 1.

**TABLE 1. Test products**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test product</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GOJO Luxury Foam Handwash</td>
<td>Nonantimicrobial hand washing product</td>
<td>Nonantimicrobial hand wash</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MICRELL Antibacterial Foam Handwash</td>
<td>0.5% Chloroxylenol hand washing product</td>
<td>PCMX hand wash</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOJO Antibacterial Plum Foam Handwash</td>
<td>0.3% Triclosan hand washing product</td>
<td>Triclosan hand wash</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PURELL Instant Hand Sanitizer Foam</td>
<td>62% Ethanol foam ABHR</td>
<td>62% EtOH foam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PURELL Instant Hand Sanitizer Advanced Formula VF481</td>
<td>70% Ethanol gel ABHR</td>
<td>70% EtOH gel</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Product application.** Table 2 shows the stepwise product application procedures for all test methods.

**Participants.** The study participants were healthy adults with two hands and were free of dermal allergies or any skin disorders on the hands or forearms. These studies were conducted in compliance with good clinical practice and good laboratory practice regulations and approved by local institutional review boards. All participants provided written informed consent.

**Overall design for antibacterial efficacy studies.** The purpose of the studies was to determine the antibacterial efficacy of various blinded test product configurations versus a relevant foodborne pathogen presented under conditions of moderate or heavy food soil. The order of use of each product configuration was determined randomly. All testing of antibacterial efficacy was performed using a modification of the ASTM International E1174-06 method (1). For both the moderate and heavy soil tests, a two-step testing sequence was used for all products. For the moderate and heavy soil tests 18 and 12 participants, respectively, tested each configuration. Each participant completed a baseline cycle, in which hands were contaminated with *E. coli* (ATCC 11229) in moderate soil (chicken broth) for the first study and in heavy soil (sterile ground beef (31)) in the second study. Samples were collected for baseline bacterial counts. After the baseline sampling, participants completed a 30-s nonmedicated soap wash followed by the product evaluation cycle, which consisted of a contamination procedure, application of the test product, and subsequent hand sampling. Baseline and postapplication samples were evaluated for the presence of *E. coli*. Each participant was used for only one test configuration and, on completion of testing, decontaminated their hands with a 1-min 70% EtOH rinse, air drying, and a 30-s nonmedicated soap wash.

**Preparation of inoculum.** A 2-liter flask was filled with 1,000 ml of tryptic soy broth, i.e., 30.0 g of dehydrated tryptic soy broth medium (BD, Franklin Lakes, NJ) added to 1 liter of deionized water, heated, and sterilized (final pH 7.3 ± 0.20). The broth was inoculated with 1.0 ml of a 24-h culture of *E. coli* grown from a cryogenic stock culture. The flask was incubated for 24 h, and the suspension was used for the contamination challenge.

**Hand contamination procedures.** For the moderate soil study, a 24-h culture of *E. coli* was suspended in commercially available chicken broth (Swanson chicken broth, Campbell Soup Company, Camden, NJ) to a final concentration of 1 × 10⁹ CFU/ml. Three aliquots of 1.5, 1.5, and 2 ml were transferred into each participant’s cupped hands. Taking care not to drip the suspension, each aliquot was distributed over the front and back surfaces of the hands up to the wrists for 20 s; hands were air dried for 30 s after the first and second aliquots and for 90 s after the third aliquot. After samples were collected from the hands for baseline bacterial counts, the hands were washed for 30 s with a
nonmedicated soap, and a second cycle of contamination was performed. After the 90-s drying step, participants applied the randomly assigned test product.

For the heavy soil study, 5.0-ml aliquots of the challenge suspension of *E. coli* was transferred to 4-oz (113-g) portions of sterile 90% lean ground beef and distributed evenly with gloved hands to achieve contaminant levels of approximately $5.0 \times 10^8$ CFU per portion. Each participant then kneaded the inoculated raw hamburger for 2 min. Hands were air dried for 90 s and then sampled for baseline counts. After a 30-s decontamination with nonmedicated soap, the cycle was repeated, and the test product was applied.

