Dry Hydrogen Peroxide: A Novel Solution for Providing the Best Environment for Higher Education

Denise Graham, Synexis Infection Consultant
Christopher Lee, MPH
Helen Boehm-Johnson, MD

Executive Summary

Infections in institutes of higher education have a broad-reaching impact on students, educators, and the community at large. Students suffering from infections, ranging from the common cold to gastroenteritis, can miss critical days of learning and potentially spread infection to their fellow students, staff, and members of the local community. Infection transmission is of particular concern on campuses with residential facilities (i.e. dormitories). The close physical contact and variable hygiene inevitable in these shared living spaces, especially for students who have recently transitioned from family to independent living, can place students at increased risk.[1]

Studies show that reducing the number of "bugs" or microbes (e.g. bacteria, viruses, and molds) living in an environment, lessens the risk of infections and can reduce troublesome allergic symptoms.[2-3] And while attempts have been made to reduce these numbers through improved manual cleaning and disinfection initiatives, research conducted in the healthcare setting shows that they can be costly and just do not get the job done well.

An innovative technology has emerged to support and enhance environmental cleaning and disinfection efforts in schools. Synexis®, dry hydrogen peroxide (DHP™) technology is a microbial reduction system that provides a continuous and effective mechanism for reducing microbes and disease-carrying pests in the air and on surfaces.[4-5] DHP™ has a 14-year history of effectively reducing environmental microbes in a wide range of settings from farms to food processing facilities, and is now being used in a number of large healthcare systems and educational institutions across the country.

This technology, which invisibly delivers a gas composed of dry hydrogen molecules generated from a room's ambient humidity and oxygen, is fully automated so there is no need to train staff and no impact on school operations. Further, it provides continued microbial reduction, regardless of whether or not students and staff are present. This is in stark contrast to other "no-touch" methods, which can only be used for disinfection when buildings are vacant.

From the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) to the American College Health Association and any of a number of government, accrediting, and professional organizations, the consensus is clear: reducing environmental pathogens—or microbes that cause infection—is an important step towards reducing acquiring an infection.

Introduction

There are multiple infection prevention and control challenges associated with the higher education setting, many of which have been highlighted by the COVID-19 pandemic. In addition to living in what are often "tight quarters," many campuses have older residential and classroom facilities with suboptimal ventilation and engineering controls which have been associated with increased rates of respiratory infections.[6-7] Further, in many of these settings, students eat in communal spaces and attend large lectures with hundreds of other students, both of which offer ample opportunities for infection to be spread from one individual to another.[7]

In other words, as stated by Kumar et al, college campuses can be "fertile ground for the spread of communicable diseases."[8]

Allergic disease, ranging from "hay-fever" symptoms to allergic asthma, is another major culprit for illness in higher education. It has also been associated with diminished quality of life, self-esteem, and academic performance among college students.[9]

The CDC has issued guidance for institutions of higher education designed to help reduce the spread of infection, including recommendations on routine environmental cleaning and disinfection. The EPA provides further guidance on maintaining a healthy physical environment in educational settings, including "practicing effective cleaning and maintenance, preventing mold and moisture, reducing chemical and contaminant exposures, ensuring good ventilation, and preventing pests and reducing pesticide exposure." Yet many interventions designed to address environmental hazards, such as electrostatic spraying or UV-C irradiation, can only be used when lecture halls and other spaces are vacant, and therefore can't address the ongoing contamination (e.g. sneezing onto shared surfaces or coughing in confined spaces) that inevitably occurs when students are present. Environmental solutions that can provide continuous reduction of pathogens, pests, and smells when students and staff are present offer an opportunity to enhance a school's environmental cleaning and disinfection efforts.

Environmental Hazards in the Higher Education Setting

To best understand how environmental hazards such as infectious microbes, allergy-inducing molds, or toxic chemicals on college and university campuses can be addressed, it is helpful to understand what they are and how they can potentially impact education settings.

Pathogens in Schools: common culprits for illness on campus

The most obvious hazards for illness on campuses are microbes which are likely to cause human disease and infection (also known as pathogens), particularly in those with chronic illness or immune system problems. Microbes such as bacteria, viruses, and fungi (including molds) can pose potential risks to students and staff alike as well as the overall educational environment.