**Bacterial recovery and microbial enumeration.** Within 5 min after contamination for baseline evaluation and after product application, oversized powder-free sterile latex gloves were placed on each participant’s hands, and 75 ml of sterile stripping fluid (0.4 g of KH$_2$PO$_4$, 10.1 g of Na$_2$HPO$_4$, and 1.0 g of isoctylphenoxypolyethoxyethanol in 1 liter of distilled water, pH adjusted to 7.8) was transferred into each glove. After a 60-s massage of the hands through the gloves, a 5.0-ml sample of the rinsate was removed from the glove and diluted in 5.0 ml of Butterfield’s phosphate buffer solution with product neutralizers. Each aliquot was serially diluted in neutralizing solution, and appropriate dilutions were plated in duplicate onto MacConkey agar plates (50.0 g of dehydrated medium [BD] added to 1 liter of deionized water, heated, and sterilized; final pH 7.1 ± 0.2) and incubated for 24 to 48 h at 30°C. Colonies were counted and recorded using the computerized Q-Count plate-counting systems (Advanced Instruments, Inc., Norwood, MA).

**Data analysis and statistical considerations.** The estimated log-transformed number of viable microorganisms recovered from each hand (the *R* value) was determined using the formula $R = \log(75 \times C_i \times 10^D \times 2) + C_i$, where 75 is the volume (in milliliters) of stripping solution instilled into each glove, $C_i$ is the arithmetic average colony count of the two plate at a particular dilution, $D$ is the dilution factor, and 2 is the neutralization dilution.

Descriptive statistics and confidence intervals were calculated using the 0.05 level of significance for type I (alpha) error. Statistical calculations of means and standard deviations were generated on the log recovery data from baseline samples, post–product application samples, and the log differences between baseline and post–product application samples. Product comparisons were made using a one-way analysis of variance with post hoc analysis (Bonferroni’s multiple comparison test) at $\alpha = 0.05$.

**Overall design for HNV study.** The purpose of the HNV study was to determine the virucidal activity of various hand hygiene regimens against HNV. Because routine culture and infectivity assays of HNV are not possible, HNV surrogates are routinely used to evaluate the virucidal activity of disinfectants and antiseptics. MNV, which is a suitable surrogate for HNV (45), was used in this study. A modification of ASTM International E2011-09 method for evaluating hygienic hand wash formulations for virus-eliminating activity using the entire hand was utilized in this study. The modification involved the use of the glove rinsate sampling method and a randomized cross-over design. A total of six participants completed testing on all of the products.

**Virus inoculum.** Strain MNV-G (Yale University, New Haven, CT) was confirmed by direct serial dilution and inoculation onto host cells. Virus stocks were stored in an ultracold freezer ($\leq -60°C$). Frozen viral stocks were thawed on the day of test. The
titer of the stock virus was at least $1 \times 10^7$ TCID_{50} (median tissue culture infective dose) per ml. The organic soil concentration was adjusted to at least 5% fetal bovine serum of the volume of the viral suspension.

Hand contamination procedures. Before viral contamination, participants washed their hands with nonmedicated soap for 1 min, rinsed their hands, and dried their hands with sterile paper towels. Each participant’s hands were then submerged to the wrists in a solution of 70% EtOH for 10 s. The solution was distributed over the entire front and back surfaces of the hands up to the wrists for 90 s and allowed to air dry until evaporation was complete. The alcohol submersion procedure was then repeated. The participants’ hands were rinsed with approximately 200 ml of deionized water and dried with an air blower. After their hands were dry, participants waited at least 20 min until the next round of viral contamination and treatment. Each participant’s hands were contaminated with 1.5 ml of MNV. The virus was rubbed over the entire surface of both hands for 90 s, not reaching above the wrists. The hands were dried for approximately 90 s. For the baseline control, samples for virus recovery were collected immediately after drying. A decontamination procedure was completed after the baseline sample collection, and a randomly assigned product regimen was applied. The decontamination procedure was repeated after all subsequent treatment rounds. Samples were collected from the participants’ hands, and the required controls were evaluated for the amount of MNV capable of replicating in cell culture.

Elution of virus. Within 5 min after each treatment regimen, loose-fitting powder-free sterile latex gloves were placed on each participant’s hands, and 40 ml of recovery medium was transferred into each glove. After a 60-s massage of the hands through the gloves, the rinseate was transferred from the glove to a sterile tube, vortexed, and serially diluted in cell culture medium. Appropriate dilutions were inoculated onto the host cell culture (RAW 264.7, ATCC TIB-71) and absorbed for 20 to 30 h at 36 ± 2°C with 5% ± 1% CO_{2}. The cultures were incubated for another 3 to 6 days at 36 ± 2°C with 5% ± 1% CO_{2} to allow for the development of viral infection.

Calculation of virus titer and reduction. The host cells were examined microscopically for the presence of infectious virions. The resulting virus-specific cytopathic effects (CPE) and test agent–specific cytotoxic effects were scored by examining both test samples and controls. The presence of residual infectious virions was scored based on virus-induced CPE. The TCID_{50} per milliliter was determined using the Spearman-Karber method (22).

When a sample contained no detectable virus, a statistical analysis was performed based on the Poisson distribution (20) to determine the theoretical maximum possible titer for that sample. The log viral reduction value was calculated by subtracting the log virus units of the treatment regimen samples from the log baseline units. Descriptive statistics and confidence intervals were calculated ($\alpha = 0.05$). Statistical calculations of means and standard deviations were generated on the log recovery data from baseline samples, post–product application samples, and the log differences between baseline and post–product application samples. Test configuration comparisons were made using a one-way analysis of variance with post hoc analysis (Bonferroni’s multiple comparison test) at $\alpha = 0.05$.

RESULTS

Reduction in microbial contamination of moderately soiled hands. Reductions of E. coli on moderately soiled hands (chicken broth) ranged from 3.10 log CFU/ml for the nonantimicrobial hand wash to 5.22 log CFU/ml for thewash-sanitize regimen with the 0.5% chloroxylenol (PCMX) hand wash and the 70% EtOH AF gel (Table 3). Although the differences were not significant, the PCMX hand wash achieved higher log reductions than did the nonantimicrobial hand wash for all regimens tested. Regimens including the 70% EtOH AF gel were superior to all other configurations ($P < 0.001$). The reductions for the majority of subjects were at the limit of detection (complete kill) for both regimens that included the 70% EtOH AF gel; therefore, these reductions may actually be underestimated. Overall, the wash-sanitize regimen was significantly superior to hand washing alone with one exception. The PCMX hand wash alone was equivalent in efficacy to the nonantimicrobial hand wash followed by the 62% EtOH foam.

Reduction in microbial contamination of heavily soiled hands. The four product configurations tested under conditions of heavy soil load produced E. coli log reductions ranging from 3.97 to 4.60 log CFU/ml (Table 4). The antimicrobial agent in the hand washing product did not impact efficacy of the regimen; the reductions produced by the same sanitizer used in combination with the 0.3% triclosan hand wash or the PCMX hand wash were equivalent. However, the choice of sanitizer did have a significant impact on efficacy. All configurations that included the 70% EtOH AF gel were superior in