An often overlooked fact is that many of these pathogens can survive for hours to weeks in the environment if conditions are right. Examples of common campus pathogens include:

Bacteria: Methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus*, or MRSA, is perhaps one of the most well-known bacteria associated with transmission in education settings. Most often, MRSA can cause skin infections, some of which can be difficult to treat. According to the CDC, MRSA can survive for hours to weeks on surfaces ranging from towels to gym equipment, allowing for spread when students or staff come in contact with these items. And contamination with MRSA can be widespread. In one study, Montgomery et al detected MRSA on nearly half (46%) of the 90 surfaces tested in athletic facilities among ten different schools while, in another study, Champion et al found 35% of 223 athletes from 9 different sports at a Division I university to be positive for MRSA.[10-11]

Molds: Molds are a type of fungus that can contaminate facilities through inadequate maintenance and housekeeping, water spills, inadequate humidity control, or condensation. They can also be brought into the building by occupants or contaminated air. Molds are notorious for causing allergies and, in some cases, infection. People sensitive to molds can experience symptoms ranging from nasal and sinus irritation/congestion to dry hacking cough and skin rashes while those with severe allergies to molds may suffer from more serious reactions such as wheezing or shortness of breath. Molds can also trigger asthma attacks and studies have shown that campuses with mold problems are much more likely to have higher school absenteeism.[12]

Viruses: Viruses responsible for respiratory and gastrointestinal (GI) infections are commonly spread throughout education settings. Rhinoviruses and human parainfluenza viruses are examples of viruses responsible for the "common cold" and can be spread through the air via larger respiratory droplets or smaller aerosols released when a person coughs, sneezes, or breathes. Droplets can also fall to surfaces where the virus can survive and then be spread to another individual who touches the surface and then touches their eyes, nose, or mouth. This surface contact can also lead to spread of GI viruses such as norovirus or rotavirus, both of which can "live" on surfaces for extended periods of time.

One of the most problematic viruses in colleges is the flu which, on average, causes 8 days or more of illness in affected college students—a historically under-vaccinated population—and is a leading impediment to academic performance.[13] Not only can the flu virus "live" on surfaces for up to 2 days, but it can also circulate in the air in doses

large enough to cause infection. In a recent study, Coleman and Sigler identified infectious doses of airborne influenza A virus in multiple locations throughout a campus up to four hours after students had vacated those locations, demonstrating that the risk of airborne spread isn't limited to when students are present.[14]

The most infamous virus today is SARS-CoV-2, the virus which causes COVID-19. SARS-CoV-2 has had devastating financial, operational, psychological, and public health impacts that will continue to be felt for years to come. Because it is so highly contagious and so widespread throughout communities, schools must now carefully consider and implement a comprehensive approach to maintaining a clean environment. COVID-19 can be spread via environmental surfaces, human hands, respiratory droplets, and airborne aerosols and outbreaks have been observed in education settings when air circulation/purification is not optimized and when mitigation strategies (e.g. masks, social distancing) are not used.

Importantly, many of these pathogens, including SARS-CoV-2, can be transmitted by students and staff with or without visible symptoms (i.e. those either asymptomatically or pre-symptomatically infected), which can create a truly invisible risk to schools and their communities.

Toxic Chemicals: Volatile Organic Compounds

Volatile organic compounds, or VOCs, are another environmental hazard that can be found lurking on campuses. VOCs are a large group of chemicals that are widely present in the indoor environment, including in education settings. They can be found in literally thousands of products including the paint on ceilings and walls, craft or hobby supplies, furniture, cleaning products, and printers/copy machines among others. When they are inside a building, the chemicals are released as a gas into the indoor air we breathe. Importantly, they may or may not be able to be smelled, and smelling is not a good indicator of health risk.

And, according to the EPA, the health risks associated with some VOCs are significant. They warn that these can include eye, nose and throat irritation, headaches, loss of coordination, nausea, damage to liver, kidney and the central nervous system. Additionally, some organics can cause cancer in animals and some are suspected or known to cause cancer in humans. Further, the EPA cautions that while people are using VOCs, they can expose themselves and others to very high pollutant levels, and elevated concentrations can remain in the air long after the activity (e.g. painting) is completed. Accordingly, the EPA advises minimizing the presence of VOCs in the environment, especially for young children and people with asthma, to decrease these potential impacts.