### Table 3. E. coli recovery and reductions in the presence of moderate food soil load

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application procedure</th>
<th>Test products</th>
<th>Mean ± SD E. coli (log CFU/ml)</th>
<th>Statistical analysis*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wash</td>
<td>Nonantimicrobial hand wash</td>
<td>8.58 ± 0.46</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wash</td>
<td>PCMX hand wash</td>
<td>8.62 ± 0.65</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wash-sanitize</td>
<td>Nonantimicrobial hand wash + 62% EtOH foam</td>
<td>8.32 ± 0.64</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wash-sanitize</td>
<td>PCMX hand wash + 62% EtOH foam</td>
<td>8.25 ± 0.45</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wash-sanitize</td>
<td>Nonantimicrobial hand wash + 70% EtOH AF gel</td>
<td>8.49 ± 0.42</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wash-sanitize</td>
<td>PCMX hand wash + 70% EtOH AF gel</td>
<td>8.57 ± 0.53</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Configurations with the same letter are statistically equivalent, and configurations with different letters are statistically different, with each letter increase (a through z) indicating that a configuration had a significantly higher log reduction.
performance to configurations that included the 62% EtOH foam ($P < 0.05$).

**Inactivation of MNV on soiled hands.** A third study was conducted to evaluate four hand hygiene configurations against MNV, a surrogate for HNV. Hand washing with the nonantimicrobial hand wash was minimally effective against MNV, producing a $<$2-log reduction (Table 5). Sanitizing with the 70% EtOH AF gel was significantly more effective than hand washing for reducing MNV ($P < 0.01$). Using a wash-sanitize regimen was more effective than either hand washing or sanitizing alone ($P < 0.05$). The SaniTwice method with the 70% EtOH AF gel was the most effective regimen, achieving a $>$4-log reduction of MNV ($P < 0.01$).

**DISCUSSION**

Previous findings suggest that hand hygiene regimens reduce the risk of transmission of pathogens from the contaminated hands of food service workers to food (10, 29, 30). The findings from our studies support and extend those from previous studies by demonstrating that hand hygiene regimens can be effective even in the presence of high organic loads and against nonenveloped viruses such as HNV.

These studies further demonstrate the improved effectiveness of wash-sanitize regimens over hand washing or sanitizing alone. In the presence of moderate food soil, the combination of the 70% EtOH AF gel with either a nonantimicrobial hand wash or an antimicrobial hand washing product each achieved $>$5-log reductions of *E. coli*. In contrast, hand washing achieved only a $<$3.6-log reduction. In the presence of heavy food soil, the use of 70% EtOH AF gel after the antimicrobial foam hand washing product in two different configurations achieved a 4.51-log reduction and a 4.60-log reduction, respectively. In the HNV study, hand washing alone produced a $<$2-log reduction. When used as part of a wash-sanitize regimen that included the 70% EtOH AF gel a 3.19-log reduction was achieved. These findings demonstrate that the addition of a high-efficacy sanitizer to a hand washing regimen results in a greater reduction of microorganisms. This finding is consistent with those of others, who reported that the primary factor influencing final microorganism levels on the hands is sanitizer use (30).

The current FDA Food Code (42) allows use of ABHRs only on hands that have been cleaned according to the recommended hand washing protocol. The Food Code (section 2-301.16) also severely restricts hand sanitizers by allowing their use only after a proper hand washing or where no direct contact with food occurs. The SaniTwice regimen has previously been shown to be an effective means for the reduction of bacteria on the hands when soap and water are unavailable. In the MNV study, use of the SaniTwice protocol with the 70% EtOH AF gel achieved a $>$4-log ($>$99.99%) reduction of MNV and was the most effective regimen tested. This combination is significantly more effective than hand washing or sanitizing alone and more effective than a wash-sanitize regimen. Therefore, these data indicate that the SaniTwice regimen is an effective method for significantly reducing bacteria and nonenveloped viruses.

In the studies presented here, the configurations that included the 70% EtOH AF gel consistently provided superior performance. These findings are consistent with previous findings that the in vivo activity of ABHRs is not solely dependent upon alcohol concentration (12, 24, 28). In a previous study, the 70% EtOH AF gel provided significantly greater HNV reduction than did other hand hygiene products that contained $>$85% ethanol (24).

**TABLE 4. E. coli recovery and reductions in the presence of heavy food soil load**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application procedure</th>
<th>Test products</th>
<th>Mean $\pm$ SD E. coli (log CFU/ml)</th>
<th>Statistical analysis$^a$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wash-sanitize</td>
<td>PCMX hand wash + 62% EtOH foam</td>
<td>7.50 $\pm$ 0.19</td>
<td>4.11 $\pm$ 0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wash-sanitize</td>
<td>Triclosan hand wash + 62% EtOH foam</td>
<td>7.54 $\pm$ 0.18</td>
<td>3.97 $\pm$ 0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wash-sanitize</td>
<td>PCMX hand wash + 70% EtOH AF gel</td>
<td>7.53 $\pm$ 0.19</td>
<td>4.60 $\pm$ 0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wash-sanitize</td>
<td>Triclosan hand wash + 70% EtOH AF gel</td>
<td>7.46 $\pm$ 0.19</td>
<td>4.51 $\pm$ 0.43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^a$ Configurations with the same letter are statistically equivalent, and configurations with different letters are statistically different, with each letter increase (b through d) indicating that a configuration had a significantly higher log reduction.

**TABLE 5. MNV recovery and reductions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application procedure</th>
<th>Test products</th>
<th>Mean $\pm$ SD MNV (log TCID$_{50}$/ml)</th>
<th>Statistical analysis$^a$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wash</td>
<td>Nonantimicrobial hand wash</td>
<td>6.98 $\pm$ 0.20</td>
<td>1.79 $\pm$ 0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanitize</td>
<td>70% EtOH AF gel</td>
<td>2.60 $\pm$ 0.41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wash-sanitize</td>
<td>Nonantimicrobial hand wash + 70% EtOH AF gel</td>
<td>3.19 $\pm$ 0.31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SaniTwice</td>
<td>70% EtOH AF gel</td>
<td>4.04 $\pm$ 0.33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^a$ Configurations with the same letter are statistically equivalent, and configurations with different letters are statistically different, with each letter increase (b through d) indicating that a configuration had a significantly higher log reduction.
Similarly, an earlier version of the 70% EtOH AF gel was more effective than hand hygiene products containing 95% ethanol and 75% isopropanol (28). Liu et al. (24) suggested that the additional ingredients in these novel ABHRs (a synergistic blend of polyquaternium polymer and organic acid) may work with the ethanol to denature the viral capsid protein. These comparisons demonstrate the importance of formulation in product efficacy.

As illustrated in the E. coli study with heavy food soil, the lower log reductions produced by the regimen including the PCMX hand wash with the 70% EtOH AF gel reflects the fact that the raw hamburger was a greater challenge than was the moderate soil (chicken broth). Despite this challenge, use of the 70% EtOH AF gel as part of the hand hygiene regimen probably would provide increased protection against the transmission of foodborne illness because it produced at least 0.5-log greater reductions than did washes paired with a typical hand sanitizer. A wash-sanitize regimen including a high-efficacy formulation should be used in high-risk environments in which uncooked meat is handled in the same vicinity as ready-to-eat foods.

A limitation of our study was that a surrogate virus, MNV, was utilized. Although MNV has been extensively studied and is considered an acceptable surrogate for HNV, the results obtained with this virus may not be an exact reflection of the actual efficacy of these products against various HNV strains. Future efforts should focus on developing routine and repeatable culture-based methods to quantify infectious HNV. Currently, clinical studies should focus on improving hand hygiene compliance by food handlers and on determining the effectiveness of hand hygiene regimens in food service settings.

This series of studies reveals that wash-sanitize regimens, particularly those including a well-formulated ABHR, can be highly efficacious, even in the presence of high organic loads and against HNV. Consequently, the inclusion of such formulations as part of a hand hygiene regimen could be a primary intervention for reducing the risk of infection transmission in food service facilities.
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