DHP: A Different Approach

The Synexis® DHP™ technology continuously uses dry hydrogen peroxide (DHP™) to reduce levels of harmful bacteria and viruses, fungi, and mold in occupied spaces. The system is also highly effective in eradicating insects; it has been proven in studies to kill bed bugs, lice, fleas, and cockroaches, another potential source of germs and infection. Finally, it is an effective strategy for reducing exposure to VOCs.

So how does it work? The system produces a dry gas, rather than an aqueous vapor, by catalytically converting ambient humidity and oxygen into Dry Hydrogen Peroxide. Whether through a unit installed in an HVAC system or a standalone unit, the DHP gas diffuses invisibly and continuously through the air.

Microbes require water to survive and have electrostatically charged points on their cell surfaces that are designed to attract water molecules. Because DHP™ (H_20_2) molecules are very similar to water (H_20) molecules, they are attracted to these charged points, attacking the microbes, disrupting their cell membranes, and incapacitating them.

In essence, DHP™ cleans every part of the room that air touches – including hard and soft surfaces, floors, walls, windows, doors, and ceilings. And because DHP™ units run continuously, there is less chance for cross-contamination and re-contamination of surfaces.

DHP and SARS-CoV-2

On October 5, 2020, the CDC updated their guidelines to acknowledge the likelihood for airborne spread of SARS-CoV-2, meaning that small virus-containing droplets or particles lingering in the air can infect people who are further than 6 feet away from the person who is infected or after that person has left the space. This position was supported by the investigation of COVID-19 cases spreading between people with no direct or indirect contact, suggesting that airborne transmission was the most likely route.[14] In March of 2021, the CDC went one step further in publishing updated ventilation recommendations designed to help improve air flow and to generate clean-to-less-clean air flow within buildings—all with the goal of reducing the concentration of viral particles indoors.

In an effort to similarly reduce the concentration of SARS-CoV-2 viral particles on surfaces, the CDC has also issued guidance on environmental cleaning and disinfection across a spectrum of settings, ranging from healthcare facilities to schools. This guidance includes use of disinfectants that meet the EPA's criteria for use against SARS-CoV-2.

The EPA states that products approved to make claims against the enveloped virus SARS-CoV-2 must have demonstrated efficacy against harder-to-kill viruses.[16] Specifically, "If an antimicrobial product can kill a small, non-enveloped virus, it should be able to kill any large, non-enveloped virus or any enveloped virus. Similarly, a product that can kill a large, non-enveloped virus should be able to kill any enveloped virus."

DHP has not only demonstrated a reduction in viral load of small, non-enveloped viruses in a number of studies, but also in reducing viral load of a gammacoronavirus, another member of the Coronavirus family.

Conclusion

Unlike any of the other available "no-touch" technologies available today, the Synexis® DHP™ system offers a game-changing capability for the ongoing mitigation of microbial threats – even in occupied spaces and hard-to-reach areas throughout a campus. Operating invisibly around the clock, this innovative, patented technology produces a gas that drastically reduces microbial bioburden without adding to the workload of an already over-taxed cleaning staff.

Since the discovery of hydrogen peroxide in the early 1800s, reams of research have demonstrated it to be a potent disinfectant. Other technologies focus on treating either just the air or just surfaces. Synexis® offers this well-established compound in a different vehicle – a near ideal gas that, by continuously diffusing low levels of DHP throughout all areas of a treated space, can achieve microbial reduction both in air and on surfaces. DHP concentration is far lower than the concentration of hydrogen peroxide in an aqueous droplet (over 1 billion molecules per cubic micron for just a 3% solution), lower than the OSHA workplace safety limit (1 ppm Time Weighted Average over a 40 hour work week), lower than the continuous exposure safety limit (238 ppb Time Weighted Average), and even lower than the equilibrium concentration of hydrogen peroxide maintained in our airways, lungs, and tears by the lactoperoxidase enzyme system (10-6 Molar, or 602 molecules per cubic micron).

From lecture halls to dining facilities, where students go, so do viruses and bacteria. And a space that's "just been cleaned" is no match for the hotbed of microbes being shared continuously. But DHP is. The DHP™-producing biodefense system continuously attacks microbes in the air and on surfaces. We fight viruses, bacteria, and odors without ever making students leave a lecture hall or pick up the dirty laundry from their dorm room floor. Let us help you in your efforts to keep your campuses open and your classrooms filled.

References:

1. Miko BA, Cohen B, Haxall K, Conway L, Kelly N, Stare D, Tropiano C, Gilman A, Seward SL Jr, Larson E. Personal and household hygiene, environmental contamination, and health in undergraduate residence halls in New York City, 2011. PLoS One. 2013 Nov 27;8(11):e81460. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0081460. PMID: 24312303; PMCID: PMC3842277
2. Rutala WA, Weber DJ. Best practices for disinfection of noncritical environmental surfaces and equipment in health care facilities: A bundle approach. Am J Infect Control. 2019;47:A96-A105.
3. Asthma and Allergy Foundation of America. Allergies: mold allergy. https://www.aafa.org/mold-allergy/. Accessed 5 January 2021.
4. Herman CK, Hess J, Cerra C. Dilute hydrogen peroxide technology for reduction of microbial colonization in the hospital setting. Am J Infect Control. 43(6):S25-S26
5. Ramirez M, Matheu L, Gomez M, Chang A, Ferrolino J, Mack R, Antillon-Klussmann F, Melgar M. Effectiveness of dry hydrogen peroxide on reducing environmental microbial bioburden risk in a pediatric oncology intensive care unit. Am J Infect Control. 2020 Aug 20:S0196-6553(20)30810-5 https://www.acha.org/documents/resources/guidelines/ACHA_Considerations_for_Reopening_IHEs_for_Spring_2021.pdf
6. Sun Y, Wang Z, Zhang Y, Sundell J. In China, students in crowded dormitories with a low ventilation rate have more common colds: evidence for airborne transmission. PLoS ONE. 2011;6(11):e27140
7. Costo D, Muoio D. College campus outbreaks require timely, effective public health measures. Infectious Disease News; 2015. https://www.healio.com/news/infectious-disease/20151217/college-campus-outbreaks-require-timely-effective-public-health-measures
8. Kumar A, Murray DL, Havlichek DH. Immunizations for the college student: a campus perspective of an outbreak and national and international considerations. Pediatr Clin North Am. 2005 Feb;52(1):229-41, xi. doi: 10.1016/j.pcl.2004.10.009. PMID: 15748933.
9. Collins KP, Weiss-Randall DN, Henry NR. Managing asthma on the college campus: findings of a Texas pilot study. Respir Care 2015; 60(8): 1085-1090. doi: 10.4187/respcare.03877
10. Montgomery K, Ryan TJ, Krause A, Starkey C. Assessment of athletic health care facility surfaces for MRSA in the secondary school setting. J Environ Health. 2010;72(6):8-11.
11. Champion AE, Goodwin TA, Brolinson PG, Werre SR, Prater MR, Inzana TJ. Prevalence and characterization of methicillin-resistant Staphylococcus aureus isolates from healthy university student athletes. Ann Clin Microbiol Antimicrob. 2014;13:33. Published 2014 Aug 2. doi:10.1186/s12941-014-0033-5
12. Simons E, Hwang SA, Fitzgerald EF, Kielb C, Lin S. The impact of school building conditions on student absenteeism in Upstate New York. Am J Public Health. 2010;100(9):1679-1686. doi:10.2105/AJPH.2009.165324

13. Nichol KL, Tummers K, Hoyer-Leitzel A, Marsh J, Moynihan M, McKelvey S. Modeling seasonal influenza outbreak in a closed college campus: impact of pre-season vaccination, in-season vaccination and holidays/breaks. PLoS One. 2010;5(3):e9548. Published 2010 Mar 4. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0009548
14. Coleman, K.K., Sigler, W.V. Airborne Influenza A Virus Exposure in an Elementary School. Sci Rep 10, 1859 (2020). https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-020-58588-1
15. The Lancet Respiratory Medicine. COVID-19 transmission-up in the air. Lancet Respir Med. 2020 Dec;8(12):1159. doi: 10.1016/S2213-2600(20)30514-2. Epub 2020 Oct 29. PMID: 33129420; PMCID: PMC7598535.
16. Environmental Protection Agency. Disinfectant Use and COVID-19. https://www.epa.gov/coronavirus/disinfectant-use-and-coronavirus-covid-19